

**BSR INTERREG III B**  
**Progress Report – Activity Report (general information)**

|                          |                      |                              |   |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Project name:</b>     | Seagull-DeVERB       |                              |   |
| <b>Reporting period:</b> | August-December 2002 | <b>Number of the report:</b> | 1 |

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Are there any changes on the general project conditions/project set up (e.g. partnership, key persons, schedules ...)?</b></p>   |
| <p>There are so far no changes of importance for the project conditions or project set up in general. The project partners in Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Russia have in general done what possibly could be expected from them bearing in mind the lack of resources due to no PHARE or Tacis funding yet. Though, the different time schedules for INTERREG and PHARE/Tacis will probably make it difficult to co-ordinate the work between the different partner regions during 2003 and cause problems to keep the timetable in line with the milestones of the INTERREG part of the project.</p> <p>Some smaller changes of a formal character concerning the partnership have occurred:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Association of Municipalities of Kalmar County is from 2003-01-01 amalgamated with the Regional Council of Kalmar County. A new Swedish law of Regional co-operation bodies governs the new body – still called The Regional Council in Kalmar County. This change has no impact on the implementation of the project, but it is still reported here as information to the Rostock secretariat.</li> <li>2. The five municipalities of Bornholm County are from 2003-01-01 amalgamated with the Bornholm County Council into a new “Regional municipality” for the whole Bornholm. Also this change has no impact on the implementation of the Seagull project, but is reported as information to the Programme secretariat in Rostock.</li> <li>3. One of the Danish partners – Agricultural Development and Innovation Centre – does not any longer have any personnel of its own, but it still exists as a legislative body. The new Regional Municipality of Bornholm now manages the responsibilities of this partner in the Seagull project.</li> </ol> <p>A general remark that is relevant to do here – not in the first hand for the Secretariat in Rostock that is aware of the fact, but for other readers of this report - is that this progress report covers some more than four months from August 21 to December 31 2002 – not the first milestone of six months according to the project application. This is not a problem for the project implementation, but explains some minor deviations between the planned and achieved activities and outputs.</p> |



## BSR INTERREG III B Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of WP1</b>           | <b>ERB strategy and Joint Transnational Development Programme (JTDP)</b>   |
| <b>Strategic focus of WP1</b> | Transnational, cross-sectoral approach to form a strategy and a JTDP for ERB in line with comprehensive EU policies. JTDP as base for investments. |
| <b>Planned results of WP1</b> | A long-term strategy and a JTDP for the whole ERB region.  |

| <b>MILESTONE</b>                 | <b>Planned activities and outputs</b>   | <b>Achieved activities and outputs</b>   | <b>Deviation</b>  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Milestone 1</b><br>1-6 months | <p>(1) Analysis of existing regional strategies and development programmes for the ERB member regions; comparisons, conclusions, etc. (2) Mapping the governance situation in each member region. (3) Mapping the equal opportunity situation in each member region. (4) Seminars and workshops in LV, LT and RU about Good Governance - politically, administratively and financially. Transparency, co-operation with citizens' groups, NGO's and the private sector. (5) Starting an expert study of a joint ERB concept for statistics and GIS for benchmarking between the member regions. (6) Creating a network between relevant Interreg projects dealing with infrastructure issues affecting ERB.</p> <p>Main outputs: 9 Good Governance seminars and</p> | <p>(1)-(3) and (5): Mapping in progress through different experts in line with the timetable according to the application.</p> <p>2002-12-04: Start up meeting with experts of wp1 – see Annexes 1.1-9.</p> <p>(4) 15 seminars and workshops have been implemented in Latvia, Lithuania and Russia, as well as a final conference in Ronneby, which at the same time was the transnational kick off meeting of the whole Seagull project.</p> <p>The seminars and workshops have gathered some 70 politicians and 60 officials from regional and local authorities in the three ERB regions. About 20 Swedish politicians and experts have participated as moderators/trainers in the seminars/workshops</p> <p>The conference in Ronneby gathered some 200 participants, out of which about 140 represented Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Russia – most of them earlier taking part in the above mentioned seminars and workshops. The conference was not planned from the beginning. It was though considered necessary as a sum up of the Good Governance activities for all Seagull partners and at the same time a general kick-off conference giving information about the whole Seagull project and the broader ERB co-operation (see also the narrative description). The location of the conference made it possible to cover the costs for the participants from the PHARE and Tacis countries.</p> <p>Examples of agendas for the Good Governance seminars and workshops – see Annexes 1.10-15.</p> | <p>(4) The outputs of the Good Governance activities surpass by far the plan due to special "bilateral" financing from the Swedish Government.</p> <p>This conference was not planned from the beginning. It was considered necessary as a broad kick-off of the whole project. The co-financing from the Swedish Government made it economically possible. Though, most of the costs for it saddles budget line 4 in WP 1 (also all costs for participants and activities during the conference and the following workshops connected to WP 2-5), and explains the high cumulated figures in Financial</p> |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

