



Project MedStrategy
*Integrated strategy for sustainable development of
Mediterranean rural areas*
Reference number: 2G-MED09-282

Fourth transnational meeting
7th - 10th February 2012
Teruel – Spain

Minutes of the meeting



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



Tuesday, 7th February

Participants

PP1 “Tindari – Nebrodi” Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Despoina KARNIADAKI Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP2 ANCI Sicilia (Italy)	Luciano DE CARO
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Chryssi MONTOKOSTA
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eleni CHATZIGEORGIOU
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Esther GARCIA SORIANO Carmen ALONSO Luis MUNOZ Josè GUILLEN
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Alfred MAZZITELLI Evelyn VELLA BRINCAT
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO

Welcome

The fourth transnational meeting of the project was opened by the introduction of Mr. Julio Esteban, Mr. Joaqim Jiste and Mr. Carlos Sanchez by Province of Teruel. They underlined the characteristics of the area of Teruel, its rural development and how MedStrategy project has being useful for their region and for the EU as a whole.

Mr. Julio Esteban thanked the Lead Partner to have involved the province in the project: in fact the project is an example of sharing experiences among regions with similar characteristics. In order to reach the social, economic and environmental development politicians and administrators have to understand which are their capacities to manage territory. Province of Teruel chose the farming sector for its characteristics and for the particular situation lived by this sector in the region. Through MedStrategy project, a set of forums were organised in order to apply the participation process which involved local social actors.

Carlo Simonetti (Lead Partner PP1 representative), gave also the welcome to all participants in particular to the representatives of Province of Teruel which hosts the meeting. He talked about the idea of the MedStrategy project and its approach, i.e. the proposal and experimentation of a new governance methodology through the implementation of a



participation process. The methodology will be useful for all the rural region in the Mediterranean area of the European Union.

C2 – Management of the project.

Ph2. Technical coordination

Mr. Simonetti introduced the next part of the meeting, i.e. up-to-dating presentations by each partner of the development of the project both on the contents and the financial part, compared to what originally planned. He also confirmed that Italy and Spain are more on less on time, Greece had some problems in the certification of the expenses, while Malta appears to have a really worrying situation as Lead Partner did not even receive any document or deliverable by Pembroke Local Council.

After this description of the general situation made by PP1, each region presented the state-of-the-art of the project compared to the working plan (*See attached presentations*).

For Italy, Mr. Simonetti described the documents produced by the LP both as in charge of some phases and as regional coordinator on the activities developed within the territory of Tindari-Nebrodi Municipalities. Concerning Component 3 all deliverables foreseen in Phases 1 and 2 were produced, moreover SWOT analysis was completed but still the comparative SWOT analysis has to be done (phase in charge of PP4 with the help of the Expert Board, not completed as SWOT analysis by Malta still misses). For Component 4, guidelines for the organisation of the participation process were produced (in collaboration with PP2) and sent to partners, while the forums in the Tindari-Nebrodi area are in progress. For C4-Ph2, the document “Selection and analysis of the Success cases” (Expert Board and PP2) and “Final report on success cases” (PP7) are ready. For C4-Ph3 LP and PP2 cooperated with PP3 for producing the Guidelines for the EASW methodology. Report on Local EASWs will be ready after the end of the participation process, which is actually in progress in all the regions. Every document produced by Italy was uploaded in the website, as asked several times by the JTS.

LP reminded to all the partners that all the mentioned documents are documents foreseen by the project as deliverables. Moreover all deliverables, after production and the approval, have to be uploaded in the project website www.medstrategyproject.eu, as requested by JTS.

For Spain, PP7 presented, on C1 Communication, the communication campaign which was focused on the participation process. It helped in involving local actors knowing about the process through for example newspapers, printed material and other communication tools (website, emails etc.). For Component 2, Spanish partners submitted the interim certificate, contributed to the evaluation report, participated to Steering Committee and Expert Board, undertook the necessary administrative tasks. C3 activities and deliverables were showed

during the meeting in Crete: territorial and Institutional analyses were realised, as SWOT analysis with the important contribution of the Province of Teruel. For Component 4 the sector of Revitalisation of sheeps farms was chosen. The Participation process was almost completed: 5 forums were organised and 67 persons participated. As for the Phase concerning Case Studies: FDS and Expert Board completed the research of case studies from different countries, analysed and selected them and finally reported the success cases in the final deliverable. Component 5 will be started soon after the end of the participation process with the definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plan and of the Transnational Local Development Methodology.

