



## 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.3

## C2: Management Component

**Editor:** Consorzio Tindari Nebrodi

**Author:** Stefania Zanna

**Due date of deliverable:** 30 April 2012

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

**Duration of the project:** 24 months (request of extension of six months under approval)

**Reference period for this report:** 01 September 2011 – 29 February 2012

**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 (extension up to 30 November 2012 under approval)
<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, 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.

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 participation 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**

The first nine-months period of the project went from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2010 (official beginning of the project) to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2011 and, as described in the previous monitoring reports, was characterised at the beginning by the resolution of some of the bureaucratic problems concerning the project contractualisation processes which delayed the beginning of its activities. The first transnational meeting took place in July 2010 and its main aims were to define the structure of work to be implemented and to agree on operative details regarding financial aspects. Moreover, during the first three months (June-August 2010), partnership completed Component 0 (preparation of pre-application and application costs), realised Component 1 – Phase 1 (producing the Communication Plan), planned Component 1 - Phase 2 (Communication Campaigns), started Component 3 – Phase 1, i.e. the activities foreseen for the integrated territorial analysis. As regards C2 (Management component) LP provided the project partners with:

- an excel file model for facilitating the management and the reporting of the expenditures by the partners and for facilitating the expenditures' check and validation by the LP
- a word file model for the reporting of activities in order to evaluate the coherence of the expenditures with the activities carried out.

Before the validation of the expenditures the partners filled in the excel model and send it to LP in order to check it and provide them with its comments. Only when LP confirm to partners that expenditures are OK the partners transfer “new expenditures” to “expenditures in validation process” and then LP check them definitively and validate them.

This procedure permits partnership to avoid errors and to save time in reporting process.

During the second six-months period (September 2010 – February 2011) the MedStrategy partners mainly worked on Component 3 of the project. They also started to work on Component 4. Moreover activities of Communication (Component 1) and Management (Component 2) were obviously developed, as transversal parts of the project itself. The main activities developed during the 2<sup>nd</sup> six-months period were: the final definition of the executive boards of the project, i.e. Steering Committee and Expert Board; the second transnational meeting among the partners in Malta; the start of the integrated territorial analysis; the start of the analysis of institutional framework; the start of the participation process; the design and choice of the project logo and website; the implementation of some other communication activities foreseen within the Communication Plan; the set up of a monitoring system and the execution of the first monitoring activities concerning the project as foreseen by the working plan.

During the following period (March-August 2011) the main activities were: for Component 1 (Communication) project website homepage was defined, a third press conference realised, project leaflets in double language printed and other communication activities realised; for Component 2 (Management), further to the constant management of the project activities, a second progress report was produced, the third transnational meeting organised where the partners discussed about matters concerning the management of the project, the communication tools, first results of analyses were presented and guidelines given for participation process; for Component 3 (Territories and

institutions) a final draft on territorial context and institutional framework was presented by each region; for Component 4 (Participation and Strategic Common Vision) a first draft of the methodology to be applied was discussed by the partnership, a selection of case-studies was prepared and presented, the first lines for the construction of a transnational strategic common vision were discussed.

As regard the period included in this monitoring report (i.e. September 2011 – February 2012), the activities developed are detailed below.

COMPONENT 1 – During the last period, communication activities were mainly addressed to the involvement of local territories in the participation process and in disseminating the project to a wider public.

For participation process each regional coordinator involved local communities through mailing lists and/or preparatory meetings addressed to local actors, citizens and stakeholders. Posters were printed to advertise on project's activities, above all during the organisation of the forums of the participation process. Posters graphic design was made by Province of Teruel (in charge of the Phase) and is common to all the local versions. Leaflets of the project in double language (English and Spanish/Italian/Maltese/Greek) for local dissemination of the project were distributed in each region. This dissemination was done at 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 in Teruel during the fourth transnational meeting inviting local newspapers and television channels plus web media. Presentations were made in Italy and Spain during local non-project conferences related to local development through official participation of project's representatives.

With regards to the internet communication, partners increased their active participation to the project website, uploading their document on the project and disseminating their local activities also on the project's website.

Partnership finally agreed on the contents of the Component 1 – Phase 3. In particular:

- The objective of the *Awareness Raising Seminars* will be 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 will be 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* will be to provide opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts and improving the involvement of local communities through training. The target will be 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* will be 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 will be 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.

