



**MedStrategy Project - Integrated Strategy for Sustainable
Development of Mediterranean Rural Areas**
Project reference no.: 2G-MED09-282

**C2 – MANAGEMENT COMPONENT:
Administrative, Financial and Technical Management of the project.
Monitoring and Evaluation of the project.**

Phase 3 – Monitoring and Evaluation

“Monitoring and Evaluation Report n.4”

November 2012



CENTRE FOR RENEWABLE
ENERGY SOURCES AND SAVING



INDEX

1. Project information
2. Project contents
 - 2.1 Summary of the project's objectives
 - 2.2 Critical success factors
 - 2.3 How the project contributed to the objectives of the MED Programme
3. How the project progressed 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
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. Evaluation of the project outcomes for the reporting period
 - 7.1 Working Plan progress
 - 7.2 Progress on deliverables achieved

1. Project information

Name of the project	Integrated Strategy for Sustainable Development of Mediterranean Rural Areas
Acronym	MedStrategy
Internal number of management	2G-MED09-282
Name of the LP organization + country	Intermunicipal Consortium “Tindari-Nebrodi” ITALY
Project starting date	01 June 2010
Project ending date	30 November 2012
Total eligible budget	1,091,055.00 €

2. Project contents

2.1 Summary of the project’s objectives

MedStrategy project aimed 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 experimented an innovative governance process through the setting up of a planning model that encourages the sustainable development of Med rural areas. The process focused 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 were:

- **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 was scheduled following strategic axes and objectives. For each strategic axis

innovative and integrated actions were pointed out. The technical and administrative tools, the financial sources/tools and the key actors requested for the implementation of each action were defined.

- **Information and communication activities** aimed 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 promoted an innovative territory management pattern which was tested at a local level to which does not correspond a single institutional entity but which presents territorial and identity homogeneity. The model made 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 contributed 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) was tested.

Another critical factor of the project was the adoption of a “bottom up” approach, connected to the community active involvement in the planning process. The participation process encouraged 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, was a useful reference for other rural territorial contexts that have similar criticalities and potential.

2.3 How the project contributed to the objectives of the MED Programme

Consistently with the Objective 4.1, the project aimed to draw up an innovative and shared planning tool (Strategic Plan) for supporting the sustainable development of Mediterranean rural areas. It consisted 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 encouraged 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 complied with the Priority Axis 4 as it supported the integrated development of Med space and it was clearly oriented towards the following topics:

- Sustainable development - the planning tool (Strategic Plan) 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. How the project progressed towards the set objectives

The project started on 1st June 2010 (official beginning of the project) and, after the resolution of some bureaucratic problems concerning the project contractualisation, organised its first transnational meeting in July 2010. 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 2nd 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.

From September 2011 to February 2012, the partnership mainly worked on the definition of the final version of the deliverables included in Component 3 participation process and in Component 4. For the Component 3 three of the four regions (i.e. Teruel, 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.

Moreover a first draft of the Diagnostic Report (i.e. the final deliverable for C3-Ph3) was produced.

For the Component 4, two regions (Sicily and Teruel) started their participation process and completed some of the forums foreseen. Greece also started the process through the involvement of local actors and citizens. With regard to C4-Ph2, the report on success cases was produced, including: a synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities, comparative experiences analysis, a set of results evaluation indicators. As for Component 5, the guidelines for the development of the component were agreed.

As regards the period included in this last monitoring report (i.e. March-November 2012), the activities developed are detailed below.

COMPONENT 1 – During the last period, communication activities were mainly addressed to continue, as in the previous period, the involvement of local territories in the participation process and in disseminating the project to a wider public. Moreover important moments were the final transnational conference and the national conferences, where the project's results were presented.

As concerns participation processes, 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. Posters graphic design was made by Province of Teruel (in charge of the Phase) and was 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. Additionally FDS for Spain and ANCI for Sicily created a presentation leaflet to resume the conclusions of the participation process, and disseminated this publication among actors and stakeholders interested in the field.

With regards to the internet communication, partners increased their active participation to the project website, uploading their documents on the project and disseminating their local activities also on the project's website. Moreover, thanks to the availability of the MED Programme JTS, information about final conference was disseminated also through the Programme website.

