B.2.3 Policy instrument 3

B.2.3.1 Definition and Context

Definition

Please name the policy instrument addressed.
For Structural Funds programmes, please provide the exact name of the Operational or Cooperation Programme concerned.

EcoGozo – the local Sustainable Development Strategy for the island of Gozo

Please describe the main features of this policy instrument (e.g. objective, characteristics, priority or measure concerned) and the reason(s) why it should be improved.

This policy instrument aims to translate the national Sustainable Development policy into a sustainability action plan for the Island of Gozo, resulting in a stronger economy, a sounder environment and an improvement of the island’s social and cultural milieu. Like all sustainability action plans, this policy is in constant need of revision and improvement. The Rural Tourism aspect – identified in the National Tourism Policy as the strategic choice for Gozo – is seen as crucial in this regard. In fact, the National Tourism Policy states that: "Gozo has established itself strongly as a quality destination attracting activity and special interest holidays. Gozo is also strong in quality relaxation travel, besides also having pioneered aspects such as rural tourism experiences. Those are attributes which strongly differentiate Gozo from mainland Malta and need to be further developed as part of the island’s strategy to achieve more sustainable tourism flows."

The following actions are listed as Policy actions with respect to Gozo:
- Development of a specific tourism strategy for Gozo within the framework of the national tourism policy
- Support Gozitan traditional crafts and promote the artisans who work in these sectors
- Initiatives supporting the rural characteristics of Gozo
- Incentives supporting Green Tourism

All these points could be dealt with by developing a transversal Destination Management strategy in order to answer all the needs identified in the policy document
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Is this an operational/cooperation programme financed by Structural Funds? (Only select YES if this policy instrument is one of the Investment for Growth and Jobs or European territorial cooperation programmes approved by the EC)

No

Is the body responsible for this policy instrument included in the partnership?

Yes

Name of this responsible body

P3 Ministry for Gozo

How do you envisage the improvement of this policy instrument (e.g. through new projects supported, through improved governance, through structural changes)?

P3 intends to use the findings of the project to improve the EcoGozo policy (policy change):

Thanks to shared experiences in the field of Destination Management, the project would provide the opportunity to focus on the consolidation of the rural tourism sector, with a view of conserving the resources of the territory and opening it up further as a tourism product. In this regard, the project could also assist in developing further the strategic direction for Gozo given in the National Tourism Policy 2015-2023 (pg 59 et seq).

The project will also provide the necessary knowledge which will assist the Ministry for Gozo in presenting mid-term amendments to the Operational Programmes and in providing feedback for the drafting of the Operational Programme for 2020-2026.
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Territorial context

Proposed self-defined performance indicator (in relation to the policy instrument addressed)

% of SMEs benefiting from the instrument that have fostered their competitiveness and rural tourism niche on the island
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What is the geographical coverage of this policy instrument?

local

What is the state of play of the issue addressed by this policy instrument in the territory? Why is this particular issue of relevance to the territory and what needs to be improved in the territorial situation?

Most of the countryside in Gozo is privately owned, or leased to private concerns for agricultural use. This creates a significant accessibility problem when it comes to rural tourism. There is a need to identify win-win opportunities which will open up access to the countryside for tourists while providing a business opportunity for land owners or title-holders to maintain their land in good state, thus averting resource loss. This is imperative for the growth of the rural tourism sector in Gozo. Such a result can be achieved by improving the local governance of tourist destinations: Tourist SMEs as well as land owners could be closely associated to the decision making process of the territories. But such destination management bodies are not easy to create and sustain, and the Ministry for Gozo needs examples and methodology do develop a policy encouraging the creation of these bodies. Such examples are expected to be shared by Destination SMEs partners.
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Is this issue linked to the national/regional innovation strategy for smart specialisation (RII)?

Yes

If yes, how?

Among the 5 objectives set for RII3, this issue is perceived as focusing on the following:
- build on each country/region’s strengths, competitive advantages and potential for excellence;
- support technological as well as practice-based innovation and aim to stimulate private sector investment;
- get stakeholders fully involved and encourage innovation and experimentation;

(ref. Guide to Research and Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialisations (RII) 3, May 2012)
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B.2.3.2 Partner relevance for policy instrument 3

Partner Relevance 1

P3 Ministry for Gozo

What are the partner’s competences and experiences in the issue addressed by this policy?

The Ministry for Gozo has been managing this policy since its inception in 2006. A dedicated structure within the organisation has been set up for this scope. The Ministry is entrusted with the regional administration of the island, and thus is directly involved in many sectors of interest to the project. (wide mission statement at http://mgz.gov.mt/en/Pages/Mission-Statement.aspx )
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What is the capacity of the partner to influence the above policy instrument 1? (e.g. in case the partner is not the policy responsible organisation, what are its links with this organisation? How is the partner involved in the design and implementation of the policy instrument?)

The partner is responsible for the drafting and the implementation of the ecoGozo policy, in consultation with the other Government Ministries. This policy is revised when ever the need for an update is felt. Priorities for funding and implementation are set by the Ministry for Gozo.
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How will the partner contribute to the content of the cooperation and benefit from it?

P3 will present partners with the ecoGozo policy, explaining the benefit of having a local sustainability strategy in place. P3 will benefit by learning from the experiences of the other partners, inter alia, the opening of access of privately held land to the public (& tourists), the right strategies and instruments to engage with SME’s and to
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B.2.3.3 Stakeholder group relevant for policy instrument 3

Please provide the indicative list of stakeholders to be involved in the project

- Esther Bajada, Director, Tourism and Economic Development Directorate – Ministry for Gozo
- Joe Muscat, CEO, Gozo Tourism Association
- Michael Grech, President, Gozo Business Chamber
- Joseph Grech, President, Gozo Confederation for Agriculture and Fisheries
- Paul Buga, CEO, Malta Tourism Authority
- Arch. Vincent Cassar, Chairman, Malta Environment and Planning Authority

The composition of the group may be enlarged between Phase 1 and Phase 2 to better reflect the needs from the planning phase to the implementation phase.

Role of these stakeholders in relation to the above policy instrument? (e.g. in the decision making process)

The Tourism and Economic Development Directorate is responsible for tourism and economic development at the ministry for Gozo. Both themes are crucial components of the proposal.

The Gozo Tourism Association is an umbrella organisation with an NGO status which brings together persons, companies, partnerships, or associations operating in the tourism industry on the island. Thus a crucial interlocutor for the aims of the proposal.

