Service Contract for a Monitoring System of the
Implementation of Projects and
Programmes of External Co-operation Financed by the
European Community

Lot 5: Mediterranean (MED) Region

Synthesis Report for the
EUROMED HERITAGE II and HERITAGE III Programmes

Final Version – 23 December 2005

**This project is funded
by the European Union**

**A project implemented by
EPU-NTUA Consortium**
ICCS-NTUA (EPU) - MWH - HSTPE -TMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES

List of Tables

1. INTRODUCTION

In its Technical Proposal, the MED Monitoring Contractor proposed to elaborate and submit to the EC Synthesis Reports on the main Regional Programmes that have been subject to monitoring in 2005, presenting in brief the monitoring activity implemented with respect to these Programmes and its key-findings, and focusing in a synthetic way on the results of the monitoring. Experience from the past had shown that such synthetic reports were very welcome to the European Commission Task Managers.

An interim version of the Synthesis Reports would be presented to (and discussed with) the EC in the mid-term (i.e. after implementing a number of monitoring missions that can lead to safe preliminary conclusions), while the final version would be submitted at the end of the Monitoring Project Year, before preparing the Annual Report.

This approach has been approved by the AIDCO/A2 and AIDCO/A3.

In July 2005, when an adequate number of monitoring visits to the projects of the Cultural Heritage II and III Programme, had been implemented, the MED Monitoring Team proceeded to the elaboration of an interim version of the Synthesis Report on the Euromed Heritage Programme, in consultation with the Head of Unit AIDCO/A3 and with the Task Manager ROM in the AIDCO/A2.

The present document is the final version of the Synthesis Report on the Euromed Heritage Programme for the year 2005.

2. PROGRAMME SYNOPSIS

2.1. Background of the Programme

Mediterranean countries have a very rich cultural heritage, which is unfortunately increasingly exposed to threats caused by the interaction of the human with his environment. These threats, which have been rising during the last decades, are mainly due to:

- A shortage of financial and human resources in regard to needs expressed;

- The conflict between the protection of cultural heritage and the economic and social dynamics;

- A shortage of institutional and legal tools for the conservation of cultural heritage.

At the 1995 Barcelona Conference, cultural heritage was recognised to be a concrete field of action to enhance the social, cultural and human dimension of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. Accordingly, the regional programme Euromed Heritage I was launched in 1997. The main characteristics of this Euromed Heritage regional programme are identified as follows:

- Promotion of awareness and knowledge of the Mediterranean cultural heritage among decision makers and the general public through the establishment of inventories and the distribution of information, including know-how, methodologies and techniques, and particularly the use of new technologies;

- Support to institutions and policies for the promotion of the cultural heritage, through exchanges of experience, transfer of know-how, and technical assistance in the fields of legislation, protection and circulation of cultural goods;

- Development of human resources and training in professions and trades linked to the cultural heritage and related activities;

- Development and enhancement of the cultural heritage as part of sustainable economic development, namely by networking between actors and the promotion of high quality cultural tourism.

In accordance with the themes of the programme, networks of private and public Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage projects established themselves. They worked to define and implement strategies and common actions for the preservation and development of the cultural heritage – notably on the contribution of the cultural heritage to sustainable development (training, management, cultural tourism and employment).

The follow-up Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers of Culture in Rhodes in September 1998 praised the achievements of the regional programmes. The co-operation developed within Euromed Heritage I enabled the establishment of closer relations between the members of the networks. It also formed a contribution to the flourishing of cultures with respect to national and regional diversity, and allowed certain conclusions to be reached and recommendations for the second phase of the programme (Euromed Heritage II) to be made. The second phase (Euromed Heritage II) was launched in the year 2000, meeting the same characteristics as the first phase of the Programme.

Pursuing the same ongoing aims as Euromed Heritage II, additional 4 projects selected during the Call for proposals relating to this Programme started in 2004; these four projects comprise the Programme Euromed Heritage III.

2.2. Programme Intervention Logic

Cultural heritage has been identified as a priority field of action since it is both an essential factor in the identity of each country and a privileged means of facilitating comprehension between the various countries and cultures of the region. It is a tangible sign of exchange processes among different cultures. The cultural heritage of the Mediterranean basin, beyond its local diversities and specificity, reflects the powerful links that unite Europe and the southern shores of the Mediterranean. The ultimate objective of the Euromed Heritage programme is to establish the idea of a common Euro-Mediterranean heritage that incorporates different traditions and customs and highlights the visible and invisible links among them. The cultural heritage should thus become a tool for a policy of openness, tolerance, peace and stability in the region.

