

**COMPART PROJECT  
INTERACT PROGRAMME**



**THE BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS ON PARTNERSHIP IN THE  
PROJECTS OF INTERREG AND DESCENTRALISED  
COOPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**

**BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS REPORT**

**DECEMBER 2006**

# COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

## CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>POLITICAL COMMITMENT AND PARTNERSHIP PROCESS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>On the political framework</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Policy dialogue</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Partnership system</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Coordination, coherence and complementarity</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>DEMOCRACY, PARTICIPATION AND DECENTRALISATION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>OWNERSHIP</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: BEST PRACTISES</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>ANNEX II : LIST OF THE PROJECTS ANALYSED</b> .....	<b>28</b>

# COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

## Introduction

The benchmarking analysis is the second work phase of the COMPART project. It has **the objective** of analysing and comparing (through a benchmark approach) the different implementations of the partnership concept in external territorial cooperation<sup>1</sup> projects (partnership in project) taking the different political and institutional contexts into account.

Partnership should be considered as a principle and a qualifying and necessary factor in Cohesion and Neighbourhood policies in which regions of the Mediterranean take part (including the Western Balkans). This means that **partnership** is not only an instrument for carrying out a project, but rather a “value” in itself, which the project must contribute to strengthening. This implies the adoption of democratic principles and values, in particular that of subsidiarity.

The benchmarking analysis has produced a comparison of different INTERREG projects<sup>2</sup> and decentralised cooperation projects which have created partnership relationships (social and institutional capital) between the European Union (EU) and external Mediterranean partners.

The analysis<sup>3</sup> was carried out through surveys on the opinions of the project partners, using specific indicators in order to identify project best practices for the implementation of partnership principles. In particular, on the basis of the existing international literature on partnerships and of the Concept Paper prepared under the COMPART project, the following **principles**, on which partnership should be based, have been established: 1) the ongoing political commitment of the partners, 2) the implementation of measures to foster democracy, participation and decentralisation, 3) and project ownership.

Each principle is divided into several **dimensions**:

- 1) Ongoing political commitment of partners: drawing up of framework cooperation agreements; implementation of political dialogue measures; long term/organized partnerships; compliance with the conditions of coherence, coordination, complementarity and concentration.
- 2) Compliance with the principles of democracy, participation and decentralisation: institutional strengthening of partners; definition of expected results in terms of democratic governance, decentralisation and horizontal and vertical subsidiarity.
- 3) Ownership: active partner participation and enhancement of partner territorial vocation.

These dimensions were analysed through the distribution of a questionnaire to the projects stakeholders: officers of local authorities and private actors. The questionnaire “measured” the perceptions of the stakeholders on the dimensions by qualitative indicators and with a **scale of value**. The scale of value goes from a level 1 - very low degree, to level 2 – low degree, level 3 – insufficient, level 4 – sufficient, level 5 - high degree and level 6 -very high degree.

---

<sup>1</sup> By the expression “external territorial cooperation” we refer to the present Neighbourhood programmes aimed at the external frontiers of the EU and to future cross-border cooperation envisaged by the IPA and ENPI instruments and territorial cooperation contemplated by the Third Objective of the Cohesion Policy.

<sup>2</sup> The projects have been identified in INTERREG IIIA – Western Macedonia/ Albania and/or FYROM programme; INTERREG III A Adriatic Cross-border and Cadres programmes; INTERREG III A Adriatic Cross-border and Cadres programmes; INTERREG IIIB MEDOCC programme; INTERREG IIIA Andalusia-Tangeri Tetouan Region (Spain-Morocco) programme, as well as in decentralised cooperation programmes.

<sup>3</sup> See the “General approach for the benchmarking analysis” produced by CeSPI and downloadable from the web site [www.compartproject.org](http://www.compartproject.org)

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Finally, the benchmarking analysis identified 7 projects as best practices in building partnerships. These projects are commented on in the analysis and set out in annex 1, while in annex 2 all the projects considered in the benchmarking are listed.

### POLITICAL COMMITMENT AND PARTNERSHIP PROCESS

#### On the political framework

##### Connection of the projects to cooperation agreement

An overview of the benchmarking reports shows that various differences exist among COMPART partners. Not all the projects are based on previous cooperation agreements. At first glance, the practices of the partners may be divided in two groups: regions which rely mostly on cooperation agreements to create partnership (Andalusia<sup>4</sup>, Tuscany<sup>5</sup>, Istria<sup>6</sup> and Tanger Tetouan – T/T - regions<sup>7</sup>); and regions which do not (Calabria, Friuli-Venezia Giulia – FVG-, Western Macedonia – WM - regions).

Concerning the partners of the first group, almost all the projects analysed were based on previous cooperation agreements between local authorities. Sometimes, the establishment of such agreements become a precondition for involvement as a partner. This was the case with the SEENET decentralised cooperation project, within which the Tuscany Region qualified participation of Istrian partners with a requirement for the establishment of a Twinning project with local authorities from Tuscany.

The strategy of Calabria, FVG, WM and of the Sarajevo canton is quite different from the regions of the first group. In their case, the majority of the projects analysed were not based on a previous cooperation agreement; even though there were a few exceptions. In the case of the Calabria region, for instance, those interviewed stressed that an informal cooperation agreement exists (in particular between the Calabria Region and other INTERREG MEDOCC regions), which aims to enhance the collaboration in European projects in the Mediterranean region. But it is only an informal agreement, even if very important for the partners.

Furthermore, in the case of the FVG the exception is represented by the ADRI.BLU project, based on a general agreement between the local bodies. Moreover, the ADRI.BLU project is linked to the

---

<sup>4</sup> Agreement between the *Oficina de Cooperación Internacional* and the Municipality of Chefchaouen (Morocco) and its Local development agency; *Convenio de cooperación y de partenariado ente la Excma. Diputación de Cádiz, a través del Instituto de Empleo y Desarrollo Socioeconómico y Tecnológico (IEDT) y el Consejo Regional de Tánger-Tetuán (CRTT)*.

<sup>5</sup> The Brioni agreement with South East Europe (SEE) local governments (SEENET); with Andalusia and the region of Tanger/Tetouan (Euromedsys). Moreover, as far as the MAEM project is concerned, the initiative arose within the network of Regions created in November 2004 among regional governments of France, Italy and Spain to support the MAEM /MEMA Network. In the specific case of the RURALMED II project, it was connected with the “experimentation and implementation of European convention of landscape in contemporary rural activities and public policies”.

<sup>6</sup> All the projects analysed in the benchmarking analysis were based on cooperation agreements with Istria’s neighbouring regions. In fact, the latter took different forms: protocol of cooperation with the Autonomous region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia (1999); declaration of intention with the Veneto region (1995); letters of intention with the Region of Carinthia (1998 and 1999).

<sup>7</sup> The “EUROMEDINCULTURE” project is linked to an agreement between the T/T region and various Italian regions and other French actors.

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

CONNETCT and FISH.LOG projects. Together, they aim at creating a policy for managing fishing resources and products and at managing and developing the fishing sector through the creation of a district called “Northern Adriatic Fishing district”.

Finally, as regards the WM region, in some cases (Prefectural Self-Administration of Florina, IZ’Supervisory Board of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, Municipality of Agia Triada<sup>8</sup>), the projects were connected to previous cooperation agreement, even if not with external or other European partners, but with Greek ones.

### **The role of cooperation agreements in the identification and implementation of partnership**

Generally, both groups considered cooperation agreements as highly relevant in the identification and implementation of projects. A particular role in this sense was played by the general agreement which forms the basis for the ADRI.BLU project as well as that underlying the MA’ARIFA project (“Partnership Convention between the Diputación de Cádiz and the Regional Council of the region of Tanger Tetouan”). The former played an invaluable role in forging consensus among institutions and operators, which is an essential precondition for obtaining tangible results. The latter, on the other hand, made it possible to have direct contact with the Regional council of Tanger Tetouan and to orient the activities financed by the *provincia de Cádiz* directly to the local needs of the Moroccan region. Moreover, the choice as partner of the *Instituto de Empleo y Desarrollo Socioeconómico y Tecnológico* (IEDT) was quite strategic as it is an institution that has managed to involve all the neighbouring Moroccan municipalities in the cooperation initiative, on the border with Spain. It managed a more efficient finalization of a cooperation agreement and it assisted in the identification of cooperation initiatives which take into consideration local development needs of both partners. For example, within the framework of this Convention, in 2000 it was possible to start a cooperation initiative with the Regional Council which led to the creation of the INTERREG IIIA Spain-Morocco programme in 2002.