| MILESTONE | <u>Planned</u> activities and outputs   | <u>Achieved</u> activities and outputs  | Deviation  |
|-----------|---|---|--|
|           | <p>workshops carried through. An infrastructure projects network established (with the South Baltic Arch and SEBTrans Link projects in the first hand).</p> | <p>A Compendium called “Good Governance as guideline in municipal and regional development”, has been elaborated during the seminars and workshops – see Annex 2.</p> <p>2002-12-02--03: The Ronneby conference: invitation, programme, intervention, resolution and participant list – see Annexes 3.1-7.</p> <p>(6) Contacts established with representatives of SEBTrans Link, Baltic Gateway and South Baltic Arc. A first seminar with representatives of all four projects is planned to June this year (end of milestone 2).</p> | <p>report 1. We are aware of this fact and will be able to handle it through reallocation of such costs between the work packages.</p> |

**BSR INTERREG III B**  
**Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title of WP2</b>           | <b>Management of Water resources</b>  |
| <b>Strategic focus of WP2</b> | Improved management with water resources and local/regional preparedness for participation in the implementation of the EU Water Frame Directive and the HELCOM Joint Comprehensive Action Programme.   |
| <b>Planned results of WP2</b> | Input to and impact on the JTDP. Conclusions about local/regional preparation needs for implementing the WFD. Methods for enhanced water quality and dialogue with citizens in water management issues. |

| <b>MILESTONE</b>                 | <b>Planned activities and outputs</b>   | <b>Achieved activities and outputs</b>  | <b>Deviation</b>   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Milestone 1</b><br>1-6 months | <p>(1) Preparations: establishing a transnational ERB water working group (WWG), compilation of existing relevant studies and strategies, translation of relevant supporting documents, preparation of work-shops about the EU WFD and tools for environmental planning, implementation and evaluation - SEA and EIA.</p> <p>(2) Preparations, pilot areas. Choosing of pilot river basin areas for further studies and activities. (3) Preparations, SE: Preparations of actions (and evaluation) concerning dialogue with affected actors (citizens, private sector, public sector, NGOs, universities, etc.) in the pilot area. Establishing of a local project group in the pilot area. Report to other partners every third month.</p> | <p>(1) Transnational water working group established in beginning of December – Annex 4.1.</p> <p>2002-10-10: First transnational workshop, Gdansk – Annex 4.2.</p> <p>2002-12-04: Second transnational workshop, Ronneby – Annex 4.3.</p> <p>Mapping and compilation of the water situation including strategies and administration in the participating regions is under way. Common report will be presented during milestone 2.</p> <p>Preparations of workshops about the EU Water Frame Directive (WFD) are ongoing. The Swedish workshop will take place in mid-March 2003.</p> <p>(2) Lyckeby small river basin is chosen as Swedish pilot area. Preparations of actions are made. Choosing of pilot river basins in the other regions is in progress.</p> <p>(3) A dialogue with Swedish stakeholders has been initiated. A local project group is established. Reporting done to the representatives of the other regions – see Annex 4.4.</p> <p>Swedish meetings:<br/>           2002-10-02: Emmaboda – see Annex 4.5.<br/>           2002-11-06: Emmaboda – see Annex 4.6.</p> | <p>Representative of Latvia is still missing.</p> <p>Will be finished during milestone 2.</p> <p>Will be decided during milestone 2.</p> |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

| MILESTONE | <u>Planned</u> activities and outputs   | <u>Achieved</u> activities and outputs | Deviation |
|-----------|---|--|-----------|
|           | Main outputs: WWG established. Written material compiled. Five workshops prepared. Six pilot river basin areas selected. Local project group established in SE. Dialogue action plan prepared for SE. |  |           |