COMPONENT 2 - During the first two months of this reporting period, partnership prepared and submitted on time the progress report. Concerning the financial reporting, all partners, except PP6-Pembroke Council, filled in the expenditures reporting file created by the LP in order to facilitate the reporting process and included, if done, expenses on Presage system.

The fourth transnational meeting took place in Teruel (Spain) from 7<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> February 2012. During the meeting the partners discussed about matters concerning:

- the methodology to be applied for the Component 1 Phase 3, i.e. Conferences, workshops and training;
- the management of the project both from a financial and technical point of view (Component 2 Phase 1);
- the Financial Situation of the project and the problems raised with the reporting/certification of the expenditures;
- the request of budget change and of the extension of project duration and the proposals for the new application form;
- the extension of the monitoring system (C2-Ph3) through additional indicators and evaluation activities addressed to the participants to the participation process;
- the diagnostic report, final deliverable of the Component 3 Phase 3, comparing the territories' quality and the different governance systems;
- the implemented participation process (C4-Ph1): territorial involvement, level of participation, issues discussed, forums realised, case studies analysed, rules applied in the Forums, etc.;
- the report on success cases (C4-Ph2) including a synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities, a comparative experiences analysis, the set of results evaluation indicators;
- the implemented European Awareness Scenario Workshops (EASW meetings): territorial involvement, level of participation, issues discussed, outputs (common vision and actions);
- the contents and use of the Thematic Areas proposed in the guidelines, i.e. Thematic area A - Innovation processes for local development, Thematic area B - Territorial cooperation and cohesion, Thematic area C - Integration of economic sectors, Thematic area D - Competitiveness and territorial marketing;
- the methodology to be applied for the Definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans for the integrated development of rural areas (C5-Ph1) and the proposals on rules and procedures for an efficient implementation of the phase;
- the definition of the structure of the Local Action Plans;
- the lines to be applied and on how to develop the Component 5 phase 2, i.e. the Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology;
- the future working plan and components deadlines.

The meeting was also the occasion to meet the JTS representatives. The Lead Partner 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 implement the dissemination activities. JTS representatives also discussed with the partners about capitalization measures.

As regards Component 2 – Phase 3, an updated evaluation system was planned and will be implemented in the next reporting period. The 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 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.

COMPONENT 3 - During the reporting period, three of the regions (i.e. Spain, Sicily and Crete) completed and presented the final framework document on the criticalities of local territorial contexts. Also reports on the institutional frameworks were produced in the final version for the three regions. Only Maltese partner have to complete their work both regarding Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Component.

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, 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.

The results about Territorial SWOT analysis mainly regard 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 about Institutional SWOT analysis mainly regard 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

The deliverable is therefore in progress but a final version can be produced only when also Maltese SWOT analysis will be produced.

COMPONENT 4 - Still suffered of some delay due to the late completion of the Component 3. 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. Two regions started their participation process (Italy and Spain) and completed some of the forums foreseen. Greece also started the process through the involvement of local actors and citizens, while Pembroke Local Council has still to start the Participation Component.

In particular, 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, the rules and procedures for an efficient implementation of Forum activities.

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”. 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.

As for Spain, 67 people have participated in forum activities. 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) followed the methodology foreseen in the guidelines both for working documents prepared and final output produced.

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.

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

In Greece the participation process started on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2011 and just the first meeting with stakeholders and actors 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.

With regard to C4-Ph2, the report on success cases was produced. The report includes: a synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities, comparative experiences analysis, a set of results evaluation indicators.

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. 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, Expert Board finally reported, in the first part of the report, five cases:

- “Rural multiservice network formula” (Aragon, Spain)
- “Val di Cornia: a new experience of cultural and touristic services” (Tuscany, Italy)
- “Reggio Nord: a governance experience of public services” (Emilia Romagna, Italy)
- “Increasing public participation and governance through access to information” (Malta)
- “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 are:

- 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, were 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).

COMPONENT 5 – Guidelines for the development of the component were agreed. 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 it 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 (“macro-objectives”) were selected. These themes constitute the common axes around which the 4 LPOPs should be structured.

- 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.

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).

In the framework of participation process a first list of potential key interventions (C5-Ph1) was drafted.

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

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

Medstrategy almost completed its process to experiment an innovative governance process through the setting up of a model encouraging the sustainable development of Med rural areas.

The partners met four times, collected data concerning their territories and institutions and ended the research part of the project, i.e. territorial and institutional diagnoses. SWOT analysis for the comparison of the four regions was partly completed.

