



## **Project MedStrategy**

*Integrated strategy for sustainable development of  
Mediterranean rural areas*

Reference number: 2G-MED09-282

## **Third transnational meeting**

27th - 29th June 2011

Peza – Crete

Minutes of the meeting



HELLENIC REPUBLIC  
REGION OF CRETE  
PREFECTURE OF HERAKLION  
MUNICIPALITY "N. KAZANTZAKIS"





## Monday, 27<sup>th</sup> June

### Participants

PP1 "Tindari – Nebrodi" Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Laura COBELLO Despoina KARNIADAKI Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP2 ANCI Sicilia (Italy)	Luisa PIRAINO
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Roussos KIPRIOTAKIS Charicleia PARASKEVA
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eirini KARAKATSANI Dimitris PAPASTEFANAKIS
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Esther GARCIA SORIANO
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Lawrence ATTARD Joe BRINCAT Alfred MAZZITELLI
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO Kostas PATLITZIANAS
Guest	Benetos SPYROU

### Welcome

The third transnational meeting of the project was opened by Carlo Simonetti (Lead partner), who gave the welcome to all participants and in particular to the representatives of Archanon-Asterousion Municipality which guests the meeting. Mr. Simonetti reminded the main aims of the MedStrategy project and in particular the proposal of a new methodology of governance through the implementation of a participation process. After this meeting, which closes the diagnosis phase, a second phase will start, which is much more difficult of the first part mainly addressed to the diagnosis of the involved territories, i.e. the planning phase. The meeting will have the main aim of analysing difficulties, problems and positive aspects of the first phase and planning the second phase of the project.

Mr. Kipriotakis, Mayor of Archanon-Asterousion Municipality, welcomed the partners of the project thanking them for being present in Crete. Mr. Kipriotakis then briefly described the municipality being born about one year ago according to new Greek laws. He also underlined how the particular conditions in the Greek economy make more and more important the economic development of rural areas (which is also one of the main contents in the MedStrategy project).



Mr. Spyrou, Mayor of Lipsi island, one of the Municipalities involved in the Observatory for Greece, thanked the organisers to be invited at the meeting. His Municipality is actively cooperating with Archanon-Asterousion Municipality for the economic progress of their territories. The Lipsi Municipality also works on development methodologies and their experience will be presented during the meeting as a case-study to reflect on.

Mr. Simonetti, then reminded the main objectives of the project and introduced the next part of the meeting, i.e. the presentation by each region of the results of the territorial analysis, through a short description of the quantitative and qualitative results and a more detailed one on the positive aspects, the problems encountered and the strengths of the applied methodology.

### **C3 - Territories and institutions: diagnosis and ex-ante evaluation.**

#### **Ph1 Integrated territorial analysis**

(see attached presentations)

For PP1 Mrs. Rubino, external expert of the Intermunicipal Consortium of Tindari-Nebrodi, presented the results and considerations on the **territory of Tindari-Nebrodi**, and in particular:

- the structure of the report on territorial analysis;
- the main results obtained from indicators calculation;
- problems encountered in applying the proposed methodology.

As regards the structure of the report, it is composed following the structure suggested in the guidelines for the implementation of this phase.

The sheets used for the description of the indicators consider the format already proposed in the above mentioned guidelines: the first part is the "Indicator description and calculation method", the second part describes the "desirable environmental objective", in the third part, titled "Evidence found", the results obtained from the indicators calculation are described.

At the end of the description of the indicators a synthetic table gives information on each indicator about its macro-objectives, its classification according to the DPSIR model, data sources, territorial coverage, time period, time trend, criticalities, presence or absence of actions realised by public administration or private sector.

PP1 then presented some of the main results obtained from the indicators calculation and concerning the territory of the 16 Municipalities which are included in the Consorzio Tindari-Nebrodi (*see attached presentation for details*).

As concerns the problems encountered in applying the proposed methodology if we have a look at the participation process (C4-Ph1):



- the number of indicators so far calculated and the collected data enabled to define a comprehensive analytical framework of the analysed territorial context. So the results obtained from the indicators calculation could be considered sufficient to open the participation process;
- the analysis document so far produced could be integrated with the gathering of specific data selected in relation to the specific issue that each country wants to focus on during the Local Pilot Operative Plan phase.