For Greece, presentations were made by both the partners. For CRES, Eleni CHATZIGEORGIOU substituted Eirini KARAKATSANI in managing the project, since September 2011. Concerning the undertaken work in Component 1, CRES gave a presentation at a non-project evening seminar organised by the Archanon Asterousion Municipality: the presentation was on integrated sustainable development for rural and island areas and in parallel reference was made to the scope and objectives of the Med-Strategy programme, and project leaflets were disseminated. Another presentation is planned in early March, at a non-project event in Athens relating to the incorporation of innovative technologies at municipal level. The presentation will focus on sustainability and RES at municipal level, referencing the scope of the MedStrategy project. As foreseen in Component 2 Progress report and Monitoring report were sent to LP for the period up to 31/08/2011. Moreover last month the audit was undertaken by the FLC, on technical and financial activities, for the period up to 31/08/2011. Concerning C3-Ph3 the SWOT analyses were received by three countries (Italy, Spain and Greece). A First Draft of Diagnostic Report was undertaken by CRES, comparing the different territorial / institutional characteristics of the regions: it will be presented as foreseen in the meeting agenda. With regards to Component 4 and 5, CRES will be involved in the participation process (forums) with local community / stakeholders, to take place in the Archanon-Asterousion Municipality. CRES also planned to engage an expert to develop the theme "Participatory local planning for sustainable RES development: identification of a pilot project": the theme will be introduced as part of the participation process, in collaboration with the regional partner. CRES will also coordinate the deliverable of C5-Ph2 'Guidelines for the drawing up of an Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas'. This will take into account the Transnational Strategic Common Vision, and a comparative evaluation of the results of the LPOPs.

Archanon-Asteourision Municipality explained to partners the Greek procedure to recognize the costs of local authorities and underlined that all the deliverables depend on the ability to absorb the budget. As regards C3, SWOT analysis was completed. As concerns participation process, after the production in October 2011 of the EASW Guidelines, the process started in December 2011 with 70 participants to the first meeting. At the moment delegates have to be chosen by the Municipalities for the process. This aspect was discussed with the LP who

reminded to Archanon-Asteourision Municipality that the participation process has to involve all the key actors in the territory (not only Public Administrations): it was therefore suggested to invite also private sector, civil society, professionals, etc. The second forum in Greece is foreseen for the end of February. Other future activities will be: the fulfillment of the participation process, cooperation with CRES- the other Greek partner, in order to participate at the next meetings that will be implemented the EASWs and the Local Pilot Operative Plan, cooperation with the expertise for the next Components of Medstrategy Project.

Pembroke Local Council had huge problems with their technical expert (Mr. Lawrence Attard) who was supposed to be present to the meeting and that could not come to Teruel. The representatives present at the meeting declared that problems with Mr. Lawrence Attard's contract still remain for bureaucratic reasons.

LP reminded in details to the Maltese partner both the documents and activities missing foreseen in the working plan and also how the missing activities and outputs from Malta are heavily affecting the delay in the project activities as a whole.

Pembroke Local Council assured that they will present soon a draft solution to be followed in the next months to recover the lost time in producing the deliverables and in spending the money. The discussion will however continue in the next days of the transnational meeting.

C2 – Management of the project.

Ph1 Administrative and financial management

LP presented the current financial situation and the problems raised with the reporting/certification of the expenditures (*See attached presentation*).

Major problems occurred with Pembroke Local Council which hasn't any certified expenditure. This affects the total project as the percentage of certified expenditures is very low and this can compromise both the requests of budget changes and extension of time. Moreover PP3, PP4 and PP6 are late in the implementation of contracting procedures regarding mainly external expert recruitment. Other problems: delay on paid out expenditures for almost all the partners, slow certification process in Greece and rejection of validated expenditures for Greece.

In order to avoid the reduction of the project the partnership will have to demonstrate that it is able to spend the rest of the budget in due time. It was decided that partners who are not able to carry out all the forecasted activities and to spend the whole forecasted amount have to transfer activities/money to other partners or to reduce their budget.

Finally a first hypothesis of budget changes was presented, together with the procedure to be followed and the procedure for requesting a project extension of 6 months.