Gozo Business Chamber is a local Chamber of Commerce for businesses operating in Gozo. Thus it is another important interlocutor.

The Gozo Confederation of Agriculture and Fisheries is the organization representing and protecting the interests of Gozo’s agricultural and Fisheries sectors. The Confederation represents the vast majority of farmers and fishermen in Gozo, thus becoming the interlocutor with the Government for this important sector in Gozo, which is crucial on the questions of land planning.

Malta Tourism Authority and Malta Environment and Planning Authority are two important national bodies in charge of the implementation of the national sustainable tourism strategy.

How will this group be involved in the project and in the interregional learning process?

This group will be closely associated to the exchange of experience process at interregional level, on the basis of once a year during Phase 1:
- In October 2017 to learn from the events organized in November in France, April 2017 in Latvia & June 2017 in Italy
- In November 2016 to learn from the events held in Ireland in October 2017, Finland in December 2017 and Slovenia in April 2018, and to build & approve the action plan.

In addition, a Joint Dissemination Workshop involving the stakeholder group members and all partners will take place in October 2016 in Gozo. This will be the occasion on to strengthen ties between these two categories of bodies. On this occasion, the stakeholder group members can ask deeper policy details to specific project partners, to gain a better understanding of the content of the “Reciprocal Improvement Analysis”.

The stakeholder group will also be associated to all exchange of experience events, through the direct participation of one member.

This person will be appointed as a member of the Steering Group, and will participate to all study trips and technical meetings.

Once Phase 1 is over and the action plan built, the stakeholder group will contribute to the improvement of EcoGozo – Local Sustainable Development Strategy for the island of Gozo.
PART C – Project description

C.1 Brief history of the project

The project was born from a need first identified in the Pomurje region (Slovenia). In 2014, a national policy was enforced to encourage the creation of Destination Management Bodies in the Slovene regions. The Regional Development Agency Mur, formerly in charge of the Pomurje regional development, was then wondering how to set up such a body and was in need for an exchange of experiences in that field. 

RDA Mur took advantage of the Rhine-Rhône-Adige Tourism Platform (P1), with which they have a nine-year-long cooperation on various topics and projects (eg ICER & Cross Interreg IVC projects), to ask for inspirations from, among which the 1st planned project (P1) resulted promising and 2nd project (P1) from which the state of the art is about to be presented and disseminated. The project was then developed, and it was disseminated to all offices of the EU regions in Brussels. In addition, the project summary was uploaded on Interreg Europe website and sent to former project partners who contributed to its dissemination.

A questionnaire was circulated by P1 to assess the relevance of potential partners, with a strong focus on regional and structural funds policies. A few selected partners were invited to a meeting held in Brussels on 10/06/2015 to start working on a common project development. People representing five organizations attended this meeting. P1 was in close contact with the other two partner organizations and reported back their contacts to the participating organizations. The idea of the project was then developed, in particular regarding the project methodological approach, including all activities dedicated to the exchange of experience and the timeline. P2 proposed first ideas in the field of communication and dissemination. On the basis of these ideas and the opinion of the participants, P2 built the communication strategy of the project and sent it to P1.

After the meeting, P1 circulated a second questionnaire based on the draft application form of the programme, so that each partner could prepare a detailed contribution that P1 could compile to write down the applicant on form. P1 also built an Excel tool based on the project's timeline to help the partners build their budget. All those contributions were prepared and sent to P1 by the end of June.

Once P1 finished preparing a draft version of the application form, all partners reviewed it and made corrections to produce this final version.
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C.2 Issue addressed

Most of the time in all EU regions, the Operational Programmes of ERDF and ESF under the Investments for Growth and Jobs objective, in line with the 3rd thematic objective of the Europe 2020 strategy, include the competitiveness of SMEs as a major objective. This is for instance the case of the OP of the Auvergne region (France) and in most of the project partner regions. This OP indicates the tourism economy as a sector with high growth potential and "Destination SMEs" focuses on this specific economic sector.

In order to have their competitiveness increased, SMEs can benefit from financial instruments as stated in the ERDF OPs. But the experience from previous programming periods shows that even SMEs which benefit from this kind of support can experience strong difficulties, have a declining growth and even disappear only after a few years. One can then consider that the role of a Managing Authority, in addition to the management of the programmes and the EU funds, can be to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the structural funds by creating favourable conditions for the SMEs to succeed. This is for instance the case of the Interreg Europe cooperation programme on page 17: "Sustainable regional growth requires a healthy climate for businesses and enterprises". Establishing such a climate is one of the ways to enhance the competitiveness of SMEs.

In the tourism sector, it is very difficult to create or develop SMEs out of the blue. Tourist SMEs are part of a destination, an area with activities, accommodation, transportation systems etc. Destinations that are well managed are more likely to generate "wise growth" in their visitor economy, and are more likely to maximize the benefits of that growth in the long term, and create additional income and jobs. When a territory is not organized as a tourist destination, it is very risky to develop any business in it. Creating favourable conditions for tourist SMEs means to encourage the territories to organize themselves as a tourist destination, aiming at:

- Strengthening the identity of the territory
- Establishing a territorial tourism development strategy
- Ensuring a cohesion between the various tourist offers in the area
- Allowing cooperation among stake holders & an effective governance system

Destination management can include, among others, land-use planning, business permits and zoning controls, environmental and cultural heritage regulations, business association initiatives, and a set of other arrangements that shape the development and daily functioning of tourism-related activities.

These are various models of Destination Management governance systems, in particular the "corporate model" and the "community model". As explained by French academics in "Management du tourisme et des Loisirs" (2014), in the corporate model, the private sector (sometimes one bigger company) has a major role in the governance of a territory. In the community model, the governance is shared between public authorities and private bodies, in particular the SMEs of the area.

The problem is that there is certainly no "one size fits all" approach to destination management, and each territory has to build its own approach.

So the project partners have to address two main questions:

- Which Destination Management system(s) does my region need?
- How can I improve my policies to encourage my territories to implement these systems, so that SMEs can benefit from the most favourable context for growth?