If instead we look at the connection with the definition of the guidelines for the drawing up of the "Integrated Strategic Plan for the Sustainable Development in Mediterranean rural Areas" (C5-Ph3):

- difficulties were met in gathering the data required for the calculation of some indicators, therefore a reduction of the number of "prior indicators" was necessary;
- a selection of "close examination indicators" has to be done in relation to the specific issue that each country wants to focus on when drawing its Local Pilot Operative Plan.

All that means that the choice of the specific issue should be carried out simultaneously with the project start-up.

Mr. Simonetti underlined that the last consideration is very important because we can decide that, in the methodology we will propose at the end of the project, we may have to reduce the key indicators and include a list of core indicators more connected to the sector of territorial development the Municipality has to choose since the beginning of the process.

For PP5 Mrs. Garcia Soriano presented the territorial analysis of **Comarca Comunidad de Teruel**. She gave a description of the main results obtained for population trends and settlement, natural and historic artistic patrimony, economic activities, labour market, details on evolution of agricultural, industrial, construction and service economic sectors (*see attached presentation for details*).

As concerns the problems encountered in calculating the indicators, she specified that:

- sometimes indicators are enunciated ambiguously, i.e. they are subject to interpretation;
- in all cases, indicators should be expressed in terms that make possible the comparison with other territories;
- all indicators should be comparable themselves and it would be desirable the comparison with a reference territory too;
- there are very important variables which do not correspond to any indicator (e.g. ADSL range, number of internet connections, etc.).

Moreover the process of information compilation is very costly and it does not result always in important conclusions. It is therefore maybe necessary to simplify the list



of indicators and to do this it is advisable to consider the relevance of each one in relation with variables to be analysed. In other words it would be necessary to define some "key indicators" able to describe every variable and sustainable development dimension efficiently.

Mrs. Karakatsani (PP4) presented the results of the territorial analysis concerning **Archanon-Asterousion Municipality in Crete** (see attached presentation for details) through the synthetic table of indicators, maps and tables.

As concerns the problems encountered during the analysis, she underlined how:

- the change in the administration level in Greece gave birth to problems with gathering the data. The report then refers to the entire territory of Crete or sometimes even Greece: rarely it was possible to have data at a Municipal level;
- in general, statistical data were scarce also for Crete and the ones coming from the Hellenistic Statistical Authority resulted from the general population census of 2001;
- because of the fact that the pilot area is not very touristic and is quite small, it was not the object of many studies in the past: desk analysis was therefore also difficult.

Both PP4 (CRES) and PP3 (Municipality Archanon-Asterousion) agreed that the next months a further research of local data should be carried out and a review of the territorial analysis will be produced.

PP6 (Pembroke-Malta), as concerns territorial analysis of **Pembroke Municipality**, was not able to present the results as problems arose in the agreements to be signed between external experts and the Pembroke Local Council. Maltese partner was therefore still not able to complete this project's phase. It was agreed with the project coordinator that their territorial analysis should be ended for the end of August.

### **C3 - Territories and institutions: diagnosis and ex-ante evaluation.**

#### **Ph2 Analysis of institutional framework**

(see attached presentations)

Mr. Simonetti introduced the component, reminding to the partners, that Institutional Analysis was supposed to be an application of the methodology presented by Mr. Attard (PP6) during the transnational meeting in Malta. The methodology proposed in Malta included two phases:

1. the first one was the separation of the *governance* levels and also the possibility of involving local actors at each level in the participation process,
2. the second phase distinguishes different systems of governance: centralised systems, decentralised systems and mixed systems.



The first hypothesis presented in Malta by Mr. Attard, foresaw a system with the analysis of physical world, community and rules. The *leif-motiv* was the evaluation criteria for actors, actions and situation and for their interaction based on efficiency, equity, accountability and adaptability. In this methodology, it is also important to understand the relationship between institutional performance and policy outcomes. Finally the methodology, called IAD frameworks, gives some "good governance principles" (see attached presentation for details).

As a matter of fact, for this phase, a clear and useful methodology does not exist. The goal was therefore to develop the first hypothesis of Mr. Attard. PP1 then decided to make a proposal grouping the "good governance principles" in Thematic Areas, as described in the power point presentation: planning, activities oriented to define actions or policies of Territorial Sustainable Development, Management of Urban Centres, Activities oriented to define actions or policies of Local Sustainable Development. The necessary information was gathered through a data collection sheet which was sent to all the Municipalities.

