



# Annex A to the Final Activity Report

## All Measures

### Baltic Sea Region

# INTERREG III B

**Title of the project:**

Seagull-DevERB

**Acronym of the project:** Seagull

**Project number:** #10

**Lead partner:** The Regional Council in Kalmar County

**LEGEND**

Form to be filled in and returned by post and e-mail to:

**BSR INTERREG III B Joint Secretariat**  
**Grubenstr. 20**  
**D-18055 Rostock**  
**GERMANY**  
**Tel: +49 381 45484 5281**  
**Fax: +49 381 45484 5282**  
**E-mail: [report@bsrinterreg.net](mailto:report@bsrinterreg.net)**

<input type="text"/>	Input field
<b>A</b>	Headings
A	Questions and instructions to applicants
	Filled in by the INTERREG III B Joint Secretariat
	Filled in by the applicant after printing
	Fields filled in automatically by formulas and links
A	Input in this field is not allowed



**EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND  
BSR INTERREG III B Neighbourhood Programme  
Community Initiative Concerning Transnational  
Co-operation On Spatial Planning 2000 - 2006**

## I. Outputs

Please state the number of the following outputs that your project has produced and describe these

<p>1. Common spatial development visions</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description</p>	<p>The Strategy part of the Joint Development Programme (JDP) includes a vision for the ERB development in 2015 (see page 22 of the Strategy document).</p>
<p>2. Concrete development concepts and strategies</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description</p>	<p>The JDP itself is a concrete, strategic development concept for ERB.</p>
<p>3. Land-use and building plans based on transnational strategies</p> <p>Number <input type="text"/> Short description</p>	
<p>4. Technical concepts and feasibility studies</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="8"/> Short description</p>	<p>The eight proposed projects/activities in the Action Programme - among them establishment of an Academy on Rural Development, of a Tourism Development Group, of Forums for Water and Energy - could be seen as technical concepts or draft feasibility studies.</p>
<p>5. Economic expertise/assessments and business plans</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description</p>	<p>The Seagull report "The role of regional industrial platforms and clusters in the development of ERB" includes economic assessments for the ERB development that has been much of the basis for the proposal in the Action Programme about establishment of an ERB structure for innovation and SME development.</p>
<p>6. Environmental impact assessment documents /Territorial impact assessment documents</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="2"/> Short description</p>	<p>No such documents directly, but the proposals in the reports Indicators for sustainable development and Statistics and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) will facilitate to make such assessments.</p>
<p>7. Promotion and marketing strategies</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description</p>	<p>The whole JDP is a promotion and marketing strategy for ERB.</p>
<p>8. New sustainable tourism products with transnational context</p> <p>Number <input type="text"/> Short description</p>	



<p>9. Guidelines, manuals</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="9"/> Short description</p>	<p>The Seagull reports Democracy in ERB, Gender Equality in ERB, Rural Areas in ERB, Indicators for sustainable development, Methods for Strengthening Public Participation, Information and Communication Strategy for ERB, Statistics and Geographical Information Systems (GIS), and Rural Development and Local Democracy comprise guidelines or manuals. The tool box worked out within WP3 contains methods for establishing innovative centres and cluster, including ways</p>
<p>10. Learning programmes</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="2"/> Short description</p>	<p>A learning programme on how to use Geographical Information Systems in regional development is presented in the Seagull report Statistics and Geographical Information Systems (GIS). GIS practice exercises are presented in a separate report.</p>
<p>11. Training courses</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="14"/> Short description</p> <p>Number of trainees <input type="text" value="343"/></p>	<p>Four training courses about using GIS in regional development and spatial planning have been carried out. One training course about sustainable sewage solutions, and nine training seminars about the Leader+ model have also been implemented.</p>
<p>12. Small-scale infrastructure investments</p> <p>Number <input type="text"/> Short description</p> <p>Please specify the amount in euro <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>13. Individuals involved directly in project events (seminars, workshops, conferences, etc.)</p> <p>Number <input type="text" value="5100"/> Short description</p>	<p>Over 5100 individuals have participated in totally about 200 trans-national/regional seminars and workshops, and two big conferences.</p>

