



## MED Programme

Project acronym: MedStrategy

Project full title: Integrated Strategy for Sustainable Development of Mediterranean Rural Areas

Project no.: 2G-MED09-282

# Monitoring and Evaluation Report n.2

## C2: Management Component

**Editor:** Consorzio Tindari Nebrodi

**Author:** Stefania Zanna

**Due date of deliverable:** 31 October 2010

**Start date of project :** 01 June 2010

**Duration of the project:** 24 months

**Reference period for this report:** 01 December 2010 – 31 August 2011

**Abstract:** This deliverable describes the activities undertaken by the MedStrategy project during the period indicated above. It includes all important aspects of realised activities, comparing what has been realized with what was foreseen by the project working plan. It also collects a synthetic scheme of project results to be achieved and indicators to be matched. The report is edited by the project coordinator with the direct contribution of the entire partnership.



**With the support of MED Programme of the European Union**

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Communities. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

## **INDEX**

1. Project information
2. Reminder of project contents
  - 2.1 Summary of the project's objectives
  - 2.2 Critical success factors
  - 2.3 How the project contributes to the objectives of the MED Programme
3. General progress of the operation towards the set objectives
4. Brief summary of the undertaken activities
  - 4.1 Description of activities, outputs and results since the project start
  - 4.2 Description of activities, outputs and results during the reporting period
  - 4.3 Next steps to be taken
5. Involvement of partners in the implementation of the project during the period covered by the report
6. Problems encountered and solutions found/proposed
7. Analysis of the project outcomes for the reporting period
  - 7.1 Working Plan progress
  - 7.2 Progress on deliverables achieved
  - 7.3 Progress on program indicators
8. Financial and economic state-of-the-art

## 1. Project information

<b>Name of the project</b>	Integrated Strategy for Sustainable Development of Mediterranean Rural Areas
<b>Acronym</b>	MedStrategy
<b>Internal number of management</b>	2G-MED09-282
<b>Name of the LP organization + country</b>	Intermunicipal Consortium “Tindari-Nebrodi” ITALY
<b>Project starting date</b>	01 June 2010
<b>Project ending date</b>	31 May 2012
<b>Total eligible budget</b>	1,091,055.00 €

## 2. Reminder of project contents

### 2.1 Summary of the project’s objectives

MedStrategy project aims to improve and address territorial governance of Med rural areas towards sustainability through an innovative integrated planning model (PM) comprising: integrated social, economic, environmental analysis; assessment of institutional framework and review of success governance modes; establishment of communities participation process; definition of 4 strategic pilot plan patterns and drawing up of 4 key interventions in the involved areas; transnational synergies in PMs’ execution.

It experiments an innovative governance process through the setting up of a planning model that encourages the sustainable development of Med rural areas. The process focuses on 3 themes: the integration of economic, social, environmental dimensions of sustainability in planning; the development of integrated & shared strategies and actions through the cooperation of local authorities and the engagement of local communities (key actors, stakeholders) for the innovation of territorial governance; the setting up of common objectives & activities (preservation of cultural and natural heritage, competitiveness of territorial system, social & gender equality, etc) for local and transnational synergies of rural areas.

The main lines of intervention are:

- **Diagnosis of the involved territories:** assessment of the 3 dimensions of sustainability (economic-social-environmental) through appropriate indicators and using GIS applications, for identifying trends and conditions, root causes of problems.
- **Diagnosis of the institutional framework:** audit of local authorities governance systems for identifying weaknesses and strengths of the present institutional system; review of success governance modes and tools.
- **Setting up of local forums** that involve key actors and local stakeholders (citizens, local administrators and decision makers, opinion leaders, business sector operators, tourism providers, professional associations, environmental associations, civil society groups etc.) in

order to elaborate and produce a common vision of future and shared “green economy” strategies.

- **Setting up of planning model and drawing up of the Strategic Plans** of the involved territories: SPs will be scheduled following strategic axes and objectives. For each strategic axis innovative and integrated actions will be pointed out. The technical and administrative tools, the financial sources/tools and the key actors requested for the implementation of each action will be defined as well as actions’ time schedule. For the monitoring and the evaluation of SPs, a model report will be defined. It consists in the performance indicators that should be monitored for verifying the implementation progress and the effectiveness of the used tools.
- **Information and communication activities** will aim to raise awareness on development planning and to encourage local cooperation and transnational networks to promote new governance models for Med area’s development.

## 2.2 Critical success factors

The project promotes an innovative territory management pattern which will be tested at a local level to which does not correspond a single institutional entity but which presents territorial and identity homogeneity. The model makes reference to a shared and integrated methodology facing problems which can have different solutions in the different territories connected to different needs and peculiarities.

The integrated approach contributes to the valorisation of local identity factors and to the endogenous and balanced development of rural areas, in order to provide new growth opportunities. In each partner country a Local Operative Plan (LOP) is tested. It is neither fixed nor purely descriptive but it is constantly evolving even after the end of the project through a “circular process” of improvement.

Another critical factor of the project is the adoption of a “bottom up” approach, connected to the community active involvement in the planning process. The process encourages the establishment of synergies among the different local Governance levels, in order to warranty a simplification of the procedures to be adopted during the planning development, and to improve the efficiency and management abilities of the different administrative structures. The innovative approach, through the drawing up of an handbook, is a useful reference for other rural territorial contexts that have similar criticalities and potential.

## 2.3 How the project contributes to the objectives of the MED Programme

Consistently with the Objective 4.1, the project aims to draw up an innovative and shared planning tool (Strategic Plan) for supporting the sustainable development of Mediterranean rural areas. It consists in the construction of a model able to set up innovation procedures and tools, in terms of organization and management, the launching of strategies and objectives through the dialogue between local authorities and actors. The project encourages the cooperation between rural areas, since they face the same problems and they can find common solutions and create synergies at local and European level.

MedStrategy complies with the Priority Axis 4 as it supports the integrated development of Med space and it is clearly oriented towards the following topics:

- Sustainable development - the planning tool (Strategic Plan) is based on the integrated assessment of the three components of sustainability in order to ensure social and economic growth and environmental protection.