In this frame, the Euromed Heritage I became operational in September 1998 and was completed in

spring 2002, with 16 projects funded and implemented in the framework of this programme. In the frame of network co-ordination meetings between coordinators and partners it was confirmed that, thanks to the experience gained through Euromed Heritage I, the Euro-Mediterranean partners have become more aware of their common culture, of the importance of their cultural identity and of the wealth of their respective cultural heritages.

Upon completion of the first part of the Programme (Euromed Heritage I), it was confirmed that the programme's main asset is its regional character, since this makes available to all partners means and experiences beyond their individual reach. Each project/action does not replace the partners' individual activities, but is intended to provide added value, including multiplier and catalyst effects. The activities do not consist of technical assistance for solving particular problems but are aimed at contributing to the creation of a "laboratory" for innovation and the development of strategic solutions. This is carried out within the general context of the entire region and with the fundamental goal of stimulating rapprochement and dialogue among its peoples and cultures.

Euromed Heritage II pursues the **strategy** defined by the Ministerial Meetings of Bologna and Rhodes in three specific areas of intervention in the field of the cultural heritage:

- *(a) knowledge,*
- *(b) human resources, and*
- *(c) development.*

Each project is implemented by a consortium comprising a number of partners.

The **specific objective** of Euromed Heritage II (10 projects) is to increase the capacity of Mediterranean countries to manage and develop their cultural heritage. The programme was designed as a process for learning and exchanging experiences for all participants, national institutions and international organisations. Within a regional framework, it aims to create a variety of sources of knowledge from which local societies can autonomously obtain information with a view to creating favourable conditions for the conservation and development of the cultural heritage.

To this purpose, the programme offers:

- financial resources;
- channels for disseminating knowledge;
- frameworks for exchanges of experience;
- parameters for the identification of new components and dimensions of the cultural heritage;
- new perspectives for the development of the cultural heritage.

Euromed Heritage III (4 projects), being in practice complementary to the Euromed Heritage II, pursues the same strategy and aims at the achievement of the same specific objective.

2.3.   Projects under the Programme

A table recapitulating all the Projects of the Programme is presented overleaf.

Table 1: Projects under the Euromed Heritage II and Euromed Heritage II Programmes

N°	CRIS	Project Title	Budget (€)	Coordinator & Country	Partner countries	Short description
1	54764	HERITAGE II **Defence Systems**	2,343,093	*Centro de Investigación para el desarrollo* Spain	Egypt, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Syria & Algeria	The military heritage buildings in the partner cities suffer decline due to the downsizing of the presence of these former military sites, and to the negligence of public authorities in the maintenance of these structures. The project's overall objective consists in highlighting Mediterranean culture as represented in the various defence systems found on Mediterranean coasts. It also aims at defining and developing the Euro-Mediterranean defensive cultural heritage existing on the coast, and strengthening the capacity of the partner countries for conserving, managing and promoting the sustainable use of Historical Defence Systems on the Mediterranean Coast. The project seeks to achieve these goals through: training courses on conservation & restoration, creation of a database providing tourist itineraries, and a CD-ROM. Through these actions, the project targets professionals, local & regional authorities, various associations, universities and tour operators.
2	54757	HERITAGE II **DELTA**	2,915,896	*Instituto per il Mediterraneo (IMED)* Italy	Algeria, Morocco, Israel, Malta, Palestine, France, Italy, Greece & Spain	The project is based on the assessment that MEDA countries need to develop their cultural heritage economically. Unfortunately, this development may have harsh consequences on the environment (pollution, mass tourism, uncontrolled urbanisation). Therefore, the Project plans to implement innovative approaches, while engaging processes for sustainable development. It aims at contributing to the territorial development of the cultural heritage through the integration of the development of cultural heritage in economic and social development. The project's strategy is focused on promotion of local partnership; planned results are a better development process, local integration and sustainable development, with a special focus on the endogenous resources. The project aims at the development of systems integrating the process of development of cultural resources with the infrastructures, services and productive sectors related to this process ("Territorial Cultural Systems").
3	54761	HERITAGE II **Filières innovantes**	3,000,000	*Politecnico di Milano (PoliMi)* Italy	France, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Turkey, Lebanon, Palestine, Morocco & Syria,	The project is inspired by successful locally developed experiences of preservation in Europe, which can be of interest for MEDA countries. Centralised models of industrialization & substitution of imports often suffer limitations because of a country's incapacity to promote strategies of openness and flexibility. Local and regional development is now an urgent issue and can be achieved through the creation of suitable institutions allowing the development of professionals from traditional arts sectors. The project focuses on exploitation of the knowledge shared in the MEDA region on traditional arts and the implementation of pilot projects. It mainly targets associations of small producers for the valorisation process. The plan of activity includes a phase of identification (12 months) and the inventory of local know-how in order to identify the most significant activities, the installation of a computerised network of local know-how (exchange of information & knowledge) to be followed by implementation of pilot schemes (24 months).
4	54744	HERITAGEII **Medimuses**	2,998,192	*En Chordais* Greece	Spain, France, Italy, Lebanon, Jordan, UK & Cyprus	Since Antiquity, the Eastern Mediterranean countries share a common musical heritage, which has provided the region with political and cultural unity. Of course, this musical heritage underwent cross-cultural exchanges and influences; and in this way, music from various countries shares some common elements. In the 19th century, ways of communication and traditional links were damaged, leading to the disappearance of the conscience of the common heritage. The overall objective of the project consists in the quest of elements issued from the Mediterranean musical heritage, in order to create a common awareness that local/national traditions all together shape the common Mediterranean Music. The Project more specifically aims at highlighting the common musical theory basis, to study styles and techniques, create an awareness of music history in the MEDA, develop a common repertoire, etc. Through the creation of various guides and events, the project intends to reach scholars, music producers, editors, teachers and the wide audience.