The indicators grouped in the four thematic areas can then be interpreted through four interpretation keys:

- the capacity to cooperate with the different levels of government for the territorial management;
- the ability of the local authorities to foster growth and innovation in a competent, efficient and effective manner;
- the capacity of the local authorities to develop policies, programs and government actions oriented at sustainable development;
- the capacity of the local authorities to promote a shared vision of the sustainable development through the activation of participative processes.

This was the base from which it will be possible to build the SWOT analysis for the institutional systems.

Mr. Simonetti then presented the results of the institutional analysis developed for the **area of Tindari-Nebrodi** (see attached presentation for details).

Mrs. Gialitaki presented the first reflections of the institutional analysis for **Archanon-Asterousion Municipality and Crete**: the analysis was focused on the problems faced by the people in the municipal area and it is not complete as the first data were collected but still further work has to be done (see attached presentation for details).

Mrs. Garcia Soriano presented the first reflections of the institutional analysis for **Comarca Comunidad de Teruel**. She underlined in its presentation that in the case of Institutional Analysis it is very important to take into account the competences of each Administration's level. If indicators are only focused on the competences of the administration in question, without considering others in upper or inferior levels, the final results will be partial and not necessarily reliable (see attached presentation for details).



As concerns institutional analysis of **Pembroke Municipality**, PP6 was not able to present the results as problems arose in the agreements to be signed between external experts and the Pembroke Local Council. Maltese partner was therefore still not able to complete this project's phase.

It was agreed with the project coordinator that their institutional analysis together with the final version of the other institutional analyses should be ended by the middle of September.

Discussion on the institutional analysis phase among partners regarded the facts that:

- it would be interesting to examine the impact of programmes and actions on the personnel of the public administrations;
- as it was said for the territorial analysis, it should be interesting to examine the interactions between different decisional levels after deciding the sector to focus on;
- the analysis of competences will have to follow the same subdivision in sectors which was made for territorial analysis for analysing the competences of institutional staff;
- it is necessary a further homogenization among the analyses as from the presentations made by the partners it seems that there are some differences and this makes the comparison difficult;
- the institutional analysis could be enriched with the idea, suggested by Archanon Asteurosion Municipality's staff, of examining the internal organisation of the public administration focusing on the different institutional levels;
- it is absolutely necessary to respect the above mentioned deadline and close the phase as soon as possible;
- the project has to always keep in mind that it has to propose a model to be extended to other Mediterranean rural territories, and so the different sectors have to be considered.

The responsible of the phase, Pembroke Local Council (PP6), will produce a framework adaptable for all the different areas in order to improve the above mentioned homogenization. The scheme will be sent to partners before the end of July. Other conclusions and deadlines are reported at the end of the document.

#### **C4 - Participation component: Strategic Common Vision.**

##### **Ph2 Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements**

The responsible of the phase, Foundation for the Social Development (PP7), presented the organisation of the work done for developing the phase. The working plan was divided in two phases (*see attached presentation for details*):

1. From 01/03/2011 to 24/06/2011: search, analysis and selection of case studies.



2. From July 2011 onwards: use of case studies in forums and pilot projects and conclusions after the analysis and use of case studies.

PP7 will produce a report on success cases composed by:

- synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities;
- comparative experiences analysis;
- set of results evaluation indicators.

Case studies, as foreseen by the project, will be used during the next two components: they will be presented and discussed in the local Forums (C4 – Participation process) and will be used for determining the monitoring indicators for the pilot projects (C5).

A scheme for all the case studies was created in order to homogenize their presentation. Considerations on the use of case studies during the participation process will be included in the deliverables regarding the participation component part.

After this general introduction on the phase, Expert Board Members presented the case studies they selected. Mrs. Quilez firstly reminded the type of reference case studies the Expert Board Members searched for and analysed, i.e. the concepts on the base of which the case studies were selected (*see attached presentation for details*).

