



Conclusions on the capitalisation workshops in Rome, June/July 2011

WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS ON PRIORITY 1 PROJECTS “STRENGTHENING INNOVATION CAPACITIES” ROME, 30TH JUNE 2011

1. Participation and expected results

The workshop was attended by representatives of half of the projects financed under the first call for Priority 1 (9 out of 21 projects), as follows:

- Objective 1.1: Dissemination of innovative technologies and know-how: AGRO- ENVIRONMED, ICE, INS MED, MET3, TEX MEDIN, SOSTENUTO
- Objective 1.2: Strengthening strategic cooperation between economic development actors and public authorities: INNOVATE MED, IC- MED, SMILIES.

According to the information collected during the desk analysis phase in which all priority 1 projects were rapidly appraised in terms of their objectives, sectors and activities, it could be said that projects represented at the workshop covered a broad spectrum of project typologies within the 1st priority. Participants' expectations concerning workshop results covered the entire range of expected results proposed by CeSPI, with a particular focus on: exchanging information on projects, tools, deliverables, results, and defining thematic clusters. These two expected results were also the ones around which the workshop was organised. In terms of the quality of the participation, attendees were keen to present their projects: all of them had prepared a project presentation and found it hard to respect the allotted time (10 minutes). Project presentations were followed with interest by all participants as numerous questions and requests for clarifications were raised after each presentation. The quality of the participation was particularly high during the first phase of the workshop, while during the second phase it was somewhat more difficult to actively involve participants in the identification of clustering methodologies, although some very good input from representatives was provided (see section 3).

2. Best practice identification and exchange

The first part of the workshop was devoted to illustrating the objectives of the workshop and at reviewing the three case studies selected for more in depth analysis (MEDLAB, TEXMEDIN, WINNOVATE projects). The case studies presentation was particularly useful to help participants understand in practice the operational meaning of the eight capitalisation dimensions identified in the CeSPI methodology. This also helped the presentations by project representatives that were mostly organised according to the eight dimensions. In this sense, it could be said **the workshop helped participants gain a shared knowledge of the concept of capitalisation and its dimensions.**

Starting from the presentation of three case studies, and followed by the short presentations of projects, the first part of the workshop was also aimed at identifying best practices that could serve as the stepping stones for the clustering process and for future capitalisation activities.

During the project presentations (see Annex II to the Report) it became quite evident that strong synergies and similarities exist among projects. **Similarities mostly concerned:** i) a strong focus **on SMEs** support and development activities; ii) the fact that most projects targeted **one or more sectors** and that as a consequence projects' sector focus overlapped with that of other projects; iii) development of **similar tools**. As concerns the focus on SMEs this was perhaps the strongest element binding projects presented in the workshop, although the scope of the focus greatly varied, ranging from SMEs in innovative, high technology sectors (eg. bio-tech; renewable energies; eco-construction) to SMEs in traditional, more mature sectors (such as agro-food, tourism, cultural heritage). This was also reflected in the fact that different projects would be tackling similar sectors: agro-food; tourism; etc.

Another point that raised the attention of participants was **sharing tools** developed by the projects. This would also seem the area in which best practices exchange could be more fruitful and where support and follow-up could be provided by Med capitalisation strategy. Other areas in which best practices could be transferred relate to **partnership and governance/mainstreaming**. Even though in such a short span of time it has not been possible for partners to illustrate in detail best practices or tools developed, in the following paragraphs we will briefly illustrate some of the **practices** that emerged during the discussion as being worthy of further analysis and dissemination.

2.1 Most projects have developed (online) **platforms/catalogues/libraries**, such as:

AGROENVIRONMED

- Development of an on-line catalogue of technologies and best environmental management practices in the Mediterranean agro-food sector to enable identification and sharing of knowledge and information at European level of eco-innovative activities;
- This catalogue will be merged into a techno-environmental platform available to both technology users (namely SMEs) and providers, to help the dissemination of technologies and best environmental management practices in the Mediterranean agro-food sector.

INS MED

- Creation of a matchmaking platform (Platform of Collaborative Intelligence) to list key actors and innovative technologies in eco-construction, and to connect suppliers and buyers. The Platform is designed so as to target the six big players of innovation in eco-construction (SMEs, corporate companies, investors, scientific and technological centres, skills development and training organisations; institutional actors).

SMILIES

- Development of a platform to attract ideas and know-how to be transmitted to the selected SMEs operating in insular economies.

MET3

- Development of a matching platform between technology providers and investors in selected sectors
- Development and dissemination of a portfolio with selected technology offers

TEXMEDIN

- Development of an ICT online library with Textile & Apparel samples provided by textile museums partners of the initiative and aimed at helping SMEs and young designers improve the quality and creativity of their products and ideas while at the same time enhancing the textile artistic heritage of interested regions.

2.2 Projects produced **Tools** such as

WINNOVATE

- Development of a transferable Scientific Index [Wireless Innovation Readiness Index (WIRI)], a tool that cities and regions (both within and beyond the network) will be able to utilize to accurately assess their innovation/ technological and wireless innovation maturity level, (coordinated by Research Centre of Athens University of Economics and Business)
- Development of a tangible, parametric methodological instrument, the Wireless Innovation Operational Toolkit, serving as guidance for municipal & regional authorities to determine the most beneficial, among a portfolio of wireless applications.

2.3 Several projects developed **innovation facilities** in the form of virtual laboratories for “open innovation”:

MEDLAB

aims at testing and developing the Living Lab (LL) approach as a way to innovate innovation policies design. LL could be defined as public private partnerships whereby businesses, public authorities and

citizens participate in innovation processes, co-creating and testing technologies, platforms, products or services, according to the principles of “open innovation”.

SOSTENUTO

aims at testing the application of innovative practices in the cultural sector, focusing more specifically on innovative methods of organisation and management. The following practices have been tested within 4 laboratories: incubator, cluster, local exchange trading system and territorial governance. The work of these laboratories is being analysed and modelled, and will then be diffused.

TEXMEDIN

aims to valorise and make accessible to designers, textile and fashion industries the clothing and textile heritage of Mediterranean regions. It foresees the set-up of pilot Inspiring Labs in each partner’s territory as incubators for creativity, allowing young designers to be trained and to exploit creatively the samples stored in the database thanks to the accompaniment of senior professionals providing market and design advice.

ICE.

Creation of incubators for cultural enterprises.

2.4 Some projects specifically foresee the drafting of **guidelines for policy orientation** and design, based on the best practices and lessons learned during their implementation.