**BSR INTERREG III B**  
**Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title of WP3</b>           | <b>Innovative Centres and SME:s as vehicles in regional development</b>   |
| <b>Strategic focus of WP3</b> | Develop networks in line with the Triple Helix model. How to develop Innovative Centres. Methods for supporting entrepreneurship, especially female ones. Spatial dimensions.                                     |
| <b>Planned results of WP3</b> | Better understanding of the role of cities/regions in dev. Innovative Ctrs. A consistent network between and within the Centres in ERB. Enhanced understanding of how cities can support female entrepreneurship. |

| <b>MILESTONE</b>                 | <b><u>Planned</u> activities and outputs</b>   | <b><u>Achieved</u> activities and outputs</b>  | <b>Deviation</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|--|------------------|
| <b>Milestone 1</b><br>1-6 months | Knowledge review of the actual situation in the ERB member regions concerning innovative environments. Mapping of existing links and plans for Innovative Centres. Review of studies already carried out or ongoing. | <p>The main focus of WP 3 for this first period of work has been to start the planned studies. Terms of References (ToR) for three studies have been compiled and experts appointed. The studies are well under way – drafts are expected in the beginning of 2003.</p> <p>Presentation of WP 3 – see Annex 5.1.</p> <p>Example of ToR – see Annex 5.2.</p> <p>Meetings:</p> <p>2002-10-28 SE Partner meeting in Karlskrona.</p> <p>2002-11-19 SE Partner meeting in Kalmar – see Annex 5.3.</p> <p>2002-12-04 Transnational meeting in Ronneby – see Annex 5.4.</p> |                  |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title of WP4</b>           | <b>Development Programmes for Rural Areas</b>   |
| <b>Strategic focus of WP4</b> | Focus local, transnational and cross-sectoral cooperation between partners active in rural development issues. Combining public, private and voluntary actors to find joint solutions.                          |
| <b>Planned results of WP4</b> | Compile (1) a joint summary report/analysis, and (2) development programmes in order to formulate visions and methods for future cooperation. Initiate pilot projects elaborated by formed Local Action Groups. |

| <b>MILESTONE</b>                 | <b>Planned activities and outputs</b>  | <b>Achieved activities and outputs</b>  | <b>Deviation</b> |
|----------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| <b>Milestone 1</b><br>1-6 months | <p>Collecting basic ERB facts and statistics relevant to study the situation in the rural areas. Existing development programmes in the region will be studied as well as EU, national and regional strategies. Analysis made through mapping and socio-economic studies. Discussions initiated about the pilot projects. In short:</p> <p>(1) Analyses of existing rural development programmes. (2) Common indicators for statistics. Forming a base for an overall study - a summary report - of the cooperating regions. (3) Mapping basic facts, socio-economic studies. (4) Discussions and agreement on how to realise the pilot projects.</p> <p>Activities: Transnational kick-off meeting carried through in Sweden.</p> | <p>(1) Existing rural development programmes have been classified, listed and analysed. The analyses will continue during milestone 2 and result in a summary report – Annex 6.1.</p> <p>(2) Common statistical indicators have been discussed and agreed upon – Annex 6.2.</p> <p>(3) Mapping of basic facts and socio-economic studies has been initiated. Will continue during milestone 2 – Annex 6.3.</p> <p>(4) Pilot projects have been discussed and initiated, and some mutual interests for all member regions have been identified.</p> <p>Transnational meetings:<br/>2002-10-10: Gdansk – Annex 6.4.<br/>2002-12-04: Ronneby – Annex 6.5.</p> <p>Swedish regional and local meetings:<br/>2002-09-23: Växjö – Annex 6.6.<br/>2002-10-10: Ljungby – Annex 6.7.<br/>2002-10-30: Ljungby – Annex 6.8.<br/>2002-10-31: Älmhult – Annex 6.9.<br/>2002-11-04: Kalmar – Annex 6.10.<br/>2002-11-12: Älmhult – Annex 6.11.<br/>2002-12-08: Älmhult – Annex 6.12.<br/>2002-12-09: Älmhult – Annex 6.13.<br/>2002-12-03, Seminar about the Leader method – Annex 6.14.</p> |                  |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

| MILESTONE | <u>Planned</u> activities and outputs   | <u>Achieved</u> activities and outputs   | Deviation  |
|-----------|---|--|--|
|           | Steering group meeting carried through in PL. Local meetings and Pilot project meetings carried through in each ERB member country. | Study tour:<br>2002-12-03: Visit to an Ostrich farm in Blekinge County, in connection to the Ronneby conference – photo in Annex 6.15. | Due to strong focus on the Leader method, a Swedish seminar on this item was carried through earlier than planned. |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of WP5</b>           | <b>Information, communication and evaluation</b>   |
| <b>Strategic focus of WP5</b> | Good dissemination of the project and its results. Creating channels for such dissemination. Fair evaluation of the project activities and outcomes.   |
| <b>Planned results of WP5</b> | A communication strategy and a developed web site for the ERB. Printed information about the project and its results. Information and discussions with representatives of the private sector and NGO: s. |