The LP already informed the JTS project officer (Mr. Cervelli) about the request of budget and duration change. Regarding the project extension, the officer informed LP that the official starting date of MedStrategy project is 01/02/2010 (and not 01/06/2010 as thought) and its duration is 28 months (and not 24 months as thought). LP can however ask for a 6-months extension and the new ending date should be 30/11/2012.

Things to be done:

1. Review the proposed budgets: following a quick check by LP some errors there are in the proposed budgets; LP will check them and will provide its comments to each partner
2. Submission of the model programme templates “request for changes” & “% budget reallocation”
3. Potential review of project activities and Application Form (AF): besides of the updating of the timetable some changes in AF may occur (of course those will be just minor changes/adjustments) according the budget changes as well as the status of project
4. Updating of the AF in Presage and submission of the requested documents, after the approval of MA/JTS

Who & when:

1. Review the proposed budgets
 - PPs check the changes of their budget with the support of LP and provided LP with the MedStrategy template “PPn_ProposedChange.xls” within 24/02/2012
 - LP sends to SC the final version of the new project budget within 29/02/2012
 - SC members send by email the approval of the proposed budget within 02/03/2012
2. Submission of the model programme templates “request for changes” & “% budget reallocation”
 - LP submits MED programme templates within 07/03/2012
3. Potential review of project activities and AF
 - LP evaluates the potential changes in AF with the support of PPs and according the new budget and timetable. LP sends an updated version of AF to PPs within 15/03/2012 and PPs provided their comments within 22/03/2012
4. Updating of the Application Form in Presage and submission of the requested documents
 - LP updates AF in Presage and submits documents within 31/03/2012

Wednesday, 8th February

Participants

PP1 “Tindari – Nebrodi” Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Despoina KARNIADAKI Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP2 ANCI Sicilia (Italy)	Luciano DE CARO
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Chryssi MONTOKOSTA
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eleni CHATZIGEORGIOU
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Esther GARCIA SORIANO Carmen ALONSO Luis MUNOZ Josè GUILLEN
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Alfred MAZZITELLI Evelyn VELLA BRINCAT
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Massimo ATTANASIO Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO
JTS	Mercedes ACITORES FRANZON Javier GOMEZ PRIETO

C4 - Participation component: Strategic Common Vision.

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

Experts Gema Quilez and Massimo Attanasio presented the results of the phase . They described the key concepts according to which the selection was made. Then they presented the contents of the report which is the final deliverable of the phase.

Case studies could be rules, procedures, methodologies or comprehensive experiences. They were supposed to be new governance experiences undergone by authorities/institutions networks or local communities dealing with social, economic and environmental issues in the sustainability perspective. A good Case Study could not be chosen paying main attention to the topic but with regard to issues related to governance and sustainable development.

Activities or plans by law ascribed to local authorities were not case studies, as long as these are considered the logical development of a law. Nor programmes or actions that simply are the enforcement of a law, though they could be interesting good practices. One key concept was the fact that it is governance aspects of cases selected what makes the difference between a good practice and a case study in this context.

According to previous key concepts it was not that simple finding suitable CASE STUDIES. During transnational meeting held in Crete in June 2011, EB already exposed some of the cases collected up to that moment but most of them were finally rejected as long as they were good practices, but not true CASE STUDIES from a governance point of view. EB finally reported 5 cases.

The report on success cases is therefore composed by:

- synthesis of cases selected and reported;
- comparative experiences analysis;
- evaluation indicators.

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

1. “Rural multiservice network formula” (Aragon, Spain)
2. “Val di Cornia: a new experience of cultural and touristic services” (Tuscany, Italy)
3. “Reggio Nord: a governance experience of public services” (Emilia Romagna, Italy)
4. “Increasing public participation and governance through access to information” (Malta)
5. “Energy Savings and behavioural change of the citizens” (Amaroussion, Greece)

These final case studies were selected from the previous set of 12 as the rest of them was, in synthesis, the natural evolution of laws so coming from traditional governance ‘attitude’. The final choice was then made considering real cases of NEW governance models, not just success cases of governance rural territories.