Despite the positive perceptions, some exceptions have emerged. While some agreements were considered relevant in the initial identification of partners, their contribution to the projects’ implementation was not essential and even quite low (EUROMEDSYS; agreement between the *Oficina de Cooperación Internacional*, the municipality of Chefchaouen and its Local development agency). Also, the benchmarking report of the Istria region demonstrated that, except for the regional authority, the Twinning projects were simply a precondition to entering into partnership and not an element that had an impact on project phases. The same goes for the T/T region. As far as the latter is concerned, the Convention in place between the *Diputacion* of Cadiz and the T/T region has facilitated not only the involvement of the T/T region in the MA’ARIFA project but also in the identification of activities.

### **New agreements**

Projects led to new cooperation agreements quite rarely. The benchmarking analysis permitted the identification of only a few such cases, such as the SEENET and the ADRI.BLU projects. The former led to new agreements of collaboration between local authorities both of Tuscany and SEE. In addition to this, it is worth noting that thanks to the project, a cooperation protocol has been activated between two project’s partners. The latter led to a cooperation initiative with the Ministry of Tourism and Culture of Tirana, but without establishing a formal agreement between the two regions.

---

<sup>8</sup> IZ’Supervisory Board of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities / Municipality of Agia Triada / Prefectural Self-Administration of Florina: General Protocol of Collaboration between the Prefectural Authority of Florina and the Municipalities of Bitola and Resen

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

In addition to this, projects led to a cooperation agreement with regions and local authorities in the case of the Municipality of Centar and of SERDA (Sarajevo Economic Regional Development Agency) in BiH.

### Policy dialogue

#### Participation of political representatives

The degree of participation of political representatives varied greatly among the COMPART partners. Tuscany is the region with the highest level of impetus and participation of political representatives in project activities. This opinion was shared by all those interviewed. Projects directly involved politicians at different levels (regional councillors and mayors in the case of the SEENET projects) and, above all, regional public officials, in project committees and other bodies established for the project management as well as in project-related meetings and events.

As far as the Moroccan partner was concerned, the political impetus of the Region of T/T was decisive for the identification of projects and for the involvement of other Moroccan territorial actors in INTERREG projects. Most of the time, the implementation phase saw the involvement of other actors which had the most technical knowledge, such as for instance the *Fondation Abdellah Guennoun* and Provincial Cultural Delegation (EUROMEDINCULTURE). At the same time, the responsibility for the management of projects was given to other actors such as the Chamber of Commerce of Tetouan or to the Municipality of Chefchaouen due to the highly technical character of the projects (EUROMEDINCULTURE and RESTAURONET respectively).

In the case of Andalusia, the political impetus was also considered generally sufficient. In particular, within the framework of the MA'ARIFA project, full political responsibility was undertaken by all the partners involved. The IEDT established a cooperation convention with each of them, in order to set out the rules to be followed in the joint management, coordination, planning and evaluation of each cooperation activity.

In WM and the Sarajevo Canton, in general, partners considered the political impetus given to the project quite high. Also considered globally high was the participation of political representatives in project activities, especially in meetings and working tables. For these reasons, the degree of political involvement was reported as high, with some exceptions both for WM (in the case of the Prefectural self-administration of Florina, the Regional health administration and the IZ'Supervisory Board of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities) and the Sarajevo Canton (SERDA, and insufficient for the IPSA institute and the LESPnet NGO).

In Calabria, FVG and Istria, the impetus given by politicians and their participation in projects was considered poor, or insufficient (in the case of Calabria territorial actors). In the specific case of Calabria, participation in project activities was mainly reserved for regional representatives at a technical level. This was explained by the very technical nature of the projects. For this reason, projects did not lead to the continuation of political contacts after their completion. Where contacts were created, they concerned mainly representatives of the regions at a technical level, or other territorial actors, such as universities (MEROPE project).

However, although generally low, the political impetus and participation was high vis-à-vis those projects which had a strategic political interest. In the ADRI.BLU project, for instance, the boost to the initiative given by institutional representatives was decisive, given that they were the very same local partner institutions (the Italians being lead partners) which participated in drawing up and

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

carrying out parts of the project. With this in mind, the involvement of the political sphere was very high as was the impetus given by the political representatives to the project.

Moreover, political impetus and participation were also high where the creation of a more structured partnership among political representatives was a precondition of involvement as partners (SEENET).

### **Continuation of political contacts**

Independently from the level of political impetus and involvement in projects, projects did not achieve significant results in terms of continuation of political contacts after their completion, neither in Tuscany nor in other regions. In the former case, the initial interest shown by politicians did not lead to the funding of any pilot projects. It shows that, in general, no direct relation exists between the degree of political impetus and the continuation of political contacts after a project's conclusion.

On the other hand, sometimes there was an indirect relationship (Istria, FVG) between the political impetus and the continuation of institutional contacts after the completion of the projects. As regards the Istria region, all the projects led to the continuation of contacts after their conclusion, especially contacts aimed at planning the second phase for each of them.

In the case of FVG, the contribution of the projects to the continuation of contacts after their conclusion was quite high, even if they have not necessarily concerned the regional authority. Within the framework of the "GO NETWORK project", for example, only the technical bodies and financial institutions involved in the project managed to maintain these contacts. In practice, though, the partnership between the corresponding financial institutions rendered possible and stimulated institutional contacts. This was also demonstrated by the EUROMEDSYS project, which notwithstanding the scarce political involvement, led to the creation of new relationships and networks, allowing the continuation of political contacts after its completion.

In addition, it is worth noting how the projects led to the creation of relationships between the regional authority and the actors from the relevant territory. With the MEROPE project, for example, a link was established between the University and the Calabria Region for other international projects.

### **Partnership system**

#### **The building of permanent structures**

Within the projects analysed, partnership with external partners was developed through the creation of committees, such as steering committees at political and technical level, working groups, periodical meetings being limited to the implementation phase.

The ADRI.BLU project represents a particular case in this sense, since the so-called "Permanent Blu working table for the Northern Adriatic" was set up as means of coordination of the activities developed within the project. Moreover, the involvement of external parties was high and developed both at institutional level and also through the setting up of individual initiatives, such as the organization of meetings, seminars and training courses.

The creation of partnership with external partners was also facilitated by the organisation of conferences, seminars and training courses; or in the benchmarking analysis of the Calabria region, where the creation of a website also proved to be a useful tool in this sense (EUROMEDSYS).

# COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

## Previous projects with external partners

In almost all cases, during the implementation of the projects there were other ongoing projects with external partners. For the majority of the COMPART partners, they concerned other INTERREG projects, but also (e.g. Tuscany) other decentralised cooperation as well as European programmes (LIFE Third Countries; Tradeonline Leonardo; Proaere Leonardo; and Sofar VI framework programme).

Particular mention should be made of the ADRI.BLU project. It can be considered part of the Pilot Project Northern Adriatic, which is divided up into various sub-projects. In this case, though, the partnership within the ADRI.BLU has been even more fruitful thanks to the simultaneous management of further common projects (such as ADRI.FISH, CORIN, also financed under the Italian Cooperation Law 84/2001).

## New partners and projects

The benchmarking analysis of the Istria region highlighted the case of the ADRI.FISH project. It was successful because of the innovative approach adopted: it supported the creation of a platform for the continuation of the transnational cooperation in the fisheries sector, that led the participating regions to enhance and expand the cooperation through three new projects, financed both under the Italian Cooperation Law 84/2001 (Fish.log and Connect projects) and the INTERREG IIIA programme (ADRI.BLU projects). The political influence of Italian regions (FVG, Emilia Romagna and Veneto) was of great importance in achieving the financing of these new projects<sup>9</sup>. These projects are very interesting because they go beyond a spot intervention. They are part of a more structured strategy developed by the Northern Adriatic Regions; a concrete expression of cross-border cooperation whose aims are to overcome borders to resolve common problems. In doing so, the regions involved combined EU instruments with those reserved to decentralised cooperation (L. 84/2001). The fisheries sector in the macro-region of the North Adriatic has in the last decade been the subject of many disputes between the three border states: Italy, Croatia and Slovenia. Before the projects were implemented, a common approach in the sector was seen as almost impossible and it was perceived by the Istrian public as a futile attempt to resolve the problems. However, it achieved the reaching of a common understanding and encouraged participation in resolving the problems.

