Bologna 30th-31st May 2011

SHAPE Project

Shaping an Holistic Approach to Protect the Adriatic Environment:

between coast and sea

Kick Off Meeting Minutes

Date: 30th-31st May 2011

Location: Bologna - ITALY

Participants: the list of attendees is attached

Monday 30th May:

Katia Raffaelli : Directorate General for Environment and Soil and Costal Defence– Emilia-Romagna Region (Lead Partner).

1. Katia Raffaelli: Welcoming to the kick-off meeting and brief introduction to the SHAPE project.

2. Round table of participants (ref. documents on partners' organizations). Brief presentation by each partner on their territory and organization.

3. Katia Raffaelli:
    § answers to participants questions
    § introduction of the SHAPE communication material (leaflet, posters)
    § presentation on SHAPE project: history, characteristics, thematics, organization and updated time plan.

    Interventions of participants:

    § Marina Markovic (PAP/RAC) comes in underlying that ICZM Protocol has become mandatory not only for those Countries that actually signed it, but for all those Countries that are part of the EU and for pre-accession Countries.

4. Barbara Grazzini- (ERVET SpA): Administrative and financial management of the project.
    Important to underline:
    n Delays of the MA and JTS in delivering official implementation documents and in the organization of national seminars for the presentation of the management software. Many questions still to be answered. The kick off is the place to collect more questions from the partners and submit them together to the JTS. the LP invites the partners to send in the following days questions and doubts that can be submitted to the MA and clarified as soon as possible.

- n Key documents: Application Form, Subsidy Contract and Annexes, Partnership Agreement, Implementation Manual 2009, Programme Management and Control Manual, Fact Sheet for project implementation, National FLC (First Level Control) Guidelines. All the documents will be available and downloadable from the project reserved area
- n Do not send questions and request directly to the JTS (Joint Technical Secretariat). You must refer only to the Lead Partner, that is in charge of direct communication with JTS. The LP will collect requests and then send them to the JTS.
- n Pay attention to sustainability;
    - e.g. limiting travels and face-to-face meetings in favour of conference calls; limiting printing
    - using the reserved area of SHAPE website to facilitate uploading and sharing documents instead of sending large emails
- n Progress Report:
    - The Progress Reports will be issued through the Information and Management System (IMS) Programme which is filled in online by the single partners with all information of evidence. Remember to report in the system when you have minimum 5.000€/10.000€ of incurred expenditures to be certified and reported.
- n First Level Control:
    - The Programme has established a Centralised system for each Participating Country, so each State has appointed a central body to carry out the First Level Control. Each partner is invited to check his FLCO in his Country.
- n Project budget headings:
    - External Expertise: When a Beneficiary decides to pursue project activities to an "in-house" structure, this structure must respect all the eligibility rules for expenditures and it shall allocate the different costs to the foreseen budget lines of the project
    - Public Procurement: All Project Partners and Lead Partners under the IPA Adriatic CBC Programme must comply with the applicable institutional, regional, national and European public procurement regulations whenever they intend to purchase goods, services as well as public works through IPA funds.
    - Promotion Costs: Promotion expenditures include all costs related to information and communication activities related to the project. All costs in this category must comply with the requirements deriving from EU Regulations on publicity and information in order to be considered as eligible
    (http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm)

5. Katia Raffaelli (RER) Closes the working sessions and thanks all the participants for their cooperation

This first day of SHAPE kick off meeting, held at the headquarters of the Emilia-Romagna Region (Lead Partner), was an important moment for project partners to know each other, to point out and share important aspects of the project implementation.

Both the LP and project partners stressed the need of more defined rules and reference documents that are still to be finalised by the IPA MA, and also the need of explanation of the new reporting procedures, etc..

Some of the most important questions that need to be submitted to the MA by the LP are highlighted below:

- how can commitment to local ARPA (Italy) be accounted and reported as far as budget management is concerned? Are they considered as in-house or sub-granter?[1]

- which kind of rules can be applied to calculate travel and subsistence (per diem) costs? the LP answered that the partners have to use the most restrictive rules on travel costs. Indeed, for example, if the organisation rules are more restrictive than European ones, there is the need to apply internal rules. The same is to be applied as far as equipment depreciation calculation is concerned and also for public procurement rules.