With regard to the Communication tools (included in C1-Ph3) we must add that further press conferences were organised during national conferences and for the international conference and a complete brochure in four different versions (double language: English-Italian, English-Spanish, English-Maltese, English-Greek) describing the project's results was produced.

Partnership worked also on Component 1 – Phase 3. The phase produced five deliverables, in particular:

- The objective of the *Awareness Raising Seminars* (organised in the four regions) was 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 was formed by different institutional level staff, leaders and actors. The contents were similar in the four regions: MedStrategy project objective and activities, Territorial Framework, Institutional framework, Success Case Studies, Participation Process Methodology.
- The objective of the *Training Courses* (one for each region) was to provide opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts and improving the involvement of local communities through training. The target was local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project for teaching them how to manage Local Operative Plans. The contents were: sustainable development planning, objectives,

methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products. Particularly innovative was the solution found for Sicily were, due to the discussion undertaken during the awareness raising seminar with Municipalities operators and taking into consideration their difficulties in being involved in a traditional training activity, an online training course was organised.

- The objective of the *Observatories of Municipalities* was 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 was formed by local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project. The contents were: information on MedStrategy development and its methodology , territorial diagnosis, institutional diagnosis, participation process results.
- *National Conferences* were organised at a local level in order to disseminate project's results, with particular regard to each participation process. The target audiences were policy developers, public authorities, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs, professional associations, investment experts.
- The final *International Conference* was organised in Patti (Sicily) on 14th November 2012. The Conference agenda presented the experiences of the project: the model for the local system analysis, the participation process, the Local Pilot Operative Plan, the Guidelines for the drawing up of an "Integrated Strategic Plan for sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas" and the results reached by each involved region. Moreover two interesting cases were presented and discussed: Parchi Val di Cornia and the project Philoxenia.

COMPONENT 2 – First of all, during the first two months of this reporting period, partnership prepared and submitted the progress report.

Then most of the time was dedicated to solve problems regarding the Financial Situation of the project, in particular the slowness of the reporting/certification process.

In this reporting period a lot of time was also dedicated to the implementation of the procedure for the budget change and for the extension of project duration. The administrative procedure last form April to June and was successfully completed.

Moreover the partnership respond on time to JTS requests regarding mainly clarifications about the 5th and the 6th progress reports and the certifications submitted as well as information on project implementation.

On the early July the LP asked to the partners a report on the progress of activities in each region. This report aimed to:

- know if any partner meets difficulties in the implementation of a phase and how the partnership can help him
- ensure that the expected results will be gained in all regions;
- avoid delays in the submission of the deliverables.

The intermediate reports of the partners was sent also to JTS.

The last period was finally dedicated to the closure of the project and the preparation of the final technical report, whose structure and contents were explained to the partners during the last transnational meeting, which was held in Patti on 12th and 13th of November.

As regards the technical coordination, LP constantly worked on coordinating partnership in order to accomplish to the project deadlines. This role was particularly important in the last period as the end of the project was getting closer and closer and it was necessary to produce the last deliverables. In particular the technical coordination regarded:

- organisation and contents of Component 1 Phase 3, i.e. Conferences, workshops, training courses and Observatories of Municipalities;

- the monitoring system (C2-Ph3) through evaluation activities addressed to the participants to the participation process and the preparation of a report about that;
- the contents of diagnostic report, final deliverable of the Component 3 Phase 3, comparing the territories' quality and the different governance systems;
- the participation process (C4-Ph1): territorial involvement, level of participation, issues discussed, forums realised, case studies analysed, rules applied in the Forums, etc.;
- the implemented European Awareness Scenario Workshops (EASW meetings): territorial involvement, level of participation, issues discussed, outputs (common vision and actions);
- 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.

COMPONENT 3 - During this last monitoring period, all the regions completed and presented the final framework document on the criticalities of local territorial contexts, working also on a printable version of the document. Also reports on the institutional frameworks were produced in the final version for all the regions.

A final version of the comparison among the regions was made through the SWOT matrixes (Diagnostic report C3-Ph3), 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.

An additional deliverable was produced in order to facilitate the work to be done, i.e. the "Guidelines for implementing the SWOT analysis": the document gives the main guidelines to implement the SWOT analysis in order to homogenize the analysis methodology and compare the final results among the regions.