- Transnational cooperation - in order to ensure the achievement of common and shared objectives, to reduce marginalisation of rural areas, to strengthen their competitiveness and to support the cohesion of MED space.
- Innovation - in terms of innovative processes and tools for increasing knowledge as well as in terms of innovative modes of governance for strengthening capacity of local authorities.

### **3. General progress of the operation towards the set objectives**

This report, i.e. the 2nd monitoring report of the project, includes the project's activities from 1st December 2010 to 31st August 2011, as the partnership decided, during the transnational meeting in Peza (Crete) to modify the contents of the monitoring reports. In particular, it was agreed that second monitoring report would include a nine-months period, from 1st December 2010 to 31st August 2011. The third one will include a six-months period (from 1st September 2011 to 29th February 2012) and the last one will concern the last three months of the project (from 1st March 2012 to 31st May 2012).

The 1<sup>st</sup> six-months period of the project (whose activities were described in the first monitoring report) was characterised by:

- the executive planning of the activities to be undertaken during the project, led by Consorzio Tindari Nebrodi during June with the close and constant collaboration of the entire partnership;
- the resolution of some of the bureaucratic problems concerning the project contractualisation processes, in particular the light delay in undertaking these bureaucratic procedures caused some practical problems for most of the public bodies participating to MedStrategy project, which however did not negatively affect the partners' participation to the first transnational meeting;
- the realisation of the first transnational meeting of the partners: main aims of the meeting were to consolidate the relations among all the partners and to define the structure of work in the field to be implemented, the general organisation and to agree on operative details regarding financial aspects. The meeting was also the occasion to discuss with the transnational partnership of the start-up of the project, planning future activities and meetings;
- the implementation of some of the foreseen activities, in particular the completion of Component 0 (preparation of pre-application and application costs), the execution of Component 1 – Phase 1, with the realisation of a first draft of the Communication Plan which was sent to partners, agreed and then produced in its final version, the planning of Component 1 - Phase 2 (communication campaigns) by each regional leader and realisation of a press conference in Patti connected to the kick-off meeting, the management of Component 2 as foreseen by the working plan, the start-up of Component 3 – Phase 1, i.e. the activities foreseen for the integrated territorial analysis, the start-up of Component 3 – Phase 2, i.e. first draft of guidelines for the institutional framework analysis.

The main activities realised during the second nine-months period were:

- a) the final definition of the executive boards of the project, i.e. Steering Committee and Expert Board;
- b) the second transnational meeting among the partners in Pembroke (Malta);

- c) the third transnational meeting among the partners in Peza (Crete);
- d) the realisation of a first draft of the integrated territorial analysis and of the analysis of institutional framework;
- e) the start of the participation process;
- f) the gathering of successful case studies;
- g) the implementation of some communication activities foreseen within the Communication Plan (project website homepage was defined and the logo chosen, a third press conference realised, project leaflets in double language printed and other communication activities realised);
- h) the set up of a monitoring system and the execution of the first monitoring activities concerning the project as foreseen by the working plan.

a) Members of Steering Committee were finally named by each region and the Committee became officially active. Steering Committee is responsible of reviewing and/or amending the work plan, costs and time schedules and reports; solving eventual disputes between partners; contractual matters; monitoring and evaluation of project. Its meetings will be held in conjunction with project's transnational meetings in order to enforce collaborative activities with partners and groups and safe efforts and resources. Steering Committee also named members of Experts Board. The Experts Board is a multidisciplinary technical board that has the responsibility for the technical quality of the project and ensures the technical consistency and coherence of the activities taking place within and between all phases. EB should ensure that the differences between the 4 local processes are respected and used to benefit the project as well as that the planning pattern proposed (Strategic Plan) presents a true transnational added-value and is replicable in the rural areas of whole MED space. The Experts Board met for the first time during the transnational meeting in Malta. The experts discussed about the difficulties to measure some aspects regarding the territory and presented to the partnership some aspects to think of, i.e.:

- first of all the concept of sustainable development in the EU documents which is really wide, then
- how to measure exploitation? The exploitation brings to two possible development possibilities or opportunities. The EB thinks is really important to stress the opportunity
- Which are the problems to construct the indicators?
- How to structure and develop the part of the project regarding the collection of the case studies, with special concern to differences that surely will come among the territories
- Another aspect to be analysed in depth will be the comparative analysis, i.e. benchmarking, in order to obtain what? A ranking? A grid? Something else?

b) The second transnational meeting took place in Pembroke (Malta) on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> December 2010. The meeting started with a press conference. Then the partners discussed about matters concerning the management of the project (both from a financial and technical point of view). As concerns communication, partners discussed and agreed on Project logo, Website and Intranet communication system, Graphical Coordinated Image. Further discussion concerned the target group to whom the website has to be addressed. The meeting was also useful for better planning both territorial and institutional analyses foreseen in project component 3 and to present the first draft lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes.

c) The third transnational meeting took place in Peza (Crete) from 27<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> June 2011. During the meeting the partners discussed about matters concerning the management of the project (both from a financial and technical point of view) and the communication tools already produced (as logo and

website) and to be produced in the future. The main results of territorial analyses were presented by each region, the problems met in applying the methodology were discussed. Moreover the main elements of institutional frameworks were presented and discussed together with remarks/observations on the methodology. Guidelines for doing the SWOT analysis (C3-Ph3) were presented by the partner in charge. The meeting was also useful for planning the participation process foreseen in project component 4 and through the presentation of the first draft lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes. Case studies selected were presented by the Expert Board members and discussed among the partners. Concerning monitoring and evaluation the reporting structure was reminded to the partners together with the scheme of indicators to be regularly calculated. Finally future project's developments and deadlines were agreed and, on the same occasion, LP discussed with P3 (which is in charge) and Expert Board on the main lines to be followed for the Phase 3, i.e. on how to construct a Transnational Strategic Common Vision. The aim of this phase will be to create an integrated common vision for sustainable development through sharing and increasing awareness in local actors.

d) Integrated Territorial Analysis Guidelines (“Territories and Institutions: diagnosis and ex-ante evaluation”) were prepared by P1 and send to project's partners to be followed during the implementation of the phase. The guidelines include:

- Methodology for territorial analysis;
- Methodology for defining the set of indicators;
- Indicators proposed for carrying out the integrated territorial analysis.

During the reporting period, each region collected the data and produced a final draft of the Integrated Territorial Analysis.