The second part of the report regards the comparative analysis. Main points of this part underlined were:

- Relevant results have been achieved through the cooperation of local authorities and the engagement of local communities.
- Presence of a high level of cooperation, involvement of the different political levels in the territory and coordinated use of resources.
- Increase of efficiency at determinate fields as direct consequence of the intervention.
- Participation is a core element in all cases reported.
- A notable effort of approximation on the part of all groups and institutions involved can be seen in cases selected.
- Social co-responsibility of all agents involved in the experiences.
- Integrated and sustainable development has been brought forward through the implementation of all cases shown.
- All cases reported show- in different fields- difficulties faced and solutions adopted.

- Cases reported show the remarkable role of “the local” as the space where the application of all policies transversal to a given topic meet.
- Importance of the appropriate choice of a suitable organisational model to carry out any intervention.
- Specific solutions tailored to specific problems at local level but with a potential for transfer to other contexts.
- Not only experiences reported are transferable, but also the methods of cooperation used independently of topic
- The implementation of actions reported caused changes in a diversity of target groups` ways of thinking and behaviour as well as changes in institutions attitudes.
- All case studies reported represent innovative experiences in the contexts where they were implemented.
- Governance issues- except for one case already explained- are the core element in all cases.
- All cases show efforts on the part of different groups in order to promote change oriented to improvement.

Last part of the report regards the evaluation indicators, divided between absolute indicators and relative indicators.

The chosen indicators were:

- new jobs created by the program
- new firms/businesses created by the program
- personnel shared (which gives a measure of how much the public administrations were ‘happy’ or ‘involved’ in the program)
- budget devoted to personnel shared

The relative indicators are the same as absolute values but they are made relative in order to be compared among the different territories. They are:

- new jobs created by the program/active population
- new firms/businesses created by the program/total number of firms
- personnel shared/total number of personnel
- budget devoted to personnel shared/total budget devoted to personnel

Case studies, as foreseen by the project, are used during the following two components: they are presented and discussed in the local Forums (C4 – Participation process) and used for determining the monitoring indicators for the pilot projects (C5 – Local Pilot Operative Plans) (*See attached presentation for details*).

It was confirmed that considerations on the use of case studies during the participation process will be included in the deliverables regarding the participation component part.

For the finalities of the Med programme the coordinator propose to include an indicator which measures how many times MedStrategy guidelines will be used to implement new governance systems. The proposal is also to use some of the indicators foreseen by the monitoring system which can measure the response of the territory to the new governance path proposed (for example: number of people participating to the participation process, number of ideas proposed, etc.).

Meeting between representatives of the European Commission. They explained thhe financial situation with a project development indicator of 20% which is very worrying. JTS and LP sollicitated project partners to communicate more and IN TIME with the LP and be more realistic about activities but above all about capacity of spend the foreseen budget.

Discussion with JTS representatives

A meeting between LP and the JTS representatives was held during the coffee break. LP presented to the JTS representatives the main project activities and informed them that the activities are successfully implemented in all regions except Malta where due to administrative problems the activities are not developing.

LP presented also the main problems met since the beginning of the project; these mainly regard problems in solving administrative obstacles for contracting experts, with particular regard to Malta which for this reason is in a strong delay with project activities, and the late certification procedure in particularly in Greece.

LP also discussed with JTS representatives project budget changes and financial situation of the project. Moreover LP presented to JTS representatives the need of having a project's extension in order to realise some dissemination activities.

After the coffee break the JTS representatives attended the project meeting.

Capitalization measures

Mrs. Acitores briefly explained what is the meaning of capitalization within the EU approach and how important this can be for the project's final results. She specified that during the meeting in Marseille a proposal of clustering among the participating projects was made in order to analyse possible future joint capitalizations, but this proposal can be integrated/changed according to the project contents. Another possible capitalization tool will be a call for proposal which will be soon published through MED programme before next summer.

Mrs. Zanna, on behalf of the LP, presented the measures foreseen within the application form of the MedStrategy project to capitalize the project's results together with a brief summary of the issues and conclusions of "Cluster and Capitalization Day" held in Marseille on 30th November 2011. (*See attached presentation*).

The capitalization strategy of the MedStrategy project will be implemented mainly through four concrete and durable tools that will be established since the beginning of the project:

1. Involvement of associated partners, which will follow the development of the planning model and will provide indications on its replicability. They will contribute to spread project results both at local level as well as at European level through their well established partnerships and networks.