COMPONENT 4 - Still suffering of some delay due to the late completion of the Component 3, the Component was, in any case, completed. The final guidelines to be followed for the establishment of the local participation processes were distributed to the partnership. Moreover an EASW methodology guidance was produced and distributed: the document was produced in order to homogenize the processes in the four regions, to correctly apply the EASW methodology and to

rule the realisation of the foreseen activities. Also these two documents are additional deliverables for the project.

All the regions completed their participation process with the organisation of all the foreseen forums / meetings. The meetings were managed according to consolidated facilitation techniques (EASW methodology) and were developed through “Plenary sessions” and “Group sessions”.

In Sicily the area selected was “Tourism” and around 80 people in total 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 Teruel, 67 people participated to the 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 outputs produced.

In Crete the participation process started on 19th November 2011. The selected topic was “Agricultural development”. The agricultural sector, and more specifically olive processing and wine making, are the main activities in the region, it was therefore considered essential that a Local Plan should incorporate best practice sustainable development in these two fields. Also important are the fields of holistic sustainable development of communities, with measures such as energy efficiency in buildings, water and waste management, transport efficiency etc. To address these issues the contribution of external experts was discussed and considered necessary, so PP3 and PP4 involved suitable experts in the above fields, in the participation process.

In Pembroke Local Council (Malta) the Forum meetings, carried out according to the guidelines published by the project partners (“Guidelines for the organization of the participation process” realized by ANCI Sicilia – PP2), were managed and organized in cooperation with commissioned external experts and facilitators. Around 30 people attended the Forums. The attendees included local politicians, public and private stakeholders, NGOs, farmers’ associations representatives, entrepreneurs who operates actively in the related fields (including tourism), employees of the managing and planning Authorities, experts and technicians (including engineers and architects).

All participants were invited to actively contribute toward a common vision for the development of a new governance model toward the sustainable development of the local rural areas during the following EASW® workshops.

As indicated in the working plan the final deliverable of this part of the project was a document for each region collecting Forum regulation and the Minutes of the Forum meetings and workshops (C4-Ph1) together with a Report on the applied EASW methodology (C4-Ph3).

With regard to C4-Ph2, the report on success cases was produced in the previous period. 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 produced. Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs) were structured through a circular process as follows:

- Introduction – explaining how LPOP is not a simply technical document but it is 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, agriculture, etc).
- Analysis of the current situation - Synthesis of territorial and institutional analysis (C3-Ph1&Ph2)
- Barriers and opportunities - Synthesis of SWOT analysis (C3-Ph3)

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 were 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.

In strategies and interventions part, the LPOPs present the strategies and the interventions (target and the key ones) identified in the local forums (C4). The strategies and interventions are described relating each one directly to one of the objectives.

In the framework of participation process also the list of key interventions (C5-Ph1) was defined in each region.

Lessons learned from the definition of the 4 LPOPs were used for defining the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM).

The guidelines 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

The guidelines serve as an operative handbook, with recommendations for policy makers in rural areas (public administration personnel, politicians, local/regional authorities), wishing to define, implement and manage local development integrated plans based on sustainability criteria. The Guidelines have been developed using a transnational methodology, on the basis of the experiences of the four rural regions that participated in the MedStrategy project. These

Guidelines aim to provide advice on improving the planning process in rural regions by adopting “Integrated Strategic Plans for sustainable development”.

The guidelines were developed using a transnational exchange of experiences between the four participating regions, who followed a commonly agreed methodology and developed Local Pilot Operative Plans.

Some key issues in implementing Integrated Strategic Plans for sustainable development, were determined:

- ✓ Local Authorities likely to face a number of challenges impeding the implementation of such plans.
- ✓ With careful consideration, they can take advantage of existing opportunities, to facilitate the process.
- ✓ Opportunities and challenges may be both external and internal.
- ✓ Partners have undergone a SWOT analysis of their territories and governance systems.
- ✓ In the “Diagnostic Report”, a comparative assessment was made, and key common challenges to address and opportunities to target have been identified, in the process of developing improved governance methods.
- ✓ The findings have been taken into consideration for the Guidelines.

4. Brief summary of the undertaken activities

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

Medstrategy completed its process to experiment an innovative governance process for Med rural areas.

The partners met five times, collected data concerning their territories and institutions and ended the research part of the project. SWOT analysis was completed and the comparison made through the Diagnostic Report.