Answers to those two questions are expected to be found thanks to exchange of experiences and know-how between regions at the policy level, which is the reason why the Interreg Europe programme, with its focus on SMEs competitiveness, is the most relevant framework to deal with these issues. Destination SMEs aims at improving policies to support SMEs in all stages of their life cycle to develop and achieve growth, which is a Specific Objective of the Interreg Europe programme.
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C.3 Objectives

Programme priority specific objective the project will contribute to

Overall objective and sub-objectives

Improve the implementation of regional development programmes, in particular programmes for investment for Growth and Jobs and, where relevant, ETC programmes, supporting SMEs in all stages of their life cycle to develop and achieve growth and engage in innovation.

The aim of the project is to improve policies of the partner regions (structural funds and regional policies), in order to increase the competitiveness of SMEs in the tourism sector which are the most suitable of these policies. This objective can be reached by supporting the deployment of these programmes through the implementation of destination management policies.

Based on the sharing of experiences, the project aims at the following sub-objectives:

- By the end of semester 5, identify at least 14 territorial policies or instruments developed by Managing Authorities and dedicated to the tourist destination management, with a strong focus on the involvement of SMEs in the local decision making process;
- By the end of semester 10, improve the 7 target policies by transferring relevant initiatives and experiences among the project partners, in order to implement the 7 action plans (one per target policy).
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C.4 Project approach

Describe the project approach to achieve the project's objective and to produce the intended outputs and results.

Destination SMEs is divided into 2 phases. The 1st phase is made of exchange between project partners (PP). It takes time, in particular at policy level and with a new partnership which is the case here. This is why phase 1 is due to last 3 years. The 2nd phase, 2 years long, aims at monitoring the improvement of the target policies.

Phase 1 is following a 3-steps approach:

Step 1: Reciprocal Improvement Analysis (RIA) 3 months from mid June to mid September 2016

On the basis of the application form where all PPs explain the needs of their region and their target policy, every PP works on a RIA: they search in their own experience and policies (local, regional, national & structural funds) how they can help the other PPs improve their target policy. So they reciprocally propose solutions for policy improvement (overall consistency and quality checks ensured by P1 & P3).

At the same time, each PP builds a stakeholder group (SHG) made up of the people who are in the best position to influence the target policy, in particular the managing authority of the policy (indicative list for each partner in part B).

At that stage, P2 with the support of all PPs designs the project communication tools.
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Step 2: Exchange of experiences (09/2016 to end of sem 5)
This step is made of all exchange of experience activities.

It starts with a 1st meeting of the SHGs by 09/2016 (presentation of the experiences identified by all PP’s in their RIA and specifically targeting the policy the SHG is in charge of).

Then on the basis of this RIA, each PP organizes a study trip in its region. The agenda template for each trip is agreed among PP’s. The aim of this visit is to share first-hand experiences on viable practices that can inspire the PP’s to improve their target policy. Such visits can include meetings with relevant stakeholders, presentations of policies & SMEs (beneficiaries of the policies), meetings with external experts on specific issues... They last two days. Each PP involves one SHG representative.

After each visit, during a third day, a technical meeting involving all PP’s is organized to ensure the quality of the exchange. This is essential, at the end of a field trip, to discuss our learnings with a peer review of the observed practices. Each PP will question the transferability of the shared practices and think about how it can concretely be useful to improve the target policies.

In addition, a Joint Dissemination Workshop takes place involving all PP’s, the SHG of the hosting region and other relevant stakeholders invited by the hosting PP. Its objective is not only to disseminate project information among regional stakeholders, but also to offer an additional opportunity of exchange: SHG members can meet PP’s and ask them more details about the experiences highlighted in the RIA. This is crucial to ensure a proper learning at stakeholders level.

In order to regularly report back on project findings, another meeting of the SHGs takes place in the middle of step 2 (semester 4).

This 2nd step is made of 7 study trips and technical meetings, 7 joint workshops, and 2 SHG meetings per partner region. At the end of step 2, P1 & P3 produce a synthesis of all project findings.

Step 3: Preparation of action plans (semester 5)
Each PP, in relation with its regional SHG (participative approach) and sometimes with the support of external experts (for P2, P3 & P7), builds a draft action plan explaining how the shared practices can help improve the target policy. A guidance document is prepared by P1 to ensure a harmonized approach. The draft action plan includes all necessary information to implement the policy improvement: background (learnings from the project), action description, players involved, timeframe, costs and funding sources when relevant.

This draft is submitted to the SHGs in November 2018 during their 3rd meeting: they assess the action plan draft, improve it and make a consensus on the final version to be formally validated by the partner.

This final action plan, one per target policy, is then used during phase 2.

At the end of phase 1, P2 publishes a paper on first achieved results in a EU level magazine to reach a wider audience.

Phase 2
Once the action plans have been approved at the end of phase 1, each PP, with the support of its SHG, starts improving the target policy. All PP’s regularly send information to P1 and meet on a semi-annual basis to monitor policy improvement progress. In September 2020, P1 organises a dissemination event in Brussels to showcase project results at EU level together with an event of the CIRPP committee of the Regions, so that other regions can get inspiration from the project.

During the 5 years, all PP’s participate to the actions of the dedicated Interreg Europe Platform when requested, so that the tool can contribute to share our project findings and bring additionnal value to our work. Platforms, together with our final EU level event, ensure external learning at EU level.

C.5 Communication strategy

Our strategy covers both internal and external communication.

- Internal communication
  The communication among partners is ensured through frequent Steering Group meetings (11 are planned). In addition, phone, emails and videoconference tools like Skype will be used as much as needed. In order to make communication easier, P1 will build an extranet based on the Agora free software, which includes: News section, calendar, forum, files storage & directory of contacts.

- External communication
  P2 is in charge of the coordination of all external communication activities validated by the Steering Group.

This project should allow policy learning at 4 levels : Individual, Organizational, Regional stakeholders and EU level stakeholders.

Regional stakeholders with the highest capacity to influence the target policies will already be closely involved through the stakeholder groups. But others, working on similar issues or which might be impacted by the work (potential beneficiaries of the policies etc.) should be informed as well. So part of our communication actions will be dedicated to informing them.

EU level stakeholders are more difficult to reach. The dedicated Interreg Europe platform will be a very useful tool to inform about our findings. In addition, our final event will be held in Brussels together with an event of the Committee of the Regions. Our results will also be published in a EU level magazine, to reach as many EU level stakeholders as possible.