2. Forums, as virtual meeting points of local authorities, key actors and stakeholders, will strength the local community awareness of the resources potential and will increase social cohesion and help reducing conflicts. Thus forums will facilitate the exploitation of new shared and balanced development initiatives.

3. Permanent Observatories of Municipalities, will favour the setting-up of a common and shared identity vision of sustainability-oriented development for the implementation of "green economy" and "green new deal" strategies coherently with the NRSFs and the "Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion – COM (2008) 616 Final".

4. Permanent communication and networking platform, that will provide updated information about LOPs (Local Operative Plans) implementation and new investment opportunities. It will also connect future interested parties (authorities and firms) for the creation of new local as well as transnational alliances.

Mrs. Acitores analysed MedStrategy approach to capitalization and suggested project's partnership to think to a higher level where the interesting experience of the project can be put in common to projects realised in other MED regions.

Mr. Gomez explained to MedStrategy partners the problems in the financial situation of the project, i.e. at the end of September 2011, the whole partnership certified 102,846.41€ versus 241,237.00€ scheduled in the subsidy contract. His suggestion was to engage and pay 115,082.43€ by the end of Next PR, (i.e. in February 2012). In any case he solicited partners to carefully think to budget changes taking into consideration their expenditure capacity.

He finally underlined how is important that deliverables are made visible to the public, and therefore how fundamental is to upload them in the project website.

C4 – Participation component: strategic common vision
Ph1. Establishment of community participation process
Ph3. Construction of a transnational strategic common vision

Each region presented in details the implemented participation process and EASW.

As for Sicily, before the start up phase of the participation process the LP defined:

- The selection criteria of the stakeholders to be involved in the participation activities.
- Rules and procedures for an efficient implementation of Forum activities.

(See attached presentation).

Preliminary meetings were organised in order to better involve local territory. A meeting with local representatives was organised on 20th of April 2011. It was aimed at identifying the intervention area of the project. At the end of the meeting it was decided to work in the “tourist sector”. Three other preliminary meetings were held with local stakeholders on 21th, 27th and 28th October 2011. These preliminary meetings with the local communities were aimed at promoting greater involvement of stakeholders in the participation activities.

As for the official Forums, three of the foreseen six meetings were held. The meetings have been managed according to consolidated facilitation techniques (EASW methodology) and have been developed through “Plenary sessions” and “Group sessions”.

In the first meeting (13th December 2011) the project and case studies were presented. There was also the presentation of the rules of the participation process and the joining into the Forums of local stakeholders. Second and third meeting regarded the EASW methodology. During the second meeting (held on 17th January 2012) participants were divided into working groups according to typologies: Politicians and Administrators, Experts and Technicians, Private sector, civil society. Each Role Group (supported by the facilitators) defined its own “negative” and “positive” vision and so identified the main problems and objectives to be pursued in relation to the 4 thematic areas proposed in the “Guidelines for the organisation of the participation process”. A representative of each Role Group then presented the work carried out by his/her own Group in order to identify common issues and goals (Plenary session).

During the third meeting (held on 31st January 2012) groups were transversal and worked each one on a theme. Each Role Group (supported by the facilitators) defined in relation to the “Common Vision” built during the second meeting (Role Groups Sessions):

- Which "Actions" could be undertaken to reach the “Common positive Vision” and therefore to pursue the main objectives identified in relation to the 4 thematic areas proposed in the "Guidelines for the organisation of the participation process".
- Who “Stakeholders” will be involved in the implementation of this Actions.

Around 60 people attended all the meetings, including entrepreneurs who mainly operate in the tourist sector (owners of Hotels, B&B, residences, farms and restaurants), members of cultural and environmental associations, and employees of the offices for the tourism promotion, politicians, administrators, experts and technicians (engineers, agronomists, architects, economists, etc. ..) etc. The next meetings, scheduled in the "Guidelines for the organisation of the participation process", will be aimed at the realisation the Local Pilot Operative Plan and at the individuation of the key interventions. They will be organized according to the Working Plan of the project.

As for Spain, 67 people have participated in forum activities. Spanish partner described the contents of all the meetings held up to now (five in total).
(See attached presentation)

The topic selected was: "Re-introduction of ranching activities - ovine and/or goats - in villages of Teruel where this activity has been important in the past but has now disappeared.