Partners also started to involve local communities for the “participation process” which will define the planning and development activities to be implemented in rural areas. Part of the participation process was realised. Case studies were selected and analysed for the evaluation of success/failure elements in terms of governance in rural areas and a report was realised.

Finally, the last component, i.e. the definition of local operative plans and of a transnational local development methodology was planned in details and started up in most regions.

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

The main activities during the reporting period were:

- the implementation of communication activities, as press conference, posters, interviews and articles, presentation of the project during seminars, etc.;
- the fulfilment of the 4<sup>th</sup> Progress report;
- the organisation of the fourth transnational meeting among the partners in Teruel (Spain);
- the fulfilment of the integrated territorial analysis for the definition of the criticalities of the local contexts (final version of three regional reports);
- the fulfilment of the analysis of institutional framework for the exam of the governance systems (data final version of three regional reports);
- a first draft of the SWOT analysis;

- the establishment of the participation process for involving local communities in the project;
- the report on 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.

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

Partners will publish the final of the diagnostic report including a SWOT matrix singling out the factors encouraging or impeding the implementation of integrated development strategies.

Community participation process will be completed in local realities and report produced on the achieved results. A transnational common vision will be created.

Local operative plans agreed in each region and a transnational local development methodology defined.

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

During the executive planning of each phase of the project partners were constantly in contact with the Lead Partner in order to jointly examine and analyses the activities to be undertaken. Generally speaking, the working methodology foresees that the partner in charge proposes the lines to be followed for its realization to the others in order to start the discussion: the final version of the methodology is then jointly agreed.

The entire partnership participated to the fourth 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 fourth 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. LP also suggested to the others the lines to be followed for the definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans for the integrated development of rural areas.

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 is mainly connected to the involvement of local communities.

P3 and P5 worked, as foreseen, as regional coordinators for local activities both on the diagnostic part of the project and realising the participation component. They also interacted with Lead Partners for the definition of the other phases. Moreover, in direct connection with the local territory, they coordinated the activities and the communication at a local level.

The third regional coordinator, P6, confirmed is responsibility in undertaking the same activities for Malta, but, due to administrative problems was unable to realize them. It however proposed to present a new working plan, specifically designed for the problematic situation of the project implementation in Malta, in order to recover the lost time.

P4 started to work on the SWOT analysis with the data and information coming by three of the four regions. They will produce a final report comparing the territories' quality and the different governance systems.

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 and in reporting them.

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

The project still suffers of the endemic problem of Public Authorities in Malta 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 present financial reporting as most of the partners have still low levels of certified 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 monitoring reports, is for another time confirmed. The delay kept in postponing the end of the phases of about 5-6 months compared to deadlines indicated in the work plan. Consequently it was decided to complete component four and five at the same time. The particular attention to be paid to communication, brought however the partnership, to the decision of asking the Managing Authority to extent the project of six months. After some preliminary contacts with the JTS officer the request was formally submitted in the end of April.

During the meeting in Teruel the level of expenses was discussed. Major problems occurred with Pembroke Local Council which has not any certified expenditure up to the end of February 2012. 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 P3, P4 and P6 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.