The structure and contents of the final territorial framework document is:

- ✓ introductory section with the title “Characterization of the economic and territorial context”;
- ✓ six thematic sections (the same of the groups of indicators), each one divided into two chapters: an introduction and the description of the indicators themselves;
- ✓ fact sheet with the description of the indicators;
- ✓ Selection of indicators (according DPSIR Model).

Each analysis of institutional framework was also produced in the final draft and will be completed in the next weeks. Data were collected through a scheme to be applied at Municipal level and the methodology applied was the IAD framework as suggested in the Guidelines proposed by the partner in charge (P6).

Finally, also with regard to the Component 3, the partner in charge (P4) presented the main guidelines to be used during the SWOT analysis.

e) The first draft lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes were discussed within the partnership. The final draft lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes were presented to the partnership by the partner in charge (P2) during the transnational meeting in Crete. P2 presented to partners the definition of participation 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 success factors to be taken into consideration in the establishment of the forums, local actors to be involved, proposals on rules and procedures for an efficient implementation of the Forums' activities. In some regions a first approach with local communities already started in order to present the project and try to involve local actors and stakeholders for the future phase of the project.

f) As concerns participation component of the project, a selection of case-studies was coordinated by P7 and done by the Expert Board to be used during the forums. Case studies were gathered and examined, all focusing on experiences of local authorities and institutions with special emphasis on governance experiences. They were presented and discussed during the third transnational meeting.

g) Following the Communication Plan defined in the previous project period, MedStrategy partnership agreed on the final aspect of the project's website ([www.medstrategyproject.eu](http://www.medstrategyproject.eu)). Province of Teruel (Partner responsible for the Communication activities C1-Ph2) made the necessary changes and introduced innovations in the website, according to the communication plan, to what agreed with the other partners and to European Med programme rules. In the private area where partners can have direct access to the menus, partners uploaded documents, deliverables, news, etc.

The design and choice of the project logo was made according to some proposals made by the partner in charge (Province of Teruel). Moreover a graphic coordinated image was decided according to the logo and colours above mentioned. The coordinated image will be used by partners in headed paper, powerpoint presentations, etc.

All the other communication tools were designed and presented to partners during the third transnational meeting in Crete. Moreover leaflets of the project in double language (English and Spanish/Italian/Maltese/Greek) for local dissemination of the project were printed and distributed in each region. This dissemination has been done in a regional and local level: public authorities, policy developers, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs and professional associations, private companies, etc.

A press conference was organised both in Malta in Crete during the transnational meetings, and international dissemination was given to the project during two transnational seminars of the project *Resater* of which Fundación Proyectos Europa is partner, and that took place the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2011 in Asturias (Spain) and the 9<sup>th</sup> June in Aragón (Spain). Those seminars presented projects to improve the quality of life and the attractiveness of rural areas.

h) A monitoring system was set up, including monitoring and evaluation report structure, analysis of the project outcomes, indicators of the progress on deliverables achieved, how to register progress on program indicators. A first monitoring report, including the first six months of the project, was then drafted.

## **4. Brief summary of the undertaken activities**

### **4.1 Description of activities, outputs and results since the project start**

Medstrategy started its process to experiment an innovative governance process through the setting up of a model encouraging the sustainable development of Med rural areas. The process will focus on 3 themes:

- the integration of economic, social, environmental dimensions of sustainability in planning;
- the development of strategies and actions through the cooperation of local authorities and local communities for the innovation of territorial governance;
- the setting up of common objectives & activities for local and transnational synergies of rural areas.

After 15 months from the beginning, the partners met three times, collected data concerning their territories and institutions and almost ended the first part of the project, i.e. territorial and institutional diagnoses. Partners also began to involve local communities for the “participation process” which will define the planning and development activities to be implemented in rural areas.

#### **4.2 Description of activities, outputs and results during the reporting period**

The main activities during the reporting period were:

- the full operation of the website and the implementation of some other communication activities, including project’s brochures and press conferences;
- the organisation of the second and the third transnational meeting among the partners in Pembroke (Malta) and in Peza (Crete);
- the fulfilment of the integrated territorial analysis for the definition of the criticalities of the local contexts (data collection and final draft of each regional report);
- the fulfilment of the analysis of institutional framework for the exam of the governance systems (data collection and final draft of each regional report);
- the start of the participation process for informing and involving local communities in the project;
- the selection and description of a set of successful case studies to be presented during the participation process to local authorities and stakeholders;
- the continuous monitoring activities concerning the project results / outputs as foreseen by the working plan.

#### **4.3 Next steps to be taken**

Partners will publish the final reports concerning integrated territorial diagnosis and local institutional frameworks. The two analyses will be summarised in a diagnostic report including a SWOT matrix singling out the factors encouraging or impeding the implementation of integrated development strategies.

A community participation process will start in local reality, structured according to a precise methodology. Forums will be aimed at informing and involving local communities in the project.

### **5. Involvement of partners in the implementation of the project during the period covered by the report**

As underlined in the previous monitoring report, partners were actively involved since the very beginning of the project. During the executive planning of the project they were constantly in contact with the Lead Partner in order to jointly examine and analyses the activities to be undertaken.

The entire partnership participated to the second and to the third transnational meeting with more than one representative for the technical part of the project, including Steering Committee representatives and Expert board members.

As concerns the technical part of the project, the partnership network worked under the central role of the Lead Partner: it coordinated the bureaucratic steps, suggested the agenda for the third meeting, produced the monitoring report and gave to the partners the necessary guidelines for the foreseen project activities. LP moreover indicated responsibilities and deadlines to the due partners. Concerning the singular phases, the Lead Partner was in charge of coordinating the integrated territorial analyses in all the regions and also suggested a set of indicators to be used for final reporting in each region. It also reviewed and further developed the guidelines for the institutional analysis which were in charge of P6.

P2 was instead in charge of preparing and presenting to partners the main guidelines to be followed for implementing the participation process at a local level. It was also active in the dissemination and communication part, as its role was mainly connected to the involvement of local communities. P3, P5 and P6 worked, as foreseen, as regional coordinators for local activities both on the diagnostic part of the project and starting the participation component. All partners followed the roles defined in the working plan. Moreover, in direct connection with the local territory, they coordinated the activities and the communication at a local level. P4 elaborated and presented to the third transnational meeting the guidelines for the implementation of the SWOT analysis.