N°	CRIS	Project Title	Budget (€)	Coordinator & Country	Partner countries	Short description
5	54763	HERITAGEII **Mediterranean Voices**	2,829,771	*London Metropolitan University* United Kingdom	France, Egypt, Lebanon, Italy, Malta, Palestine, Turkey, Spain, Greece & Malta	The project has been designed to promote an awareness of the cultural heritage of Mediterranean urban areas, and to create and strengthen stakeholder networks. The project brings a variety of disciplinary specialists together (anthropology, architecture, urban planning, history and tourism studies) around an investigation over oral heritage in a range of historical Mediterranean urban neighbourhoods. The main objective of the project is the development of innovative approaches to urban heritage management; while it mainly centres on the creation of a database (on oral and social history) with memories of people and places (collected in selected neighbourhoods of cosmopolitan cities), which will be made available to the wide public through a Website and published outputs. The activities comprise collection of data, development of a Website, dissemination of findings, seminars and exhibitions, and production of promotional materials.
6	54762	HERITAGE II **Navigation du Savoir**	3,000,000	*University of Malta, Mediterranean Institute* Malta	Spain, France, Cyprus, Algeria, Tunisia, Italy & UK	The Mediterranean coast counts numerous arsenals which form a network of high historical interest that bears the tradition and knowledge from the entire MEDA region. These arsenals are today confronted to difficulties and urgencies (renovation, tourism, environmental protection, maintenance, preservation of know-how). Therefore, the project aims at creating a network of historical arsenals in order to transform them into places of dialogue and instruments of respect for cultural heritage. Its main objectives are the promotion of a common Mediterranean inheritance, the support and improvement of policies for the protection and promotion of the inheritance, the development of human resources and tourism. In order to achieve these objectives, the project is divided into sub-projects: creation of a multimedia network; tourism development; cultural routes of the arsenals; exposition on the maritime inheritance; development of traditional Mediterranean carpentry; development of underwater archaeology techniques.
7	54760	HERITAGE II **Patrimoines Partagés**	2,603,423	*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)* France	Algeria, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Morocco, Spain, Syria & Tunisia	The project was designed to improve the knowledge, management and upgrading of the architectural and urban styles inherited from the 19th and 20th centuries, as a specific element of the Mediterranean cultural heritage common to the North and South coasts. Groups targeted by the project are mainly from the MEDA countries and comprise specialists in architecture and town-planning, central administrations (town planners), the wide public. The project's objective is the contribution to the upgrading and strengthening of a regional cooperation concerning the Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage with a view to improving its management and preservation. Six sub-projects have been planned, which aim at inventory, disseminate and valorise knowledge and practices, create new decision-making tools and rehabilitation tools, drawing of recommendations (each sub-project is coordinated by one institution partner to the project).
8	54754	HERITAGE II **PRODECOM**	643,637	*Chamber of Fine Arts* France	Algeria, Greece, Jordan, Morocco & Turkey	Prodecom is inspired by the exchange process between the Chamber of Fine Arts in Paris, artists and craftsmen in the MEDA region, and their desire to build a co-operation network and exchange their experiences. The project particularly addresses the problems linked with export of cultural products to Europe, transportation costs, competition between markets, etc. The project's overall objective is to maintain economically viable cultural heritage in arts and crafts in the MEDA region and strengthen its traditional links with Europe. This issue is also linked with the preservation and promotion of Euro-Mediterranean artistic and crafts heritage, the strengthening of new interregional relations to exchange know-how and experiences, the development of cultural action and heritage safeguard as an economically viable and socially building-up activity. Through its activities, the project foresees the publication of a guide and an exhibition on arts and crafts, the creation of a Website, the training of Artists, a label "Cultural and Development Produce".