These are for example:

INS MED and SOSTENUTO, with the drafting of a “green book”;

MED LAB, with the drafting of a white/position paper on the future of Regional cohesion policy, linking the concept of LL with the EU 2020 strategy. This “policy work” is very important especially given the **difficulties encountered by projects in the governance/mainstreaming dimension of capitalisation**.

2.5 Finally, some best practices arose also in the field of the **partnership dimension** of capitalisation:

INS MED

acknowledges that a key positive aspect of the project is the restricted partnership (four partners); while

WINNOVATE,

a project promoting the uptake of wireless innovation technologies by local authorities, adopted the principle of “twinning”, whereby each institutional actor in a given region is accompanied by a “technical” partner – specifically in the case of WINNOVATE a technological/research organisation expert in the field of wireless technologies.

3. Objective and results in terms of clustering opportunities

In order to proceed with the identification of potential clusters around which to build future capitalisation activities, a table was prepared listing a set of key words characterising each project. The table is presented in Annex 1. Participants were asked to integrate and comment on such key words and through a brainstorming session identify emerging **cross-cutting issues**. The issues that were identified are listed below:

- Support to **“hard” innovation** (involving innovative technological processes): technology transfer, finance for innovation, incubation of innovative start-ups, etc.
- Support to **“soft” innovation** (innovation without a technological component), including for example: living labs; value chains analysis methodology, innovation for social development, open innovation
- Promotion of **culture** (heritage preservation; fashion and design; arts and crafts, including performing arts; traditional industries/sectors linked to the territory, such as food and tourism).
- **Advocacy or Policy “work”**: contributing to the policy debate through for example green books, position papers, elaboration of policy guidelines
- **Sustainable development**, including identification of eco-compatible products and processes aimed at the preservation of natural resources

- **Platforms for cooperation** aimed at for example: matchmaking tools between innovation providers and technology users; internationalization; disseminating the knowledge base; promoting networking and technology transfer

As it can be evinced the cross-cutting issues identified during the brainstorming exercise refer both to project goals/aims (such as support for hard and soft innovation), to sectors (such as culture), as well as typologies of activities that can be implemented “transversally”, ie. in projects dealing with different issues and with different goals (platforms for cooperation). On the basis of such issues **a tentative list of clusters** was then formed and projects grouped accordingly as follows:

- **Technology transfer/Hard innovation:** MET 3, INNOVATE MED, IC MED, SMILIES, AGRO ENVIRONMED, INS MED
- **Soft Innovation:** MED LAB, TEXMEDIN, ICE, INNOVATE MED, SOSTENUTO
- **Culture and heritage preservation:** SOSTENUTO, ICE, TEXMEDIN, WINNOVATE
- **Policy mainstreaming:** MED LAB, INS MED, SOSTENUTO
- **Sustainable use of resources:** INS MED, AGRO ENVIRONMED, SMILIES, SOSTENUTO, IC MED

Participants were then asked to react to the proposed clustering.

Representative from MET3 project appreciated the idea cross-cutting activity of co-operative platforms that was highlighted during the brainstorming session. He proposed that these tools should be capitalised for example through the creation of a single platform for matchmaking and dissemination at EU level. He observed however that the idea of “cross-cutting” clusters could pose some problems. In his opinion a distinction should be made between projects/clusters dealing with low tech/mature sectors and high tech/less mature sectors. Following the cross-cutting issues identified during the brainstorming he then proposed that clustering could be done according to **diverse criteria**:

- 1) Horizontal issues, such as platforms facilities
- 2) Sector Approach
- 3) Innovation policy “themes” or tools such as, for example:
 - Research and Development/hard innovation (science and technology based)
 - Innovation projects clustering (such as implemented by the IC Med project, that could be transferred to low tech sectors)
 - Open innovation that could be applied to both mature and less mature sectors
 - Innovation financing/Start up of innovative enterprises.

He proposed that a capitalisation activity could be organised in the form of a **brokerage event at the EU level** to showcase technologies and innovative models and business opportunities developed across the different projects.

Representative from TEXMEDIN expressed his difficulty in thinking about clustering for capitalisation since his project is focused on a very specific sector and it would be difficult for him to think about how to join in with other projects operating in different sectors. He therefore would see two main approaches to be followed:

- Horizontal clustering, that is applying methodologies/approaches such as the living lab model to projects operating in different sectors
- Vertical clustering, that is widening the approach developed by TEXMEDIN to other themes (such as for example culture and heritage preservation)
-

Representative of AGROENVIRONMED agreed with the identified clusters. She stressed the idea of the **importance of creating a single platform collecting knowledge developed by the different project, such as a virtual library of project tools and outputs.**

Representative of SOSTENUTO promoted the idea of transversal clustering, ie clustering project from different sectors, so a to “build bridges” among them and support hybridization and identification of synergies. Finally, presented with a matrix listing several themes following **the KEEP table** developed by INTERREG, projects were asked to select the themes that mostly represented them. The most selected sectors are shown in order of preference here below:

- SMEs INNOVATION
- SMEs CLUSTERS
- INCUBATORS
- CREATIVE CLUSTERS
- R&D and SCIENCE COOPERATION
- GREEN TECHNOLOGY
- REGIONAL PLANNING
- PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP
- AGRO FOOD/ ENERGY SUSTAINABLE BUILDINGS
- CULTURE
- TOURISM

4. Conclusions and recommendations for follow-up

Projects do share a genuine interest in learning from other experiences and in sharing best practices both in terms of developed tools as well as management approaches. In this regard the most relevant follow-up activity would be to look into ways of **organising and managing knowledge, tools, practices produced by the projects.**

More difficulties are encountered in the subsequent step of best practice exchange, ie capitalisation. Several obstacles concur to this difficulty.

The first one is that projects find it **hard to look “beyond”** their own goals and activities and tend to think of capitalisation in a narrow perspective, ie. in relation to their own project.

The second obstacle, related with the first one, is linked to the lack of clarity concerning the operational meaning of capitalisation and the ultimate goal of the capitalisation exercise in which they have been involved. It should be made clear for example whether the capitalisation strategy is aimed at identifying new projects for which a call is being prepared; and/or at providing inputs for the next MED programming phase; and/or enhancing the results achieved through this first round of financed projects by stimulating exchange of best practices. This clarification is a key aspect in ensuring the involvement of projects in the identification of future capitalisation activities and as a consequence the effectiveness of the capitalisation strategy.