Mr. Patlitzianas, Mr. Attanasio and Mrs. Quilez then presented the following case studies:

1. "Energy Savings from Intelligent Metering and Behavioural Change of the Citizens of Amaroussion" of Municipality of Amaroussion – Attiki, Greece
2. "Floating Autonomous Environmental Friendly and Efficient Desalination Plant" of Iraklea Island – Cyclades, Greece
3. "Territorial Governance of Carnia: from the five-year development plan 2001-2006 to a new mountain plan", Italy
4. "Organisational Models for the Management of Public Services" of Emilia Romagna Region, Italy
5. "Creation of the political administrative figure 'Comarca' in the region of Aragon" of the Department of Territorial Policy Justice and Internal Affairs of the Government of Aragon, Spain
6. "Strategic Plan for Comarca Comunidad de Teruel" of the Comarca Comunidad de Teruel, Spain
7. "Department of Citizen Participation of the Government of Aragon" of Region of Aragon, Spain
8. "Spanish Programme for Sustainable Rural Development. Implementation of the Programme in Aragon" of the Department of Environment Government in Aragon, Spain
9. "Regional Map of Landscape" of the Department of Territorial Policy, Justice and Internal Affairs of the Government of Aragon, Spain



10. "Cooperation on Provincial Government University for Creation of ICT System for Voice Access to Cultural and Touristic Information about the Territory" of Computer Science & Systems Engineering Department University of Zaragoza, Spain

In addition to the case studies presented by the Expert Board Members, Mr. Spyrou (Mayor of Lipsi island) presented the case study of a governance system based on the experience of small islands (i.e. islands with less than 3.500 inhabitants). Its approach considers that it should not be always considered the tourism as the main source of economic development, as tourists are a population which shortly stops in a place and does not directly contribute to its development. The goal should be a 365 days-society, although he admitted that it is very difficult to convince the society that the tourism is not the only development alternative. Maybe it should be better to analyse the development starting from the under-development. The small islands in Greece are usually called 'desert islands' but they are not: they want to adopt a development model without imitating any other territorial reality. Separate interventions are needed to this direction.

He stated that the economic development in such small realities is for sure more expensive but it can be accomplished, especially as concerns sustainable development. It is however necessary to consider specific characteristics: first of all education, then territorial development plans, the launch of the traditional productions (for example the wine production), the concept that islands are autonomous communities having the claim of giving origin to autonomous societies, the valorisation of local "identities", the beginning of an 'alliance system' with the 3-4 other closest similar realities.

The discussion of the partners about the phase began with some observations on the data that the case studies scheme should include. More information about how each case study was financed, how it was managed and so on should be included in the scheme. Furthermore it should be better explained how and why each selected case study is a good example of *governance*.

As the time for the meeting ended, it was decided to postpone further discussion on the case studies and the last presentation foreseen by the agenda, i.e. the presentation of C3-Ph3 – SWOT Analysis, to the beginning of the morning session of Tuesday.



**Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> June**

**Participants**

PP1 "Tindari – Nebrodi" Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Laura COBELLO Despoina KARNIADAKI Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP2 ANCI Sicilia (Italy)	Luisa PIRAINO
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Roussos KIPRIOTAKIS Charicleia PARASKEVA
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eirini KARAKATSANI Dimitris PAPASTEFANAKIS
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Esther GARCIA SORIANO
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Lawrence ATTARD Joe BRINCAT Alfred MAZZITELLI
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO Kostas PATLITZIANAS
Guest	Benetos SPYROU

**C4 - Participation component: Strategic Common Vision.**

**Ph2 Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements**

The second meeting day started with further discussion on the case-studies. Mrs. Quilez, on behalf of the Expert Board, summarised the case-studies presented on Monday underlining the need of deepening the information. Mr. Attanasio added that the choice of case studies should be made in a way that could be generalised and applied to other contexts. Mr. Simonetti confirmed that case studies have to be used to inform people participating to the forums about previous noteworthy experiences. In other words the case studies must be selected for their innovative approach to *governance*.

Mrs Karniadaki added that case studies should be selected according to some key-aspects: who developed the experience, how it was developed (through forums, communication, involvement of local communities, etc.), how much did it cost, which were the results. She also pointed that we must know the results of the case



studies in order to evaluate them. Discussion also regarded the fact that the selection made until now was made within the countries where the project partners are settled: instead the project has to look also for experiences in other countries outside of the Mediterranean. The selection criteria of the case studies should though always be the same: focus on rural areas and successful governance models. The EB members should always mention how people accepted the solution adopted, who managed the project who was involved, who financed the project, how long

Case studies will be used within the core part of the project, i.e. the participation process. Mrs. Cobello specified that case-studies were included within the Participation Component in order to be used as concrete examples in realities comparable to the ones included in the project: the core of the case (green energy, waste management, etc.) must be a tool to strengthen the development or to improve the local governance.

Finally it was decided that in the scheme must be added: time period, money and key actors involved. It was agreed that Mr. Attanasio, on behalf of the Expert Board, will revise the scheme of the case studies with the additional information needed.