As a general remark, all our activities will respect these principles:
- Environmental efficiency: paper documents will be reduced as much as possible.
- In order not to waste money and efforts, all actions will be strongly dedicated to our target groups.
- Graphic identity will be based on Interreg Europe logo and specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To raise interest in our project, so that as many relevant stakeholders as possible can contribute to our work and benefit from it. | Regional stakeholders: members of the stakeholder groups + other relevant regional stakeholders, for example people working on DSD Management Issues, people working on structural funds management, potential beneficiaries of the targeted policies. | Paper documents
  First of all, P2 will propose and produce a project poster which will be translated and printed by all partners after validation by the Steering Group. This poster will be displayed in the premises of the partner and used during all events.
  In addition, we need a dissemination tool that can briefly present the project, the partnership, and most importantly the webpage address of Destination SMEs. This document should remain concise, easy to disseminate, and its shape should encourage people to read it, keep it and use it. This is the reason why the partners decided to produce a small document shaped as a bookmark, that will deliver info, and be useful enough to be kept by the people. This document will be translated into all languages of the project partners.
  Web communication
  P2 will upload information about Destination SMEs on the dedicated webpage of the Interreg Europe website. All partners will do the same on their own website. |
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C.6 Expected results and outputs of the project

C.6.1 Overview of the expected outputs and results

Describe in more detail the outputs and results the project intends to produce. Provide qualitative and quantitative information regarding outputs and results of the project, including those related to management and communication activities.

Outputs:
- Project management:
  - 1 subsidy contract signed; 1 Partnership agreement signed by all partners; 11 Steering Group meetings & minutes (9 during Phase 1 + 2 project meetings during Phase 2 which are also Steering Group meetings).
  - 6 audited progress reports in Phase 1, 2 audited progress reports and final report in Phase 2;
- Communication and dissemination:
  - 7 project posters; 1 created and updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website; 1 Information leaflet about the project; 5 video newsletters; 7 Joint Dissemination Workshops (1 per partner region on the occasion of the study trips); 1 final video presenting project results; 1 Final Dissemination Event (Brussels); 14 press releases issued by the partners;
- Exchange of experiences:
  - 7 Stakeholder groups created (1 per policy);
  - 3 Stakeholder group meetings in Phase 1 in each partner country (total of 21 meetings and minutes).
- Reciprocal Improvement Analysis (1/partner)
  - 1 synthesis paper of project findings issued by PI & P5
  - 7 study trips lasting 2 days each organized in each partner country to exchange experience, 7 visit agendas.
  - 7 Technical meetings to debrief after the study visits (peer reviews); 7 technical meetings
  - 1 Technical meeting in Brussels at the end of Phase 1 to discuss draft action plans; Minutes of this meeting.
  - 7 action plans produced (1 per target policy)

Results:
- Project management:
  - Successful project running which achieves its objectives, notably through effective joint working culture between partners => no serious conflict; effective financial management & accounting => all reports submitted in due time
- Communication and dissemination:
  - Expected attendance of 400 people in dissemination events (average of 40 per Joint Dissemination Workshop + 123 participants to the Final Dissemination Event); expected average number of 100 sessions at the project
C.6.2 Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Self-defined performance indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1</td>
<td>% of tourist SMEs benefiting from the instrument that has increased the number of territories where a destination management strategy has been implemented.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2</td>
<td>% of SMEs benefiting from the instrument that have transformed rural businesses into tourist ones</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3</td>
<td>% of SMEs benefiting from the instrument that have fostered their competitiveness and rural tourism niche on the island</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4</td>
<td>% of tourist SMEs benefiting from the instrument that have increased their participation in a management body/cluster</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5</td>
<td>% of tourist enterprises benefiting from the instrument that have increased their participation as groups in development projects and measures</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6</td>
<td>% of tourist SMEs benefiting from the instrument that has increased competitiveness and exporting capacity</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7</td>
<td>% of tourist SMEs benefiting from the instrument that have increased the development of tourist destinations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.6.3 Innovative character

Check done on the Interact-KEEP database, no project tackling the topic of Destination SMEs has been found. A few very concrete cross-border projects developed a destination management body for a specific territory, but the link to regional & structural funds policies did not exist. Other projects, like the Interreg IIIC North Deal iLink, focused on building a network of tourist destinations, which is not the purpose of Destination SMEs at all.

PT was involved in projects co-financed by Interreg IVC as a Lead Partner (ICER and CerS) or as a Partner (B2N), and had the opportunity to work with a few of the Destination SMEs partners in these projects, but the topics were rather different. The aim of ICER was to improve the attractiveness of rural regions for eco-responsible investors. The aim of CerS was to create new jobs in rural areas in the field of tourist and rural services. B2N was the link between SMEs and the environment. In addition, PT was the Lead Partner of the TOURAGE project (with P8 as a partner), dealing with the development of tours for seniors in remote regions.

But if these projects all tackled the tourist economy, none of them concentrated on the improvement of ERDF policies, and none of them dealt with Destination Management issues. Destination SMEs has a new partner ship, focuses on a new topic, and is not a follow-up project.

Of course, all partners will use results of previous projects (Interreg or not) as much as possible. It is also true for projects in which the partners were not involved. For example, the results of Loodood and H4Food could have an interest for us. These projects were dealing with food industries SMEs, and local food industry can sometimes be considered as a tourist asset. Food industry is clearly not the target of the Destination SMEs project, but project partners won’t ignore findings of those projects that could be of any use for us.
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In addition, communication activities dedicated to the regional, national and European stakeholders will contribute to the durability of the results by encouraging other authorities to take them into account in their own policies.

The participation of all project partners to the activities of Interreg Europe platforms will also help to make our results durable.

C.7 Horizontal principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of contribution</th>
<th>Description of the contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Positive effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities and non-discrimination</td>
<td>Positive effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity between men and women</td>
<td>Positive effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital agenda for Europe</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.8 Project management

C.8.1 Management arrangements

The project has the following management bodies:
1. Lead partner (P1): Project Manager (PM) and Financial Manager (FM) nominated by P1 as its staff.
2. Regional Co-ordinators (RC) nominated by each Project Partner (PP).
3. Steering Group (SG) made up of PM, RC and one representative of each stakeholder group (SHG).

The decision-making structure is the SG. It represents all PPs with equal voting rights (1 vote per PP). The decision-making process is based on a three-fourths majority rule. In order to ensure SHG's involvement, the SG includes a representative of every SHG with an observer status. The SG has 14 members (7 PP entitled to vote + 7 observers). Other people can attend as observers. The SG has overall responsibilities for decision-making, monitoring and evaluation regarding all operational and financial issues. The SG takes the main decisions, validates working programme and time plan, outlines objectives; decides about communication activities; evaluates activities progress and partners financial situation in line with the AF.