14. Information products describing results

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Websites</li> </ul>	<p>The project activities and results are displayed at the ERB web site. WP 3 results are especially displayed with an own part of the webpage. All project reports and end products are also to be find at the site of the Regional Council in Kalmar County. Project descriptions and links to the ERB site could be find at Region Blekinge's and SSKL's sites. Also the other ERB members' sites have info about the project or links to the ERB site. Also other web sites have links to the ERB site.</p> <p>A brochure with a tool box about development in rural areas and implementation of local mobilization projects.</p> <p>Radio and TV broadcasts with politicians from the member regions and with the project management.</p> <p>At least 25 presentations of the project results, mainly to political decision bodies in the ERB member regions, but also at BSR conferences and to national government representatives and representatives of the EU Commission.</p>
<p>Number <input type="text" value="###"/> Short description</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brochures</li> </ul>	
<p>Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TV and radio broadcasts, films</li> </ul>	
<p>Number <input type="text" value="9"/> Short description</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentations and lectures</li> </ul>	
<p>Number <input type="text" value="25"/> Short description</p>	

15. Has your project produced any outputs other than those listed above?  
Please describe these outputs briefly and, if possible, quantify them

Output	
Presentation of ERB and Seagull project results in the publication Entrepreneurial Spirit in Cities and Regions Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description	The publication was printed during autumn 2005 in 30 000 copies and distributed across Europe to Business and Industry, EU institutions, Local and Regional Authorities, Education and Training institutions, and at many conferences around Europe.
Advertisement about the project results in the Parliament Magazine, October 17, 2005 Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description	This bi-monthly magazine is distributed to all who work in the European Parliament, to senior members of the Commission as well as the Council, and to all Heads of Government and Ministries in the 25 EU member countries, and to individuals from key companies and organisations across Europe. The estimated readership is 20 000 persons.
Article about the draft project results in a German scientific publication called Transnational Cooperation on Spatial Development Number <input type="text" value="1"/> Short description	The publication is one in a series of publications about "Informationen zur Raumentwicklung", published by Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung. The article is named Sweden and the Baltic Sea Region Cooperation - contribution to Territorial Cohesion and Sustainable Development together with the new Member States and Russia.
The final JDP documents Number <input type="text" value="6"/> Short description	The final JDP documents have been printed in the following editions: the Strategy and the Action Programme in 1000 English and 500 Swedish copies each, and a Summary of the JDP in 1000 English and 1000 Swedish copies. The documents are distributed to mainly public stakeholders in all ERB member regions and to national and EU decision bodies. They have been and will be distributed at different conferences about BSR cooperation, Interreg programmes and projects, etc.
Number <input type="text"/> Short description	
Number <input type="text"/> Short description	
Number <input type="text"/> Short description	
Number <input type="text"/> Short description	

Number	Short description
--------	-------------------

## II. Results

Please evaluate the contribution of your project relating to the following objectives.

	Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		No
	Yes		
	To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
	Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		
<b>a) Changing or developing institutions to improve their performance with regard to spatial development activities</b>			
• Local authorities in E-BSR <sup>3</sup>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Regional authorities in E-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• National/sectoral authorities in E-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Private businesses in E-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• In particular SME <sup>4</sup> in E-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Local authorities in W-BSR <sup>5</sup>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Regional authorities in W-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• National/sectoral authorities in W-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Private businesses in W-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• In particular SME in W-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Other in W-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
• Other in E-BSR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

<sup>3</sup> New EU Member States, Russia and Belarus

<sup>4</sup> Small and Medium Size Enterprises

<sup>5</sup> Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Sweden

If yes in any of the above list, please explain **briefly** how, and give the list of institutions with their location (country) (maximum 1000 characters)

The process of developing and working out the JDP has given new ideas and input to the spatial development activities in the ERB member regions: The Regional Council in Kalmar County (SE), Region Blekinge (SE), SSKL and the County Council in Kronoberg County (SE), the Regional Municipality of Bornholm (DK), the Kurzeme Planning Region (LT), the Klaipeda County Governor's Administration (LT), the Marshals' offices of the Pomeranian and Warmia-Mazurian Regions (PL), and the Governor's Administration of the Kaliningrad Region (RU).