### **C3 - Territories and institutions: diagnosis and ex-ante evaluation.**

#### **Ph3 SWOT Analysis**

(see attached presentation)

Mrs. Karakatsani, on behalf of CRES PP4 responsible of the phase, presented the phase. The aim of the phase is for the partners to analyse the results of the framework documents and develop an auto-evaluation activity of their contents.

A general introduction on the methodology was made together with a presentation on how this methodology can be used within the MedStrategy project. The methodology outlines the internal and external factors relevant for a strategic planning process. Mrs. Karakatsani underlined how the process of strategy formation should be seen as a continuous learning process, i.e. as learning taking place within regions themselves and their institutional structures (*see attached presentation for details*).

At the end a first draft of the SWOT analysis made for Archanon-Asterousion Municipality, Crete was presented.

Discussion among partners mainly regarded the interpretation of endogenous and exogenous factors compared to the contents and objectives of the project. In particular, the opportunities and threats have to be interpreted also as opportunities and threats internal to the chosen territory. With regard to this matter, the partner in charge of the phase will prepare short guidelines on the methodology to be applied which will be sent to partners and will then become the first introduction to the final report.



## **C4 – Participation component**

### **Ph1 Establishment of Community Participation Process**

### **Ph3 Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision**

(see attached presentation)

Mrs. Piraino, on behalf of ANCI-Sicilia (PP2) responsible for the Phase 1, presented the lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes. The presentation regarded:

- the description of the Component and its objectives,
- the identification and involvement of public and private stakeholders,
- the creation and management of the public forums through the working groups,
- the typology of local actors to be involved,
- the rules to be followed in organising the forums,
- the number and contents of the forums to be organised in each region,
- the work programme to be used to organise the forums,
- proposals on rules and procedures for an efficient implementation of the Forums' activities.

Mrs. Cobello explained to partners the exact characteristics of each meeting included in participation process. Participation process is active during the entire lifecycle of the project. In particular:

1. First Meeting: presentation of the project, presentation of the results of the analysis area, territorial and institutional analysis and SWOT analysis, presentation of case studies, membership of the participants (participants has to sign a formal acceptance and involve themselves in participating to the entire process), subdivision of the participants in the forum groups according to the four categories, rules of the participatory process. There will be one facilitator per group.
2. Second Meeting: application of the EASW methodology and, due to the short time at our disposal, determination of a common vision for each group on the specific field chosen. Then the groups meet together to produce a common for the four groups vision. It is important to arrive to the third meeting with the priorities decided in a certain way.
3. Third Meeting: the common vision obtained in the second meeting is the reference base for the third meeting. There is again the subdivision in four groups but not according to the category: they are mixed. The four groups will work on how that vision can become real and who has to do it: the four groups can work on different parts of the chosen thematic area. The result will be a list of actions that participants consider important: it is possible to let participants vote the importance of each action in order to make a ranking.
4. Fourth meeting: on the basis of the main actions decided during the third meeting the forum can define a local pilot operative plan (LPOP). The work is



done through the subdivision in groups but the subdivision criteria will be decided after.

5. Fifth meeting: on the basis of the main actions decided during the third meeting the forum can define a LPOP. The work is done through the subdivision in groups but the subdivision criteria will be decided after. The fourth and fifth meeting verify the development of LPOPs.

Sixth meeting: presentation of the results to the forum itself. It is possible to invite to this meeting representatives of other Municipalities, key actors, etc. not previously involved in the participation process.

It was agreed that PP2, the partner in charge of C3-Ph1, will send to the partners a short guidelines document describing the implementation lines for this phase.

## **C1 – Communication**

### **Ph2 Communication Campaign**

(see attached presentation)

Mrs. Garcia Soriano, on behalf of Province of Teruel which is in charge of C1-Ph2, presented the main issues regarding the contents of the above mentioned phase. She presented the following issues:

- The manual where is described how all the communication tools were built
- The Graphical Coordinated Image and other tools
- The Website and the Web management for the partners
- The Intranet communication system

Discussion among partners mainly regarded some small changes to be made to the project website: it was decided to replace the olive tree picture with the picture used in other communication tools, in the intranet part a forum should be added to the communication tools foreseen, moreover it will be verified if it is possible for each partner to send messages, singularly, to two-three or all partners.

It was also agreed that PP5, the partner in charge of C1-Ph2, will verify that all communication tools of the project are developed following the communication guidelines of MED Programme.