The more specific part of communication connected to the design and management website (C1-Ph2) and designing other communication tools was in charge of Province of Teruel (P5) which received the constant and active support of FDS (P7) both in designing the above mentioned communication tools and deciding on contents. FDS (P7) also coordinated the activities of the expert board and partners in selecting successful case studies to be used in the participation process.

## **6. Problems encountered and solutions found/proposed**

The project still suffers of the endemic problem of Public Authorities in officially giving public offices (for technicians to be involved in the project, first level controllers, etc.) and in spending money with a certain flexibility and speed. These administrative problems had consequences also on the actual financial reporting as most of the partners delayed contracting activities (externals expertise, services, etc.) and have still low levels of expenses compared to the time passed by.

In spite of the efforts made, a substantial delay, due to the above mentioned problems, which was already underlined in the previous report, is actually confirmed. The delay is affecting also the project activities, postponing the end of the phases at the moment of about 5-6 months compared to deadlines indicated in the work plan.

A new work plan was agreed by the partnership during the third transnational meeting in order to accelerate some phases and recover the lost time. Next discussion about this aspect will be developed during the transnational meeting which will be held in Teruel next January. During the meeting also the level of expenses will be discussed. During the third transnational meeting partners discuss about the opportunity to request an extension of the project and an adjustment of project's budget. Partners agreed to decide on it after the submission of the current progress report.

Even if Lead partner produced and provided to each partner specific files for supporting the expenditures management and reporting and the activities reporting, substantial problems keep to be encountered in reporting activities and in certification process. Also one of the partners meet still difficulties in the use of Presage system. These difficulties get worse for the problems encountered in ascribing expenditures to project's components and brought especially the LP to additional work in managing the financial part of the project.

## **7. Analysis of the project outcomes for the reporting period**

### **7.1 Working Plan progress**

**From 01 December 2010 to 31 August 2011**

(see following page)

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
<b>COMPONENT 0 (PREPARATION COSTS ONLY): Preparation of Pre-Application and Application Forms.</b> Development of the project idea. Communication among partners for ensure that the proposal meets their needs and competences. Consultation with members of JTS and the National Contacts point. Preparation and submission of pre-Application and Application Forms and the annexed documents.					
C0-Ph1	<b>Preparation of Pre-Application Form (PAF)</b> P1, P2, P3, P4 and P5 worked together previously. P1, acting as coordinator, searched for further motivated partners in other Med countries. So partnership was extended and enriched by the participation of partner P6. P1 developed the project idea, prepared and submitted to partners the project proposal. Several communications between partners occurred for ensuring that the proposal meets partners needs and competences. P1 verified the coherence of the proposal with the priority Axis and the specific objective that is related to. P1 communicated frequently with JTS for ensuring that Pre-Application form was filled up correctly. Letter of intents and the Pre-application form were prepared and submitted on time.	<u>7 Letter of intents</u>  <u>1 Pre-Application Form</u>	The phase was completed and reported in the progress report 1.	No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget because some partners were not able to report all expenditures occurred during to the preparation phase due to administrative problems.
C0-Ph2	<b>Preparation of Application Form (AF)</b> P1, with the suggestions of the Selection Committee, submitted to Ps a first draft of AF and asked their contribution with particular regard to technical activities and human resources. Strong communication occurred between P1 and Ps for clarifications and advices. Ps worked in a motivated way providing contribution according to timetable fixed by P1. Ps fully agreed with repartition of activities and costs proposed by P1. They signed and sent Partnership Agreement and Commitment Letters to P1. P1 communicated frequently with JTS for ensuring that AF was filled up correctly. AF and annexed documents were fully completed and submitted. During this phase ASAEL was substituted by actual P7, which fully participated in the preparation.	<u>1 Partnership Agreement</u> <u>7 Commitment Letters</u>  <u>1 Application Form</u>	The phase was completed and reported in the progress report 1.	No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget because some partners were not able to report all expenditures occurred during to the preparation phase due to administrative problems.
<b>COMMUNICATION COMPONENT (C1): Design of communication plan. Website. Promotion campaigns towards targeted audience and general public. Conferences, workshops and training.</b> Design of Communication Plan that will be clearly address towards the information of potential and final beneficiaries as well as the general public and it will support the capitalization and					