	<b>No</b>	
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		
	<b>Yes</b>	
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		
<b>b) Changing or improving methods of spatial planning and managing spatial development</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
If yes, please explain <b>briefly</b> how. Please report separately each case where TIA has been applied and use of EIA has been improved (e.g. in combination with TIA or other spatial planning instruments)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(maximum 1000 characters)		
The strategy part of the JDP contains methodology discussions with impact on all member regions of ERB.		
	<b>No</b>	
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		
	<b>Yes</b>	
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		
<b>c) Building new or improving existing legislation</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
If yes, please explain <b>briefly</b> how, please specify the number of cases and countries affected	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(maximum 1000 characters)		

	Yes	No
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		
<b>d) Establishing, strengthening or enlarging co-operation and strategic networks for reaching consensus on development measures and creating synergies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Transnational</b> <span style="float: right;"><input type="radio"/></span></li> <li>• <b>Vertical</b> (between different levels, e.g. local, regional, national, supranational bodies) <span style="float: right;"><input type="radio"/></span></li> <li>• <b>Horizontal</b> (between different sectors, e.g. spatial planning, regional policy, environmental policy) <span style="float: right;"><input type="radio"/></span></li> <li>• <b>Involving the general public</b> in planning and decision-making processes <span style="float: right;"><input type="radio"/></span></li> <li>• <b>Involving business sector</b> in planning and decision-making processes <span style="float: right;"><input type="radio"/></span></li> </ul>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>
If yes, please describe the geographical scale for network operation:		
<b>Regional level</b> <span style="float: right;">(maximum 500 characters)</span>		
The general public has been involved in WP 2 (Water management) in Sweden (Lyckeby River) and the Kaliningrad Region (Gurjevka River) about its attitudes to different water issues.		
<b>National level</b> <span style="float: right;">(maximum 500 characters)</span>		
<b>Macro-zone level</b> (several regions from neighbouring countries constituting one macroregion) <span style="float: right;">(maximum 500 characters)</span>		
The whole JDP and its development and approval process is a consensus result on how to prioritize mutual development activities within ERB. Networks have been built within all WP:s of the project, covering all member regions of ERB. The JDP process has perhaps had a certain impact on the Kaliningrad Region, where experts have developed a new regional strategy and a special Gender analysis.		
<b>Baltic Sea level</b> <span style="float: right;">(maximum 500 characters)</span>		
<b>European level</b> <span style="float: right;">(maximum 500 characters)</span>		

	<b>No</b>	
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		
	<b>Yes</b>	
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		

**e) Enhancing pan-European/pan-Baltic framework concepts**

- ESDP
- VASAB Plus
- Baltic21
- NDAP
- Others (please specify below)

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>

(maximum 500 characters)

VASAB Plus, Baltic 21, others.  
 If yes in any of the above list, please give a short description. If you have stated B21, please indicate the date of awarding your project B21 label. If you have mentioned NDAP, please indicate the time period for which your project has been officially included into the NDAP by CBSS and EU Commission. If you have mentioned VASAB 2010 Plus, please refer to concrete key themes of VASAB 2010 Plus.

(maximum 1000 characters)

The JDP is well in line with e.g. VASAB Plus and Baltic 21 perspectives. The JDP analyses and proposals are also a central input to the current work with developing a new Interreg crossborder programme for southeast Sweden, Bornholm, Northern Poland, Klaipeda County (and indirectly also the Kaliningrad Region).

	<b>No</b>	
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)		
	<b>Yes</b>	
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		

**f) Setting up political agreements for implementing or maintaining the project's outputs or results**

<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------

If yes, please explain **briefly** how (indicate also the topics of the agreements and the signatories)  
 (maximum 1000 characters)

Such an agreement has been the main prerequisite of the project, and the politically approved JDP is the main result. Main topics are: (1) A competitive business environment, (2) An improved transport infrastructure, (3) A strong social dimension, and (4) A sustainable environmental and energy policy. The signatories are representatives of the member regions of ERB.

Such an agreement has been the main prerequisite of the project, and the politically approved JDP is the main result. Main topics are: (1) A competitive business environment, (2) An improved transport infrastructure, (3) A strong social dimension, and (4) A sustainable environmental and energy policy. The signatories are representatives of the member regions of ERB.