Some preliminary meetings were organised for the identification of stakeholders related to the topic from a wide variety of points of view but also for organizational purposes in order to introduce to the methodology for the Forum, detailed definition of themes to be developed, materials to be used, detailed working plan and timetable, logistics. An agreement was also signed with Comarca Comunidad de Teruel as long as there were several municipalities interested in the experience of re-introduction of ranching activities oriented to create economic activity and ensure survival of severely depopulated villages.

The other meetings (five in total at the moment) followed the methodology foreseen in the guidelines both for working documents prepared and final output produced.

Moreover during the first meeting in Perales de Alfambra, participants were explained the MED frame for the participation process, knew materials previously elaborated in medstrategy, the objectives of the participation process and the rules for the forums.

Second meeting was addressed to build a shared common vision. As the output was the vision of each role group, it was remarked that, surprisingly, the four groups provided quite similar visions however they were different typologies of groups according to professional profiles...

The aim of the third meeting was the identification of the strategic lines in each theme. Participants were divided into 4 thematic groups in such a way that each participant was allocated to the group where he/she could be more useful for.

During the fourth meeting participants elaborated the Local Pilot Operative Plan. Finally on the fifth meeting, plenary session, key interventions were defined attributing a priority level. Main key interventions selected were:

- Creation of a manual of processes compiling in an easy way steps to become an entrepreneur in the ovine activity in Teruel today: useful and easy to follow guide.
- Creation of a Platform for “alive” Information on the sector in the territory.
- Individual tutorials with all interested people (already working).
- Creation of an employment workshop oriented to fulfil training necessities of people interested in become an entrepreneur in the ranching activity concerning ovine in Teruel.

The last meeting, for the approval of LPOP and key interventions will be celebrated in May/June.

In Greece just the first meeting with stakeholders was realised: the selected topic is agricultural development. Greek partners in charge finally selected the experts through a long and complicated public call procedure: these experts will take care and coordinate the meetings which will be held in the next weeks.

Malta presented the programme to be followed for the participation process in the area of six Municipalities selected in the Northern Harbour Region. The area is very particular in its mix of rural locations and residential/commercial area and comprises the prime touristic and entertainment area in Malta. The chosen sector is energy in the rural areas where tourism is the main resource. The process will try to reconcile the importance of the rural tourism product with the elements of sustainability: in particular the process will include a special mention of the responsibility of the tourism establishment towards the community and a mention of the energy targets of the country and the EU.

At the end of the presentations on this Component, partners agreed on new deadlines: in particular within June participation processes and local operative plan (C5-Ph1) have to be completed, within July the key interventions (C5-Ph3) have to be identified and possibly implemented. After that, and in particular with the completion of the participation process, LP will be able to start to discuss with the partner in charge about the contents and production of the Guidelines, i.e. the final deliverable of the project.

C5 - Strategic planning in MED rural areas

Ph1. Definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans for the integrated development of rural areas

Ph2. Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology

In order to deepen the matters regarding the future developments of the project, LP explained the main guidelines to be followed for the implement of Component 5.

(See attached presentation)

LP explained how, in MedStrategy project, Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs) will be structured as a circular process that consists mainly of six phases:

1. Through the Analysis we define the profile of our community that describes its economy, environment and people; we also describe trends affecting our community, the problems it faces, and the opportunities ahead.
2. Strategic planning looks at the big picture and helps community decide what is important
3. During Implementation, we do the things which will get us where we want to be
4. After completing our activities, we evaluate them to see how well they worked and we improve them (back to Planning) considering lessons learned
5. Participation process facilitates the contribution of the local community for finding common and jointly responsible solutions and its encourages an integrated and intersectorial approach to planning
6. Communication activities aimed to increase community's visibility as well as to ensure the information of citizens and to support transparency in governance process.