Almost all the projects provided the opportunity to develop many new relationships<sup>10</sup> with external partners, even if not always for the implementation of new projects. When new projects were identified, they were presented mainly within the framework of the INTERREG programmes, both carrying out a second phase of the same project (EUROMEDSYS II, RURALMED II), or presenting new projects with the same partners, such as the MEROPE consortium and MA'ARIFA<sup>11</sup>. In particular, the benchmarking analysis of the region of T/T indicated that the EUROMEDSYS project was a good practice in this sense. EUROMEDSYS led to the participation of the T/T region in new INTERREG projects with Andalusia, such as the RETSE (*Reseau Transfrontalier des Services aux Entreprises*) financed under the INTERREG IIIA Spain Morocco programme, and to the second phase of

---

<sup>9</sup> The cooperation in these projects has resulted in the 1st International fish and fishing equipment fair in the Republic of Croatia with promoters from Croatia and from the three Italian regions Emilia Romagna, FVG and Veneto.

<sup>10</sup> For example, within the framework of the SEENET project: the city of Rovinj/Rovigno has established contacts and has the intention of maintaining the partnership with a Public service firm from Pisa; whereas the Municipality of Brtonigla/Verteneglio has designed a project with the expert from the Tuscany Region for the development of educational itineraries on archaeological sites in the municipality's territory.

<sup>11</sup> The IEDT has provided for and implemented new projects (e.g. ARRABT project within the framework of the INTERREG III A Spain-Morocco programme).

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

EUROMEDSYS, as well as to new decentralised cooperation projects<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, from the point of view of new cooperation opportunities, EUROMEDSYS has been very fruitful for other Moroccan territorial actors also. The Chamber of commerce (CCIS) of Tetouan, for instance, has established contacts with some Andalusian actors: the Development Institute of Andalusia (IFA), and the technical centres linked to IMPIVA (*Instituto de la Mediana y Pequeña Industria Valenciana*) of Valencia. Finally, it is worth stressing that EUROMEDSYS has given rise to new internal partnerships among Moroccan actors initially not involved in the project. The region of T/T has started a partnership with the *Institut de Recherche Agronomique*, which will probably be involved in studies and training initiatives aimed at the region's private operators (*Directions Provinciales de Agriculture, Offices Regional de Mise en valeur Agricole, Associations des professionnels de la region, etc.*), to be implemented within the INTERREG MEDOCC programme.

In addition to this, the new relationships created led to other projects ideas (Tuscany<sup>13</sup>, Calabria<sup>14</sup>, Greece<sup>15</sup>) not linked to INTERREG programmes. There are cases between SEE (South Eastern Europe) partners in which city projects of one local authority will be replicated in another project. The SEENET project has shown how the creation of new contacts may be facilitated by study visits and missions in SEE territories, for instance. In this context, a significant role was played in the creation and establishment of new common activities by the Tuscan experts that were in charge of individual SEE projects and those institutions or firms that were included in capacity-building activities for SEE partners.

### **Improvement of partnership dialogue**

The partnership dialogue with external partners has been considerably improved by the projects analysed. The Calabria region stressed how this improvement has been mainly due to the fact that projects represented a first opportunity to cooperate or simply to meet with external partners in order to exchange opinions, ideas and proposals on future initiatives. In relation to these proposals, the benchmarking analysis confirmed that the greater the number of meetings and exchanges of information organised, the higher the contribution of the project to the improvement of partnership dialogue (MAEM project).

In contrast with the other COMPART partners, the benchmarking report of the Sarajevo Canton presented a situation which was quite fragmented. While the Municipality of Centar and the City Council considered that projects very much improved the partnership dialogue with external

---

<sup>12</sup> For example, projects for the training of local civil servants and political representatives (FAMSI) and for the building of the Congress.

<sup>13</sup> Within the framework of the MEROPE project, a new relationship was developed with the *Communauté Urbaine de Marrakech* for the improvement of the viability of private transport and goods transportation vehicles in the city centre. In particular, the study aimed at identifying short-term programmes to improve circulation and medium term solutions to parking-related problems. The studies were extended to include goods distribution transport and were carried out under the technical supervision of Siena Parcheggi (local partner of the Tuscany Region in the MEROPE project). Moreover, the RURALMED II project led to the establishment of 14 regional local programmes and 3 interregional programmes.

<sup>14</sup> For example, the University of Reggio Calabria organised a training course in Olive grove management in collaboration with the Universities of Algeria and the CRAED Centre. Furthermore, considering the interest demonstrated in the Euromedsys project, its format have been replicated in a new project, financed within the framework of the "Interregional cooperation programme" (Agrimedsys), financed by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

<sup>15</sup> In particular, the Educational Institute participated in a new collaboration programme with the East-West Institute; and the NGO ARKTOUROS received a proposal for financing networking actions by the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

partners, other actors considered this contribution almost sufficient (LESPnet NGO) or insufficient (IPSA institute).

### Coordination, coherence and complementarity

#### Involvement of different departments

The coordination among the different departments of the institutions involved in the projects was quite satisfying (Tuscany; FVG; WM; Calabrian territorial actors such as CERERE (*Centro Regionale per il Recupero dei centri Storici Calabresi*) and the University of Reggio Calabria). Different departments were involved in all phases of the projects with particular regard to the implementation phase, except in more sector-specific projects (such as “GO NETWORK”) or when very technical skills were required.

In the specific case of the Istria Region, the office for interregional and cross-border cooperation, responsible for the preliminary activities (project definition, establishment of partnership) was supported by a sectoral department (department of agriculture for ADRI.FISH and the Institute for Physical Planning for CONSPACE) in charge of the implementation phase. Istrian partners were not involved in monitoring and evaluation activities (e.g. CONSPACE). On the other hand, when municipalities were involved (SEENET), the inclusion of one or more departments in the project’s implementation depended on the internal administrative organisation. For the cities of Rovinj and Pazin, two or more departments were involved (in Pazin, the Department for Local Self-government and the Department of Finance in Rovinj), while for Verteneglio, a small municipality with one general department, only one person was in charge of the implementation of the two projects.

As far as the Calabria region is concerned, notwithstanding the high level of coordination registered by territorial actors, the benchmarking analysis revealed a lack of coordination within the regional authority, since in all the projects analysed the department of international relations was the only one to be involved.

#### Coherence with the local territorial strategy

All the projects were considered to perfectly reflect the interests of the Regions in relation to a particular sector or issue. Projects were considered as being highly coherent with the local development strategy (Tuscany, FVG, Istria, Calabria, WM, the Sarajevo Canton). In particular, in Calabria most of the projects (EUROMEDSYS; MEROPE; CIMPA) were in line with the local development plans<sup>16</sup>. In addition, it is worth noting that the CIMPA project was in line with the Leader Plus programme and with the Action Plan of the Local Action Group Valle del Crati, which is the area where the pilot projects are located. It is also worth noting that within the framework of the MA’ARIFA project, IEDT had to guarantee that all projects were in line with the provincial development strategy, in order to avoid overlaps between the project proposals made by the different municipalities and to maximise the efficiency of the use of resources.

In the case of Tuscany, the projects were considered in line with the interests of the Region in supporting small to medium-sized enterprises (SME) (EUROMEDSYS) and in responding to local needs such as the preservation of cultural heritage, territorial management and decentralisation (MAEM). The MEROPE project is of particular interest in this sense. The idea of the MEROPE project

---

<sup>16</sup> Within the framework of the MEROPE project, the implementation of the pilot project in the Province of Cosenza was seen as being perfectly in line with the will of the provincial administration to improve the local transport system in an innovative and sustainable manner.

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

grew from the experience of cities like Florence, Siena, Terni, Modena, Piacenza, Genoa, Seville, Naples and Rome, which contacted their regional administrations to ask them to propose an international project addressing problems of mobility and logistics in their areas. After initial contact, the consortium was enlarged and the project was developed. Therefore, it is reported that the project emerged directly as a response to real territorial needs and that the actions implemented throughout MEROPE have a real use and impact. The project was designed taking into account the indications of the Logistics Plan of the Tuscany Region and it is included in the Urban Traffic Plan of the Florence Municipality. Finally, it is worth noting that within the SEENET project, local initiatives have been agreed according to existing cooperative mechanism at local level.

### **Influence on the local territorial strategy**

Due to the great level of coherence between the projects and the local development strategies, the projects' results have had a sufficient influence on the local territorial strategy (Tuscany, Calabria, WM, Istria, FVG). For instance, the benchmarking analysis of the Tuscany region reported the example of the MEROPE projects, whose results have led to further study or to inclusion in mobility plans of some local sites. Indeed, as a result of the transit analysis for electronic gates undertaken in Terni by the Region of Umbria, the public administration is currently working towards revising access and parking permits to the Limited Traffic Area, meanwhile in Piacenza, the results of the survey and the study carried out within MEROPE were taken into consideration by the Local Council, who in the summer of 2004 committed itself to updating the General Plan of Urban Traffic 1998. Furthermore, from the results of the MEROPE project, the Province and the Council of Piacenza have decided to undertake a further analysis and evaluation of a economic-financial nature regarding the introduction of a transit point for urban goods distribution.