	<b>No</b>	
Project is neutral (has brought no effects for the objective)	<b>Yes</b>	
To some extent (e.g. project has brought positive effects for the objective)		
Very much (this objective has been main focus of the project)		
<b>g) Integrating a gender equality perspective</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, please explain shortly how <span style="float: right;">(maximum 1000 characters)</span>		
<p>Gender equality issues have been important parts of the whole process of developing the JDP. Two studies have been worked out. A series av seminars have been carried through with intensive discussions. The strategy part of the JDP contains special gender discussions and proposals. The Kaliningrad Region has within the Tacis financed part of the Seagull project compiled a special Russian Gender Report.</p>		
Please identify the impact your project has had on your daily work. Please indicate <b>how many days (per month)</b> you have saved in your monthly work and <b>how many persons</b> this concerns in the entire project.		
How much time you have saved per month (days)?	Number of days:	<input type="text"/>
How many persons concerned?	umber of persons:	<input type="text"/>
<b>For further results please go to one of the Annexes according to the measure of your project:</b>		
Measure 1.1 = Annex A.1.1	Measure 2.1 = Annex A.2.1	
Measure 1.2 = Annex A.1.2	Measure 2.2 = Annex A.2.2	
Measure 1.3 = Annex A.1.3	Measure 2.3 = Annex A.2.3	
	Measure 3 = Annex A.3	

### III. Dissemination and Durability

#### 1. Please describe, how you have disseminated the project results.

Dissemination means and measures <small>(maximum 500 characters)</small>	Target groups <small>(maximum 300 characters)</small>
Webpages, especially <a href="http://www.eurobalt.org">www.eurobalt.org</a> and <a href="http://www.kalmar.regionforbund.se">www.kalmar.regionforbund.se</a>	All categories interested in regional development, especially politicians and officials on different levels working with such development issues
Seagull News	All parties that have participated in the implementation of the project.
JDP (Summary, Strategy and Action Programme) - in English and Swedish. (Drafts also in Russian, Polish, Lithuanian and Latvian).	See above under I.15. The drafts in Russian, Polish, Lithuanian and Latvian were produced during spring 2005 in order to make it possible for politicians and officials to comment the proposals presented in the draft JDP.
Presentation of results in the publication Entrepreneurial Spirit in Cities and Regions, in The Parliament Magazine and in a German Scientific publication.	See above under I.15.
Conferences	BSSSCs annual conferences, a special conference arranged by the Rostock Interreg secretariat in Malmö spring 2006, Baltic Sea Conference in Visby summer 2006. We will continue to present the results at conferences during autumn 2006.
Oral presentations	To representatives of the EU Commission and Parliament and to the Swedish Government.

**2. Please describe how the outputs and results produced by your project will be further used and by whom.**

Output/result (maximum 140 characters)	Users in the future (maximum 250 characters)	Description how the outputs/results will be used (maximum 350 characters)
The approved JDP	The Council and Board as well as member regions of ERB, Stakeholders of the new cross-border programme for the southern Baltic Sea Region.	The implementation of the Seagull II project. Further implementation within the ERB cooperation of the prioritised activities presented in the Action Programme part of the JDP. Input to the member regions own development plans and programmes. Input to the new cross-border programme for parts of the southern Baltic Sea Region.
Environmental/energy parts of the JDP and relevant project reports	Stakeholders of the BEE project.	Input to some of the WPs of the BEE project.
The business development parts of the JDP and relevant project reports	Stakeholders of the RED project.	Input to some of the WPs of the RED project.
The approved JDP.	Stakeholders of e.g. new BSR Interreg financed transnational and cross-border projects.	Input to such projects.

Which outputs or results of your project are transferable to the other areas of the Baltic Sea Region or other regions in Europe and need very broad dissemination beyond the project capacity?