ANNEX 1. BRAINSTORMING FOR CLUSTERING THROUGH PROJECTS' KEY WORDS

THIS TABLE WAS DEVELOPED AS A DISCUSSION TOOL FOR CLUSTERING BY "EXTRACTING" KEY WORDS FROM PROJECT PRESENTATIONS AS TO THE SECTORS, ACTIVITIES, TOOLS, APPROACHES COVERED BY THE DIFFERENT PROJECTS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEXMEDIN <p>Sector: Textile and Apparel What: Cultural heritage preservation and enhancement Model: Inspiring Labs Platforms: ICT online library with T&A samples Activities: Fashion contest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICE <p>Approach: Culture as economic value Support to cultural SMEs (including micro) Network of cultural SMEs (arts and culture) Model: Cultural incubators (virtual) Activities: Cultural integrated itineraries Sectors: tourism, industrial design, arts & crafts, cinema, ... Valorisation of territories (UNESCO sites)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MET3 <p>TT (marketing research) Focus on more advanced technologies Sectors: Agro-food, Environmental technologies, Energy (renewables); Horizontal technologies (ICT) Support: Technology providers/SMEs/Public sectors/facilitators Model: Partnership scheme with regional antenna Capitalisation: toolbox for actors in value chain Platform: Matching platform</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMILIES <p>Support insular SMEs (audit/check up activities) What: Technology Transfer; Start-up of innovative SMEs, including financing Sectors: tourism, arts & crafts, retail commerce, agro-food, building and construction, energy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSMED <p>What: Business development; Innovation technology Sector: Eco-construction/Water management Platform: Match-making platform grouping the 6 "big players" Approach: Value chain Policy work: Green book for policy makers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WINNOVATE <p>Promote uptake of wireless technologies by national and regional authorities Pilot Tourism, Water and irrigation Tools: Wireless readiness index; Wireless operational Toolkit</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOSTENUTO <p>Approach: Culture as a means for social and economic development Facilities: 5 "open" labs - business incubator; cluster; local exchange trading system; territorial governance Policy work: Green book (Policy "manifesto") Analysis and "modelling" of best practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC MED <p>Incubation of inter-cluster innovative projects Inter-cluster cooperation What: Financing for innovation/TT Sub sectors: renewable energies, naval technology, biotechnology, aerospace/ict</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INNOVATE MED <p>Support Micro SMEs in traditional sectors to innovate and internationalise Local clusters Sectors: food and arts and crafts (fashion complements)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGROENVIRONMED <p>What: Technology transfer for sustainable production Sector: Agro-food (olive oil, meat, dairy, fruit and vegetables; wine) Platform: Catalogue of best environmental practices/best available technologies and platform for matchmaking</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEDLAB <p>Approach: living lab for social innovation Sector: transversal Policy work: Contribute to debate on future of regional cohesion policy Open innovation (soft innovation)</p>	

ANNEX II - SHORT PROJECT PRESENTATIONS (MADE BY PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES)

IC –MED: Inter Cluster Méditerranée

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Innovation and cluster development.

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To develop and strengthen inter-cluster cooperation

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: **Diagnosis**: identification of possible areas and actors to involve; Definition of **transnational inter-cluster** (renewable energy, port/nautical technology, biotechnology, ICT); **Incubation** of selected pilot project (two per partner); **Financial and technical support** is provided to projects from IC – MED.

Each of the depicted phases has a **methodology**, furthermore every incubated project will produce a **report**, finally the direct and simultaneous contacts between projects represent an added value: this **network** will in fact survive to the IC –MED project duration.

AGRO ENVIRONMEND: Leaders in Eco- Innovation

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Agro- food, Eco- innovation.

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To promote eco innovation in companies of the agro- food sector by developing environmental technologies and best practices.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Project strategy proceeds like so: identification of **SMEs** in the following sub-sectors: Olive Oil, Fruit and Vegetables, Meat; Wine, Dairy Products; **analysis** of the state of the art of production processes; elaboration of an online **catalogue** with available technologies and best practices. This catalogue will be insert in a **platform**: a web tool available for providers and demanding companies.

AGRO ENVIRONMED goal is to set up conferences to disseminate the tools to providers and companies but also to make them aware of financial possibilities in the European framework.

INS MED :Innovation for Eco- Construction in Mediterranean

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Eco- Construction

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To structure an eco-design/ construction cluster and to diffuse the related innovative technologies in the Med area

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: **Analysis** of the state of the art on eco- construction with focus on **water management**, creation of a **matchmaking platform** for corporate companies, institutional actors, SMEs, scientific centres etc.

The capitalization of the project activities will be carried out with a **Green Book** including a synthesis of best practices on eco management and water resources.

Possible connection is foreseen with project MARIE

SOSTENUTO: Thinking culture as a factor of social and economic development.

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Cultural sector

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To reinforce economic development through culture and to encourage decision makers to take into account the economic and social potential of the cultural sector.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: 4 **laboratories** will frame the experiment of 4 innovative modes of organisation and management in the cultural sector: **Business incubator** (cultural entrepreneurs) , **Cluster** (arts and crafts sector), **Local exchange trading system** (know how, services, competences), **Territorial governance** (territorial development strategies).

The results will be disseminated at local, regional and European level through various means, especially: a website, two transnational conferences and a **Green paper**.

SMILIES: Small Mediterranean Insular Light Industries Enhancement and Support

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Manufacturing activities on small and medium islands (Tourism, Agro, Retail commerce, etc)

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To support existing economic activities and to develop potential SMEs with innovative ideas.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: **Multi level partnership** between key actors at local and transnational level to improve the global impact of small industry on island development. Industrial **innovation policies** to generate economic diversification and new models of development. Mediterranean **network** of experts, entrepreneurs and local authorities. **Platform** to attract more ideas and know how to be transmitted to the selected SMEs.

INNOVATE MED: Innovative Actions for Trade and Enterprises in the Mediterranean

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Traditional economic sectors (Food, handcraft etc.)

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To revitalize micro SMEs through the internationalization of their products.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Identification of **innovative clusters**, local SMEs **peer reviews**, Improvement of **communication skills** among partners (see CHORD 27th June).

ICE: Incubators for Cultural Enterprises

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: SMEs in cultural sector

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To strengthen SMEs involved in the art and cultural sector through the reinforcement of their competitiveness and their capacity of creating economic and social value in the concerned territories.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: **International network** of experts and enterprises to exchange experiences and receive skilled support. Creation of **cultural incubators**. Valorization of territories through **narrative videos** (to be presented in Athens at the end of the year at the Art Business Forum).