P1 has the overall responsibility of the organization & financial implementation of the project in line with the rules of the EU and Interreg Europe. P1 is responsible for the division of tasks among PPs and ensures that the tasks are fulfilled in accordance with the application form. P1 delivers to the PPs the management tools and check lists, time tables, as well as monitoring and report forms to be used to homogenize the collection of information. PM and RC collaborate using Internet (extranet tool provided by P1), emails, phone & Skype. Personal meetings are combined with other project events. P1 receives payments of programme funding and transfers them to PPs in accordance with the reported work. The PM nominated by P1, Thomas Doutrelier, is fluent in English and experienced in EU projects & partnership management through his role in ICER and CoEs Interreg VC projects. PM is project and partnership driver, he leads SG. His role consists in coordination, organization, information and motivation. He is also responsible for SG meetings preparation, drafting every 6 months the progress reports, working contacts with the JS and public relations.

P2 appoints a communication manager responsible for the coordination and implementation of the communication strategy, including preparing the English version of all documents (poster, bookmark, videos). All PPs translate all communication material into their own language, and provide P2 with content for the webpage.

P1 & P3 share the responsibility of the quality check of the Reciprocate Improvement Analysis and of the synthesis paper, gathering all project findings.

All RC are responsible for their part of project day-to-day carrying out, as well as public relations, preparing activities implementation, communication on regional level, drafting reports and financial management, regular advances, results and outputs evaluation. Every six months RC prepares a contribution to progress report and submits it to the PM.

Financial management

In the semester 1, FM ensures that all concerned PPs select their First Level Controller (FLC) in compliance with the Interreg Europe "country specific information". Every six months, the RLCs send out to their FLC all accounting documents necessary to issue signed "standard partner control confirmation" & signed "standard control report". Then the RLCs check the documents and reports, the link of expenditures with project activities, checks that expenditures have been verified by a controller and that control documents are correct and complete. He gives feedback to RC and prepares a financial report for the PM to be included in the progress report for the Joint Secretariat. FM & PM send this progress report to the JS with all "standard partner control confirmations".

Working language is English.

C.8.2 Project coordinator

Will project management be externalised? No
C.8.3 Finance manager

Will financial management be externalised? No

C.8.4 Communication manager

Will communication management be externalised? No
D.1 PHASE 1 ‘Interregional learning’ - Detailed work plan per period

Semester 1

a) Exchange of experience

During semester 1, all project partners work on the step 1 of the project approach as explained in section C4: the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis (RIA). For all exchange of experiences activities including the RIA, P3 will be supported by an external expert.

On the basis of the application form where all PPs explain the needs of their region and their target policy, every PP works on a Reciprocal Improvement Analysis. They identify in their own experiences & policies (local, regional, national &structural funds) how they can help the other PPs improve their targeted policy instrument. So they reciprocally propose solutions for policy improvement. This analysis is launched during the first meeting of the Steering Group in May in Brussels, on the basis of a template and a short guidance paper provided by P1.

It lasts 3 months. Overall consistency and quality-check of the RIA are ensured by P1 and P3 (with the support of P3’s external expert).

At the same time, each PP builds a stakeholder group (SHG) made of the people who are in the best position to influence their targeted policy instrument. In particular, the managing authority of the targeted policy instrument is member of the SHG (members of the SHG detailed in section B2).

In every partner region, the first meeting of the Stakeholder Group takes place by the end of Semester 1. This first meeting is dedicated to the following topics:
- Presentation of the details of the project (partnership, timeline)
- Presentation of the experiences identified by all PPs in their Reciprocal Improvement Analysis & specifically targeting the policy the SHG is in charge of.

On this occasion, the SHG can identify experiences that would be worth studying into deeper details during the second step of the exchange of experience process. Each partner prepares minutes of this meeting.

All partners commit themselves to participate to the actions of the dedicated Interreg Europe platform as much as requested.

b) Communication and dissemination

On the basis of the graphic identity provided by Interreg Europe, P2 works on a project poster which is proposed to the Steering Group. Once approved, all partners translate it into their own language and print it, so that it can be displayed in the premises of the partners as soon as possible and in any case by the end of semester 1.

In order to create a dissemination tool that can briefly present the project, the partnership, and most importantly the webpage address of Destination SMEs, P2 prepares a project leaflet shaped as a bookmark. This document will remain concise, easy to disseminate, and its shape should encourage people to read it, keep it and use it. This is the reason why the partners decided to produce a small document shaped as a bookmark, that will deliver information, and be useful enough to be kept by the people.

Once the Steering Group has approved a final version of the document, all partners translate it and print 300 copies of it by the end of semester 1.

The Interreg Europe programme provides the projects with a dedicated webpage that can be used by the partners. P2 uploads project information on this dedicated webpage and keeps it up to date. P2 also creates a Destination SMEs Facebook profile, twitter and Instagram accounts, and feeds them with project related content.

In order to ensure proper dissemination at the regional level, all partners upload project information on their own websites.

c) Project management

Once the project is approved, P1 signs the subcontract with the Managing Authority of the Interreg Europe programme.

P1 participates to programme events (Lead Partner seminar...).

The first task of the partners is to nominate the Steering Group members, so that the decision making body of the project can start working.

On its first meeting in May 2016 in Brussels, the Partnership Agreement is provided by P1 and signed by the participants if they are the legal representative of the partner or organizations. Other signatures will be collected by express mail, so that the Partnership Agreement is signed by the end of the semester (7 original copies).

P1, P2, P3 and P5 start the selection procedure of their First Level Controller, in compliance with the national rules stated in the "In your country" section of the Interreg Europe website. Their PLCs are selected and approved by the end of the semester.

So the first meeting of the Steering Group held in May is dedicated to:
- Reminding project procedures
- Signing the Partnership Agreement
- Reminding PLC selection procedure and monitoring the status of partners 1, 2, 3 and 5 regarding their PLC
- Approval of the project poster and of the project leaflet proposed by P2
- Presentation by P1 of a template for the Reciprocal analysis and launch of this analysis
- Reminder about the creation of the Stakeholder groups and their first meeting in September, monitoring of the status of all partners regarding this task.