N°	CRIS	Project Title	Budget (€)	Coordinator & Country	Partner countries	Short description
9	54758	HERITAGE II **UNIMED**	1,516,890	*Universita del Mediterraneo* Italy	Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Portugal, Spain, Tunisia & Turkey	A large part of cultural assets are concentrated in the Mediterranean basin, which therefore entail the need of considerable managerial resources (in documentation, protection and preservation). However, a disparity in approaches and technological knowledge exists between the countries all along the Mediterranean coast; therefore, bringing new information technologies to the less advanced countries could help narrowing these gaps. The project plans to improve cooperation in the preservation, restoration and management of cultural heritage, in order to create a Mediterranean community sharing know-how and experiences. Unimed is the continuation of previously established databases on legislation and other key aspects of cultural heritage. Activities are focused on the upgrade of the database, the implementation of a portal, simulation of real cases and best practices, training activities and project management.
10	74677	HERITAGE II **Regional Management Support Unit (RMSU)**	3,500,000	*Ministry of Culture (ICCD)* Italy		The "Regional Management and Support Unit" was set up to assist Euromed Heritage partners and beneficiaries in achieving project objectives, ensure coherent implementation, regional co-operation, project ownership, sustainability, and exchange of information & results. There is a need for a better identification of common challenges and formulation of commonly endorsed strategies, wider dissemination of results and public awareness to enhance sustainability and the impact of allocated funds and provide an integrated feedback for future planning. Therefore, the RMSU should ensure that the programme interacts in a way that promotes constructive dialogue challenges and opportunities among them and with the entire range of beneficiaries from governments to civil society. The objectives will be achieved through Support, Visibility, Training, and Monitoring. They include the application of management, administration and monitoring mechanisms and the consolidation of networks for better share of information, best-practices and HR.
11	54759	HERITAGE II **IKONOS**	2,535,092	*Malta Centre for Restoration (MCR)* Malta	Algeria, Greece, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia & UK	The project aims at the creation of a network of institutions, which can pool resources to provide practical solutions to the pressing problems identified in the Mediterranean region. The project has been structured in six "sub-projects": a common cataloguing approach; set up of distance learning nodes; catalogue of heritage artefacts; training of trainers; long-term capacity building; risk assessment of artefacts using tele-heritage (pilot project). Horizontally integrated activities concern all activities dealing with overall project management and the monitoring of progress achieved with the individual sub-projects. Overall coordination has been assigned to the Malta Centre for Restoration, responsible for ensuring the success of the project on a day-to-day basis by managing the needs of all the other participants, addressing their problems and co-ordinating their activities. The specific tasks to monitor progress are set and reviewed by a Steering Committee composed of the Project Coordinator and the Team Leader of each partner institution.
12	54756	HERITAGE II **TEMPER**	1,113,902	*University of Cambridge* United Kingdom	Greece, Turkey, Malta & Israel	The general objective of the project is to strengthen the concept of a common Euro-Mediterranean heritage using the shared prehistory. The main issues associated with these prehistory sites are: the fragility of remains; the importance of interpretation and knowledge dissemination to render sites understandable; the needed dissemination of the knowledge base; insufficient information about prehistoric sites in the centralised education system. The project aims at making Mediterranean prehistory accessible and attractive to all, through developing integrated site management plans and educational pilot programmes. The main activities of the project are more particularly focused on the development of management plans for prehistoric sites; training of professionals; development of educational programmes; scientific workshops on management plans and on education. Five pilot sites have been selected for that purpose.