MET 3: Mediterranean Technology Transfer

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Technology Transfer (Agro food, Environmental technology, Renewable energy, ICT, etc.)

MAIN OBJECTIVES: To transfer technology from universities and research centers to the business sector and to add a scientific value to new products (e.g. Cosmetic industry exploiting Mediterranean ingredients with scientific support).

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Organisation of **transnational network** of Research and Technology Organisations. Development and dissemination of a **portfolio** with selected technology offers. **Capacity building** events. **Toolbox** with guidelines and manuals on effective transfer of technology. **Matching platform** between technology providers and investors. Involvement of **Innovation Intermediaries** (Brokers, Business Advisors, Technology mentors etc.).

WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS

ON PRIORITY 2 PROJECTS “ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT”

ROME, 28TH JUNE 2011

1. Participation of the projects and expected results

The meeting was attended by the following projects: COASTANCE, CAT MED, SHIFT, MED- IPPC-NET, ZERO WASTE, FREE MED, PROTECT and CLIMEPORT constituting about 60% (8/13) of first call projects under the second priority of the MED Programme, and they were represented at the meeting by an average of about 2 persons per project.

MARIE and ELIH-MED are two strategic projects just begun and PROFORBIOMED is a second call project.

Other participants at the meeting were: Lazio Region, NCP Italy, NCP France, NCP Cyprus, the MED Managing Authority and two ongoing evaluation experts.

All participants at the meeting manifested high interest for the initiative with a good level of involvement; this made it possible to achieve the objectives of the workshop with fruitful exchange of information and ideas.

The ranking of preferences accorded to expected results by participants is as follows:

- Identification of common capitalization activities: CAT MED, PROFORBIOMED, FREE MED, NCP Italy, MARIE, COASTANCE, PROTECT, NCP France, CLIMEPORT (9)
- Sharing lexicon concept, objectives: PROFORBIOMED, Lazio Region, FREE MED, NCP Italy, COASTANCE, CLIMEPORT (6)
- Defining thematic clusters: CAT MED, NCP France, MED-IPPC-NET, PROTECT, Managing Authority, CLIMEPORT (6)
- Exchange information on projects, tools, deliverables, and results: FREE MED, MED-IPPC-NET, COASTANCE (3)
- Sharing strengths and weaknesses in capitalization key dimensions: CAT MED, ELIH-MED (2)
- Sharing the need to build a capitalization community: Lazio Region, MARIE (2)
- What other projects are doing on capitalization: SHIFT, MARIE (2)

Based on the indications from the beginning of the workshop is clear how the projects expected to learn primarily an identification of common capitalization activities, confirming the willingness “to do activity of capitalization”.

Later, encouraged to ask about what means “making capitalization”, they have identified the need to learn - as first step - a “common lexicon” and to “define thematic clusters”.

2. Objective and results in terms of best practice identification and exchange

After the three projects analysis presentation from CeSPI, the projects confirmed the **importance to know what and how other projects are implementing their activities, and underlined their interest to share more information**. In particular, the COASTANCE project emphasized the importance of having more information on the projects to proceed with the activities and CAT MED foresaw the possibility of sharing results, hoping to be assisted in finding synergies between projects.

They discussed a lot on how and what is the best way to have more information about the results and output of the others projects. They didn't discuss about the topics, results and tools presented during the meeting.

The three project analyzed were very interested to present their project results, consistent with what has been filled in the Capitalization sheet. They agreed with the review made by CESPI, both as strengths and weaknesses. The three projects studied have presented their best practices and immediately they didn't find

synergies for instance between CAT MED and COASTANCE. The presentation of SHIFT was particularly empty of content and best practices, as partially shown in the capitalisation sheet.

Following a summary of the presentations of the three analyzed projects:

COASTANCE: Regional action strategies for coastal zone adaptation to climate change. The project action is structured in three components each of which foresees some tools such as a **methodology to anticipate coastal risks**, a **territorial action plans for coastal protection** management and **guidelines for environmental impacts studies** focused on coastal protection works and plans. Among the Operative Purposes one is dedicated to: "Capitalisation of knowledge and resources already acquired in the field of coastal protection".

COASTANCE has already developed synergies with the following projects: MAREMED (MED), SHAPE (IPA Adriatic) and MICORE (7FP).

CAT MED: Change Mediterranean Metropolis Around Time. The project aims to link climate change prevention to urban sustainable development and it is composed of three main phases and tools:

- Analysis: technicians and experts develop a **Common Indicator System**
- Experimentation: this phase involve eleven key metropolitan actors willing to implement pilot action called **Green Apple**.
- Support: politicians and decision makers are brought together in a **platform** and sign a **commitment**, which engage them to follow the sustainable urban model. All experiences are collected in a **methodology guide** in order to be capitalized.

Project representatives showed the intention, for the future, to increase and intensify the results achieved by CAT MED by enlarging the partnership to other Mediterranean cities.

SHIFT: Sustainable Tourism in Fragile Territories. The partner of the project responsible of communication activities has set the whole presentation on dissemination activities. This is one of the many cases of projects that intend capitalization activities only in terms of dissemination activities. The project intends to provide a tested and transferable governance model for sustainable tourism in the Mediterranean area, experimenting innovative stakeholder-oriented actions, integrated quality management (IQM), but up to now does not seem to have developed practical and operational tools.

For facilitating the exchange of practices, it was given the chance to **other projects** to make a brief presentation of their main objectives and expected results.

MARIE

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Energy Efficiency

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Reduce energy consumption in buildings; involve the emerging sector of energy efficient building renovation.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Prepare a **strategy** on Energy Efficiency; create a **platform**, a virtual market for stakeholders and other actors to be maintained at the end of the project; establish **objective criteria** to access this market; try to generate a **policy commitment** among 9 regional interest group and provide financial and technical support to mainstream project results into regional policies.

MARIE representative suggested the elaboration of a **trademark** to apply to those projects whose activities are certified by MED programme as good for capitalization.

CLIMEPORT

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Ports management

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Climate change mitigation and carbon emissions reduction

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Creation of an **action plan** to reduce emissions; elaboration of a common **methodology** for all ports involved to assess the level of emissions; ports **commitment** to execute action plans.

CLIMEPORT representative expects, for the future, to extend projects results to many other ports in the world as the current work is focused on transferability.

PROTECT

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Forest preservation and management

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Prevention of forest fire

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Development of a forest condition **assessment** based on a Canadian model (wind, temperature *and* bio mass); improvement of **communication** activities; involvement of private actors and public bodies such as the civil protection.