Main Outputs

7 Reciprocal Improvement Analysis
1 meeting of the Stakeholder Group in each partner region (total of 7 meetings), minutes of these meetings
1 project leaflet shaped as a bookmark (200 copies per partner in local language)
1 Project webpage created on Interreg Europe website
1 meeting of the Steering Group with 14 participants, minutes of the SG meeting
1 Signed Subsidy Contract
1 Signed Partnership Agreement

Semester 2

a) Exchange of experience

This is when the second step of phase 1 starts.

P3 organizes in October 2016 a two days study trip in Gozo to show relevant policies and practices to all project partners. A proposal of study visit agenda, based on the reciprocal analysis prepared by P3 and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is sent by P3 in advance to P1 (responsible for the exchange of experience coordination), an d after approval to all partners.

At the end of this study trip, on a third day, P3 organizes a technical meeting of all the partners to discuss the learnings of the study visit.

This is essential, at the end of a field trip, to discuss our learnings with a Peer Review of the observed practices. Each PP must question the transferability of the shared practices and think about how it can concretely be useful to improve the target policies. The Peer Review is also the occasion for the hosting partner to receive official commenda tions and proposals for improvements on its own policies.

P1 is in charge of preparing and leading this meeting. P1 issues minutes of the meeting.

On the same format, P1 organizes a two days study trip and a technical meeting in Luxembourg, France, in November 2016. The agenda of the visit, also based on the Reciprocal analysis and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is provided by P1 in advance. P1 issues minutes of the technical meeting.

On those two occasions, 21 people are expected to participate (3 people per partner region: 2 staff members of the partner organization + 1 representative of the stakeholder group of the partner).

Control number: d3e0f225df6865b28fb67754370f467
All partners commit themselves to participate to the actions of the dedicated Interreg Europe platform as much as requested.

b) Communication and dissemination

During the trip of the partners to Gozo in October, a Joint Dissemination Workshop (JDW) is organized by P3, involving all partners, all members of the Maltese Stakeholder group and other relevant regional stakeholders invited by P3. Its objective is to disseminate project information among regional stakeholders, but also to offer an additional opportunity for exchange of experience. This event, which can be organized like a workshop including a networking cocktail with one to one relations, is an excellent opportunity for the SHG members to meet the partners and ask them more precise questions about the experiences they highlighted in the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis. This JDW is crucial to ensure a proper learning at the level of the stakeholders (50 to 50 participants are expected).

On the same format, P1 organizes a Joint Dissemination Workshop in Auvergne in November.

Before hosting these events, P3 and P1 issue a press release to relevant media (regional press or specialized media).

During every study visit, P2 films and produces a short movie. The movies of the events in Gozo and Auvergne are compiled to build a video newsletter issued by P2 in December. All partners translate the subtitles so that P2 can send by email the newsletter by the end of the year to 200 contacts per partner (total 1400 recipients).

P2 keeps the project webpage and social media up-to-date with the support of all partners, who also upload project information on their corporate websites.

c) Project management

In the first days of the semester, all RC are asked to hand over activities and financial reports for the period of the first semester to PM and FM in order to allow an effective monitoring. In addition the partners provide expenditure forecasts for these 6 months to the FM. PM and FM will compile partners' reports and produce a 1st Progress report to JS.

At the end of the partners stay in Gozo, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants (from partners and SHGs).

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (preparation of PR1)
- Budget monitoring
- Reminder about the timetable of the project (in particular the exchange of experience process)
P1 issues the minutes of this meeting.

At the end of the partners stay in Auvergne, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants.

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (status of PR1 and deadlines for PR2)
- Presentation by P2 of a format for the video newsletter (on the basis of the movie made in Gozo), discussion and approval by the Steering Group
P1 issues the minutes of this meeting.

At the end of the semester, P1 receives the ERDF related to PR1 and transfers the due amounts to the partners.

Main Outputs

1 study trip in Gozo, Malta (2 days, 21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Gozo (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in Gozo
1 study trip to Auvergne (France 21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Auvergne (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in Auvergne
2 press releases sent to the media
1 video newsletter produced and sent to 1400 contacts.

Updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website

2 Steering Group meetings + minutes of the meetings
Progress report n°1 sent to the JS

Semester 3

a) Exchange of experience

P6 organizes in April 2017 a two days study trip in Vidzeme region to show relevant policies and practices to all project partners. A proposal of study visit agenda, based on the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis prepared by P6 and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is sent by P6 in advance to P1 (responsible for the exchange of expert once coordination), and after approval to all partners.

At the end of this study trip, on a third day, P6 organizes a technical meeting of all the partners to discuss the learnings of the study visit. P1 is in charge of preparing and leading this meeting. P1 issues minutes of the meeting.

On the same format, P2 organizes a two days study trip and a technical meeting in the Grand Peredza area, Aosta Valley, Italy, in June. The agenda of the visit, also based on the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is provided by P2 in advance.

P1 issues minutes of the technical meeting.

On those two occasions, 21 people are expected to participate (3 people per partner region; 2 staff members of the partner organization + 1 representative of the stakeholder group of the partner).

All partners commit themselves to participate to the actions of dedicated Interreg Europe platform as much as requested.

b) Communication and dissemination

During the trip of the partners to Vidzeme in April, a Joint Dissemination Workshop (JDW) is organized by P6, involving all project partners, all members of the Latvian Stakeholder group and other relevant regional stakeholders invited by P6. Its objective is to disseminate project information among regional stakeholders, but also to offer an additional opportunity for exchange of experience. This event, which can be organized like a workshop including a networking cocktail with one to one relations, is an excellent opportunity for the SHG members to meet the partners and ask them more precise questions about the experiences they highlighted in the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis. This JDW is crucial to ensure a proper learning at the level of the stakeholders (50 to 50 participants are expected).

On the same format, P2 organizes a Joint Dissemination Workshop in Aosta Valley in June.

Before hosting these events, P6 and P2 issue a press release to relevant media (regional press or specialized media).

During every study visit, P2 films and produces a short movie. The movies of the events in Vidzeme and Aosta Valley are compiled to build a video newsletter issued by P2 during semester 4. All partners translate the subtitles.

All along the project implementation, P2 keeps the project webpage and social medias up-to-date with the support of all partners, who also upload project information on their own corporate websites.

c) Project management

In the first days of the semester, all RC are asked to hand over activities and financial reports for the period of semester 2 to PM and FM in order to allow an effective monitoring. In addition the partners provide expenditure forecasts for these 6 months to the FM. PM and FM will compile partners' reports and produce a 2nd Progress report to JS.