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

### **7.1 Working Plan progress**

**From 01 September 2011 to 29 February 2012**

(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>
<p><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.</p>					
C0-Ph1	<p><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.</p>	<p><u>7 Letter of intents</u> <u>1 Pre-Application Form</u></p>	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	<p><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 ASAEEL was substituted by actual P7, which fully participated in the preparation.</p>	<p><u>1 Partnership Agreement</u> <u>7 Commitment Letters</u> <u>1 Application Form</u></p>	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.
<p><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 development of project results. The main communications tools that will be performed are: Website and logo; production of paper popular material (leaflet, brochure &amp; posters);</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>
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,	Further contents were uploaded on the project's website (www.medstrategyproject.eu). Each regional coordinator involved local communities through mailing lists and/or preparatory meetings addressed to local actors, citizens and stakeholders. Posters were printed to advertise on project's activities, above all during the organisation of the forums of the participation process. Posters graphic design was made by Province of Teruel (in charge of the Phase) and is common to all the local versions. Leaflets of the project in double language (English and Spanish/Italian/Maltese/Greek) for local dissemination of the project were distributed in each region. This dissemination was done at a regional and local level:	No changes in work program neither in 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 (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>English/Greek and 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>	<p>public authorities, policy developers, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs and professional associations, private companies, etc.</p> <p>A press conference was organised in Teruel during the fourth transnational meeting inviting local newspapers and television channels plus web media.</p> <p>Presentations were made in Italy and Spain during local non-project conferences related to local development through official participation of project's representatives.</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</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,</p>	<p>Partnership agreed on the contents of the Phase . In particular:</p> <p>The objective of the Awareness Raising Seminars will be to introduce the target group to the project and collect adhesions for training courses and encouraging community involvement with special regard to institutional staff</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</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 (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>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.</p>	<p>best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be 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> 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> They will be addressed to different institutional level staff, leaders and actors to present the project and collect adhesions for training</p>	<p>to participate to strategic planning process. The target will be 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.</p> <p>The objective of training courses will be to provide opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts and improving the involvement of local communities through training. The target will be 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</p> <p>The objective of the Observatories of Municipalities will be to involve other Municipalities than the ones included in the 'project' and highlighting the project results</p>	<p>to strategic planning processes, and therefore will be carried out later on. Conferences have to be organized at the end of the project.</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>
		<p>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, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be organised.</p>	<p>and expertise making these visible to the large public. The target will be 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. 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><b>MANAGEMENT COMPONENT (C2): Administrative, Financial and Technical Management of the project. Monitoring and Evaluation of the project.</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Project secretariat is responsible for keeping all documents,</p>	<p><u>1 Subsidy Contract</u></p> <p><u>1 Start-up report</u></p> <p><u>3 Progress reports (1 each six months)</u></p> <p><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</p>	<p>Delay in spending money and in reporting and certifying expenditures due to administrative problems and due to difficulties in justifying costs according to Presage requirements (extended disaggregation of costs by phase).</p>	<p>Costs of this phase will be higher to the foreseen budget because the work time requested for the reporting and certification activities is higher than the foreseen one.</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>
	files and correspondence with partners, JTS and MA. Documents are available in the project's website too.		of information and knowledge within the partnership. The fourth progress report was sent to the Managing Authority in due time. LP informed MA about all administrative changes made. As it was agreed by project Steering Committee the request of a 6-months extension and project's budget reallocation was submitted.		
<b>C2-Ph2</b>	<p><b>Technical coordination</b></p> <p>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>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>1 Overall Work plan</u></p> <p><u>3 Progress Reports (1 each six months)</u></p> <p><u>1 Final report</u></p> <p><u>5 Minutes of project 's meetings</u></p>	Further work plan was further revised, due to the initial delay underlined in previous progress reports, examined by the entire partnership and agreed during the fourth transnational meeting. Steering Committee and Expert Board worked as foreseen in the project. Fourth transnational meeting was held in Teruel (Spain) for discussing about financial matters, presenting project activities already realised and discuss future implementation.	No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress. However work time in this phase during the reporting period is higher than the foreseen one due to the mayor efforts requested at the beginning of the project.
<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</p>	<p><u>4 Monitoring and evaluation report (1 each 6 months)</u></p>	Monitoring and evaluation system was improved and a further monitoring report produced by	No changes in expected monitoring outputs. Improvements were made to	Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; 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>
	<p>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>P1. 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>the evaluation system through the proposal of some additional indicators and evaluation questionnaires to be filled both by the “internal” actors of the project (partners) and the “external” ones (participants to the participation processes in the regions).</p>	
<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>					
<p><b>C3-Ph1</b></p>	<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>During the reporting period, three of the regions (i.e. Spain, Sicily and Crete) completed and presented the final framework document.</p>	<p>Phase will be ended with further delay compared to the original work plan: territorial framework documents are ready for three regions but still missing from Malta. However no changes are expected in the foreseen outputs.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; even if this phase is completed in three regions (Sicily, Greece and Spain) 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 <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>
<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 territories competitiveness and attractiveness 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.</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". These reports will be put into the Framework Document.</p>	<p>Reports on the institutional frameworks were produced in the final version by the three regions (Sicily, Spain and Greece) but not by Malta.</p>	<p>Phase will be ended with further delay compared to the original work plan: institutional framework documents are ready for three regions but still missing from Malta. However no change is expected in the foreseen outputs.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget; even if this phase is almost completed in three regions (Sicily, Greece and Spain) not all costs occurred for the implementation of the activities have been reported yet.</p>
<b>C3-Ph3</b>	<p><b>SWOT Analysis</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><u>1 Diagnostic Report</u></p> <p>This Report concerns problems and barriers, opportunities and assets regarding quality and availability of local resources, territorial competitiveness and attractiveness, training and competences of human resources.</p>	<p>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, 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. The deliverable is in progress but a final version can be produced only when also Maltese SWOT analysis will be produced.</p>	<p>Phase will end in delay compared to the original work plan. SWOT report will be ready after the completion of the work to be done in the two previous phases also by Maltese partner. No changes in expected outputs.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.</p>
<b>PARTECIPATION COMPONENT: STRATEGIC COMMON VISION (C4) . Community consultation and participation process, review of success cases, common vision.</b>					