ZEROWASTE

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Waste management

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Drastic reduction of waste production, Recycling, Energy production.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: State of the art and **comparative analysis** among partners; collection of **good practices in a database**; Drafting of a **handbook** to help municipalities implementing the Zero Waste strategy; and promotion of home composting.

MED IPPC NET

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Application of the IPPC Directive

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Identify best practices and methodology to implement the IPPC Directive.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Regional and interregional **analysis** to highlight weaknesses of the IPPC Directive implementation; **software check list** supporting the grant of the permit; realization of a **good practice guide** with the help of involved companies (bottom up approach).

PROFORBIOMED

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Forest management

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Encourage the use of forest bio mass; promote an economic impact in rural areas by creating new jobs in the forest industry.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Involvement of public authorities, universities and international organizations; Implementation of **pilot actions**.

It is PROFORBIOMED intention to identify projects from MED and other programmes working on the same thematic in order to find synergies. Project representative also expressed the wish to influence European decision makers.

ELIH- MED

FIELD OF INTERVENTION: Energy efficiency

MAIN OBJECTIVES: Develop energy efficiency housing, focussing on social housing. Identify funding simplified mechanisms to expand energy efficiency housing.

TOOLS and DELIVERABLES: Identify **energy solutions** and produce an **eco-building guideline**.

The discussion and the level of participation among the projects were very high. The most important points of discussion were:

- Identify permanent instruments for knowledge accumulation, monitoring and exchange of best practices and tools of the projects. **Projects need to exchange more information.**
- Identify what may be “objects to be capitalized”. The projects, often, fail to see how operational tools produced in their projects (for instance, a manual for coastal management) may be objects to be capitalized with other projects dealing different issues (for instance: urban management tool). The projects are likely to remain focused on their specific issues, sometimes limiting the concept of capitalization with the transfer of good practices. For this reason the roles of the JTS and CeSPI are very important; they have an overall view of all projects, topics and results and they could **propose links**

among the projects with similar or complementary operative tools, similar approach to manage the policy commitment and to influence the same European policies;

- Identify economic resources and prepare a launch of a **call for capitalization** activities as soon as possible.

All the project representatives' intervened in the discussion that was particularly animated when we moved to the **identification of clusters** hypothesis. CeSPI presented a proposal of clusters for animating the discussion.

3. Objective and results in terms of clustering opportunities

CeSPI presented a cluster hypothesis based on a mix of different criteria: thematic, sector and territorial criteria with the aim of gathering opinions and suggestions from representatives of the projects. In specific it was proposed:

Urban/territorial development cluster

This cluster gathers all the projects that have developed tools for sustainable territorial management in related specific areas (cities, coastal areas, ports, etc.).

About this cluster there was interest, after intense discussion, from the following projects: CAT MED, COASTANCE, FREE MED, CLIMEPORT, ELIH-MED, MARIE. After hearing projects presentations ZERO WASTE AND MED-IPPC-NET have also been added to this cluster.

CAT MED and especially COASTANCE have recognized that **a cluster of "territorial development" can join these projects with a strong synergy, even assuming the development of sub clusters to deepen more specific topics.**

ELIH-MED and MARIE have highlighted the strong role that has the energy issue especially in urban management and planning as well declaring their strong interest in this cluster

Forest, natural and rural landscapes

This cluster has obviously interested only the projects that deal the issue of forests as PROTECT and PROFORBIOMED.

Governance and policy

This cluster could involve all those projects that have developed methodologies and tools of governance and who are interested in mainstreaming good practices in policies. This cluster has not been much discussed. All projects are aware of being involved in the governance agenda, even if at different levels. For this priority are particularly important: CAT MED, COASTANCE, and CLIMEPORT

Environment, including waste management

The cluster includes the projects that have developed tools for better environmental sustainability in different topics. During the discussion it was suggested to use the term "natural resources" instead of "environment".

The projects interested were: MED-IPPC-NET, SHIFT, SUSTEN, and ZERO WASTE. This cluster has not received great consensus, probably because it **should be better specified in sub-topics**. At the beginning of the discussion, some projects showed large doubts about the cluster proposals: they saw it as too large and not very practical/operative. By some projects there were a clear difficulty to find synergies with other projects outside their specific issue, for instance this was the case with the projects on integrated management coastal zone or urban management. After the discussion we have the impression that they developed a better understanding of the "higher" objectives of the capitalization activity. The projects have given the impression of accepting the cross-cutting nature of the proposed cluster, even if they have confirmed the need to better understand the tools and the results of other projects. They have confirmed their **need to be guided in the selection and identification of clusters.**

At the end of discussion the projects have acknowledged some **possible synergies** between:

- COASTANCE: coastal management links with CAT MED. Many cities are on the coast. Good practices of coastal management can be used in urban maritime cities and good practices of urban cities can influence methodologies for coastal management
- COASTANCE: the withdrawal of sediments from ports links with CLIMEPORT. The port management and coastal management and withdrawal of sediments are very closed topics and connected.
- ELIH MED/CAT MED suggest organizing clusters following the **EU 20-20-20** strategy guidelines in order to draw the attention of the decision makers. They propose to use as key words: climate change - energy efficiencies- energy and emission reduction.
- PROFORBIOMED suggests adding a **cluster on (renewable) energy**. PROFORBIOMED aims to positively use forest biomass as a renewable resource that can help forests management. It links with MARIE where bio mass can be used in energy efficient buildings, as a supplement to home heating sources.
- MARIE proposes to add a cluster on “new business opportunities” as “business” is a cross-cutting issue; it could be a sub-cluster linked to the emergence of new green SMEs, green jobs, **green economy**.

4. Conclusions and recommendations for the follow up

- The projects need to have **more clear the goals of the capitalization process through the clustering**: at what level is important to cluster the projects and to do what?
- It will be necessary to spend more time to identify an appropriate tool (through the capitalization community) to **better understand and share the capitalization lexicon**. If we want to involve more projects, a common knowledge should be diffused.
- Is better not to engage the projects of the second call: in most cases they don't have yet tools or derivable useful to be exchanged. The workshops should be postponed in 2013. The projects of the second call may be involved only after the first call projects have been clustered, proposing appropriate new sub clusters.
- We need **flexibility in the clusters** definition and in the projects involvement. It's better not to give a detailed definition of the clusters and **to enable the creation of sub-clusters**, even for the aggregation of the second call projects. Of course, all sub-clusters must have identified a common red thread linked to the main cluster.
- Can be useful to identify, through a top-down approach, some clusters with related topics and start a "negotiation" process of projects aggregation.

**WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS
ON PRIORITY 3 PROJECTS “IMPROVEMENT OF MOBILITY AND TERRITORIAL ACCESSIBILITY”
ROME ,1ST JULY 2011**

1. Participation and expected results

The following projects were represented: TERCONMED, BACKGROUNDS and PORTA (from the second call). Only 4 projects had been selected within the first call for project. In that context, the participation rate is 50%. Other participants were representatives of the MED program JTS, of the ongoing evaluation team, and of the Montenegro National Contact Point
Project participants expressed different kinds of expectations.

- **Sharing lexicon, concept, objectives**

TERCONMED partners mainly expect the creation of a common language. Another important outcome is experience sharing among projects and notably sharing constraints, strengths and weaknesses. TERCONMED partners also underlined the need to better understand the role of the STC and its experts (Cespi/IM) in the capitalization process

- **Exchange information on projects, tools, deliverables, results**

An important issue is to find ways for sustaining the projects results and activities through the identification of channels that could allow this sustainability

BACKGROUNDS' partners expect some information from projects dealing with transport and accessibility in other programs such as IPA or ENPI CBC. Capitalization could also be an opportunity to identify potential end users for the deliverables and tools that are being elaborated within the project: GIS tool, database. In the same line, there are so many results and deliverables emerging from other project to which we have no access or that are very often difficult to find. The capitalization process should help project partners to overcome such difficulties.

BACKGROUNDS partners underlined that projects partners often lack information about activities undertaken within other projects. For example, BACKGROUNDS is reaching the end of its work program with a lot of results and deliverables, nevertheless, it is difficult for partners to envisage to get involved in a thematic clusters such as the one that is presented by the Cespi/IM team. Some support and intermediate steps are needed.

- **Sharing strengths and weaknesses in capitalization key dimensions**

An issue at stake for projects' partners is to have a clearer idea of where European and national policies are going. This could be useful in order to use and disseminate the results of their projects. The capitalization strategy could be the starting point of the next programming period of the EU policies. In that perspective, involving national authorities in the capitalization process is instrumental.

TERCONMED representative stresses the importance to create a capitalization community in order not to lose the achieved results after the end of the project.

PORTA asks for support in terms of funds, tools and channels from a transnational point of view to help projects diffuse the results beyond the project lifetime.

BACKGROUNDS thinks it would be helpful to know what capitalization activities have been carried out, not only in the MED program but also in other programs such as ENPI and IPA and at European level (CeSPI made clear that only MED program will be taken into account). Representative also says that projects need more information on how to use results for the next programming period. JTS explains that projects contributions at this stage are the starting point with a view to the next call.

Representatives of the Med Program (JTS and National Contact Points) underlined the need to share a common understanding on the meaning of capitalization. The first analysis of projects presented in the Capitalization Sheets by the Cespi/IM team highlighted a strong ambiguity of capitalization that covers different interpretations:

- Capitalization at the project level is most of the time equated with processes and practices allowing to improve and sustain project activities beyond the end of the ERDF (or other funds) grants;
- Capitalization at the Program level is understood as a component of a “macro-regional approach” that is a broad vision of Mediterranean policies to which contribute transnational cooperation program such as the MED Program.

2. Objective and results in terms of best practice identification and exchange

Participants identified the following **issues and expectations** :

- The basic problem faced by partners is that “nobody knows everything, everybody knows something, knowledge stays in the network”. The challenge is to **create an open community** going beyond the classical “circle” of technical actors and partners. A very critical issue shared by all projects is the involvement of politicians and high level decision makers from the national and the European level.
- An other common objective is to **commit more regional authorities to support logistic activities**. A database gathering information on both the demand and the supply side could be useful in enhancing regional policies. Regional authorities have not been directly involved in the project. They are “touched” mainly through the participation of port authorities.
- An important issue is also to create **communication with projects and partners from the ENPI and the IPA programs** where similar issues and results could certainly be shared.
- Partners also fear that between the end of the project and the beginning of the next one (as part of a cluster) there is a gap. It is CeSPI/IM’s job to **fill that gap** helping projects to share information and experiences.

The following **practices** were presented and discussed:

- The TERCONMED project will organise a capitalization conference in Valencia (Spain) on the 29th September 2011. This conference will involve projects’ partners from all the Mediterranean area. A dedicated web site has been created.
- The BACKGROUNDS GIS tool is an automatic map with a collection of data. It will be finalised in a few months. The main end users are port authorities with regional authorities but also maritime services and agencies dealing with transport. The tool provides with information on freight coming from the catchment area: local production, import and export, potential in export development, the corridors and routes currently used. It is thus mainly focus on the demand side. The component 5 of the project deals with scenarios envisaging how regional authorities could address the needs identified by improving the maritime transport offer.
- The TERCONMED database is currently under constitution, gathering information on all the ports participating to the project: technical characteristics of the containers terminals, custom procedures, working conditions... It is mainly focus on the supply side of maritime transport. Targeted end users are thus companies and producers that envisage using short sea shipping and containers.
- Social Web portals allows to share information about events, publications and outputs produced by a given project and by other projects and networks as well. It also provides with a registration tool, allowing users to apply for events.

- The PORTA work program includes classical dissemination activities such as the elaboration of Internet tools, the publishing of brochures, the organisation of conferences and the participation of project's partners to conferences. Capitalization as such as not been yet addressed by specific activities.

3. Objective and results in terms of clustering opportunities

Workshop participants discussed two kinds of results for projects clustering, a thematic approach and a "process approach".

A first approach was to identify new themes that could constitute clusters that is gathering projects from different priorities of the MED Program. The following themes were thus identified:

- **integrated coastal zones management:** COASTANCE, CLIMEPORT, MAREMED
- **urban development:** CAT MED, PORTA, BACKGROUNDS
- **valorisation of local production:** MED EMPORIOM, RURURBAL, NOVAGRIMED, BACKGROUNDS
- **climate change energy efficiency:** TERCONMED, PORTA, (CLIMEPORT)
- **sustainable tourism**
- **agro food**
- **information society**
- **blue belt** (European Commission: Mediterranean sea without barriers. Free movement of goods)

Participants also discussed an alternative approach that consists in considering projects as strategic processes. In that framework, projects share common issues that are cross cutting the traditional division in thematic priorities which is the usual approach implemented in the transnational cooperation programs. The following **cross cutting issues** have been identified and discussed:

- territorial information systems (tools)
- mainstreaming
- harmonization of administrative procedures
- policy makers involvement (good practices, tools)
- communication tools & social network
- awareness raising tools (suggested by PORTA)
- raise other funds different from ERDF

Participants notice how thematic and process clusters are **complementary** e.g. in valorization of local production we will deal with policy makers involvement and urban development etc.