At the end of the partners stay in Vidzeme, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants (from partners and SHGs).

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (preparation and status of PR2)
- Budget monitoring

Control number: d3e0f226df6865b28fb677548370f467
Main Outputs

1 study trip in Vidzeme region, Latvia (2 days, 21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Vidzeme (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in Vidzeme
1 study trip to Aosta Valley, Italy (21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Aosta Valley (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in Grand Paradis, Aosta Valley
2 press releases sent to the media
1 video newsletter produced (newsletter n°2)
Updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website
2 Steering Group meetings + minutes of the meetings
Progress report n°2 sent to the JS
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Semester 4

a) Exchange of experience

In every partner region, the second meeting of the Stakeholder Group takes place in October. This second meeting is dedicated to the learnings from the study trips organized in October 2016 in Malta, November 2016 in France, April 2017 in Latvia and June 2017 in Italy, with a specific focus on the experiences identified during the first meeting of the SHG as particularly interesting for the targeted policy instrument.

Each partner prepares minutes of this meeting.

P4 organizes in October 2016 a two days study trip in Cork County, Ireland, to show relevant policies and practices to all project partners. A proposal of study visit agenda, based on the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis prepared by P4 and on the request of the Stakeholder groups, is sent by P4 in advance to P1 (responsible for the exchange of experience coordination), and after approval to all partners.

At the end of this study trip, on a third day, P4 organizes a technical meeting of all the partners to discuss the learnings of the study visit. P1 is in charge of preparing and leading this meeting. P1 issues minutes of the meeting.

On the same format, P5 organizes a two days study trip and a technical meeting in North Karelia, Finland, in December 2017. The agenda of the visit, also based on the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is provided by P5 in advance.

P1 issues minutes of the technical meeting.

On those two occasions, 21 people are expected to participate (3 people per partner region; 2 staff members of the partner organization + 1 representative of the stakeholder group of the partner).

All partners commit themselves to participate to the actions of the dedicated Interreg Europe platform as much as requested.
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b) Communication and dissemination

In October, P3 sends newsletter n°3 to 300 contacts per partner (total 1,400 recipients).

During the trip of the partners to Ireland in October, a Joint Dissemination Workshop (JOW) is organized by P4, involving all partners, all members of the Irish Stakeholder group and other relevant regional stakeholders invited by P4.

Its objective is to disseminate project information among regional stakeholders, but also to offer an additional opportunity for exchange of experience. This event, which can be organized like a workshop (including a networking cocktail with one-to-one sessions), is an opportunity for the SHG members to meet the partners and ask them more precise questions about the experiences they highlighted in the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis. This JOW is crucial to ensure a proper learning at the level of the stakeholders (30 to 60 participants are expected).

On the same format, P5 organizes a Joint Dissemination Workshop in Finland in December.

Before hosting these events, P4 and P5 issue a press release to relevant media (regional press or specialized media).

During every study visit, P2 films and produces a short movie. The movies of the events in Ireland and Finland are compiled to build a video newsletter issued by P2 in September.

All along the project implementation, P2 keeps the project webpage & social medias up-to-date with the support of all partners, who also upload project information on their own corporate websites.
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c) Project management

In the first days of the semester, all RC are asked to hand over activities and financial reports for the period of semester 3 to PM and FM in order to allow an effective monitoring. In addition the partners provide expenditures forecasts for these 6 months to the FM. PM and FM will compile partners’ reports and produce a 3rd Progress report to JS.

At the end of the partners stay in Ireland, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants.

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (preparation of PR3)
- Budget monitoring
- Remind about the start of the project (in particular the exchange of experience process)

P1 issues the minutes of this meeting.

At the end of the partners stay in Finland, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants.

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (status of PR3 and deadlines for PR4)

P1 issues the minutes of this meeting.

At the end of the semester, P1 receives the ERDF related to PR3 and transfers the due amounts to the partners.
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Main Outputs

1 meeting of the Stakeholder Group in each partner region (total of 7 meetings) + minutes of these meetings
1 study trip in Cork County, Ireland (2 days, 21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Cork County (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in Cork County
1 study trip to North Karelia, Finland (21 participants)
1 technical meeting in North Karelia (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders in North Karelia
2 press releases sent to the media
1 video newsletter sent to 1,400 contacts (newsletter n°2)
1 video newsletter produced (newsletter n°3)
Updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website

Control number: d3e0f228df6865b28fb677548370f467
2 Steering Group meetings + minutes of the meetings
Progress report n°3 sent to the JS

Semester 5

a) Exchange of experience
P7 organizes in April 2018 a two days study trip in Pomurje region, Slovenia, to show relevant policies and practices to all project partners. A proposal of study visit agenda, based on the Reciprocal Improvement Analysis prepared by P7 and on the requests of the Stakeholder groups, is sent by P7 in advance to P1 (responsible for the exchange of experience coordination), and after approval to all partners.

At the end of this study trip, on a third day, P7 organizes a technical meeting of all the partners to discuss the learnings of the study visit. P1 is in charge of preparing and leading this meeting. P1 issues minutes of the meeting.

On this occasion, 21 people are expected to participate (3 people per partner region: 2 staff members of the partner organization + 1 representative of the stakeholder group per the partner).

This is the last study trip of the project. Once it is over, P1 and P3 (with the support of P3’s external expert) produce a synthesis of all project findings, lessons learnt and the list of measures for improvement, putting an emphasis on the success factors for the transfer process of good practice and also on the risks to be taken into consideration. In this document, P1 and P3 will also incorporate relevant policy instruments or practices highlighted by the dedicated Interreg Europe platform and by other approved Interreg Europe projects tackling similar issues (if existing).

Then, the step 3 of the project can start: the preparation of the action plans.

b) Communication and dissemination

In April in Slovenia, P2 submits to the Steering Group a methodology to evaluate our communication strategy: overall approach, evaluation questions and indicators. After validation of this methodology by the Steering Group, P2 leads this evaluation.

During the trip of the partners to Pomurje in April, a Joint Dissemination Workshop (JDW) is organized by P7, involving all project partners, all members of the Slovenian Stakeholder group and other relevant regional stakeholders invited by P7.