By contrast, the benchmarking analysis of the Sarajevo canton and T/T region highlighted how project results have not influenced the local territorial strategy very much.

As far as the Istria region is concerned, those interviewed highlighted the presence of a multi-level problem. Although there is a high level of coherence between the projects and the local development strategy, the results cannot directly influence the regional strategy since the latter depends primarily on the national government. On the other hand, where municipalities were involved (SEENET), the project highly influenced the local territorial strategy, since local economic development is a high priority for all the SEE Partners. For the Municipality of Verteneglio one of the projects implemented has provided an opportunity to consider new approaches and new development sectors. Moreover, in the latter case, the project results were fully included in the local development strategy.

## DEMOCRACY, PARTICIPATION AND DECENTRALISATION

### **Institution and capacity-building**

In general, projects gave sufficient importance to capacity-building activities towards all categories of stakeholders, especially regional and local authorities and universities and research centres. Private and civil society actors benefited to a lesser extent from these kind of activities. However, projects such as the "GO NETWORK project" (FVG) were more directed towards private actors in order to improve the credit/guarantee system for SMEs, and the project of the NGO ARKTOUROS ("PROTECTION OF MOUNTAINS ON THE BASIS OF THE PROTECTION OF BEARS") in WM involved civil society.

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

In practice, capacity-building activities concerned seminars, workshops, training, exchange of know-how and studies. Capacity-building activities assumed even more importance vis-à-vis external partners (Istria and T/T regions). The benchmarking analysis of Istria stressed the role played by the SEENET project, which provided the opportunity of organising workshops at SEE local level. This gave 21 SEE local governments the chance to include more representatives from local and regional public institutions (such as municipal firms, chambers of commerce, development offices, NGOs, etc.) in such activities. These kinds of activities were not limited to the project partners, but tried to include all the relevant stakeholders of the different territories according to a participatory approach.

However, it is worth noting that in most cases capacity-building was generated by the direct involvement of institutions in projects and by the discussion among the partners, through working tables, for example. It is possible to say, though, that the INTERREG projects generated capacity-building above all through a “learning by doing” effect (Calabria, FVG). The MEROPE project, for example, generated capacity-building through the direct involvement of the authorities in charge of the management of the transport system in public conferences and in pilot actions.

Also in this case, the *learning by doing effect* acquire more importance when considering third country partners. In this sense, in relation to the EUROMEDSYS project, notwithstanding a lack of capacity-building activities, the regional authority of T/T considered the project as having a high impact on the institutional building of its human resources. This was mainly due to contact with their European counterparts and to their pace of work, as well as to the delays imposed by INTERREG. All these factors stimulated the region to improve its practices and standards in order to be more competitive. Moreover, the project stimulated the region to establish contacts with other territorial actors and to develop relationships with other European regions of the Mediterranean.

### **Participation of stakeholders in different project phases**

The benchmarking analysis shows that the participation of stakeholders in different project phases varied greatly among the COMPART partners. Globally, regional and local authorities were the most involved in all the project phases, even though in some cases (e.g. Calabria and FVG, Andalusia, T/T regions), a subdivision of tasks exists among stakeholders. In particular, private actors or universities and research centres were most likely to be involved in the implementation phase, during which most technical know-how is needed. As far as the Calabria region is concerned, research centres actors (CERERE) were designated as implementing authorities.

The results of the benchmarking analysis conducted in the WM region indicated a different situation. Among the different categories of stakeholders, the private sector and the university and research centre participated the most, especially in implementation and monitoring and evaluation phases.

Finally, as far as third countries are concerned, only Istria considered the global participation of stakeholders as sufficient. On the contrary, it was low for both the Sarajevo canton and the T/T region. In particular, the latter stressed how the participation of Moroccan stakeholders has mainly been limited to the implementation phase.

### **Creation of Networks**

In general, the projects analysed have not been very effective in the creation of networks as expected results. Only the WM represents an exception to this trend. In almost all the projects considered, cross-border and transnational networks among the various actors were created as an expected result. In particular, it is worth noting that there is an **effort to create a Euro-region between Greece and FYROM in the crossborder area of Prespes**. Moreover, in two cases

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

INTERREG III A projects have stimulated the creation of networks after their completion. Specifically, the “Production of Multimedia Educational Material” project led to the creation of a Commercial and Educational Network. This is mostly a private initiative and it is based on the good interpersonal relations created between the actors involved in the initial project.

The benchmarking analysis of the Calabria region revealed that only the CASTRUM project led to the creation of networks after the conclusion of the project with public authorities, civil society organisation and Universities of Morocco. The network is a virtual network, the parties are in contact *via* the internet for the exchange of ideas and proposals on how to manage castles and *medinas*. The importance of website and new communication technology tools for the creation of networks was also stressed by the partners of the EUROMEDSYS project. In the latter case, however, the project has not led to the creation of new networks. It is worth noting that this was mainly due to the lack of knowledge from ARSSA (*Agenzia Regionale per lo Sviluppo ed i Servizi in Agricoltura*) of other funding opportunities outside INTERREG for the design sustainability of other projects.

In the case of external partners, networks have been created above all as unintended results of the projects. In Istria, for example, projects have not led to the creation of a specific network but in some particular cases (e.g. ADRI.FISH) have created a large and long-lasting network between the regions and institutions involved in the four projects and many stakeholders related to the fisheries sector

### **Involvement of central government**

In general, central government was not seen as playing an active role in the projects. It was only rarely directly involved (CONSPACE). Despite this, the level to which central government was kept informed was higher, even if still not sufficient, although this has only led to a slight improvement of relationships with the central government. The Istrian benchmarking analysis considered the ADRI.BLU project as an exception to this, since, although the Italian national government was not involved in the project activities, the Regions informed the central government about the ongoing international activity. This constant information flow facilitated the signing (in September 2005) of a common intent protocol among the regions involved in the project and the relevant Fisheries Ministries.

However, the lack of involvement of the central government created some problems. For instance, the benchmarking analysis of the Calabria region revealed that since the field of action of CIMPA required a phase of implementation at the national level, it was difficult to provide the further development required by the project.

### **OWNERSHIP**

The sense of ownership was quite high for almost all the partners (Tuscany, Calabria, FVG, Istria) in all phases of the project. Some of the Italian regions (Tuscany, FVG) indicated that the satisfactory sense of ownership was mainly due to their direct involvement in the strategic and operational phase of the projects. As regards Tuscany, this was also due to the commitment of the regional authority to the achievement of the project’s objectives. In the case of the MEROPE project, for instance, as lead partner and due to the large and diversified consortium, the institution was forced to dedicate a lot of time and energy to liaising with partners and encouraging them to complete project activities successfully and within the given deadlines. This constant monitoring and contact heightened the institution’s sense of ownership of the project. Another respondent

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

indicated that the sense of ownership was enhanced by the active involvement and responsibility of the institution in all the project's phases.

As far as the Sarajevo canton is concerned, it is worth stressing that while the sense of ownership was quite high for the local authorities, even if limited to the planning and implementation phases, civil society actors (IPSA institute and the LESPnet NGO) complained of very low ownership.

### **Enhancement of capacities**

The benchmarking analysis of Tuscany and FVG considered that projects contributed significantly to the enhancement of the capacities of local stakeholders for different reasons. The former pointed out that the institutions' personnel involved in the management and implementation of the project gained valuable experience in cooperation, management, evaluation in addition to technical knowledge. Concerning this last aspect, for example, the RURALMED II (Tuscany) project represented a best practice since it enhanced the capacity of the partners through experimental research and innovative planning. Furthermore, partners also gained benefits from the interaction with new geographically distant partners. In certain cases, this led to the partners coordinating their strategies at transnational level, as well as coordinating sectors at regional level (EUROMEDSYS). The latter, on the other hand, stressed that the improvement of capacities was mainly due to the direct involvement in phases of the projects and to the understanding of the way in which external partners' associations and foundations function.

By contrast, projects played a less important role in the enhancement of the capacities of other COMPART partners, such as Calabria, Sarajevo Canton and Istria. In fact the situation was quite fragmented. Projects contributed to the enhancement of local capacities only in a few cases. In Calabria and T/T, this was mainly due to the lack of direct participation of regional administrations. As mentioned above, these two regions tended to involve technical actors. As regards the T/T region, though in one sense this division of tasks extended participation to other actors, a lack of direct involvement has hindered the appropriation of results by political representatives. On the other hand, when the region was directly involved in project activities, the influence of project results on political representatives was higher (MA'ARIFA and EUROMEDSYS), as were the possibilities for the region to reinforce previous relationships while also establishing new partnerships and generating new projects.