4. Conclusions and recommendations for the follow up

Next steps agreed were the following:

- Elaboration and diffusion of a **clustering proposal** issued by the Cespi/IM team;
- Elaboration and diffusion of a matrix synthesising the potential synergies between projects issued by the Cespi/IM team;
- Animation of clusters through case studies and peer reviews of projects;
- Participation to the Med program annual event on the 19th October 2011.

WORKSHOP CONCLUSIONS

ON PRIORITY 4 PROJECTS “PROMOTION OF A POLYCENTRIC AND INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT OF THE MED SPACE”

ROME, 27TH JUNE 2011

1. Participation and expected results

Four projects (out of 12 of the first call) participated to the workshop: CHORD; PHILOXENIA; NOVAGRIMED; QUALIGOUV. It is worth stressing that two other projects were involved in the interviews, although they could not participate: RURURBAL and WASMAN. In addition, FORET MODEL participated to the process by sending a questionnaire filled in and MEDGOVERNANCE demonstrated interest to be involved. In this way 8 projects shared information and expressed interest to participate in the capitalization process.

The first part was dedicated to present the objectives of the capitalisation activities. At this aim a first presentation was made by the JTS. Following this presentation, projects' representatives arose some issues to be taken into account in the next future. In particular, they stressed that many of these projects will end in mid 2012. Once ended, **they won't dispose of resources to actively participate to the capitalisation events or other activities**. It would be important to deal with that issues identifying possible solutions. Curzio Cervelli made some proposals to be further discussed and clarified with the other joint management organisms of the MED OP. A first proposal was to **launch a capitalisation call** for projects. Another proposal was to give first call projects further funding to be exclusively spent for the purpose of capitalisation.

CeSPI presented the methodology and explained the key dimensions chosen on the basis of the literature as the most relevant to analyse projects' results and outputs. Concentrating the analysis on the key dimensions will allow to respond to the two main objectives of the capitalisation process: to give evidence to results in order to identify possible synergies among projects; to aggregate results at a larger scale to asses to what extent single projects have contributed to achieve MED OP objectives; to draw lessons for improving the quality of the projects and make recommendations for the future programming of the OP MED.

2. Objective and results in terms of best practice identification and exchange

CeSPI, in agreement with the JTS, concentrated the analysis on a sample of projects of the first call giving priority to those projects having reached a significant transnational dimension and level of expenditure as well as having produced the majority of the deliverables and having made them available in their website. In the case of the priority 4, four projects were identified and analysed: WASMAN; RURURBAL; CHORD; PHILOXENIA.

The following main kind of deliverables/ tools were identified.

Methodological tool: *Philoxenia*, for example, has elaborated a «Common Operational Mechanism (C.O.M.) of reception activities in the Mediterranean countryside». This mechanism foresees the financial, technical and cultural support of persons wishing to install themselves in the target zones, to create their own micro-projects and also to contribute to vitality of their rural territories. WASMAN has adapted the “MULTI-CRITERIA Analysis model” to the field of waste management.

Diagnosis/ State of the arts in order to improve the knowledge of the different territories involved in the projects by carrying out local diagnosis. Some of these tools respond to the need to have a better view of the distribution of competences between local, regional and national authorities in a particular field in the countries concerned by a project (e.g. WASMAN: State-of-the-art¹ on waste management). Others aims to promote networking among local stakeholders (e.g. CHORD has produced a joint database of services and key stakeholders).

¹ Available at: http://www.wasman.eu/media/uploads/deliverables/Wasman_State_of_art_Final_Report_1.pdf

Transnational guides: RURURBAL is elaborating a Guide. It stems from the identification of good practices coming from the experimental actions of the partnership and concerning the interaction of the local producers and the citizens of the peri-urban zones.

NOVAGRIMED developed a methodological guide for the implementation of “Bio routes”, with the aim to reinforce the attractiveness of territories by putting their resources (e.g. biological products; architecture; landscapes; artisanal productions, etc.) into synergy.

Common strategies: by taking into consideration the local specificities and the results of the pilot activities, such deliverables want to constitute a guidance for future actions to be undertaken in the territories involved in the project or, eventually, in other contexts. Some examples.

The final aim of CHORD is to develop and experiment a common strategy for cultural hubs by the exchange of experience and expertise in developing an integrated and commonly-developed strategy for cultural heritage and service promotion in rural areas; through experimenting innovative cultural services and promoting initiatives that can increase the attractiveness and economic value of the cultural heritage of the MED area.

RURURBAL will define a Transnational charter for the promotion of local agro-alimentary systems of governance that will be able to create new political visions and a common policy in the Med area.

NOVAGRIMED elaborates a Strategic document has been elaborated in order to implement the concept of “Sustainable Mediterranean Agro-energetic district”.

The analysis carried out and the discussion during the workshop stressed how the majority of projects has adopted a **similar approach in networking: on the basis of a common methodology/ implementation strategy, adapted to local realities, experimental/ pilot actions have been carried out at local level**. This approach **represents an innovative aspects** in respect with the previous programming period (2000-2006), during which projects showed a lower intensity of cooperation having given more attention to exchange of experience and practices than to experimentations.

Nonetheless, there is the **risk** that, without a good exchange of information among the partners, **information on results achieved remain mainly at local level, reducing the effect in terms of transnational added value** of the activities carried out. This remains a very important issue, good practices should be capitalised in order to draw lessons on how to deal with that problem in future programming.

Territorial governance is at the heart of the projects analysed. Also in the case of this dimension, results are different from what we saw in the previous programming period where the **involvement of local stakeholders** was considered as weak and sporadic. The capitalisation activity should contribute to give evidence to results in terms of local territorial dynamics; to draw lessons and identify constraints in order to reinforce the contribution of territorial cooperation projects in this dimension and make results sustainable.

According to their objectives, projects have involved different kind of territorial actors on the basis of different modalities: from activities aiming at sensibilisation, raising awareness and promoting capacity building of local stakeholders through the organisation of local workshops (RURURBAL); to the creation of **local platforms** as the basis for involving local stakeholders directly in the definition and implementation of pilot projects (RURURBAL; WASMAN).