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
development of project results. The main communications tools that will be performed are: Website and logo; production of paper popular material (leaflet, brochure & posters); dissemination through medias (local press conferences, interviews & articles); Conferences, workshops and training					
<b>C1-Ph1</b>	<b>Communication Plan (CP)</b> The main aim of this phase is producing an agreed communication strategy that will contribute to inform potential and final beneficiaries as well as the general public and to facilitate local and European partnerships. With the project launch the Communication Plan will be drawn up and approved by the Steering Committee. CP will define the various communication activities, when and where each activity will take place and the target group which each activity is directed to.	<u>1 Communication plan</u>	Communication Plan was drawn up by the Lead Partner and a final version was agreed in the previous period. During the entire duration of the project the foreseen activities will be implemented.	No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase mainly keep within the budget of this phase and the desired outputs were obtained.
<b>C1-Ph2</b>	<b>Communication campaign</b> At the beginning of the project, project's logo and website will be performed. Website will contain project's documents and deliverables and links with EU institutions, MED Programme site as well as with sustainable development related sites. Promotion campaigns will be organized in all 4 areas for encouraging community involvement and presentation of results . Project's launch will be by local press conferences. Conferences will be held for announcing other public events of the project. Information on project activities and results will be spread via local press, radios and TV channels. Paper popular material (leaflets, brochures, posters) will be produced and disseminated in order to show clearly the project and its objectives.	<u>1 Project's logo:</u> It will allow an immediate recognition of project and its deliverables and it will be placed in the website and all documents and materials produced, together with EU and MED Programme logos. <u>1 Project's website</u> It will inform targeted groups & the general public and will facilitate feedback and exchange of experiences among partners and with other institutions & firms. <u>6 Press conferences</u> <u>10 Interviews and articles</u> <u>4 Project presentation leaflets in double language</u> (English/Maltese, English/Italian, English/Greek and	Project's logo was agreed by the partnership. It was also improved the structure of the project's website (www.medstrategyproject.eu ) and contents uploaded. The website informs general public about the project's activities, it also works as a communication tool inside the project's partnership. As regards other communication tools, a press conference was organized in Peza (Crete), in coincidence with the third transnational meeting. Moreover four project presentation leaflets in double language were printed and used to disseminate about the project's contents.	Some delay in the definition of the final version of the website due to administrative problems of partner in charge and in uploading project documents and contents. Project website is now perfectly working.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
		<p>English/Spanish</p> <p><u>4 Brochures in double languages</u> (English/Maltese, English/Italian, English/Greek and English/Spanish). This will provide more detail information about the local project (objectives, methods, community involvement) and an abstract of the local projects in the other 4 partners countries.</p> <p><u>15 Project posters in 1 language</u> (Italian, Greek, Spanish, Maltese) for publicizing project events.</p> <p><u>1 CD/DVD</u></p> <p>Project presentation and results in 5 languages (English, Italian, Greek, Spanish, Maltese)</p>			
<b>C1-Ph3</b>	<p><b>Conferences &amp; workshops &amp; training</b></p> <p>All project's deliverables are public documents and will be used for disseminating information on specific project activities and results.</p> <p>Results will be disseminated to appropriate organisations and related material will be prepared for seminars and conferences and distributed to international forums.</p> <p>At the end of the project, a conference will be organized in each country.</p> <p>In each area 1 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</p>	<p><u>8 Papers and presentations for non projects conferences</u></p> <p><u>4 Training courses</u></p> <p>In Italy, Greece, Spain and Malta a training courses for local authorities and local experts focused on development planning, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be</p>	<p>This phase and its contents were discussed with partners also during the third transnational meeting in Crete. Activities to be carried out are foreseen in following steps of the project and in particular after the participation process will be implemented.</p>	<p>Papers will be presented when the final results of the territorial analyses (C3-Ph1) and participation process will be ready.</p> <p>In fact training courses, awareness seminars, observatories of Municipalities are connected to strategic planning processes, and therefore will</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	external to the project. Courses will focus on sustainable development planning.	<p>organised.</p> <p><u>1 International conference.</u> This will be organised in Sicily. The target audience will be EU institutions, policy developers, public authorities, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs &amp; professional associations, investment experts.</p> <p><u>4 National conferences.</u></p> <p>These will be organised in Italy, Greece, Spain and Malta. The target audience will be policy developers, public authorities, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs &amp; professional associations, investment experts.</p> <p><u>4 Awareness raising seminars</u></p> <p>They will be addressed to different institutional level staff, leaders and actors to present the project and collect adhesions for training courses.</p> <p><u>4 Observatories of Municipalities.</u></p> <p>In each country a training course for local authorities and local experts focused on development planning,</p>		be carried out later on. Conferences have to be organized at the end of the project.	