In addition, as far as third country partners are concerned, the low impact on the enhancement of local capacities could be considered as being due to the lack of financial resources for non-EU partners and a lack of necessary expertise in the management of projects of this kind (Istria).

### **Enhancement of territorial resources**

It is worth noting that projects only slightly contributed to the enhancement of territorial resources. In particular, while a few projects contributed to enhancing local resources in Tuscany (MAEM and RURALMED II projects) and the Sarajevo Canton ("THE UN HUMAN SETTLEMENTS PROGRAM UIG"; "TOURISM, AGRICULTURE"), their impact was very low in the other cases.

This result is quite surprising, above all compared to the high level of coherence of many of the projects analysed with the local territorial strategy. In this regard, it is worth noting that in the majority of cases, the response registered in the questionnaires was not insufficient but scarce. The case of the MEROPE project is enlightening. The MEROPE project took into account environmental conditions and economic resources while aiming at rationalising the logistics chain in urban areas. Within this framework, partners experimented with the use of environmentally friendly vehicles and transit points outside historical centres. In this sense, the project was seen as having potential for

## **COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME**

enhancing territorial resources, as well as reducing the environmental impact of transportation vehicles through the implementation of the planned computerised platform. Despite this potential, the impact of the project was evaluated as scarce both by the Tuscany and Calabria regions. The latter stressed that the potential impact on the enhancement of local resources depended on the willingness of decision-makers to apply the results obtained and tested during the pilot project. Hence, it is possible to argue that there is a need to involve the responsible levels of government in projects and to keep them informed.

# COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

## Conclusion

As a first point, the benchmarking analysis aimed to gauge the extent to which projects are connected to previous cooperation agreements and to what extent the existence of such agreements has been significant for the identification and implementation of the activities.

The analysis shows that the majority of the COMPART partners (Andalusia, Tuscany, Istria and Tanger Tetouan regions) rely on cooperation agreements to create partnerships. Thus it can firstly be said that the **existence of cooperation agreement facilitates the creation of partnership**. This is especially true for third country partners (Istria and T/T region), for whom the participation in the cooperation agreement facilitates, in turn, their involvement in other projects with the same European partners. Secondly, cooperation agreements imply a process of negotiation between the various partners involved. This dialogue leads to a better reciprocal understanding which helps to integrate the local needs of all the partners into the activities to be financed and to **forging consensus and trust among the partners**, which is fundamental to obtain tangible results.

Moreover, cooperation agreements **help to reduce project fragmentation**, by pursuing the global objective through a long or medium-term strategy whose realisation often envisages the use of different sources of funding and the implementation of different projects. The ADRI.FISH and ADRI.BLU projects should be considered best practices in this sense. These projects are very interesting because they go beyond a spot intervention. They are **part of a more structured strategy** developed by the Northern Adriatic regions, whose implementation was made possible by combining EE instruments with those aimed at decentralised cooperation (Italian Cooperation Law 84/2001).

In order to be effective, cooperation agreements **should be accompanied by a concrete political will to cooperate**. The benchmarking analysis shows that in many cases, the aim of cooperation agreements was limited to partnership identification.

Finally, the results of the benchmarking analysis have highlighted that **only in very few cases did projects lead to the development of new cooperation agreements**. From this result, it is possible to draw the conclusion that, while the identification of new projects is often facilitated by previous cooperation agreements, they have **only rarely led to more structured and strengthened relationships among partners**.

In order to understand the degree of political commitment towards external territorial cooperation projects, the benchmarking analysis attempted to investigate the extent to which political representatives gave impetus and participated in project activities and to what extent their impetus/involvement led to the continuation of political contacts after the conclusion of projects.

The benchmarking analysis revealed that **political impetus was quite low as was political involvement in the activities of the projects**. Exceptions to this trend were mainly due to three factors. Firstly, the degree of political impetus is higher when a project is considered strategic in order to achieve political objectives. This is the case, for example, of the ADRI.FISH and ADRI.BLU projects, which have contributed to the creation of a policy for managing fishing resources and products and for managing and developing the fisheries sector among the partners involved. Secondly, the involvement of politicians is high if it is considered to be a precondition to participation as a partner (SEENET), or where, as the case of Tuscany showed, external territorial cooperation as well as decentralised cooperation are considered an essential tool in the development strategy of the regional authority.

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

However, the benchmarking analysis has shown that the stability of political relationships does not depend exclusively on the degree of political impetus and participation in projects. In general, no direct relation exists between the degree of political impetus and the continuation of contacts after a project's conclusion. On the basis of the results of the benchmarking analysis, it is possible to conclude that in most cases, **the continuation of contact after the completion of a project is not necessarily due to the degree of involvement of political representatives**. In fact, most of the time projects are developed and implemented by non-political actors. Undoubtedly, institutional contacts among the partners directly involved in a project are more important than contacts at a political level. In addition, the benchmarking analysis has also shown that the maintenance of contacts is mainly due to the strength of partnerships and to the possibility of reproducing them through available financial instruments. However, the question as to whether the projects support the continuation of political dialogue remains open. **In the end, participation is more at a technical and bureaucratic level than at a political level, with poor interaction.**

The benchmarking analysis also focused on the process which led to the creation of partnerships. In particular, the aim of the analysis was to understand the extent to which the development of partnerships is due to permanent institutions or regular meetings created within the projects and whether stakeholders have reproduced the partnership in other projects. In addition, this part also aimed to understand the extent to which projects have contributed to the identification of new projects, to the creation of new contacts and to the improvement of partnership dialogue.

Projects have contributed to the development of partnerships through the management system put in place, which encourages the implementation of the partnership principle through the **creation of committees at a political and technical level**, working groups and periodic meetings, as well as through participation in events and seminars organised by the projects.

The benchmarking analysis shows that partnership can be built and strengthened by working together. For this reason too, almost all the projects were characterised by consolidated partnerships, since during the implementation phase there were other ongoing projects with external partners.

Furthermore, the benchmarking analysis revealed that the projects analysed have successfully strengthened existing partnerships but also led to the **creation of new contacts** which in turn resulted, in some cases, to the identification and **implementation of new projects**, not only within the INTERREG initiative. The ADRI.FISH project represents a best practice in this regard, together with the EUROMEDSYS and the SEENET projects. The ADRI.FISH project led to the **creation of a platform** for the continuation of transnational cooperation in the fisheries sector. The participating regions enhanced and expanded the cooperation through three new projects, financed both by the Italian Cooperation Law 84/2001 (Fish.log; Connect) and through the INTERREG IIIA programme (ADRI.BLU). As far as the EUROMEDSYS and SEENET projects are concerned, they have greatly contributed to strengthening partnerships and the creation of new contacts with external partners from the T/T and Istria regions respectively.

The benchmarking analysis has also indicated the **need to reduce the fragmentation of projects and improve their impact on local development**. In order to do so, there is a need to ensure coordination among the different institutional departments, as well as to **ensure coherence between projects and local development strategies**. Concerning this last point, the MEROPE project represents a best practice, since it was generated directly by real local needs, and as such has considerably influenced the local territorial strategy.

The second part of the benchmarking analysis centred on analysing three main aspects: the degree of implementation of capacity-building activities within projects; the degree of participation of the various categories of stakeholders in different project phases; and the role of the central government

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

in projects, that is, to what extent the central government was involved in projects or kept informed of their results.

Firstly, the benchmarking analysis demonstrates the **high potential of projects for generating capacity-building of partners**, through the implementation of specific activities but above all through a “learning by doing effect”. The direct involvement in project activities and interaction between partners is very effective in strengthening capacities. This is especially important in those countries where the decentralisation process still needs to be strengthened (e.g. Morocco and Croatia). In this sense, projects **could also contribute to boosting the decentralisation process**, or in making regional authorities more proactive, as the project (“PRODUCTION OF MULTIMEDIA EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL”) for the a Euro-region between Greece and FYROM in the crossborder area of Prespes has shown.

The positive impact on capacities does only not concern regional authorities, but also other territorial actors. The benchmarking analysis reveals that although regional authorities are the most involved in project phases, when more technical knowledge is needed the implementation phase is characterised by a division of tasks between public administrations and other actors, especially private, university and research centre actors. Notwithstanding this, **the process still needs to be opened up, especially as regards the planning phase**, where regional authorities have played a major role.