Its objective is to disseminate project information among regional stakeholders, but also to offer an additional opportunity for exchange of experiences. This JDW is crucial to ensure a proper learning at the level of the stakeholders (30 to 50 participants are expected).

Before hosting the events, P7 issues a press release to relevant media (regional press or specialized media).

During the study visit, P2 films and produces a short movie. The movie of the event in Slovenia is compiled to build video newsletter n°4 issued by P2. All partners translate the subtitles so that P2 can send this newsletter in June to 200 contacts per partner (total 1400 recipients).

All along the project implementation, P2 keeps the project webpage and social media up-to-date with the support of all partners, who also upload project information on their own corporate websites.

Main Outputs
1 study trip in Pomurje region, Slovenia (2 days, 21 participants)
1 technical meeting in Pomurje (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
1 Joint Dissemination Workshop of the partners, SHG and regional stakeholders is Pomurje
1 press release sent to the media
1 synthesis paper of project findings issued by P1 & P3
1 video newsletter produced (newsletter n°4)
2 video newsletters sent to 1400 people (newsletters 3 and 4)
Updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website
1 Steering Group meeting + minutes of the meeting
1 guidance document to prepare the action plans issued by P1
Progress report n°4 sent to the JS
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Semester 6

a) Exchange of experience
All partners, on the basis of project first findings and lessons learnt with the support of their Stakeholder groups and external expert (P7), prepare a draft version of their action plan.

These drafts are discussed among the partners during a technical meeting held in Brussels in October and organized by P1. P1 issues minutes of the meeting.

Then the draft action plans are submitted to the SHGs in November 2018 during their 3rd meeting; they assess the action plan draft, improve it and approve a final version. This third meeting of the Stakeholder groups is also the occasion to present the learnings from the study trips organized in Ireland in October 2017, in Finland in December 2017 and in Slovenia in April 2018, with a specific focus on the experiences identified during the first meeting of the SHG as particularly interesting for the targeted policy instrument.

Each partner prepares minutes of this meeting.

This final action plan, one per targeted policy instrument, is then used during phase 2 as a guide to improve the target policy.

All partners commit themselves to participate to the actions of Interreg Europe platforms as much as requested.
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b) Communication and dissemination

P2 finalizes the evaluation of the communication strategy of the project. On the basis of the results of this evaluation, P2 proposes improvements in case of need to the Steering Group in October in Brussels.

P2 compiles all films made during the project and builds a synthetic movie explaining the main findings and results of the project. This movie, once approved by the Steering Group in October, will be used as video newsletter sent to 1400 recipients in November. It will also be uploaded on the corpora websites of the partners and on streaming platforms. This movie will also be used during the Final Dissemination Event in Brussels (semester 9).

A press release is validated by the Steering Group in October and sent by P2 to EU level media at the end of Phase 1.

In addition, all partners send a press release to present the results of the project to regional and/or specialized media.

P2 continues to update the webpage and social media of the project, and all partners also update their corporate websites with project results.

1,051 / 1,500 characters

---

c) Project management

In the first days of the semester, all RC are asked to hand over activities and financial reports for the period of semester 5 to PM and FM in order to allow an effective monitoring. In addition the partners provide expenditures forecasts for these 6 months to the PM. PM and FM will compile partners’ reports and produce a 6th Progress report to JS.

In October in Brussels, a meeting of the Steering Group is organized with 14 participants (from partners and SHGs).

This meeting is dedicated to:
- Monitoring the reporting process of all partners (preparation and status of PR5 + deadlines for PR6)
- Budget monitoring
- Results of the evaluation of the communication strategy and discussion of potential improvements proposed by P2
- Validation of the EU level article proposed by P2
- Reminder about activities to be done during Phase 2
- Presentation by P1 of the progress monitoring procedures

P1 issues the minutes of this meeting.

At the end of the semester, P1 receives the ERDF related to PR5 and transfers the due amounts to the partners.

All partners start to compile PR6 to be sent to the Joint Secretariat during semester 7.
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Main Outputs

1 technical meeting in Brussels (21 participants) + minutes of the meeting
7 action plans produced
7 press releases sent to the media
1 article in EU level magazine
1 video newsletter (n°5) produced and sent to 1400 contacts
Updated project webpage on Interreg Europe website
1 Steering Group meeting + minutes of the meeting
1 meeting of the Stakeholder Group in each partner region (total of 7 meetings) + minutes of these meetings
Progress report n°5 sent to the JS
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D.2 PHASE 2 - Detailed work plan per period

Semester 7

a) Action plan implementation follow-up

Each region starts the implementation of its action plan. The relevant stakeholders for the implementation are mobilized.

b) Communication and dissemination

The partners ensure regular updates of the project website with information on the action plan implementation.

c) Project management

The lead partner prepares the progress report for the joint secretariat.

Main Outputs

Website updates
1 progress report

---

Semester 8

a) Action plan implementation follow-up

Each partner monitors the action plan implementation by contacting the stakeholders and beneficiaries of the different actions. All partners meet to learn from each other by exchanging on the success and difficulties met in the implementation of their action plan.

b) Communication and dissemination

The partners ensure regular updates of the project website with information on the action plan implementation.

c) Project management

Main Outputs

1 project meeting
Website updates

---

Semester 9

a) Action plan implementation follow-up

Each partner continues monitoring the action plan implementation and is in regular contact with the stakeholders and beneficiaries of the different actions.

b) Communication and dissemination

The partners organize a final dissemination event gathering executives and policy makers from the regions and from other relevant institutions. The aim is to promote the project achievements and to disseminate the results of the action plan implementation to a large audience. The project website is updated accordingly.

c) Project management

The lead partner prepares the progress report for the joint secretariat.

Main Outputs

1 high-level political dissemination event
Website updates
1 annual progress report

---

Semester 10

Control number: d3e0f2264f6865b28fb677548370467
| a) Action plan implementation follow-up | Each partner finalises the monitoring of the action plan implementation. Each partner discusses the results of this implementation with the relevant regional stakeholders and beneficiaries. All partners meet to exchange and draw conclusions on the two years of action plan implementation. |
| b) Communication and dissemination | The partners ensure regular updates of the project website with information on the action plan implementation. |
| c) Project management | Each partner summarises the level of achievement of its action plan. The lead partner compiles the information and prepares the last progress report (final report) for the joint secretariat. |

**Main Outputs**

| 1 project meeting |
| 1 annual progress report |
| 1 final project report |