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogrammation))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
		objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be organised.			
<p><b>MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (C2): Administrative, Financial and Technical Management of the project. Monitoring and Evaluation of the project.</b>  Establishment of steering committee; setting up and following up of management and coordination system concerning technical, administrative and financial management of the project; setting up of monitoring and evaluation system. P1 is responsible for the overall coordination of the project and the contractual issues and he supervises the MED programme rules. P1 works in strong collaboration with Steering Committee (SC), Experts Board (EB) and the Responsibles of the Phases (RoPs).</p>					
<b>C2-Ph1</b>	<p><b>Administrative and financial management</b>  P1 coordinates administrative, financial and contractual issues and supervises the implementation of Med programme rules. P1 signs the Subsidy Contract and sends the start-up Report.  P1 gathers and controls documents provided by PPs and collates the 6-months progress reports and the final report. P1 makes the payment to PPs.  P1 mobilises PPs for achieving project outcomes, to timeline and within budget. P1 ensures interaction and exchange of information and knowledge. All PPs use ICT communication tools to exchange information and documents.  Project secretariat is responsible for keeping all documents, files and correspondence with partners, JTS and MA. Documents are available in the project's website too.</p>	<p><u>1 Subsidy Contract</u>  <u>1 Start-up report</u>  <u>3 Progress reports (1 each six months)</u>  <u>1 Final technical report</u></p>	<p>Lead Partner took care, together with the partners, of the necessary administrative and financial steps. It supported and advised partners on the reporting activities and it gathered and controlled documents provided by partners. It also mobilised partners for achieving project outcomes, to timeline and within budget and ensured interaction and exchange of information and knowledge within the partnership. The second progress report was sent to the Managing Authority on time. LP informed MA about all administrative changes made.</p>	<p>Delay in spending money and in reporting and certifying expenditures due to internal administrative problems and due to difficulties in justifying costs according to Presage requirements (extended disaggregation of costs by phase).</p>	<p>The total amount reported is still lower than the forecasted amount. But staff costs is higher to the foreseen budget because the work time requested for the reporting and certification activities is higher than the foreseen one.</p>
<b>C2-Ph2</b>	<p><b>Technical coordination</b>  P1 is responsible for the overall technical coordination of the project that will be carried out in strong collaboration with Steering Committee (SC), Experts Board (EB) and the Responsibles of the Phases (RoPs).</p>	<p><u>1 Overall Work plan</u>  <u>3 Progress Reports (1 each six months)</u>  <u>1 Final report</u></p>	<p>Work plan was further revised, due to the initial delay underlined in the previous progress reports, examined by the entire</p>	<p>No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress. However work time in this</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	<p>During the kick-off meeting PPs will appoint the members of SC. EB members will be appointed by SC. P1 will produce the overall work plan of the project. In collaboration with EB and RoP, P1 produces the 6-months activity reports.</p> <p>In collaboration with RoPs, EB produces the guides and bibliography for helping PPs in the implementation of phases.</p> <p>5 project meetings (2 Italy, 1 Greece, 1 Spain, 1 Malta) will be held for monitoring and discussing project progress.</p>	<p><u>5 Minutes of project 's meetings</u></p>	<p>partnership and agreed during the third transnational meeting. After the submission of the current progress report the partners will discuss about the opportunity to request an extension of the project and an adjustment of project's budget.</p> <p>Steering Committee and Expert Board worked as foreseen in the project.</p> <p>Third transnational meeting was held in Peza for presenting project activities already realised and discussing future activities.</p>		<p>phase during the reporting period is higher than the foreseen one due to the mayor efforts requested at the beginning of the project.</p>
<b>C2-Ph3</b>	<p><b>Monitoring and evaluation</b></p> <p>Following the establishment of SC the monitoring and evaluation system will be set up. In collaboration with P1, SC will implement the evaluation process that regards the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effectiveness and efficiency of the project: technical consistency and coherence of the activities taking place within and between all phases; activities adherence to the project goals, budget and time frame;</li> <li>- quality of management and partnership: efficiency of management system; consistence and quality of partners collaboration;</li> <li>- achievement of project objectives: evaluation of the project on the basis of output and results indicators.</li> </ul>	<p><u>4 Monitoring and evaluation report (1 each 6 months)</u></p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation system was planned. The report structure includes a short analysis of the project outcomes, the quantification of the progress indicators on deliverables achieved, the progress on program indicators.</p> <p>First monitoring and evaluation report concerning the first six-months period was prepared by P1. During the third transnational meeting it was agreed to postpone the second monitoring report including a period of nine months (instead of six) in order to make</p>	<p>No changes in expected outputs. However work programme was slightly changed with regard to the periods to be monitored. The second monitoring report will include 9 months (December 2010-August 2011), the third one will include a six-months period (September 2011-February 2012) and the last one will concern the last three months of the project (March-May 2012).</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; this phase is still in progress.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
			the deadlines coincide with the ones of the progress reports.		
<p><b>TERRITORIES AND INSTITUTIONS - DIAGNOSIS AND EX ANTE EVALUATION (C3) : Integrated analysis and evaluation of economic, social and environmental sustainability dimensions and of institutional framework.</b></p> <p>Diagnosis of environmental, social and economic local systems through the development of appropriate set of indicators and gis applications for identifying trends and conditions. analysis of institutional structures of local authorities for pointing out the interdependences of different institutional levels, the competences of the last and their capacity to support/manage growth and innovation. swot analysis for defining those factors that could encourage or impede the development policies.</p>					
<b>C3-Ph1</b>	<p><b>Integrated territorial analysis in relation to the 3 sustainability dimensions</b></p> <p>Following the proposal of the RoP an Audit process will be activated for the definition of the criticalities of the local contexts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- data gathering and diagnosis of the involved rural areas through the development of appropriate set of indicators for identifying trends and conditions.</li> <li>- GIS applications will be used and immediately available for the Local Administrations.</li> </ul> <p>Framework Document will be an orientation tool and shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-show, synthetically and in an integrated way, the problems of environmental and socioeconomic sustainability of local systems;</li> <li>-show a set of key indicators according to the territorial specificities;</li> <li>-develop the subjects according to regional and global dimensions.</li> <li>- Identity characteristics</li> </ul>	<p><u>4 Framework Documents of the criticalities of local territorial contexts.</u></p> <p>These will be easily understandable as they will be published to increase the citizen's knowledge of territorial contexts and the awareness of services quality and potentials of their own resources and identity values.</p>	<p>According to the guidelines, the structure for the Framework Document and the methodology prepared by P1, partners collected the necessary data in order also to calculate the values of the proposed set of indicators. A final draft of territorial diagnosis report was prepared by each region and presented during the third transnational meeting. Some changes/improvements were agreed during the third meeting among the partners and the final reports will be produced in short time.</p>	<p>Phase will be ended with further delay compared to the original work plan: territorial framework documents will be ready at the end of September 2011.</p> <p>No changes in expected outputs.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; even if this phase is almost completed not all costs occurred for the implementation of the activities have been reported yet.</p>
<b>C3-Ph2</b>	<p><b>Analysis of institutional framework</b></p> <p>The priority objective will be to analyse the governance systems of the Local Authorities (LA) pointing out the interdependences of different institutional levels and the criticalities (competences, efficacy and efficiency) of the LA and their capacity to support growth and innovation. The results will evaluate the LA ability to develop policies and programs, aimed at the sustainability of the Local Development, that have to be able to increase the</p>	<p><u>4 Reports on the institutional framework</u></p> <p>These reports consist of a Key Indicators Set of Local Authorities (LA) efficiency and efficacy, of an interdependences analysis and of a "LA Conceptual map".</p>	<p>According to the "Guidelines for carrying out the analysis of institutional framework" prepared by P6 and LP, partners presented their first results during the third transnational meeting. The final version of institutional reports</p>	<p>Phase will be ended in delay compared to the original work plan: reports on the institutional framework will be ready at the end of October 2011.</p> <p>No changes in expected</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; even if this phase is almost completed not all costs occurred for the implementation of the activities have been reported yet.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	territories competitiveness and attractivity coherently with the EU, national and regional programmes. The results will complete the Framework Document with an analysis of the local governance levels and will be spread in order to increase the citizen's and LA' awareness.	These reports will be put into the Framework Document.	will be ready at the end of October.	outputs.	
<b>C3-Ph3</b>	<b>SWOT Analysis</b> The Ps, considering the results of the Framework Document, will develop an auto-evaluation activity of their contexts through a "SWOT" methodology, aimed at singling out the factors encouraging or impeding the implementation of integrated development strategies. This phase, which schedules occasions of comparison about the different institutional assets and specific issues, will allow each local reality to compare the results and the goals achieved in the 4 studied areas. The final report (Diagnostic Report, DR) will compare the territories' quality and the different governance systems. It will be drawn up on the basis of common criteria indicated by the Experts Board. The DR will be the reference document for the participation process.	<u>1 Diagnostic Report</u> This Report concerns problems and barriers, opportunities and assets regarding quality and availability of local resources, territorial competitiveness and attractivity, training and competences of human resources.	Partner in charge (P4) prepared the main guidelines to be used during the SWOT analysis and presented them to the partners during the meeting in Crete. This phase will be completed before the end of November 2011.	Phase will start in delay compared to the original work plan: diagnostic report will be ready at the end of November 2011. No changes in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.
<b>PARTECIPATION COMPONENT: STRATEGIC COMMON VISION (C4) . Community consultation and participation process, review of success cases, common vision.</b> Establishment of community involvement process: Forum divided into Plenums and Thematic Focus Groups. Identification of priority intervention sectors and targets. Selection of the success cases on sustainable local development policies and evaluation of success/failure factors through performance and benchmarking indicators. Trans-national comparison and evaluation of problems and solutions perceived/proposed by the local actors. Construction of a Strategic Common Vision (EASW methodology).					
<b>C4-Ph1</b>	<b>Establishment of community participation process</b> In each local reality a participation process (Forum) will be started, structured according to methodologies indicated by the Experts Board. Forum will be aimed at informing and involving local communities in the project. During the start-up phase, the selection criteria of the stakeholders, the consultation and participation rules and procedures will be established. The meetings will be divided into Plenums and Thematic Focus Groups and managed according to consolidated facilitation techniques. Stakeholders of other local communities will be invited to participate as observers. The subjects discussed and agreed in the Forums will	<u>Review of participation methods</u> A synthetic description of most common participation methods and tools. <u>4 Forums regulation</u> Rule and procedures for an efficient implementation of Forum activities. <u>24 Minutes of Forum meetings and workshops</u>	The final draft lines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes and above all for the organization of the forums were presented to the partnership by the partner in charge (P2) during the transnational meeting in Crete. The forums will start in November 2011. However some	Work program and expected outputs are the same foreseen in the application form.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs (Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	orient the choices, which will have to be shared by all the territory institutional actors.	These will include list of participants, issues discussed, results agreed in each meeting of Local Forums.	first contacts and preparatory meetings were realized in order to start to inform local communities about the project. Further activities will be implemented during the next reporting period.		
<b>C4-Ph2</b>	<p><b>Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements</b></p> <p>In this phase, the Forums activities will be addressed towards the analysis of experiences in similar rural contexts in Mediterranean area, which have been able to bring forward integrated and sustainable local development. Success cases will be proposed by EB. The comparison of the paths and results got, will allow to pick out strategies, tools and actions which have determined the success of these experiences. The difficulties faced and the solutions adopted can represent concrete examples to refer to in order to orient the choices of the Forum. The Report of this phase will give the necessary reference values to develop an associated monitoring indicators system of the goals and improvements achieved by local communities.</p>	<p><u>1 Report on Success Cases</u> Synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities. Comparative experiences analysis. Set of results evaluation indicators.</p>	Expert Board, in close cooperation with partners, gathered and examined interesting case studies, all focusing on experiences of local authorities and institutions with special emphasis on governance experiences. They were presented and discussed during the third transnational meeting and will be presented to local stakeholders during the forums.	Case studies were already selected and partly described on paper. Short delay in producing the final foreseen report which will be ready at the end of October 2011. No changes in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; even if this phase is almost completed not all costs occurred for the implementation of the activities have been reported yet.
<b>C4-Ph3</b>	<p><b>Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision (TSCV)</b></p> <p>The aim of this phase is to create an integrated Common Vision for sustainable development through sharing and increasing awareness in local actors. They will be stimulated in participating to identifying and planning concrete solutions to the existing problems. According to EASW@ (European Awareness Scenario Workshop) methodology, Forums based on the deliverables worked out in C3 (Framework Document, Diagnostic Report) will define 2 alternative visions of the future: negative (nothing changes) and positive (things change improving). In each area 1 workshop is scheduled. Following taking into account the "Review of Success</p>	<p><u>4 Reports on local EASWs</u> These will include list of participants, common negative and positive visions, shared ideas and projects defined in each Local EASW.</p>	Partner in charge (P3) discussed the main guidelines to be used during the EASW with P1 and Expert Board during the meeting in Crete. It was agreed this phase should be developed at the same time of the participation process. Final version of the guidelines to be followed by partners will be prepared by P3 for the end of September 2001, then the construction of a strategic	Compared to the application form the phase was extended due to slight change in methodology. It will be developed together with participation process and then end with the end of the project itself. However there will be no change in the expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	Cases they will suggest ideas and projects which can support the above established common and convergent positive vision.		common vision will start together with the forums.		
<b>STRATEGIC PLANNING IN MED RURAL AREAS (C5): Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology (Transnational Action Plan) and the Local Pilot Operative Plans (pilot projects)</b>					
<p>For each rural area involved in the project a Pilot Strategic Plan will be drawn up. This will contain the key actions oriented toward innovation and sustainability of local system, for increasing its competitiveness. Start-up, implementation and monitoring of 1 key action in each rural area involved in the project. Comparative evaluation of the 4 local planning process and definition of Strategic Plan pattern. Production of an operative handbook on Strategic Planning for LAs in MED rural area.</p>					
C5-Ph1	<b>Definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs) for the integrated development of rural areas</b> Ps, coherently with the common vision identified in the local forums, will test the methodology defined in the previous phase (TLDM), through the drawing of Local Pilot Operative Plans (pilot projects) for the development oriented to sustainability. The LPOPs, structured as a circular process, shall: - specify the key approaches to be adopted to develop an integrated planning - identify challenges and priorities to be enacted, to increase competitiveness and improve the attractivity potential of local systems - define financial resources needed - single out specific competences - attribute responsibilities for LPOP management and processes carrying out - define Target and Key Interventions - identify monitoring and evaluation indicators	<u>4 Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs)</u> Report on LPOP will be structured as a Local Action Plan and will be organized for: - Sustainability Objectives - Intervention sectors/fields - Strategic Lines - Targets - Projects and actions - Timing & Costs - Actors - Monitoring indicators	No activity implemented during the reporting period. The phase will start in November 2011.	Short delay in starting the phase due to the delay in the previous component. No changes in expected outputs.	No cost is actually reported in this phase.
C5-Ph2	<b>Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM)</b> The Experts Board, taking into account the TSCV and through a comparative evaluation of the results included in the LPOPs, will define the framework of the TLDM for the definition of an "Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas" The results of this phase will be included in the Guidelines that will be structured as an operative handbook. This will indicate an innovative Transnational Tool to define and manage local development integrated	<u>1 Guidelines for the drawing up of an "Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas"</u> The guidelines will single out: - Environmental and Governance Audit methods - Auto-evaluation methods	No activity implemented during the reporting period. The phase will start in January 2012.	Work program and expected outputs are the same foreseen in the application form.	No cost is actually reported in this phase.