By contrast, **central government has played a limited role**, being uninvolved in project activities and only being kept scarcely informed of project results. While on the one hand this can be considered a positive aspect as it reveals an autonomy of actions on the part of the regions in external territorial cooperation, on the other it should be seen as a constraint. The benchmarking analysis highlights the **need to establish a connection and to share strategy** with central government, especially in those cases where the decentralisation process is not advanced. The case of the Istria region is emblematic in this sense, the results of projects not being integrated into the regional territorial strategy as that depends primarily on national competence.

Finally, the third part of the benchmarking analysis is dedicated to the ownership principle. The benchmarking analysis revealed quite a **high sense of ownership on the part of stakeholders**, especially where they were directly involved in project phases. Direct involvement has generated, in turn, an enhancement in the capacities of partners (e.g. RURALMED II). However, especially in the case of external partners, the achievement of this result has been hindered by other factors, such as the lack of sufficient financial resources and of necessary expertise.

In addition, the results of the benchmarking analysis show that **there is no direct relationship between the sense of ownership and the impact of projects** on the enhancement of local resources. Partners have stressed that in order to achieve this aim, **there is a need to involve and inform the competent** (national, regional or local, according to their own administrative organisational structure) **political level in the project**. This conclusion supports the thesis that the success of future cross-border projects under ENPI and IPA will basically depend on the creation of real political partnerships among local authorities, with central governments and the involvement of the private sector. The benchmarking analysis has enabled the identification of best practices that are useful in indicating aspects and measures for building partnerships. The main results of the benchmarking analysis are summarised below.

## **COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME**

**Main finding of the benchmarking analysis:  
the hypothesis that the impact of projects depends on partnership efficacy  
is confirmed**

- 1) The importance of cooperation agreements and of a strategy to reduce project fragmentation.
- 2) The importance of political and institutional mechanisms for creating a true and long-lasting partnership
- 3) The need to improve political awareness of the necessity of establishing long-lasting partnership. Best practices sustain political involvement and the stability of relationships
- 4) The need to improve the integration of CBC in regional and local development plans as well as interaction among departments
- 5) The need to establish connections with and to share strategy with central government
- 6) The strengths and weaknesses of local authorities and the private sector have been identified, depending on the context. Exchange of best practices and mutual learning and implementation of institution-building activities in projects are required. They can contribute to the decentralisation process.
- 7) The need to finance concrete actions: the real impact of pilot actions improves the credibility and stability of partnerships
- 8) The need to increase financial resources for investment in concrete actions
- 9) Ownership is increasing but there is a need to support the participation of stakeholders (especially of external partners) in identification, monitoring and evaluation.

# COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

## ANNEX 1: BEST PRACTISES

<b>ADRI.FISH</b> <b>Promotion of a sustainable FISHerY in Northern ADRIatic Sea</b>	
Programme	Interreg IIIB CADSES -
Lead partner	Veneto Region (IT)
Other partners	<b>Friuli Venezia Giulia Region (IT); Emilia Romagna Region (IT); Federcoopesca association (IT); Istrian Region (HR) – Directorate for agriculture, forest economy, hunting and water economy; Municipality of Izola (SI)</b>
Duration	06/2003 – 05/2005
Financing	1.971.000,00 € (ERDF)
Objectives	The Adri.fish project intends to fill the lack of knowledge that troubles the fish sector in the Adriatic area so far by starting a qualifying process and increasing of the value added of the fish products on transnational level. In that way it will give a strong drive to the development of the whole fish sector of the Northern Adriatic area.
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Creation of a social-economic observatory, located in the city of Chioggia, dedicated to the analysis and the study of fishing on economic themes and social themes</li> <li>▪ Realization of a study of practicability to identify the depressed zones which are subjects to specific structures and infrastructural lack for the logistic and the fish range trade</li> <li>▪ Constitution of new fishermen's associations of the Balkan Adriatic area which make known the principles for a practicable and rational fishing among the fish workers</li> <li>▪ Realization of coordinate and transnational initiatives for the qualifying, the promotion and the marketing of the fishing products. for the fish products of the Northern Adriatic area,</li> <li>▪ Creation of an exchange system of knowledge and experience</li> </ul>
Results/outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Socio-Economic Observatory of Fishing in the Northern Adriatic Sea               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Constitution of the Socio-Economic Observatory of Fishing in the Northern Adriatic Sea based in Chioggia (Veneto Region)</li> <li>1.2. Analysis of the economic characteristics of the fish market in the Northern Adriatic Sea</li> <li>1.3. Report on the characterisation of fish production in the Partner regions of the Project</li> <li>1.4. Research on the consumption of fish products in the Northern Adriatic Sea</li> <li>1.5. Analysis on the economy of coast fishing within three miles of Northern Adriatic Sea regions</li> <li>1.6. Analysis on the employment in the fish market in the Partner regions</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Realisation of a feasibility study aimed at identifying critical points in logistics and in services related to the fish market that characterise the area of the Northern Adriatic;</li> <li>3. Active and successful exchange of knowledge between partners and operators in the fish market of the Northern Adriatic Sea through:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. establishment of the Adri.fish information network</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2. implementation of a training and management service for exchange activities of the personnel involved in the project</li> <li>3.3. Realisation of a Newsletter for fishing in Northern Adriatic Sea</li> <li>4. Promotion of associationism and cooperation in Slovenia and Croatia and the creation of a Fishery association in Croatia;</li> <li>5. Qualification of fish products in the Northern Adriatic Sea: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.1. Realisation of a product traceability pilot action</li> <li>5.2. creation of a quality and traceability trademark for fish products in the Northern Adriatic Sea</li> <li>5.3. Formulation of a guideline suitable for the creation of a common marketing strategy for the Northern Adriatic Sea</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>ADRI.BLU Project (Interreg IIIA – Northern Adriatic Countries)</b>	
Programme	INTERREG IIIA (Italy Adriatic)
Lead partner	Emilia Romagna
Other partners	Veneto Region (IT); <b>Friuli Venezia Giulia Region (IT)</b> ; Consorzio UNIPROM (IT); Izola municipality (Slovenia), <b>Istria county and Coastal Mountain County (Croatia)</b> , NORFISH and the Chamber of Commerce of the Bosnian Federation (Bosnia-Herzegovina)
Duration	May 2004; October 2006
Financing	2.706.707 €
Objectives	The objective of the <i>ADRI.BLU</i> project is the promotion of the socio-economic development and trans-border cooperation among the countries in the Adriatic area. Specifically, the program aims at strengthening the cooperation among all Italian Adriatic regions (from Friuli-Venezia Giulia to Puglia) and Eastern Adriatic Countries (Croatia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro and Albania) in order to create a homogeneous territorial and maritime area, including all the Adriatic countries.
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation of a “Blue Table Working Group” aiming at improving coordination among fishing and territorial policies in the Northern</li> <li>2. Adriatic area;</li> <li>3. Drafting of guidelines concerning the waters classification for fishing and aquiculture SMEs and drafting of technical regulations for a sustainable exploitation of the Adriatic natural and biological resources;</li> <li>4. Implementation of an innovative tool for the planning and management of the economic fishing activities, based on a Geographic Information System (GIS);</li> <li>5. Pilot action consisting on the construction of artificial barriers in order to</li> <li>6. increase sea biodiversity;</li> <li>7. Socio-economic animation for the realization of training activities and technical assistance to fishing operators concerning fishing-sustainable policies and management of fishing activities;</li> <li>8. Information, dissemination and promotion activities.</li> </ul>

**COMPART PROJECT  
INTERACT PROGRAMME**

<b>EUROMEDSYS – Systèmes économiques locaux de coopération transnationale</b>	
Programme	III B MEDOCC (Measure 1.1)
Lead partner	<b>Tuscany Region</b>
Partners	<b>Regione Calabria</b> , Regione Campania, Regione Sardegna, Regione Emilia Romagna, Région Provence-Alpes-Côte-d’Azur , Ministère de l’Aménagement du Territoire et de l’Environnement – Algérie, Instituto de Fomento de Andalucía - Junta de Andalucía, IMPIVA - Instituto de la Pequeña y Mediana Industria Valenciana, Gouvernorat de Sousse et Gouvernorat de Sfax – Tunisie, <b>Conseil Régional de Tanger Tétouan – Maroc</b> , BIC Toscana S.C.p.A – Italia
Duration	24 months
Approval	30/10/2002
Financing	Total: 2.566.288,00
Objectives	The project aims at contributing to the development of the local economic systems in the Mediterranean area in order to create platforms for institutional cooperation in the Mediterranean area. SMEs economic integration will be improved, in particular in three different sectors: Mediterranean Habitat, Traditional Food, Advanced services to the SMEs.
Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Activities of preparation and study (questionnaire, workshops, seminars)</li> <li>2. Pilot projects identification in the single region on the three different sectors (Habitat, Food, SMEs) , definition of certification labels</li> <li>3. Identification and exchange of best practices, models for certification</li> <li>4. Networking</li> <li>5. Training and technical assistance in the third countries.</li> </ol>
Results/outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Three pilot projects in the different sectors focalised in the sector and providing practical actions</li> <li>2. Definition of high quality standards for each category and for the certification, in order to focalise the production sector in the Mediterranean following these standards,</li> <li>3. Creation of a network between producers in the Mediterranean area</li> <li>4. Improvement and diffusion of the certification systems</li> <li>5. Diffusion of the products in the restaurants</li> <li>6. Growth of the employment rate.</li> </ol>