The following session of the agenda was postponed to the second day.
The presentation is available on the project private area.

---

[1] During the beneficiaries' seminar in Bologna, the JTS clearly defined the difference between subcontractor and subgranter. The former is an external body/professional which is selected through a public call for tender and performs some project activities on behalf of the beneficiary. The latter is an organisation selected for running a mini project on the area (the definition recalls the past Interreg IIIC regional framework programmes). Therefore if Arpa is not inhouse, it will be considered a subcontractor.

Tuesday 31st May 2011

The second day of the kick off meeting was devoted to the presentation of the activities to be implemented within WP3, WP4 and WP5 by Lead Partner and project partners, and also to the project time plan.

1. Katia Raffaelli welcomes the participants and opens the work session

2. Fabrizio Tollari (ERVET Spa): Plan and timing of project activities. Scheduled meetings and events.

   The presentation downloadable from the project private area is exhaustive of the info provided and shared.

   Interventions of participants:

   § PAP/RAC asks if it's possible to postpone the issue of the first project output of 3-6 months: the short time before the foreseen issue wouldn't allow the choice of experts to elaborate it;

   § LP agrees and proposes to submit this request to the JTS in writing form; LP says that delays in the start of project activities is a common problem among IPA participants, and therefore the Managing Authority should agree with this change

   § Puglia Region proposes to postpone the International Conference, for which it is responsible, foreseen in the first part of October 2011 in order to include it within the Mediterre event that will be held by the Region in January 2012. Puglia said it will be an important way to raise more awareness of the media on the SHAPE conference and it would allow the partners to have more time to collect data on the project implementation and therefore to have more issues to discuss.

   § LP agrees and says it will ask in writing form to the Managing Authority the possibility to shift the organization of this conference within the project time plan

3. Marina Markovic (PAP/RAC) Presentation on ICZM Protocol

   Marina stresses the importance of articles 5 and 6 of the Protocol (objectives and principles of ICZM) as a starting point of the SHAPE project activities.

   She underlines the necessity to consider article 8 and its effects on the actual state of coastal zones.

   Interventions of participants:

   Puglia Region comes in on the implementation of art. 8 asking if it would be possible to change the target of their pilot action in order to make it compliant with the article objectives.

Marina proposes to invite representatives of the Italian Ministry for Environment to the workshop on outlines of national ICZM strategy in order to involve directly the national level and therefore provide a support to the elaboration of such strategy.

4   Roberto Bertaggia (Veneto Region): "Shipping towards Maritime Spatial Planning" (MSP)

Important to underline:

n   Work package 4:
   - 5 actions;
   - Progress: from August 2011 to February 2014
   - Organized by Veneto Region - Progetto Venezia Department
   - Amount: € 851.700

n   Action 4.1:
   - Output: A report on the legislation analysis and an holistic approach to a common and legally binding planning.
   - Roles: B1 will draw up the common outline for the action and will provide overall coordination. LB, B4, B5, B7, B8, B9, B12 will prepare the required documents and analysis.
   - Duration: 01/08/2011- 01/03/2013.

n   Action 4.2:
   - Output: Report on the state of the art, the pressures and conflicts in the Adriatic Sea
   - Roles: B1 will draw up the common outline for the action and will provide the general coordination. LB, B5, B7, B9, B12 will prepare the required data, analysis and documents and will cooperate in the definition of assessment tools, objectives and measures programs.
   - Duration: 01/08/2011- 01/03/2013

   Main Topics proposed:

air	climate
water	ground and underground
biodiversity, flora e fauna	economy and society
Sites of cultural and historical interest	health
population	

n   Action 4.3:
   - Output: Report on various scenarios based on different assumptions of use and evaluation mechanism. Thematic maps on:
     . uses of the sea and the coast
     . Interaction and conflicts between uses
   o   The action should be strongly linked with the WP5 action that develops the GIS Atlas of status and uses.