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>
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).					
C4-Ph1	<p><b>Establishment of community participation process</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The subjects discussed and agreed in the Forums will orient the choices, which will have to be shared by all the territory institutional actors.</p>	<p><u>Review of participation methods</u></p> <p>A synthetic description of most common participation methods and tools.</p> <p><u>4 Forums regulation</u></p> <p>Rule and procedures for an efficient implementation of Forum activities.</p> <p><u>24 Minutes of Forum meetings and workshops</u></p> <p>These will include list of participants, issues discussed, results agreed in each meeting of Local Forums.</p>	<p>Some first contacts and preparatory meetings were realized in order to start to inform local communities about the project.</p> <p>Two regions started their participation process (Italy and Spain) and completed some of the forums foreseen. Greece also started the process through the involvement of local actors and citizens, while Pembroke Local Council has still to start the Participation Component.</p>	<p>Some delay in starting the component, compared to the original application form were mainly due to delay in completion of the Component 3.</p>	<p>Costs of this phase are inferior to the foreseen budget as this phase is still in progress.</p>
C4-Ph2	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The difficulties faced and the solutions adopted can represent concrete examples to refer to in order to orient the choices of the Forum.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><u>1 Report on Success Cases</u></p> <p>Synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities.</p> <p>Comparative experiences analysis. Set of results evaluation indicators.</p>	<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. The report on success cases was produced. The report includes: a synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities, comparative experiences analysis,</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>

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>
	communities.		a set of results evaluation indicators.		
<b>C4-Ph3</b>	<p><b>Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision (TSCV)</b> 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 Cases" they will suggest ideas and projects which can support the above established common and convergent positive vision.</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) further discussed the main guidelines to be used during the EASW with P1 and Expert Board during the meeting in Teruel. It was confirmed that this phase should be developed at the same time of C4-Ph1.	Compared to the application form the phase was extended due to change in methodology and the delay by Maltese partner. It will be completed 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.
<p><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> <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>					
<b>C5-Ph1</b>	<p><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</p>	<p><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</p>	Guidelines for the development of the component were agreed. 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	Delay in starting the phase due to the delay in the previous components. No changes in 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 (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>local systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-define financial resources needed</li> <li>-single out specific competences</li> <li>-attribute responsibilities for LPOP management and processes carrying out</li> <li>-define Target and Key Interventions</li> <li>-identify monitoring and evaluation indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Projects and actions</li> <li>-Timing &amp; Costs</li> <li>-Actors</li> <li>-Monitoring indicators</li> </ul>	<p>people; we also describe trends affecting our community, the problems it faces, and the opportunities ahead.</p> <p>2. Strategic planning looks at the big picture and helps community decide what is important</p> <p>3. During Implementation, we do the things which will get us where we want to be</p> <p>4. After completing our activities, we evaluate them to see how well they worked and we improve them (back to Planning) considering lessons learned</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Each region (Italia, Greece, Spain and Malta) will develop the LPOP of the sector that the region chose (tourism, energy etc).</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>
<b>C5-Ph2</b>	<p><b>Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM)</b></p> <p>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”</p> <p>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 Plans based on sustainability criteria.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p><u>1 Guidelines for the drawing up of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas”</u></p> <p>The guidelines will single out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Environmental and Governance Audit methods</li> <li>-Auto-evaluation methods</li> <li>-Participated Process Models</li> <li>-Guide for drawing-up of Local Operative Plans</li> <li>-Efficiency and Coherence Monitoring Indicators of Strategic Plans</li> </ul>	<p>Lessons learned from the definition of the 4 LPOPs will be used for define the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM).</p> <p>The guidelines will single out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental and governance audit methods</li> <li>Auto-evaluation methods</li> <li>Participated process models</li> <li>Guide for drawing-up of Local Operative Plans</li> <li>Efficiency and coherence monitoring indicators of Strategic Plans</li> </ul> <p>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).</p>	<p>Delay in starting the phase due to the delay in the previous components.</p> <p>No changes in expected outputs.</p>	<p>No cost is actually reported in this phase.</p>
<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</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> </ul>	<p>In the framework of participation process a first list of potential key interventions was drafted</p>	<p>Delay in starting the phase due to the delay in the previous components.</p> <p>No changes in expected outputs.</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	<b>Activities implemented during reporting period</b> <i>Description of activities (activities implemented during the period, mention any change in dates, partners, ...)</i>	<b>Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs</b> <i>(Please mention and explain minor changes in work programme and expected outputs (which do not require a project reprogramming))</i>	<b>Financial reporting</b> <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>
	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Human resources</li> <li>-Technical abilities</li> <li>-Financial resources</li> <li>-Monitoring indicators</li> </ul>			