| <b>MILESTONE</b>                 | <b>Planned activities and outputs</b>  | <b>Achieved activities and outputs</b>   | <b>Deviation</b>  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <b>Milestone 1</b><br>1-6 months | (1) Preparations of an Information and Communication strategy for ERB. (2) Preparations of a plan for evaluation of the whole Seagull project. | (1) Preparations of an Information and Communication Strategy have been carried out and will continue during WP 2 in line with the decided timetable.<br><br>(2) Also preparations of a process-oriented evaluation of the whole project have been carried through. Evaluators will be procured through tendering during this spring.<br><br>Due to evident demands, it was decided directly after the project start to compile an information brochure about the project. The brochure was printed during October in English and Swedish (4000 copies each) – see Annex 7.1-2.<br><br>Also two sets of Roll ups have been produced for exhibitions and for information during conferences and seminars, regional and local council meetings, etc. – see Annex 7.3.<br><br>The brochure is now translated into Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish and Russian and will be printed during early spring.<br><br>Transnational meetings:<br>2002-09-26: Gdansk – Annex 7.4.<br>2002-12-03: Ronneby – Annex 7.5.<br><br>Dissemination activities:<br>- Information to the Swedish and Danish regional bodies carried out.<br>- Exhibition made about the ERB cooperation and the Seagull project during the annual BSSSC conference in Lillehammer, | According to the approved Seagull application, such printed information was not planned until milestone 3.<br><br>Also planned for milestone 3 according to the approved application.<br><br>More activities than planned in the application. |

## BSR INTERREG III B

### Progress Report – Activity Report (activities and outputs)

| MILESTONE | <u>Planned</u> activities and outputs | <u>Achieved</u> activities and outputs   | Deviation   |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
|           |                                       | <p>Norway, October 24-26, 2002 (The roll ups and the brochure were used and spread for the first time).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information seminars in Kaliningrad Oblast, Lithuania and Latvia – see Annexes 7.6-8.</li> <li>- Spreading out the English version of the Information brochure to all ERB member regions.</li> <li>- Spreading out the Swedish version of the Information brochure to the Swedish and Danish ERB member regions, all Swedish and Danish project partners, and to all councillors in the regional bodies and the 25 Local Authorities of the three Swedish ERB member regions, which means that about 2000 councillors have got the brochure.</li> </ul> <p>The ERB web site:<br/>It is decided that this web site shall be a focal point for all information about the Seagull project. While awaiting a more thorough re-shaping of the ERB web site (proposal planned to be compiled during milestone 3 according to the project application), we have continuously since the project start worked on improvements of the existing one – see Annex 7.9.</p> <p>Media contacts:<br/>There has been some reporting in mainly Swedish media (newspapers and radio) about the project – see examples in Annex 7.10.</p> | <p>Better development than planned. The positive development of the existing web site will probably influence the need of a more thorough re-shaping of the site.</p> |

**Please give a narrative description of the project implementation so far and highlight the accumulated results.**

**Narrative description:**

The implementation started with a Steering Committee meeting in connection to the ERB Board meeting on Bornholm in the last part of August 2002. These meetings were a kind of very early kick-off of the project for an inner circle of project actors. Agenda and minutes from the Steering Committee meeting – see Annex 8.1-2.

The Steering Committee has members from all ERB member regions, see Annex 8.3. The idea is that this committee will function as steering committee also for connected PHARE and Tacis projects – but with different chairpersons due to the different PHARE/Tacis projects.

The activities during milestone 1 are best characterised as start up actions for all work packages – in general successful in spite of no PHARE and Tacis support for the south-eastern Baltic Sea partners. Some of the financial problems have been solved through allocation of activities to the EU part of the ERB region.

The project management has put much effort to support the eastern partners with preparations of PHARE and Tacis applications – see Annexes 7.6-8.

Much effort has also been put into information and dissemination activities in order to get all partners involved in the project and its main objectives and planned results. Many transnational and national meetings have therefore been carried out during the period. The Good Governance seminars and workshops have been a backbone of the project activities for the partners in Latvia, Lithuania and Russia. The Good Governance activities including the Ronneby conference have thereby strengthened the base for the Latvian, Lithuanian and Russian parties active participation in the continuation of the project and other activities within the ERB co-operation.