- o Roles: B1 will draw up the common outline for the action and will provide the general coordination, will handle the data processing at basin scale. LB, B5, B7, B8, B9, B12 will prepare the required data, analysis, documents, and will share the evaluation process and scenarios.
- o Duration: 01/03/2012- 01/12/2013

n Action 4.4:
- - Output: Report on results of pilot studies
- - Roles: B1 will be the coordinator of the WP Participants (LB, B1, B3, B4, B7, B9, B11, B12) will develop pilot projects on particular subjects, testing the methodology on MSP.
- - Duration: 01/01/2012- 01/12/2013
- - Pilot Projects:
  - ü LP Emilia Romagna Region → Proposal to reduce conflicts in the coastal-marine area
  - ü B1 Veneto Region → Data processing on an existing sea trial-field
  - ü B3 Regional Agency for Environmental Protection of Molise → Environmental stresses due to presence of toxic materials
  - ü B4 ECAT Tirana - Environmental Center for Administration and Technology → Research on the current sea & land uses.
  - ü B7 Regional Development Centre Koper → Proposal for spatial arrangements of a municipal coastal strip (Piran).
  - ü B9 Abruzzo Region – Service Maritime Works and Marine Water → Quality Data processing on sea water quality using toxicology
  - ü B11 Marche Region – Coastal Defence Department → Economic analysis applied at a maritime state property territorial unit.
  - ü B12 Puglia Region – Mediterranean Department → Analyses of multiple stressors operating in the two Marine Protected Areas: Torre Gualceto and Tremiti Islands.

n Action 4.5:
- - Output: Handbook on a common scientific methodology for MSP.
- - Roles: B1 coordinates. All partners, in particular, LP, B1, B2, B4, B5, B7, B8, B9, B10, B12 will share the contents of the guidelines and cooperate in the drafting of the manual.
- - Duration: 01/04/2013- 01/02/2014
- - Workshop in Emilia Romagna Region (LP) on: - Analysis of ecosystem; - Problem analysis and creation of thematic mapping; - Pilot projects.

5 Slavko Mezek (Regional Center of Development Capodistria): Integration & promotion between ICZM & MSP

Important to underline:

n Main activities WP5:
- o 5.1. Definition of topics & Data supporting ICZM & MSP
- o 5.2. Design, implementation of ICZM&MSP Information system
- o 5.3. Design & implementation of GIS Atlas

- o 5.4 In-depth Examination for Pilot Actions – Collection of Data
- o 5.5 Collection and assessment of data (policy, planning, tools)
- n Activity 5.1: July 2011-June 2012
    - B7: coordination of WP activities;
    - B7, LB, B6 and B1 will define the topic scheme;
- n Activity 5.2: March 2012-June 2013
    - B7 coordination of WP activities;
    - All partners: Contribution to the discussion and testing; application of the DB at regional scale
- n Activity 5.3: February 2013-January 2014
    - B7 coordination of WP activities and creates the GIS ATLAS for all;
    - All partners: each partner has to contribute with data collection and transmission and offer the possibility to implement the experimental GIS locally and will be financially committed to contribute to the GIS Atlas cost (joint financing)
- n Activity 5.4: August 2011-February 2014
- n   -   B7 coordinates the action
    - LB, B1(Veneto), B9(Abruzzo) will be involved in Pilot action 5.4.1
    - B6(Istra) and B11(Marche) will be involved in Pilot action 5.4.2
    - B4(ECAT), B5(HNC, BIH), B11(Marche) will be involved in Pilot action 5.4.3
    - B3(Molise), B12(Puglia) will participate in the Action
- n Activity 5.5: September 2011-December 2012
    - B7: coordination of WP activities;
    - All partners: each partner has to contribute with information/documents collection and transmission.
- n Outputs :
    - 1 Report on main topics & data needed to implement GIS Atlas&database; Procedure and requirements for data collection; Data availability at basin and regional scale (Deadline: 30.06.2012)
    - 1 Report on Database design (Deadline: 30.06.2013)
    - 1 Common GIS Atlas for the marine Adriatic region (Deadline: 30.01.2014)
    - Pilot Actions: summary report, maps, GIS (Deadline: 30.01.2014)
    - Data-base on legal aspects, current policy and planning tools on ICZM and MSP in the Adriatic Basin (Deadline: 31.12.2012)
    - Local GIS realized or implemented in compliance to the common requirements and specific needs (Deadline: 31.12.2014)