## **C2 – Management**

### **Ph2 Technical coordination**

(see attached presentation)

Mr. Simonetti, on behalf of PP1, gave to the partners an overview of the management situation and the main steps and the components/phases of the project foreseen by the working plan in the next months.



He presented a proposal of schedule of the project: it can be considered that partners have almost completed Phases 1 and 2 of Component 3, even if both the institutional and territorial analyses will be reviewed. It is necessary to do the SWOT analysis and complete the due deliverables.

Decisions and deadlines were presented by Mrs. Zanna and agreed according to the scheme attached.

Finally, the partnership agreed on the date for the 4th Transnational meeting. Next transnational meeting will be held in Teruel (partner in charge for the organisation is Province of Teruel) on **Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> and Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> of January 2012**. The arrival of the partners in Teruel is foreseen for Sunday 22<sup>nd</sup> of January.

## **C2 – Management**

### **Ph3 Monitoring and Evaluation**

Mrs. Zanna (PP1) reminded to the partners the report structure for monitoring the project which includes a short analysis of the project outcomes, the quantification of the progress indicators on deliverables achieved, the progress on program indicators.

As the contents and indicators agreed during the last meeting in Malta were chosen in accordance to contents and indicators included in the progress reports, PP1 proposed to partners to postpone the second monitoring report including a period of nine months instead of six in order to make the deadlines coincide with the ones of progress reports.

It was agreed that next (second) monitoring report will include a nine-months period, from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2011. The third one will include a six-months period (from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011 to 29<sup>th</sup> February 2012) and the last one will concern the last three months of the project (from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2012).

According to the report structure, and following the deadlines written above, partners have to send the values calculated for the set of indicators to PP1 itself which takes care of reporting.

## **C2 – Management**

### **Ph1 Administrative and financial management of the project**

Mrs. Karnadiaki (PP1) gave to the partners a short summary of the administrative and financial problems met until now.

As some partners met problems with filling in the excel file that PP1 provided to partners for reporting and monitoring their expenditures, she provided further



explanations on how to use this file. Moreover a further explanation on how to include costs within the different project components was given, together with the documents to be annexed and kept both for verifying the work and expenditures made.

She also underlined partners' difficulties in using PRESAGE system for the first and second progress reports and invited the partnership to use this tool in a more constant and continuous way.

### **Press conference**

In the framework of the project meeting a press conference for the presentation of the project and of the partners was held in Peza on Tuesday morning.

### **Steering Committee meeting**

#### Participants

PP1 "Tindari – Nebrodi" Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Stefania ZANNA (on behalf of Fernando LOPEZ)
PP2 ANCI Sicilia (Italy)	Luisa PIRAINO (on behalf of Andrea PIRAINO)
PP3 Municipality of N. Kazantzakis (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eirini KARAKATSANI
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Esther GARCIA SORIANO (on behalf of Ismael BRENCHAT GIL)
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Lawrence ATTARD (on behalf of Joseph ZAMMIT)
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Pilar TORNOS ALONSO

The Steering Committee met at the end of the transnational meeting.

Its results were:

- Approval of the time schedule proposed by PP1 by the partners (see enclosed scheme)
- Approval of general modalities of phases' implementation (according to what it was presented and decided during the meeting)
- Approval of the minutes of the meeting



## Experts Board meeting

### Participants

PP1 "Tindari – Nebrodi" Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Carlo SIMONETTI
Expert Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO Kostas PATLITZIANAS

Experts Board met at the end of the meeting together with a LP representative. The discussion among the members present in Peza, mainly regarded:

- Analysis of territorial analysis results
- Revision of the structure of the social-economic context described by partners
- Homogenization of the data at the same territorial level among the partners
- Analysis of institutional analysis first results
- Exam and discussion on improvements and changes to be adopted for the Case-Studies (C4-Ph2)

The results of the above mentioned discussion were then presented to the partnership.

## Wednesday, 29<sup>th</sup> June

### Participants

PP1 "Tindari – Nebrodi" Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Laura COBELLO Despoina KARNIADAKI Carlo SIMONETTI Claudia RUBINO Stefania ZANNA
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Charicleia PARASKEVA
Experts Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO

The meeting was mainly focused at the C2-Ph1 Administrative and financial management of the project.

Due to the economic crisis in Greece, very restrictive rules are applied by the national FLC to the financial management and evaluation of the MED projects. This causes some problems to the reporting of PP3 expenditures. PP3 explained to PP1 which problems he met till now and they discussed on how to solve them.