<b>MA’ARIFA</b>	
Programme	Interreg III A Spain – Morocco
Lead partner	Diputación de Cadiz through the Instituto De Empleo Y Desarrollo Tecnológico (IEDT)
Other partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Diputación De Cádiz: Instituto De Empleo Y Desarrollo Tecnológico (IEDT) Project Leader; Fundación Provincial De Cultura; Área De Políticas</li> </ul>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

	<p>De Igualdad, Juventud, Solidaridad Internacional; <b>Fondo Andaluz De Municipios Para La Solidaridad Internacional</b>; Mancomunidad De Municipios De La Sierra De Cádiz; Mancomunidad De Municipios Del Bajo Guadalquivir; Mancomunidad De Municipios Del Campo De Gibraltar; Mancomunidad De Municipios De La Janda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Conseil Regionale Tánger-Tetuán</b> (Moroccan)</li> <li>▪ Commune of Cádiz: Instituto De Fomento Empleo Y Formación De La Ciudad De Cádiz;</li> <li>▪ Commune of San Fernando: Instituto Municipal De Promoción De La Ciudad De San Fernando; Instituto Municipal De Promoción De La Ciudad De San Fernando; Commune of Puerto Real; Instituto Municipal De Promoción Fomento Socioeconómico Y Formación.</li> <li>▪ Commune of Sherry: Instituto De Promoción Y Desarrollo De La Ciudad De Jerez; Gerencia De Urbanismo</li> <li>▪ Commune of El Puerto De Santa María</li> <li>▪ Commune of Setenil De Las Bodegas: Centro De Recursos Del Olivo</li> <li>▪ Commune of Olvera</li> <li>▪ Commune of Algeciras</li> <li>▪ Labour Unions: Unión Provincial De Comisiones Obreras De Cádiz; Unión General De Trabajadores Cádiz</li> </ul> <p>Private:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confederación De Empresarios De Cádiz; Cámara De Comercio, Industria Y Navegación De Cádiz</li> <li>▪ Cámara Oficial De Comercio Industria Y Navegación Del Campo De Gibraltar; Cámara Oficial De Comercio E Industria De Jerez De La Frontera; Consejo Andaluz De Cámaras; Asociación Cardijn</li> <li>▪ IFECA</li> <li>▪ Universidad De Cádiz: Aula Universitaria Del Estrecho; Grupo De Investigación TAM (Tecnología Del Medio Ambiente)</li> </ul>
Financing	<p>First Interreg IIIA call: 12.575.911,90 € Second Interreg IIIa call: 26.436.114,37 €</p>
Objectives	<p>MA'ARIFA is a comprehensive project for the improvement of competitiveness and development capacity for the Tanger-Tetouan region and the province of Cadiz. It is elaborated by the Diputación de Cadiz, through its Institute for Employment and Technological Development, which has taken on the task facilitation, coordination and integration of the different activities and partners. These activities have been structured along the following axes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Urban Development,</li> <li>2. Andalusi* culture and crafts,</li> <li>3. Cooperation between universities,</li> <li>4. Tourism and Heritage,</li> <li>5. New technologies and entrepreneurial development.</li> </ol>
Activities	<p>294 activities have been taken on within the Ma'arifa project, according to the following structure:</p> <p>1.2 Development of strategies for urban and territorial planning and coastal areas.</p> <p>1.2.1 Creation of an urban renewal programme in neighbourhoods with high immigrant population.</p> <p>2.1 Development of strategies for sustainability and fostering of renewable energy.</p> <p>2.1.2 Creation of centre for research, restoration and environmental education for the Cadiz coastline.</p> <p>2.1.5 Renewable energies laboratory</p>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

	<p>2.2 Development of strategies for cultural sustainability, historical and ethnographical heritage and local identity.</p> <p>2.2.1 Andalusi music promotion centre.</p> <p>2.2.3 Towns and ports in the Gibraltar Strait</p> <p>2.2.4 Restoration and rehabilitation of historical and archaeological heritage in both sides of the Strait</p> <p>3.1 Inception of strategies for socio-economic development and fostering access to labour market.</p> <p>3.1.1 Fostering Business and Tourism Resources</p> <p>3.1.2 Start-up of a Project for Awareness and Impulse for Microenterprises</p> <p>3.1.4 Industrial Areas Management</p> <p>3.1.5. Start-up of a Centre for Business Fostering</p> <p>3.2 Development of cooperation strategies on technological development, research and enhancement of the information society.</p> <p>3.2.3. Technical assistance to enterprises towards adaptation to the new economy</p> <p>3.3 Development of cooperation strategies on training, education and access to labour market.</p> <p>3.3.3. Creation of a multifunctional information centre</p> <p>4.1 Social and institutional cooperation programme between IEDT (Diputación de Cádiz) and the Conseil Regional de Tanger-Tetouan.</p> <p>4.1.1. Social and Institutional Cooperation Programme</p> <p>4.1.2. Institutional Cooperation for Valuation of Environmental</p> <p>4.1.3 Endogenous Resources.</p> <p>4.1.4. Management and Planning Under the Principle of Sustainability: Local Agents Development</p> <p>4.1.5. Training and Capacity Building of Local Administrations' Technicians: Technical</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

\* The term *Andalusi* refers to those cultural features stemming from the Islamic tradition in Spain and therefore currently common to both Spanish and Moroccan cultures.

<b>MEROPE</b>	
Programme	Interreg III B MEDOCC
Lead partner	<b>Tuscany region</b>
Other partners	Regions: <b>Calabria</b> , Emilia-Romagna, Umbria, Municipality of Genoa, Company Public Transports Spa, FEDERTRASPORTO, Association de Investigacion y Cooperacion Industrial de Andalucia, Universidad de Catalunya, Serveis Ferroviaris de Mallorca, ARMINES, C.E.T.E Méditerranée, Communauté Urbaine de Marrakech
Duration	24 months
Approval	18/12/2002
Financing	Total: 2.702.060,00
Objectives	MEROPE main objective is to study and develop evaluation models and telematic instruments for the management and control of the mobility and logistic in the urban and metropolitan areas. The goals is apply ICT applications in order to support the definition of integrated system for transport and provide and improve the economic competitiveness, the mobility and the general urban quality life.
Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General analysis of the state of the art</li> <li>2. Definition of an ICT model for the logistic systems and the mobility in the</li> </ol>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

	<p>urban and metropolitan areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Feasibility studies in each target country</li> <li>4. Pilot projects implementation</li> <li>5. Evaluation of the impact on mobility, competitiveness, rules, sustainability, economic development, etc.</li> <li>6. Definition of standards, guidelines and best practices for the local and regional authorities</li> <li>7. Promotion of the MEROPE approach, dissemination of the results.</li> </ol>
Results/outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A model for the application of ICT technologies to mobility sector has been defined</li> <li>2. Guidelines and best practices has been identified in order to ensure a follow up and a future application of the project results</li> <li>3. Improvement on the knowledge of the local system of mobility in the involved countries</li> <li>4. Reduction of the environmental impacts of the mobility system</li> </ol>