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	Financial reporting <i>(Has the project been able to keep within the budget of this Component - Phase and still achieve the desired outputs? (In case of negative answer, please explain the main problems incurred))</i>
	Plans based on sustainability criteria. TLDM will strengthen MED rural areas cohesion and improve local governance through the definition of a suitable territorial asset for development strategies (as foreseen by Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion.	-Participated Process Models -Guide for drawing-up of Local Operative Plans -Efficiency and Coherence Monitoring Indicators of Strategic Plans			
<b>C5-Ph3</b>	<p><b>Identification of Key Interventions (KI)</b></p> <p>In each territorial context the partners will develop a Key Intervention (KI), singled out by the Experts Board, among the ones considered of priority and common in the 4 LPOPs.</p> <p>KI will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-be intersectorial</li> <li>-aim at the social economic development of the rural areas</li> <li>-have to be shared and involve different levels of decisional power</li> </ul> <p>The KI will be a useful resource for all the partners and will become an example of “good practice” (e.g. Quality Trademark of Tourist Structures, Desk-office for the enterprises, Coordinative Office for territorial planning). Within each KI the partners will define technical solutions, procedure and administrative modalities, human resources and technical competences needed for realizing the intervention.</p>	<p><u>4 Final Report for each Key Intervention</u></p> <p>It will describe the reasons of the choice of the Key Interventions according to the priorities singled out in the LPOPs and will define:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Priorities actions</li> <li>-Human resources</li> <li>-Technical abilities</li> <li>-Financial resources</li> <li>-Monitoring indicators</li> </ul>	No activity implemented during the reporting period. The phase will start in January 2012.	Work program and expected outputs are the same foreseen in the application form.	No cost is actually reported in this phase.