Interventions of participants:

- n Luisa Perini (LP) asks if data collection shall be carried out by coordinator or by each project partner.
- n Slavko answer that each PP shall do the collection

n   Luisa therefore underlines that homogenization of data could be difficult if each partner uses different methods and criteria for data collection, so she proposed the elaboration of a list of minimum requirements and guidelines for data collection and elaboration in order to facilitate the GIS creation.

6   Guido Croce (ERVET SpA): Communication, Knowledge Management and Dissemination

Important to underline:

n   Communication Rules:
   - All project official communications shall specify that the project has received funding from the EU, within the framework of the IPA Adriatic CBC Programme, by means of the proper display of : the European flag (emblem) and a reference to the European Union; The IPA Adriatic CBC Programme logo and slogan.
   - Communication tools that must be mandatory provided/communicated within the Project Progress reports: Project Website; Project Logo; Promotional Materials for conferences, seminars, exhibitions, etc.

n   Target Groups for External Communication: Regional and local public authorities of the partner Regions involved in the project (included their decision makers and elected politicians); General Public; Media; EU Commission, Brussels regional offices, specialised Networks.

n   Website: Two private areas to share documents, comments and decisions:
   o   For Project Partners
   o   For members of Adriatic Regional Forum

n   Partners Communication Reports:
   - To be realized before the end of each year and shall contain:
      1. Description of developed communication activities
      2. Copy of developed documents or promotion material
      3. Effectiveness of communication activities

7   Olga Sedioli (LP) talks about communication materials

A brief questionnaire on the liking of the logo, leaflet and posters displayed had been given to the participants, and she discusses the results.
She clarifies that pictures are merely examples: the partners are asked to provide representative pictures of their territories to create the official leaflets.
Olga proposes to elaborate more than one version of the leaflet, with different selections of pictures.

During this working session the partners made several questions on different issues related to the project actions and seemed very concerned about the application of the art. 8 of the Protocol.

Puglia Region asked what precisely means to apply art.8 outside the "protected area". Puglia indeed choose as the "pilot action" a buffer area of 100 metres that is part of a natural oasis, and wonders if this is in conflict with the Protocol.
In addition, Puglia Region said that they have problems in implementing the actions related to data collection and elaboration because the regional coast is so long and so differentiated that it would be necessary a much greater budget to collect quality data required for the WP3 activities.
Puglia Region therefore propose to limit data collection to the pilot area, that has to be changed in order to be in compliance with the Protocol objectives.
So LP proposes to explain the problem to MA and to ask to them about the possibility to restrict the research area in order to have a more interesting and significant pilot area from the Protocol objectives point of view.

Some partners also suggested to PAP/RAC the possibility to chose the same area (coastal or marine…) for the activities of WP3 and WP4 in order to facilitate their work. This is already foreseen in the Application Form; LP and PAP/RAC asked to be very clear in the explanation of the pilot actions: coordination and integration are necessary to implement synergic activities and avoid duplications.
They proposed to the WP3 and WP4 coordinators to elaborate a form for the description of pilot actions, in order to prove their compliance with Protocol objectives and the coherence of the local activities with them.

Finally the partners made some comments about the logo and the leaflet of the project.
Some of them suggested to change the colour of the logo, so asked the LP to change it using brighter colours to make it more vibrant.
LP decided to elaborate different logo drafts so that the partners can vote and choose the one they prefer.