In the case of WASMAN, Waste Management Partnership have been created since the beginning of the project. WMP represents a sort of **laboratory** (non formal), where local stakeholders (local authorities, the chambers of commerce and the other local professional organisations) actively participated in the application of the multi-criteria analysis and in the identification of suitable revision of the existing Waste management plans. Within PHILOXENIA a “**support network for business project promoters**” has been established in all the territories involved by the projects. In the case of CHORD, all partners have now set up innovative **cultural networks** that are incorporating economic stakeholders and are directed to the international promotion and territorial marketing of the area.

Pilot projects have often been the occasion to promote public-private collaborations. RURURBAL, for example, has put in place experimental actions, promoted by public institutions partners of the project, regarding the production, distribution, commercialization and promotion of local food products.

Sustainability is another dimension in which the capitalisation process can give interesting insights. Similarly to the previous programming period, most of the time, **projects seek to ensure sustainability by perpetuating partnership through the creation of association or permanent networks**. The RURURBAL project, for example, aims at establishing a European network based on the Transnational charter for the promotion of local agro-alimentary systems of governance that will be able to create new political visions and a common policy in the Med area. In the case of the PHILOXENIA project, many of the partners have already been involved in other projects, always linked to the theme of the PHILOXENIA project (promoting welcoming policies of new population in the countryside), nurturing the approach with new elements (in Interreg IV C, the project is Gris Plus: Geomatics Regional Information Society Initiative Plus). The possibility to replicate the experience in other contexts has also been explored, with particular regards to the Black sea region. In the case of WASMAN, partners located on coastal zones are considering to launch a new project dealing with the marine waste.

Beyond the sustainability of the partnership, it is worth stressing that territorial cooperation is more and more confronted with the need to ensure the **sustainability of projects' results**. There are some interesting experiences to be capitalised and lessons to be drawn in order to improve the quality of the projects for the future programming period. On the basis of the analysis and of the results of the discussion during the workshop, many projects are seeking to ensure sustainability **by integrating projects' results into existing policy framework (Mainstreaming); or to influence existing policies (Governance)**. As for the first aspect, some projects are working on the possibility to integrate their results into existing policy framework or in the mainstreaming of the structural funds (e.g. WASMAN; CHORD).

Besides, the majority of projects are seeking **to influence policy making**, mainly by mean of policy recommendations. NOVAGRIMED, for example, will elaborate political recommendations to the EU level in order to ensure that Mediterranean specificities are taken into account in the future of the EU agricultural policy.

As stressed by projects' representatives during the interviews and the workshops, the sustainability of projects' results depends most of the times on the commitment of policy makers to translate that recommendations and results at policy level. At this regard, projects present many constraints. The **involvement of political representatives appears as sporadic**, mainly limited to brief speeches during project events. Moreover, projects stressed the **need to learn how to better communicate to policy makers**.

It is worth stressing that **constraints in involving policy makers are often linked to structural weaknesses of projects**. Many times, although promoting policy changes represents one of the main objectives, projects have not a clear strategy on how to reach a commitment from policy makers. This result shows a weak level of coherence between the objectives and expected results of the projects with the foreseen activities. The composition of the partnership is another very important aspect: interviews led to the conclusions that the involvement of key actors able to reach the political level represents a strength point when dealing with that issue.

Capitalisation is perceived by projects mainly as a dissemination activity linked to communication. In some projects, capitalisation is seen as a way to share information about results achieved among the partners. Also for these reasons, projects have not developed significant synergies with other MED projects. Another reason is that it is quite **hard to get information on what other projects are doing** and what deliverables they are producing, as well as on the events they organize. All these issues are to be taken into consideration for the capitalisation of the OP MED.

An interesting approach to capitalisation is the one adopted by the QUALIGOUV project, which has established contacts with different kind of organizations working in the field of forest management, among which FAO and UNEP.

3. Objective and results in terms of clustering opportunities

The **second part** of the workshop was dedicated to discuss the issue of clustering. To stimulate the discussion, CeSPI presented a first hypothesis of clusters, subdividing the projects in the following thematic clusters:

1. Rural territorial development - Rururbal, Med-Emporium, Philoxenia, Chord, Novagrimes;
2. Urban territorial development – Crepudmed;
3. Agriculture, Local Food Production: Novagrimes, Rururbal, Med Emporium;
4. Forest and natural landscapes: Foret modèle, Qualigouv;
5. Governance and policy: medgovernance, novagrimes, qualigouv;
6. Cultural Heritage: Chord, Culture;
7. Environment, including waste management: Wasman.

On the basis of the features of the projects, diverse representatives suggested to merge the cluster on “Rural territorial development” and on “Agriculture, Local Food Production” in another cluster dedicated to “**Local development based on the valorisation of natural resources**”.

Moreover, participants suggested to add “**Energy**” as possible thematic clusters, although they stress the need to better specify this possible cluster by taking into account suggestions by other projects. Philoxenia project would prefer to participate in a cluster dealing with entrepreneurship.

Some clusters seemed not to be much of interest for the participants. It was the case for the following: “Forest and natural landscapes”, considered as too narrow; “Cultural heritage”, due to the fact that it could be part of other clusters, dealing for example with “local development” and/or “Environment”.

When defining thematic clusters it would be important to keep in mind possible complementarities with **the EU 2020 strategy** and with the future design of the EU regional policy. At the same time, some topics should be cross-cutting along the different clusters. For example, the majority of participants agree that **Governance (in terms of policy influence) should be considered a cross-cutting issue**.

Communication was considered by participants as another cross-cutting issues. Actually there is a strong need to stimulate a learning process among projects on communication tools and strategy, especially towards policy makers.

Participants stressed also the need to foresee **a limited number of clusters, connecting together projects of different priorities**.

4. Conclusions and recommendation for the follow up

- Before defining thematic clusters it would be important to **identify the objectives of the clustering**. At this aim a reflection should be conducted and an agreement reached between CeSPI/IM and JTS;
- It would be important to **clarify the links between the work to be done within thematic clusters and the call for capitalisation projects**;
- How to deal with **cross-cutting issues**? There are many cross-cutting issues to be dealt with during the capitalisation process. **A choice should be made** in order to identify the most strategic in agreement with CeSPI/IM and the JTS.
- When defining thematic clusters, the **features of the second call projects should be taken into account**. How to do that? Through the “library”/ matrix that is foreseen by the JTS? Could the semi-closed questionnaire prepared by CeSPI be a possible tool to prepare that matrix? It would be really important to establish a good coordination between CeSPI/IM and the JTS in that task.