**3. Please briefly describe these outputs and results and how they are transferable.**

<b>Output/result</b> (maximum 140 characters)	<b>Methods of transferring</b> (maximum 340 characters)	<b>Target groups</b> (maximum 300 characters)
The approved JDP.	Downloading from the web site. Printed copies distributed at conferences, etc.	Other Euroregions and macroregions, as well as other larger crossborder cooperation regions.
Tool Box for Triple Helix Cooperation.	Over the web site.	Representatives of the public an private sectors and universities that are interested in developing innovative centres an clusters.

Dossier number: #10 Acronym: Seagull Title: Seagull-DevERB LP: The Regional Council in Kalmar County

**4. Please indicate how you want to continue the co-operation beyond the project horizon (to ensure durability of the results of your project).**

	Overall project area	East-West direction
Ad hoc exchange of information	<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Institutional structures for maintaining of the project results (if yes, please indicate what structures for maintenance of the project results were established, which partners will support them financially, what will the tasks be for such structures) (maximum 500 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> yes
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">                     The ERB bodies. The Council and Board with regional and local politicians and officials of all member regions were established several years before the Seagull project started. The partners are since two years financing an International Secretariat, located to Elblag in Poland. The main task for this structure is to implement the JDP that now is the development programme for the cooperation..                 </div>		
Long run action plan for maintaining the project results (if yes, please indicate by whom an action plan has been agreed and what is its time horizon) (maximum 300 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> yes
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">                     The most important part of the JDP is the Action Programme, adopted by the ERB structure.                 </div>		
Adjustment of the regional/national strategic documents or/and planning procedures for maintaining the project results (if yes, please indicate the nature of such adjustments and names of documents and procedures affected) (maximum 300 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> yes
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">                     The JDP has already been a frame document for the new Regional Development Programme for the Regional Council in Kalmar County and will hopefully play a similar role for the other ERB member Regions' future development programmes/plans.                 </div>		
Follow-up projects (if yes, please indicate the type and number of the follow-up projects and possible funding sources e.g. INTERREG, national public funds, national private funds, other EU funds) (maximum 500 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> yes
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">                     Seagull II (Interreg III B); BEE (Interreg III B); RED (Interreg III B). Transport infrastructure projects (national public funds). Also the new Interreg programmas (strand A and B) will be used for implenting parts of the JDP.                 </div>		
Other (please specify) (maximum 500 characters)	<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px;"></div>		

**5. If you do not plan to continue the cross-sectoral partnership established by the project please indicate the main reasons:**

Cross-sectoral problems have been solved within project time frame

Partnership has not turned out to be very successful

Partners not representing spatial and regional planning (e.g. sectors, business etc.) have no interest to continue

Other (please specify)

(maximum 500 characters)

**6. In case your project has laid ground for large scale investment/s (≥10M euros), please describe shortly its/their nature. Please describe briefly how your project contributed to this investment so far. Name the investors who participated in the project events.**

(maximum 1000+1000 characters)

**7. Please give more details concerning the large scale investment described in the question above. Please be as realistic as possible.**

Yes	No
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- Infrastructure
- Real estate (housing and offices)
- IT
- Tourism
- Energy saving
- Others (please specify below)

(maximum 250 characters)

If yes in any of the the above list, please provide details on:

Total amount of expected investment in thousand EURO	<input type="text"/>	.000 EUR
Amount of expected investment in thousand EURO in new Member States	<input type="text"/>	.000 EUR
Amount of expected investment in thousand EURO in Russia and Belarus	<input type="text"/>	.000 EUR
Expected time of investment start-	<input type="text"/>	
Expected time of investment completion	<input type="text"/>	

**8. Please indicate how (if any) you plan to continue the large scale investments beyond the project horizon**

Yes	No
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- Investments will be implemented directly by project partners
- Project partners will lobby vis-à-vis public authorities and private sector to implement the investment
- Number of potential investors contacted so far (e.g. invited to the project events)
- Project partners will introduce (have introduced) investments to relevant strategic documents
- Project partners will wait for some window of opportunities to implement the given investment
- Investment has been implemented in the project time frame
- Other forms of follow-up (please specify below)

(maximum 250 characters)

The JDP contains a proposal to develop a "plan" for prioritised transport infrastructure investments in ERB. This is a part of implementing the JDP.