<b>RURALMED II – Forum permanent et réseau de centres pour le développement rural en Méditerranée</b>	
Programme	III B MEDOCC (Axis 2 Measure 1)
Lead partner	Junta de Andalucia - Espana
Partners	ARSIA –TOSCANA, Associação Odiana – Portugal, Atelier dei Paesaggi Mediterranei- <b>Toscana</b> , Centre de Recherche en Economie Appliquée pour le Développement - Unité de Recherche sur le Développement Rural – Algerie, DISTAFA - Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologia Agroforestali ed Ambientali – Calabria, ERSAT – Ente Regionale di Sviluppo e Assistenza Tecnica in Agricoltura, Società consortile Langhe Monferrato, Roero, Ministère de l’Agriculture, du Développement Rural et des Eaux et Forêts - Maroc , Région-Provence-Alpes-Côte-d’Azur, <b>Regione Calabria</b> , Université de Florence, Faculté d’Architecture - Département Urbanisme et Planification
Duration	01/05/2004 - 30/06/2006
Financing	Total € 2510667
Objectives & Activities	<p>«Rural Med II» aims at the implementation of the «Rural Med project, network for exchange of experiences and for coordination among rural development initiatives on the Northern and Southern shores of the Mediterranean.</p> <p>This second phase of the project aims specifically at enlarging the existing network and the implementation of common projects which have already been identified.</p> <p>The network aims at reinforcing and promoting the process of rural participatory development in Western Mediterranean through the exchange of experiences and best practices and the implementation of joint training programmes and projects through the use of the instruments specifically created by "Rural Med I".</p> <p>The project is implemented through studies and pilot activities into five thematic areas: Gender perspectives, Rural Tourism, Rural Landscape, Participatory Development, Technological Innovation in Agriculture.</p>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

<b>SEENET</b> <b>South East Europe Net</b>	
Programme	Decentralised cooperation programme that has been supported by the Tuscany Region and the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the NGOs Ucodep and Cospe.
Project partners	<p>Italian Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <b>Tuscany Region</b>, NGOs Ucodep and Cospe</li> <li>▪ Tuscan local authorities involved: Florence Municipality, Arezzo Municipality, Carrara Municipality, Montale Municipality, Quarrata Municipality, Pistoia Municipality, Prato Municipality, Pontedera Municipality, Mugello Mountainous District , Empolse Val d'Elsa District, Arezzo Province, Livorno Province, Pisa Province</li> </ul> <p>SEE Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Region of Istria</b></li> <li>▪ Pazin Municipality, Rovigno Municipality, Varaždin Municipality, <b>Verteneglio Municipality</b>, Scutari Municipality, Herzegovina-Neretva Canton, Sarajevo Canton, Sarajevo Municipality, Mostar Municipality, Nevesinje Municipality, Prjedor Municipality, Sanski Most Municipality, Livno Municipality, Trebinje Municipality, Tuzla Municipality, Skopje Municipality, Kraguievac Municipality, Nis Municipality, Vozdovac Municipality, Pec/Peja Municipality</li> </ul>
Duration	07/2003 – 07/2006
Financing	<p>The project promoted by the NGOs is financed by the Italian Law no.49 from 1987 on international cooperation for development with a total amount of approximately 1.878.593 EUR allocated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) DGCS – MAE: 1.032.758 EUR;</li> <li>2) NGOs: 148.533 euro <i>in cash</i> and 146.158 euro as valorisation of the personnel work;</li> <li>3) Local counterparts: 552.144 EUR.</li> </ol>
Objectives	<p>The main objective of the programme SEENET is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ to improve, in the full realization of the guidelines on the decentralized cooperation, the capacities of the Local institutions in South-East European countries in the definition of policies and programmes for the citizen, with particular reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the actions of harmonization and management adjustment of the local public services in conformity with the European standards;</li> <li>▪ the identification of the support role to local actions of development and the carrying out of an active policy and use of the support of the international community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Improvement of the local public services.</b> Improvement of the local public services. The actions in this framework integrate the development of the management of the public services with actions of technical support with the objective to strengthen the analysis and planning abilities in the</li> </ol>

## COMPART PROJECT INTERACT PROGRAMME

	<p>same services. Such actions followed common methodologies allowing the comparison and the exchange among the participants both of the results and of the elements of the process;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>Support to the local economic development.</b> The actions proposed in this sector aim to define the role and to strengthen the action abilities of the LAs, particularly in the aspects of aggregation and coordination of the dawning economic strengths, favouring its development through actions of capacity building and support to the planning, with particular reference to the opportunities offered by the international community;</li> <li>3. <b>Coordination of the network and creation of new partnerships.</b> In this part there are managed the actions of general coordination of the project, the updating of the site, tool of transversal communication to the two projects of intervention. Besides, through the structure of coordination the activities of widening of the net were promoted.</li> </ol>
Results/outcomes	<p>At regional level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activates cooperation network between the Tuscan and SEE LAs;</li> <li>▪ Realisation of the Web site as an information and communication instrument</li> <li>▪ Exchanges of Best Practices at regional level analysed and shared between the network stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Capacity building experiences of working methodologies evaluated and shared</li> </ul> <p>At local level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Methodologies of participative sharing in each LA</li> <li>▪ Long and medium term Programmes in the two intervention sectors defined for each SEE Partner</li> <li>▪ Priority Project proposals identified and realised for each SEE Partner</li> </ul>

**COMPART PROJECT  
INTERACT PROGRAMME**

**ANNEX II : LIST OF THE PROJECTS ANALYSED**

<b>Projects</b>	<b>Programme</b>	<b>Analysed by</b>
<b>ADRI.FISH</b>	INTERREG III B CADSES	LDA Verteneglio (CR)
<b>ADRI.BLU</b>	INTERREG III A – ITALY ADRIATIC	FVG (IT)
<b>ACUERDOS DIPUTACIÓN DE CÓRDOBA CON EL MUNICIPIO DE CHEFCHAOUEN (MA)</b>		FAMSI (ES)
<b>BALKAN CULTURE AGENCY, PROMOTION OF A MUTUAL CULTURAL IDENTITY AND TOURIST DEVELOPMENT</b>	INTERREG III A/CARDS GREECE ALBANIA	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER OF PODRINJE</b>	CARDS (2005-2006)	SERDA (BH)
<b>CASTRUM</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Calabria region (IT)
<b>CIMPA</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Calabria region (IT)
<b>COOPERACIÓN TRANSFRONTERIZA EN EL ÁMBITO DEL DESARROLLO TECNOLÓGICO RED DE COOPERACIÓN</b>	INTERREG III A SPAIN- MOROCCO	FAMSI (ES)
<b>CONSPACE</b>	INTERREG III B CADSES	LDA Verteneglio (CR)
<b>CREATION OF A PICTURE GALLERY IN FLORINA WITH CULTURAL ACTIVITIES</b>	INTERREG III A GREECE- FYROM	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>CROSS-BORDER ACTIONS FOR THE CONTROL OF ANIMAL ORIGIN FOOD</b>	INTERREG III A GREECE- ALBANIA	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>EUROMEDINCULTURE</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	T/T region (MA)
<b>EUROMEDSYS</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	T/T region (MA); Tuscany region (IT); Calabria (IT)
<b>GO NETWORK</b>	INTERREG III B CADSES	FVG (IT)
<b>ITALIAN PARTICIPATION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EASTERN SLAVONIA</b>	Decentralised cooperation project financed by the Italian Ministry of foreign affairs and FVG region (Law no. 49/87)	FVG (IT)
<b>MA'ARIFA</b>	INTERREG III A SPAIN-	T/T region (MA) ; FAMSI

**COMPART PROJECT  
INTERACT PROGRAMME**

	MOROCCO	(ES)
<b>MAEM - Master en affaires euro-méditerranéennes</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Tuscany region (IT)
<b>MEROPE</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Calabria region (IT)
<b>NEI SUONI DEI LUOGHI</b>	INTERREG III A – ITALY ADRIATIC	FVG (IT)
<b>PRODUCTION OF MULTIMEDIA EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL</b>	INTERREG III A GREECE-ALBANIA	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>PROTECTION OF MOUNTAINS ON THE BASIS OF THE PROTECTION OF BEARS</b>	INTERREG III A GREECE-FYROM	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>PROTECTION &amp; PROMOTION OF THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT IN AVGI - KASTORIA</b>	INTERREG III A/CARDS GREECE-ALBANIA	Western Macedonia region (GR)
<b>RURALMED I</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Calabria region (IT)
<b>RURALMED II</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	Tuscany region (IT)
<b>RESTAURONET</b>	INTERREG III B MEDOCC	T/T region (MA)
<b>ROAD AND MOTORWAY MANAGEMENT IN THE PHARE COUNTRIES</b>	CARDS (1998)	SERDA (BH)
<b>SAFETY SAUSAGE</b>	INTERREG EURED (2003-2005)	SERDA (BH)
<b>SEENET</b>	Decentralised cooperation supported by the Tuscany Region and Italian Cooperation	LDA Verteneglio (CR); Tuscany region (IT)
<b>THE UN HUMAN SETTLEMENTS PROGRAM UIG</b>	INTERREG III A (2004-2006)	SERDA (BH)
<b>TOURISM, AGRICULTURE</b>	CARDS (2004-2006)	SERDA (BH)