Partners also strongly involved local communities in the “participation process” which defined the planning and development activities to be implemented. The methodology applied (EASW) was described and a Strategic Common Vision defined in each region. Case studies were selected and analysed and a report was realised.

Operative plans and pilot key interventions were the result of the participation processes. Finally the definition of a transnational local development methodology was defined.

Partners constantly informed local communities about project’s implementation and results through targeted meetings, distribution of project documents and e-mails and uploading project deliverables on the website.

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

The main activities during the last period were:

- the implementation of communication activities mainly connected to the participation processes in the different regions and to the national and international conferences;
- the fulfilment of the 5th and 6th Progress report;
- the fulfilment of the administrative procedure for the change of budget and the extension of the project duration;

- the fulfilment of the integrated territorial analysis for the definition of the criticalities of the local contexts (printing version by all regions);
- the fulfilment of the analysis of institutional framework for the exam of the governance systems (printing version by all regions);
- the fulfilment of the Diagnostic report;
- the realisation of the participation processes for involving local communities in the project and the reporting on it;
- the report on successful case studies;
- the report on local European Awareness Scenario Workshops;
- the definition of the 4 Local Pilot Operative Plans;
- the description of the key interventions in all regions;
- the writing of the Guidelines for the drawing up of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas”;
- the continuous monitoring activities concerning the project results and the evaluation of the participation process.

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

During the last nine-months period (March-November 2012), the involvement of the partners was further increased: this was mainly due to the effort the partnership had to do both to realise the last activities and to accomplish to the requests of the Technical Secretariat.

Lead Partner took the role of examining and analysing the activities and deliverables realised by partners, of coordinating the partners in their last activities, of pressing for the realisation of deliverables in due time, of being in contact with JTS for the due reports, financial matters, etc. LP moreover indicated responsibilities and deadlines to the due partners.

Concerning each component and phase, Lead Partner was in charge of coordinating the integrated territorial analyses in all the regions: it followed with particular regard Maltese partner, which was in delay in realising the phase and coordinated the final editing of the other framework documents. LP also reminded to the other partners the lines to be followed for the definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans for the integrated development of rural areas at the end of the participation process.

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. This was done during the previous periods, but during the current period P2 worked on suggesting the correct procedure to be applied in the different regions, giving to the partners the due clarifications, checking the draft of participation process reports, and so on. P2 was also active in the dissemination and communication part, as its role is mainly connected to the involvement of local communities and in particular in the first contacts for the future realisation of the awareness raising seminars and training courses for local Municipalities.

P3, P5 and P6 worked, as foreseen, as regional coordinators for local activities both on the diagnostic part of the project (especially Malta which was on delay in Component 3) and realising the participation component (all the regions). They also interacted with Lead Partner for the implementation of the other phases. Moreover, in direct connection with the local territory, they coordinated the activities and the communication at a local level. In particular P6 also coordinated the work and examined the reports on the institutional frameworks of the other partners.

P4 worked on the realisation of the Diagnostic Report (C3-Ph3). It also worked on the Guidelines for the drawing up of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas”.

P7 completed the phase C4-Ph2 with the production by the Expert Board of the final version of the Report on Success Cases.

The more specific part of communication connected to the 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.

6. Problems encountered and solutions found/proposed

The project suffered of a substantial delay, mainly due to the problems met with Maltese public authorities described in previous reports, which substantially affected the completion of some of the project phases. The delay kept in postponing the end of the phases of about 5-6 months compared to deadlines indicated in the original working plan: an extension of 6 months was asked and approved by the Managing Authority.

Administrative problems were also met, especially regarding the level of expenses and certifications of various partners: in fact sometimes in the public administrations paying out an expenditure requests several steps and a lot of time. Furthermore most partners have a small staff team involved in the project: those persons mainly work on the implementation of running activities, so partners cannot upload the expenditures frequently. Since the beginning of the project, LP tried to facilitate the reporting process, providing partners with specific model for expenditures and activities reporting. However for the above mentioned reasons some partners still met problems with the reporting process.

The slowness of expenditures certification and consequently the lack of the payments cause financial problems to the partners as most of them are rural administrations with low budget availability.

As regards the implementation of project activities, besides of the administrative/financial problems the necessity of the 6-months extension raised also from the main characteristic of the project, i.e. the active involvement of the local communities in the project implementation and in particularly in the definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plan. Participation process facilitated the contribution of the local community for finding common and jointly responsible solutions and it encouraged an integrated and intersectorial approach to planning but it needed more than the forecasted time for reaching the expected results.