The Good Governance seminars exposed at the same time the lack of knowledge about ERB and its activities. The Ronneby conference made it possible to gather a great number of local and regional politicians from the PHARE and Tacis partners, who are considered as key-actors in the coming implementation of the Seagull project. The conference made it possible to give all participants a basic and comprehensive information including discussion about the aims and contents of the Seagull project and the ERB co-operation as a whole.

In order to get the members of the Steering Committee to knowing each other better, and get a wider picture of Euroregion cooperation including ideas of interest for the ERB and the Seagull project, the committee and the project management made a study tour to the Euroregion Alsace in November – see Annexes 8.4-7.

Sub-contracts, building on the subsidy contract, have been sent from the lead partner to all other project partners. Most of them are signed by now. The remaining ones will be signed during milestone 2. A dummy of a sub contract is attached as Annex 9.

A strong project secretariat with special project leaders for the different work packages and a project manager, financial manager and a secretariat officer has turned out to be – so far – a backbone for possible project success. Such a strong group is, as we consider it, a necessity for such a multicomplex project as Seagull. This group has good opportunities to drive the project forwards, and – especially – put much effort on information and dissemination activities that are badly needed for all project partners or ERB member regions taking part in the project – and this is needed during the whole implementation period.

Implementing this kind of project is - in spite of all technical, economic and administrative problems or constraints – a demanding and very positive challenge. Only the networks formed between human beings with different backgrounds, knowledge, opportunities, ideas of the future, etc. are fascinating. Problems occurring all the time are issues to overcome and a demanding part of the implementation of the project – though very irritating and boring when you are “mid in it” so to say.

## **BSR INTERREG III B Progress Report – Activity Report (CEEC/NIS activities)**

### **Accumulated results:**

Networks, working groups or expert groups for the different work packages formed. Meetings with them carried out and project activities discussed and planned.

Preparations and implementation of mapping and other surveys have started in line with the application.

Good Governance activities successfully implemented.

Information material produced much earlier than planned according to the approved Seagull application.

The present web site of ERB has been developed with Seagull information much better than we thought when we prepared the application – almost all annexes referred to in this report could be found on the web site.

More activities than planned have been carried out.

### **Meetings (for co-ordination, information and decisions):**

Information and discussion about the project at all ERB board and council meetings.

Steering Committee meetings – see above.

Danish co-ordination meeting.

Interreg secretariat meetings once a month since the start.

## BSR INTERREG III B Progress Report – Activity Report (CEEC/NIS activities)

**Please describe the activities that have been carried out in the candidate countries, Russia and Belarus.**

Most of the activities by the non EU partners have dealt with (a) contributing to the partnership and the expert groups for the different work packages of the project, (b) participation in the transnational meetings, and (c) preparations for PHARE and Tacis applications.

A considerable part of the participation activities in Latvia, Lithuania and Russia have been connected to the intensive Good Governance activities during autumn 2002.

The Polish partners have had some constructive co-ordination meetings, and have agreed on making a common application to the PHARE CPC programme for Poland.

The Swedish project management has, as is mentioned earlier in this report, supported the eastern parties with economic calculations for PHARE and Tacis applications. The general aim is that all these partners will apply for PHARE or Tacis funding at the closest possible opportunity – hopefully for all partners during spring 2003.

Opportunities for alternative financing is being surveyed, e.g. from the Nordic Council of Ministers.

In spite of no PHARE/Tacis funding yet, the eastern Seagull parties have arranged several local or regional activities or meetings about Seagull – some examples:

Klaipeda County:

- All Klaipeda County municipalities have prepared SWOT analyses about the present water management situation and have delivered them to the Swedish WP 2 Project leader.
- Regional discussions have been initiated with potential information dissemination partners in the region (newspapers, news agencies and radio stations).

The Polish partners:

- Co-ordinating meeting between the three Polish project partners about experts to the different Seagull work packages.
- Several meetings with potential Polish partners of the project
- Meetings concerning preparations of a Polish PHARE application
- Preparations of WP 2 activities.

Kaliningrad Region:

- Project information activities in the region to local and regional authorities.
- Assignments of experts to the different Seagull work packages
- Good preparations of a Tacis application.

As one can read from the indicative figures on page 4 of the financial part of this first progress report, the non-EU partners have put considerable resources into the Seagull project – in spite of lack of PHARE and Tacis funding so far. The figures there are not including in kind time that the partners have set aside for participating in the Good Governance activities excluding their participation in the Ronneby conference in December 2002.