## **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
- 4 Press conferences
- 5 Article on newspapers
- 3 Project presentation leaflets in double language
- 3 Project posters

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

- 1 Subsidy Contract
- 1 Start-up report
- 3 Progress reports
- 1 Overall Work plan
- 4 Minutes of project 's meeting
- 3 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.

- 3 Framework Documents of the criticalities of local territorial contexts
- 3 Reports on the institutional framework

### PARTECIPATION COMPONENT: STRATEGIC COMMON VISION (C4): Community consultation and participation process, review of success cases, common vision.

- 1 Forum Regulation (identical for the four regions)
- 1 Report on Success Cases
- 3 Reports on local EASWs

### OTHER MATERIALS PRODUCTS NOT INCLUDED INTO THE WORK-PLAN

- Guidelines for implementing the integrated territorial analysis
- Guidelines for implementing the analysis of institutional framework
- Guidelines for implementing the SWOT analysis

- Guidelines for the organisation of the participation process
- EASW Guidance
- Visual Identity Booklet
- Guidelines for the definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans

### 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	3	Communication tools
European institutions towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	4	1	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	90	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Other public and semi-public bodies towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	100	75	Target structures for communication tool dissemination
Private sector towards which communication tools will be disseminated	Quantitative	100	85	Target structures for communication tool dissemination

<b>Indicator</b>		<b>Foreseen</b>	<b>Achieved (cumul)</b>	<b>Unit</b>
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
Number of data bases developed	Quantitative	1	1	databases
Number of updated on-line data bases which will remain usable even after the closure of the project	Quantitative	1	1	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	8	communication action
European institutions concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	2	2	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	45	Target structures for communication actions
Other public and semi-public bodies concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	50	35	Target structures for communication actions
Private sector concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	50	35	Target structures for communication actions
Specific partners concerned by communication actions	Quantitative	2	2	Target structures for communication actions
<b>Specific indicators of the priority</b>				
New networks of cities or local authorities for polycentrism	Quantitative	1	1	Permanent networks established
Common studies aimed at strategies or plans, methodologies or tools at transnational level	Quantitative	4	3	Joint implementation or working plans or strategies
Joint strategies and agreements	Quantitative	4	3	Joint implementation or working plans or strategies
Local authorities involved in transnational activities	Quantitative	20	12	New transnational activities set up by local authorities

Indicator		Foreseen	Achieved (cumul)	Unit
Isolated areas authorities involved in transnational activities	Quantitative	18	8	New initiatives or structures for support promoted by local authorities of the isolated areas

\* These indicators will be counted after the realization of the Local Pilot Operative Plans.

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

After **21** months, the financial state-of-the-art of the project presents some important characteristics with respect to the foreseen budget:

- the increase of Staff costs and External expertises costs that reflects the need of major efforts in particular in C1, C2 and C4 and the reduction of “Durable” costs , “Consumable” costs and “Overheads” that reflects a lower need for project implementation but also the administrative difficulties of some partners in ascribing expenditures to project’s budget.
- the increase of costs in C1, C2 and C5 that reflects the major efforts needed for implementing the forecasted activities and the reduction of costs in C3 that reflects a better planning of activities in this component which allow to save time and money.

The amendment of project’s budget (< 10%) was requested for adjusting these modifications in a new AF.

As regards the reporting/certification process, even if the main project activities started up and are implementing almost on time, the reporting and the certification of the expenditures was delayed. Lead partner produced and provided to each partner specific files for supporting the expenditures management but, substantial difficulties kept to be encountered in reporting and certification process. These difficulties brought all partners but especially the LP to additional work in managing the financial part of the project. However the last months, thanks to the efforts of the partners, the status of the certification process is improved and all partners except Malta added at least one certification in the progress report.