## IV. Experience gathered upon the project implementation

1. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with regard to the aspects of the project implementation listed below:

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Project outputs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Project results	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support from the Joint Secretariat during the project implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Co-operation with other partners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
INTERREG III B rules concerning project management (excluding financial principles)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
INTERREG III B rules concerning financial management	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Please describe shortly the performance of your project management and financial management systems (major principles, centralised or decentralised system, auditing system etc.). What were the main advantages and disadvantages of your management system? What recommendations would you give to future projects?

(maximum 1000+1000+500 characters)

We have used a centralised management and auditing system, recommended by the Rostock secretariat when we started the project.

The main advantage with this model has been good control of the implementation and the budget. The main disadvantage has been that the implementation has been dominated by mainly Swedish but also Danish partners. The parallel problems with topping up with Phare and Tacis funding for the eastern parties have lowered the engagement from officials of public institutions of those regions, even if the project has been politically anchored from the beginning in all ERB member regions.

A more decentralised model with clearly defined implementation responsibilities for all project partners.

**3. Did you have any difficulties in following your financial plan? If yes, please provide some details. Which costs were higher/lower than planned?**

(maximum 1000+500 characters)

No mayor difficulties, but we only used 90,5 % of the budget allocations. Especiall costs for meetings and dissemination have been lower than planned, but also costs for external expertise and travel and accommodation.

**4. Did you have other problems in the project implementation? If yes, please provide some details. What kind of solutions did you find? What would you do in a different manner next time?**

(maximum 1000+500 characters)

As mentioned above, there have been problems with especially Phare cofinancing. We have managed to get the eastern partners to finance parts of their costs from own funds, but we have also used the Interreg budget for covering travel and accommodation costs for partners from Poland, Lithuania and Latvia.

**5. Has your project met all your intended goals? If your project has not achieved or only partly achieved the planned results, please provide some details and explain the possible reasons.**

(maximum 1000+500 characters)

Yes.

**6. If your project gathered some non-EU partners, please describe their role, involvement and benefits they gained through the project.**

(maximum 1000+1000 characters)

Our partners from Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia have all taken active part in the project implementation, even if especially the Swedish partners have dominated the implementation activities. Poland has implemented a small Phare financed project, Lithuania a small project financed by funds from the Nordic Council of Ministers, and Latvia a Phare project directed to WP2, 3 and 4 issues. For the second part of the implementation period, our Russian partner from the Kaliningrad Region got Tacis funding that made it possible to actively participate in all project activities.

Benifits for all eastern parties have learning of modern principles and models of spatial and regional planning, learning of water management planning, learning of triple helix cooperation ideas in order to promote development of innovative environments for the private sector and develop cluster cooperation, and learning about analyses, tools and methods for rural development. Especially our Russian partners could take very activ part in the project implementation during the last milestones thanks to Tacis funding. The made e.g. own regional development analyses and carried out a special study of the gender equality situation in the region. One of the Russian communes worked very actively with rural development issues and applied successively the Leader+ method for many municipal activities.

**7. What kind of feedback would you like to give to the Joint Secretariat (offices in Rostock, Karlskrona and Riga) about the Secretariat's work at the different stages of your project's lifetime? How useful and user-friendly have you found the BSR INTERREG III B homepage?**

(maximum 1000+500 characters)

We appreciate in general all contacts with the Joint Secretariat very much. Some critical comments though: During the implementation period the accounting principles have changed over time. New demands on indicators have been added. Too detailed such demands could make the implementation less flexible - we apprehend this as a trend towards too theoretical thinking of indicators as "a mädschen für alles" as instrument for assessing project implementation and results. This Annex A (All measures) to the Final Activity Report is very detailed and was not known for us when we started the project. It has been very time consuming to fill in. For coming projects, please inform the project partners of the accounting demands already at project start to make it easier for them to prepare for both progress reports and not the least the final report.

The web site quite OK.

**V. Signature**

<b>V.1. Signature of the Lead Partner</b>		<b>V.2. Official stamp of the Lead Partner</b>	
<b>V.3. Name and title of the Signatory</b>	Håkan Brynielsson, CEO		
<b>V.4. Lead Partner</b>	The Regional Council in Kalmar County		
<b>V.5. Place, Date of submission</b>			