7. Evaluation of the project outcomes for the reporting period

7.1 Working Plan progress

From 01 March 2012 to 30 November 2012

(see following page)

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
C0-Ph1	<p>Preparation of Pre-Application Form (PAF) 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>	<p>The phase was completed and reported in the report 1.</p>	<p>No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.</p>
C0-Ph2	<p>Preparation of Application Form (AF) P1, with the suggestions of the Selection Committee, submitted to Ps a first draft of AF and asked their contribution with particular regard to technical activities and human resources. Strong communication occurred between P1 and Ps for clarifications and advices. Ps worked in a motivated way providing contribution according to timetable fixed by P1. Ps fully agreed with repartition of activities and costs proposed by P1. They signed and sent Partnership Agreement and Commitment Letters to P1. P1 communicated frequently with JTS for ensuring that AF was filled up correctly. AF and annexed documents were fully completed and submitted. During this phase ASAEL was substituted by actual P7, which fully participated in the preparation.</p>	<p><u>1 Partnership Agreement</u> <u>7 Commitment Letters</u> <u>1 Application Form</u></p>	<p>The phase was completed and reported in report 1.</p>	<p>No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.</p>
C1-Ph1	<p>Communication Plan (CP) 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.</p>	<p><u>1 Communication plan</u></p>	<p>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 were implemented.</p>	<p>No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.</p>
C1-Ph2	<p>Communication campaign 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.</p>	<p><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</p>	<p>All the produced contents were uploaded on the project's website. Communication activities were mainly addressed to local</p>	<p>No changes in work program neither in expected outputs.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
	<p>Promotion campaigns will be organized in all 4 areas for encouraging community involvement and presentation of results .</p> <p>Project's launch will be by local press conferences. Conferences will be held for announcing other public events of the project.</p> <p>Information on project activities and results will be spread via local press, radios and TV channels.</p> <p>Paper popular material (leaflets, brochures, posters) will be produced and disseminated in order to show clearly the project and its objectives.</p>	<p>and all documents and materials produced, together with EU and MED Programme logos.</p> <p><u>1 Project's website</u></p> <p>It will inform targeted groups & the general public and will facilitate feedback and exchange of experiences among partners and with other institutions & firms.</p> <p><u>6 Press conferences</u></p> <p><u>10 Interviews and articles</u></p> <p><u>4 Project presentation leaflets in double language</u> (English/Maltese, English/Italian, 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>communities as the participation processes and final national conferences were implemented in all regions, but also to a transnational one due to the organization of the final international conference. Press conferences were organized during the last transnational meeting and during the conferences.</p> <p>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 processes and for the awareness raising seminars and training courses. Graphic design was made by Province of Teruel (in charge of the Phase). Leaflets and more detailed brochures describing the project in double language (English and Spanish/Italian/Maltese/Greek) for local dissemination of the project were distributed in each region.</p>	