The structure of each LPOP should be the following:

- **Introduction** - LPOP should be introduced by a representative of the local government as is not a simply technical document but it's the commitment of the local government for a more efficient and sustainable territorial governance.
- **Framework of LPOP** - European, national and regional policies/programmes/rules on rural development with particular attention to the targeted sectors (tourism, energy etc).
- **Analysis of the current situation** - Synthesis of territorial and institutional analysis (C3-Ph1&Ph2)
- **Barriers and opportunities** - Synthesis of SWOT analysis (C3-Ph3)

Each region (Italia, Greece, Spain and Malta) will develop the LPOP of the sector that the region chose (tourism, energy etc). In order to use common and transnational parameters in the development of the 4 LPOPs, 4 common themes ("macroobjectives") were selected. These themes constitute the common axes around which the 4 LPOPs should be structured. Also the 4 themes refer to the Objective 4.1 of MED Programme (Coordination of development policies and improvement of territorial governance) as our project was chosen for contributing to this objective of MED Programme.

• **Objectives and interventions** are the core parts of LPOPs and they depend on the success of the participation process. The objectives identified in the local forums (C4) set the direction of the LPOPs. Objectives should relate directly to one of the themes (common axes). They should be described in details so that everyone will know where we want to go. At this step, we do not need to say how we will achieve the objectives.

• In **strategies and interventions** part, the LPOPs will present the strategies and the interventions (target and the key ones) identified in the local forums (C4). The strategies and interventions will be described relating each one directly to one of the objectives. The templates produced in the guidelines of C4-Ph1 could be used.

The office/organization that will manage the implementation of LPOP should be defined and its tasks will be described in the plan. This may be an existing group or a new one. The office is responsible for communicating the plan to the community, and promoting the entire planning process. One of the most important functions of the office is to establish a schedule to complete each phase of the plan and see to it that each phase is completed. The schedule should allow sufficient time to complete each element and be flexible enough to allow for contingencies.

Lessons learned from the definition of the 4 LPOPs will be used for define the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM).

The guidelines will single out:

- Environmental and governance audit methods
- Auto-evaluation methods
- Participated process models
- Guide for drawing-up of Local Operative Plans
- Efficiency and coherence monitoring indicators of Strategic Plans

Even if the main contents of the guidelines will be available after the completion of LPOPs, this phase could start up immediately working on the outputs of the previous components (C3 and C4).

Partners agreed that the next steps of this Component will be:

1. LP (responsible for C5-Ph1) and PP4 (responsible of C5-Ph2) will provide the partners with the guidelines for the implementation of phases within 10/03/2012
2. Partners will send their comments back within 25/03/2012
3. The final version of the guidelines will be available within 30/04/2012

Thursday, 9th February

Participants

PP1 “Tindari – Nebrodi” Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Chryssi MONTOKOSTA
PP4 CRES - Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (Greece)	Eleni CHATZIGEORGIOU
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Carmen ALONSO Luis MUNOZ
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Alfred MAZZITELLI Evelyn VELLA BRINCAT
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO

C3 – Territories and institutions: diagnosis and ex-ante evaluation

Ph3 SWOT Analysis

A first comparison was made through the three SWOT matrix at disposal (Italy, Greece and Spain) by PP4, the partner in charge of the phase, who presented the first results of this comparison using the common indicators and thematic areas previously agreed. A format was previously developed to facilitate the process of linkage between the Institutional and Territorial Analyses with the SWOT analysis. The format comprised thematic areas and specific indicators per thematic area.

(See attached presentation)

The results presented about **Territorial SWOT analysis** mainly regarded six thematic areas and 2-3 key indicators per thematic area:

- socio-demographic aspects
- settlement system
- system of environmental and historic-cultural resources
- economic and production aspects
- territorial services,
- environmental services

The results presented about **Institutional SWOT analysis** mainly regarded four thematic areas on the capacity of Local Authorities to:

- cooperate with the different levels of government for the territorial management
- foster growth & innovation in a competent, efficient and effective way

- develop policies, programs and government actions for sustainable development
- promote a shared vision of sustainable development through participatory processes

Next steps will be:

- Similar comparisons to be undertaken per thematic area and per indicator for all territorial and institutional sub-categories
- Similarities / differences highlighted
- Creation of inventory of possible key areas to focus on, which will assist in developing set of key interventions
- When all 4 SWOT analyses have been completed, issue Draft Diagnostic Report to partners and Expert Board
- Incorporate comments and finalise the report

C2 – Management of the project
Ph3. Monitoring and Evaluation

Mrs. Zanna (PP1) reminded to the partners the main aspects to be monitored and evaluated in the project.
(See attached presentation)

In fact evaluation process regards the following points:

- a) effectiveness and efficiency of the project: technical consistency and coherence of the activities taking place within and between all phases;
- b) activities adherence to the project goals, budget and time frame;
- c) quality of management and partnership: efficiency of management system; consistence and quality of partners collaboration;
- d) achievement of project objectives: evaluation of the project on the basis of output and results indicators.