Furthermore, partners and Mr. Attanasio discussed on the development of the following components in the Archanon-Asterousion territory:

- C3-Ph1 Integrated territorial analysis
- C3-Ph2 Analysis of institutional framework



- C4-Ph1 Establishment of Community Participation Process
- C4-Ph2 Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements
- C4-Ph3 Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision



## Scheme of conclusions and deadlines

### C1 – Communication

#### Phase 3 – Conferences, workshops and training

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
31/12/2011	Short guidelines describing how to settle training courses and awareness raising seminars sent to partners	PP1
31/01/2011	Realisation of one awareness raising seminar for institutional level staff, leaders and actors in the four regions	All Partners
31/03/2011	Realisation of one training course for local authorities and experts in the four regions	All Partners

### C2 – Management component

#### Phase 1 - Administrative and financial management of the project

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
31/08/2011	End of the third 6-months period for reporting to the MA	
15/09/2011	Partners fill in their new expenditures in Presage and they update the excel reporting file and sent it to the PP1	All Partners
30/09/2011	Partners sent to PP1 their activities report	All Partners
15/10/2011	Resolution of validation problems or other	PP1
25/10/2011	Partners sent to PP1 the certificates of expenditures	
30/10/2011	Third progress report sent to the MA of MED Programme	PP1

#### Phase 3 – Monitoring and evaluation

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
30/09/2011	Partners send their report and indicators regarding the period 1st December 2010 – 31st August 2011	All Partners
30/10/2011	Second monitoring and Evaluation Report	PP1



### **C3 - Territories and institutions: diagnosis and evaluation**

#### Phase 1 – Integrated territorial analysis

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
31/08/2011	Delivery of the framework document to the Lead Partner and Steering Committee	PP6
31/08/2011	Improvement of the framework document and deliver to the Lead Partner and Steering Committee	All Partners
15/09/2011	Comments on framework documents to partners	PP1 and SC
30/09/2011	Final version of framework document to the Lead Partner and Steering Committee	All Partners

#### Phase 2 – Analysis of institutional framework

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
15/07/2011	Final revised version of guidelines sent to partners	PP6
15/09/2011	Deliver of the institutional reports to PP6 and Steering Committee	All Partners
30/09/2011	Comments on institutional reports to partners	PP6 and SC
15/10/2011	Final version of institutional report to PP6 and Steering Committee	All Partners

#### Phase 3 – SWOT Analysis

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
15/10/2011	Deliver of first draft of comparative SWOT analyses to Partners, Steering Committee and Expert Board	PP4
22/10/2011	Comments / remarks on the SWOT analyses	All partners, SC, EB
31/10/2011	Deliver of final version of comparative SWOT analyses to Partners, Steering Committee and Expert Board	PP4

### **C4 – Participation Component: Strategic Common Vision**

#### Phase 1 – Establishment of community participation process

##### Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
15/09/2011	Final version of guidelines sent to Lead Partner and PPs and approval by the Steering Committee	PP2 and SC



10/09 – 31/10/2011	Preparatory activities to involve local actors and stakeholders	All partners
01/11/2011	Starting date of the participation process	All partners

Phase 2 – Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements

Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
31/07/2011	Deliver of final proposal of Case Studies to Partners	EB
30/09/2011	Comments / remarks on the Case Studies	All partners, SC
15/10/2011	Deliver of Final Report on Success Cases to Partners	PP7

Phase 3 – Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision (TSCV)

Timetable

Date	Activity	Partner in charge
15/09/2011	Guidelines sent to PPs and approval by the Steering Committee	PP3 and SC
15/11/2011	Starting date of the process for constructing a strategic common vision (EASW methodology).	All partners

**Next meeting**

The next project meeting will be held in Teruel (Spain) on 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> January 2012.



## Acronyms

LP or PP1	Lead Partner
PPs or Ps	Project partners
EB	Experts Board
SC	Steering Committee
MA	Management Authority of MED Programme
FLC	First Level Control
RoP	Responsible of the phase
PP1	Intermunicipal Consortium "Tindari-Nebrodi" (Lead Partner)
PP2	National Association of Sicilian Municipalities
PP3	Archanon Asterousion Municipality
PP4	CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving
PP5	Province of Teruel
PP6	Pembroke Local Council
PP7	Foundation for the Social Development