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
		Project presentation and results in 5 languages (English, Italian, Greek, Spanish, Maltese)		
C1-Ph3	<p>Conferences & workshops & training</p> <p>All project's deliverables are public documents and will be used for disseminating information on specific project activities and results. 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. In each area 1 training course, which will become the Standing Observatory of Municipalities, will be organised aiming at providing opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts. It will see the participation of local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project. Courses will focus on sustainable development planning.</p>	<p><u>8 Papers and presentations for non projects conferences</u></p> <p><u>4 Training courses</u></p> <p>In Italy, Greece, Spain and Malta a training courses for local authorities and local experts focused on development planning, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be organised.</p> <p><u>1 International conference.</u></p> <p>This will be organised in Sicily. The target audience will be EU institutions, policy developers, public authorities, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs & professional associations, investment experts.</p> <p><u>4 National conferences.</u></p> <p>These will be organised in Italy, Greece, Spain and Malta. The target audience will be policy developers, public authorities, development agencies, research organizations, entrepreneurs & professional associations, investment experts.</p>	<p>Awareness Raising Seminars and Training courses contents were realised in all regions. Also Observatories of Municipalities were organised.</p> <p>The objective of the Awareness Raising Seminars was 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 was formed by different institutional level staff, leaders and actors. The contents in all regions were: MedStrategy project objective and activities, Territorial Framework, Institutional framework, Success Case Studies, Participation Process Methodology.</p> <p>The objective of training courses was to provide opportunities for learning and getting qualified experts and to improve the involvement of local communities through training. The target was formed by local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff,</p>	<p>Training courses, awareness seminars, observatories of Municipalities were connected to strategic planning processes, and were completed between September and October 2012 .</p> <p>National conferences were organized at the end of the project.</p> <p>The international conference took place in Patti (Sicily) on 14th November 2012.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
		<p><u>4 Awareness raising seminars</u></p> <p>They will be addressed to different institutional level staff, leaders and actors to present the project and collect adhesions for training courses.</p> <p><u>4 Observatories of Municipalities.</u></p> <p>In each country a training course for local authorities and local experts focused on development planning, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products, will be organised.</p>	<p>also external to the project for teaching them how to manage Local Operative Plans. The contents were: sustainable development planning, objectives, methods, best practices, quality of management, services and products.</p> <p>The Observatories of Municipalities will involve other Municipalities than the ones included in the ‘project’ and highlight the project results and expertise making these visible to the large public. The target is local experts, decision makers and local authorities staff, also external to the project. The contents: information on MedStrategy development and its methodology, territorial diagnosis, institutional diagnosis, participation process results. National conferences presenting project’s results at a local level were realized in all regions. The international conference took place in Patti (Sicily) on 14th November 2012.</p>	
C2-Ph1	<p>Administrative and financial management</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</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>As in the previous reporting periods, Lead Partner took care, together with the partners, of the necessary administrative and</p>	<p>Delay in spending money and in reporting and certifying expenditures</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
	<p>progress reports and the final report. P1 makes the payment to PPs. P1 mobilises PPs for achieving project outcomes, to timeline and within budget. P1 ensures interaction and exchange of information and knowledge. All PPs use ICT communication tools to exchange information and documents. Project secretariat is responsible for keeping all documents, files and correspondence with partners, JTS and MA. Documents are available in the project's website too.</p>	<p><u>1 Final technical report</u></p>	<p>financial steps. It supported and advised partners on the reporting activities and it gathered and controlled documents provided by partners. It also mobilised partners for achieving project outcomes, to timeline and within budget and ensured interaction and exchange of information and knowledge within the partnership. The fifth and sixth progress reports were sent to the Managing Authority in due time. LP informed MA about all administrative changes made. LP also coordinated the gathering of information about both financial expenses and deliverables produced requested by the JTS before and after the approval of the project extension.</p>	<p>due to administrative problems and due to difficulties in justifying costs according to Presage requirements (extended disaggregation of costs by phase).</p>
C2-Ph2	<p>Technical coordination 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). 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. In collaboration with RoPs, EB produces the guides and bibliography for helping PPs in the implementation of phases. 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> <u>3 Progress Reports (1 each six months)</u> <u>1 Final report</u> <u>5 Minutes of project's meetings</u></p>	<p>Work plan was revised, due to the initial delay underlined in previous progress reports, examined by the entire partnership and agreed during the fourth transnational meeting. Extension of the project will mainly be used for communication and dissemination. Steering Committee and Expert Board</p>	<p>The work, due to the postponing of the final deadline of the project, was obviously increased as the number of outputs (total number of progress reports 6 + final report). The extension of the project of course also affected the technical</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
			worked as foreseen in the project.	coordination as this activity is transversal to all the others.
C2-Ph3	<p>Monitoring and evaluation Following the establishment of SC the monitoring and evaluation system will be set up. In collaboration with P1, SC will implement the evaluation process that regards the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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; - quality of management and partnership: efficiency of management system; consistence and quality of partners collaboration; - achievement of project objectives: evaluation of the project on the basis of output and results indicators. 	<p><u>4 Monitoring and evaluation report (1 each 6 months)</u></p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation system was improved in the previous period and a further monitoring report produced by LP. Moreover an evaluation questionnaire was created and distributed during participation processes in the different regions in order to have an evaluation by ‘external’ actors, as the local actors and stakeholders. The report on this was included in this last monitoring report.</p>	<p>No changes in expected monitoring outputs. Improvements were made to the evaluation system through the proposal and use of evaluation questionnaires filled by the “external” actors of the project (partners), i.e. participants to the participation processes in the regions.</p>