## **7.2 Progress on deliverables achieved**

The project, up to now, produced the following deliverables:

### PREPARATION COMPONENT (C0): Preparation of Pre-Application and Application Forms.

- 7 Letter of intents
- 1 Pre-Application Form1 Partnership Agreement
- 7 Commitment Letters
- 1 Application Form

### COMMUNICATION COMPONENT (C1): Design of communication plan. Website. Promotion campaigns towards targeted audience and general public. Conferences, workshops and training.

- 1 Communication plan
- 1 Project's logo
- 1 Project's website
- 3 Press conferences
- 1 Article on newspaper
- 4 Project presentation leaflets in double language

### MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (C2): Administrative, Financial and Technical Management of the project. Monitoring and Evaluation of the project.

- 1 Subsidy Contract
- 1 Start-up report
- 2 Progress reports
- 1 Overall Work plan
- 3 Minutes of project 's meeting
- 2 Monitoring and evaluation reports

### TERRITORIES AND INSTITUTIONS - DIAGNOSIS AND EX ANTE EVALUATION (C3) : Integrated analysis and evaluation of economic, social and environmental sustainability dimensions and of institutional framework.

- 4 Framework Documents of the criticalities of local territorial contexts (draft)
- 4 Reports on the institutional framework (draft)

### 7.3 Progress on program indicators

Indicator		Foreseen	Achieved (cumul)	Unit
<b>Common indicators for all priorities</b>				
Local and regional authorities involved in experimental activities (pilot activities)	Quantitative	25	0	Involved structures
Other public and semi-public bodies involved in experimental activities (pilot activities)	Quantitative	40	0	Involved structures
Private sector structures and networks involved in experimental activities (pilot activities)	Quantitative	40	0	Involved structures
Third sector organisms involved in experimental activities (pilot activities)	Quantitative	30	0	Involved structures
Number of communication tools developed from the following list: brochures, DVD, Cd Rom, video, guides, etc. (indicate the number)	Quantitative	4	2	Communication tools
European institutions towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	4	0	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
State Administrations towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	4	0	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Local and Regional Authorities towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	120	20	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Other public and semi-public bodies towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	100	20	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Private sector towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	100	15	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Specific partners towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	4	4	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Number of websites developed	Quantitative	1	1	Website

<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Foreseen</b>	<b>Achieved (cumul)</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Number of data bases developed	Quantitative	1	0	databases
Number of updated on-line data bases which will remain usable even after the closure of the project	Quantitative	1	0	databases
Number of targeted communication actions carried out by the partnership from the following list: events, seminars, conferences, exhibitions, information and awareness raising campaigns, etc	Quantitative	13	3	communication action
European institutions concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	2	0	Target structures for communication actions
State Administration concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	4	0	Target structures for communication actions
Local and Regional Authorities concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	60	20	Target structures for communication actions
Other public and semi-public bodies concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	50	20	Target structures for communication actions
Private sector concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	50	15	Target structures for communication actions
Specific partners concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	2	0	Target structures for communication actions
<b>Specific indicators of the priority</b>				
New networks of cities or local authorities for polycentrism	Quantitative	1	0	Permanent networks established
Common studies aimed at strategies or plans, methodologies or tools at transnational level	Quantitative	4	0	Joint implementation or working plans or strategies
Joint strategies and agreements	Quantitative	4	0	Joint implementation or working plans or strategies
Local authorities involved in transnational activities	Quantitative	20	6	New transnational activities set up by local authorities
Isolated areas authorities involved in transnational activities	Quantitative	18	4	New initiatives or structures for support promoted by local authorities of the isolated areas

## **8. Financial and economic state-of-the-art**

The financial state-of-the-art of the project, after 15 months, presents some important characteristics.

First of all costs of some phases are inferior to the foreseen budget because some partners were not able to report all expenditures occurred during the phase due to administrative problems.

Moreover, in few cases, costs of the phase with particular regard to personnel are higher to the foreseen budget because the work time requested for the activities was higher than the foreseen one.

Both the problems can substantially affect the future economic management of the project if the partners will not work to improve the situation. A possible solution is asking to the Managing Authority to change the budget according to the partners' requests.

It was also noticed some delay in reporting and certifying expenditures due to difficulties in justifying costs according to Presage requirements (extended disaggregation of costs by phase).

Finally, even if Lead partner produced and provided to each partner specific files for supporting the expenditures management and reporting and the activities reporting, substantial problems keep to be encountered in reporting activities and in certification process. These difficulties get worse for the problems encountered in ascribing expenditures to project's components and brought especially the LP to additional work in managing the financial part of the project.