For each point the best evaluation technique was presented. For point a some additional indicators and a questionnaire to be filled by the partners will be prepared and submitted to partners by the LP. For point b some additional indicators, a questionnaire to be filled by the participants to the participation process and a summary report to be realized by the LP partner will be prepared and submitted to partners. Finally, for point c and evaluation questionnaire to be filled by partners and a summary report to be produced by the LP will be prepared and submitted to partners. For point d the set of monitoring indicators, already included in previous monitoring report is the best tool. Levels reached and way to measure indicators for the next months were reminded.

C1 – Communication

Ph2. Communication Campaign

Ph3. Conferences, workshops and training

Mr. Simonetti, reminded to partners, with regards to the communication campaigns and local promotional campaigns, which are the deliverables to be reached according to the project. It was also confirmed that all the produced documents must be uploaded in the project website as agreed in previous meetings (as previously underlined). Also the use of intranet system must be increased.

Mrs. Zanna presented the main contents and deliverables foreseen by Component 1 – Phase 3. *(See attached presentation)*

In Phase 3 the project says:

“Results have to be disseminated to appropriate organisations and related material will be prepared for seminars and conferences and distributed to international forums. At the end of the project, a conference will be organized in each country. In each area one training course, which will become the Standing Observatory of Municipalities, will be organised aiming at providing opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts. It will see the participation of local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project. Courses will focus on sustainable development planning.”

Mrs. Zanna presented in particular the objectives and contents of the awareness raising seminars, the training courses and the observatories of municipalities.

The objective of the Awareness Raising Seminars is to introduce the target group to the project and collect adhesions for training courses and encouraging community involvement with special regard to institutional staff to participate to strategic planning process. The target is different institutional level staff, leaders and actors. The contents will be: MedStrategy project objective and activities, Territorial Framework, Institutional framework, Success Case Studies, Participation Process Methodology.

The objective of training courses is to provide opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts and improving the involvement of local communities through training. The target are local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project for teaching them how to manage Local Operative Plans. The contents will be: sustainable development planning, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products

The objective of the Observatories of Municipalities is to involve other Municipalities than the ones included in the ‘project’ and highlighting the project results and expertise making

these visible to the large public. The target is local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project. The contents will be: information on MedStrategy development and its methodology , territorial diagnosis, institutional diagnosis, participation process results.

Steering Committee meeting

At the end of the day, the Steering Committee me. It worked on:

- Approval of the time schedule proposed by PP1 to the partners
- 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

Friday, 10th February

Participants

PP1 “Tindari – Nebrodi” Public Services Intermunicipal Consortium (Italy)	Claudia RUBINO Carlo SIMONETTI Stefania ZANNA
PP3 Municipality of Archanon-Asterousion (Greece)	Aikaterini GIALITAKI Chryssi MONTOKOSTA
PP5 Province of Teruel (Spain)	Carmen ALONSO Luis MUNOZ Josè GUILLEN
PP6 Pembroke Local Council (Malta)	Alfred MAZZITELLI Evelyn VELLA BRINCAT
PP7 Foundation for the Social Development (Spain)	Sara FERNANDEZ ESCUER Pilar TORNOS ALONSO
Experts Board Members	Gema QUILEZ ENCIISO

Meetings between the Lead Partner and the partners

During the morning of Friday 10th of February, Lead Partner met PP3, PP5, PP6 and PP7 in a short meeting in order to clarify some specific aspects concerning the development of the project.

Financial aspects with particular regard to administrative and financial management of the project and the future changes in the budget lines to be proposed to EC and certification problems were examined and solutions proposed.

PP1 then met PP5: the meeting was focused on additional financial matters with particular regard to the future changes in the budget lines to be proposed to JTS.

Moreover the development of the component 5 was discussed as well as the management of project’s web site.

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 Province of Teruel on Wednesday morning.

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
JTS	Joint Technical Secretariat
RoP	Responsible of the phase
PP1	Intermunicipal Consortium "Tindari-Nebrodi"
PP2	ANCI Sicilia - 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