C3-Ph1	<p>Integrated territorial analysis in relation to the 3 sustainability dimensions 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"> - data gathering and diagnosis of the involved rural areas through the development of appropriate set of indicators for identifying trends and conditions. - GIS applications will be used and immediately available for the Local Administrations. <p>Framework Document will be an orientation tool and shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -show, synthetically and in an integrated way, the problems of environmental and socioeconomic sustainability of local systems; -show a set of key indicators according to the territorial specificities; -develop the subjects according to regional and global dimensions. - Identity characteristics 	<p><u>4 Framework Documents of the criticalities of local territorial contexts.</u> 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 previous period, all the regions completed and presented the final framework document.</p>	<p>Territorial framework documents are ready for all regions and uploaded in the project website. No changes are expected in the foreseen outputs.</p>
C3-Ph2	<p>Analysis of institutional framework 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</p>	<p><u>4 Reports on the institutional framework</u> These reports consist of a Key Indicators Set of Local</p>	<p>Reports on the institutional frameworks were produced in the final version by all regions.</p>	<p>Institutional framework documents are ready for all regions and uploaded</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
	<p>their capacity to support growth and innovation.</p> <p>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 attractivity coherently with the EU, national and regional programmes.</p> <p>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>Authorities (LA) efficiency and efficacy, of an interdependences analysis and of a "LA Conceptual map".</p> <p>These reports will be put into the Framework Document.</p>		<p>in the project website.</p> <p>No change is expected in the foreseen outputs.</p>
C3-Ph3	<p>SWOT Analysis</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 attractivity, training and competences of human resources.</p>	<p>The diagnostic report was produced by the partner in charge as 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.</p>	<p>No changes in expected outputs.</p>
C4-Ph1	<p>Establishment of community participation process</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>All regions realised their participation process. Participants in all regions were local actors and citizens: the level of participation both in numbers and typology can be considered really satisfying.</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>The only change in the outputs regards the Forum Regulations: originally foreseen as four different documents. Partnership in fact agreed on a common regulation which therefore</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
				constitute 1 document instead of four. Moreover the minutes of forum meetings were reported together with the reports on local EASWs (deliverable of C4-Ph3).
C4-Ph2	<p>Selection and analysis of the Success Cases: evaluation of success/failure elements</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. 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 communities.</p>	<p><u>1 Report on Success Cases</u> Synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities. Comparative experiences analysis. Set of results evaluation indicators.</p>	<p>The report on success cases was produced by the Expert Board. The report includes: a synthesis of performances and goals achieved in the reference local realities, comparative experiences analysis, a set of results evaluation indicators.</p>	<p>No changes in expected outputs.</p>
C4-Ph3	<p>Construction of a Transnational Strategic Common Vision (TSCV)</p> <p>The aim of this phase is to create an integrated Common Vision for sustainable development through sharing and increasing awareness in local actors. They will be stimulated in participating to identifying and planning concrete solutions to the existing problems. According to EASW@(European Awareness Scenario Workshop)methodology, Forums based on the deliverables worked out in C3 (Framework Document,Diagnostic Report) will define 2 alternative visions of the future: negative (nothing changes) and positive (things change improving). In each area 1 workshop is scheduled. Following taking into account the“Review of Success 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>	<p>The phase has been developing at the same time of C4-Ph1. European Awareness Scenario Workshops are in fact a fundamental part of the participation process and the report on their realisation is a substantial part of the report of participation processes.</p>	<p>The reports on local EASWs were reported together with the minutes of forum meetings (deliverable of C4-Ph1).</p>
C5-Ph1	<p>Definition of the Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs) for the integrated development of rural areas</p> <p>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</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</p>	<p>Guidelines for the development of the component were agreed. Local Pilot Operative Plans (LPOPs) were structured as a circular</p>	<p>Slow implementation of the phase due to the fact that the local communities</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
	<p>sustanaibility. The LPOPs,structured as a circular process,shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -specify the key approaches to be adopted to develop an integrated planning -identify challenges and priorities to be enacted, to increase competitiveness and improve the attractivity potential of local systems -define financial resources needed -single out specific competences -attribute responsibilities for LPOP management and processes carrying out -define Target and Key Interventions -identify monitoring and evaluation indicators 	<p>for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sustainability Objectives -Intervention sectors/fields -Strategic Lines -Targets -Projects and actions -Timing & Costs -Actors -Monitoring indicators 	<p>process that consists mainly of six phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the Analysis we define the profile of our community that describes its economy, environment and people; we also describe trends affecting our community, the problems it faces, and the opportunities ahead. 2. Strategic planning looks at the big picture and helps community decide what is important 3. During Implementation, we do the things which will get us where we want to be 4. After completing our activities, we evaluate them to see how well they worked and we improve them (back to Planning) considering lessons learned 5. Participation process facilitates the contribution of the local community for finding common and jointly responsible solutions and its encourages an integrated and intersectorial approach to planning 6. Communication activities aimed to increase community's visibility as well as to ensure the information of citizens and to support transparency in governance process. <p>Each region (Italia, Greece, Spain</p>	<p>involvement requests more time for the definition of LPOP. No changes in expected outputs.</p>

Phase	Description in the original project	Deliverables in the original project	Activities implemented during reporting period	Evolution in Work programme and expected outputs
			and Malta) developed the LPOP of the sector that the region chose (tourism, agriculture, etc).	
C5-Ph2	<p>Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM) The Experts Board, taking into account the TSCV and through a comparative evaluation of the results included in the LPOPs, will define the framework of the TLDM for the definition of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas” The results of this phase will be included in the Guidelines that will be structured as an operative handbook. This will indicate an innovative Transnational Tool to define and manage local development integrated Plans based on sustainability criteria. TLDM will strengthen MED rural areas cohesion and improve local governance through the definition of a suitable territorial asset for development strategies (as foreseen by Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion.</p>	<p><u>1 Guidelines for the drawing up of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas”</u> The guidelines will single out: -Environmental and Governance Audit methods -Auto-evaluation methods -Participated Process Models -Guide for drawing-up of Local Operative Plans -Efficiency and Coherence Monitoring Indicators of Strategic Plans</p>	<p>Lessons learned from the definition of the 4 LPOPs were used for define the Transnational Local Development Methodology (TLDM). The guidelines singled 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.</p>	<p>No changes in expected outputs.</p>
C5-Ph3	<p>Identification of Key Interventions (KI) 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. KI will: -be intersectorial -aim at the social economic development of the rural areas -have to be shared and involve different levels of decisional power The KI will be a useful resource for all the partners and will become an example of “good practice” (e.g. Quality Trademark of Tourist Structures, Desk-office for the enterprises, Coordinative Office for territorial planning). Within each KI the partners will define technical solutions, procedure and administrative modalities, human resources and technical competences needed for realizing the intervention.</p>	<p><u>4 Final Report for each Key Intervention</u> It will describe the reasons of the choice of the Key Interventions according to the priorities singled out in the LPOPs and will define: -Priorities actions -Human resources -Technical abilities -Financial resources -Monitoring indicators</p>	<p>Description of the key interventions in each region.</p>	<p>Slow implementation of the phase due to the fact that the local communities involvement requests more time for the definition of LPOP. No changes in expected outputs.</p>

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
- 6 Press conferences
- 25 Article on newspapers
- 4 Project presentation leaflets in double language
- 4 Project brochures in double language
- 15 Project posters
- 6 papers and presentations for non project conferences
- 4 Training courses
- 1 International conference
- 4 National conferences
- 4 Awareness raising seminars
- 4 Observatories of Municipalities

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

- 1 Subsidy Contract
- 1 Start-up report
- 6 Progress reports
- 1 final technical report (to be produced within 31st January 2013)
- 1 Overall Work plan
- 5 Minutes of project 's meeting
- 4 Monitoring and evaluation reports

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

- 4 Framework Documents of the criticalities of local territorial contexts
- 4 Reports on the institutional framework
- 1 Diagnostic Report

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)
- 24 Minutes of Forum meetings and workshops
- 1 Report on Success Cases
- 4 Reports on local EASWs

STRATEGIC PLANNING IN MED RURAL AREAS (C5): Definition of the Transnational Local Development Methodology and the Local Pilot Operative Plans

- 4 Local Pilot Operative Plans
- 1 Guidelines for the drawing up of an “Integrated Strategic Plan for the sustainable development in Mediterranean rural areas”
- 7 Final Report for each Key Intervention

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