N°	CRIS	Project Title	Budget (€)	Coordinator & Country	Partner countries	Short description
13	75468	HERITAGE III **RehabiMed**	3,429,376	*Col.legi d'Aparelladors I Arquitectes Tecnics de Barcelona (CAATB)* Spain	France, Cyprus, Egypt, Morocco & Tunisia	Traditional architecture is very present in the MEDA region and conveys an important part of the Mediterranean culture and know-how. Rehabimed builds on the Euromed Heritage I project CORPUS (inventory and study of traditional architecture in the MEDA region); it focuses on rehabilitation activities of this architecture taking into account environmental elements (social, economical and urban), and intends to open onto pilot projects. The project seeks to create networks of experts, reinforce rehabilitation and maintenance activities in order to improve life conditions and preserve cultural and historical identity. The project's activities can be summarized as the identification of successful experiences, transfer of know-how and the implementation of four pilot projects in every MEDA partner country.
14	74955	HERITAGE III **Discover Islamic Art**	2,676,241	*Museum With No Frontiers (MWNF)* Belgium	Algeria, Egypt, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Morocco, Palestine, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey & UK	The project develops on the Exhibition Trails on Islamic Art in the MEDA region realized by the same coordinator (Euromed Heritage I). The project's overall objective consists in facilitating euro-Mediterranean institutional and political cooperation through overcoming nationalised interpretations of history and establishing new ways of presenting the common cultural heritage. Specific objectives are defined as the creation of cooperation agreements between EU and MEDA institutions, and educational material, the transformation of museums as gateways to the region, and improvement of tourist approach to the region. Expected results consist in the development of a Website and an IT database, a book and a CD-ROM, implementation of an awareness campaign and workshops. Through targeting cultural authorities and museums, the project will also benefit to scholars, experts, visitors, the tourism and art-publishing industries and cultural industry.
15	93421	HERITAGE III **QANTARA** Patrimoine Méditerranée	3,668,514	*Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA)* France	Algeria, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Spain & Tunisia	MEDA populations need to develop a better knowledge of their cultural heritage and its place within the Euro-Mediterranean context. QANTARA wishes to develop preservation and conservation policies and put forward a unified heritage; people need to become aware of the influences that have always existed between MEDA countries. The project's contribution to this objective consists in a multimedia cross-cutting database of about 1,000 items, aimed at promoting Euro-Mediterranean cultural and artistic heritage. The project is grounded on the concept of cross-cutting identity, and will allow demonstrating that the identity of every MEDA country is nourished with the identity of all other MEDA countries. Project partners take part in the provision of data; items introduced in the database cover all multimedia supports (photo, video, text) but are selected following geographic and historic criteria. Items selected are witnesses of the circulation of ideas, shapes and techniques, without taking into account the circulation direction (North/South, West/East, etc.).
16	76566	HERITAGE III **Byzantium – Early Islam**	1,237,719	*Hellenic Society for the Protection of the Environment and the Cultural Heritage* Greece	Cyprus, Israel, Italy & Palestine	The important historical area which is surrounding the Mediterranean basin is full of small and large, open-air archaeological sites and historic monuments, with sculptures, relieves, mosaics and murals, exposed to the climate and various dangers (robberies, vandalism, demolition and inconsiderate construction) which constitute a permanent threat for the precious heritage. Professionals responsible for safeguarding the heritage and developing future sustainable policies, are constrained by political considerations and lack the financial and technical skills to carry out their tasks properly. It is now vital that these professionals (and relevant stakeholders) acquire all skills required to manage their heritage wealth, safeguard cultural sites and restore them for public view. Professionals participating in the project are expected to become active in the cultural sector of their countries, influence and implement national policies relevant to the effective management of the Byzantine and Islamic cultural heritage.

3. WORKPLAN

3.1. Incorporation of the EUROMED Heritage Programme in the Workplan

The definition of the M-Portfolio started with the reception of the list of projects to be monitored in 2005, prepared by AIDCO/A2 in coordination with the EC Delegations in MED Countries and with AIDCO/A3 for (non de-concentrated) regional programmes. The portfolio was checked by the MED M-Team so as to ensure the monitorability of the projects versus the three main monitorability criteria. Based on this, the M-Team prepared a proposed Workplan for 2005, which was adjusted and consolidated through continuous coordination and consultation with the concerned AIDCO Units (A2 and A3 and with the EC Delegations).

In the frame of this process, the M-Portfolio regarding Euromed Heritage II and III projects has remained within its initial scope, with, however, some minor modifications of the plan of Project-Visits. All these modifications that occurred in the frame of the M-Team's cooperation with AIDCO and the EC Delegations have been approved by AIDCO/A2, on the basis of the following main inputs:

Table 2: Modifications of the M-Portfolio regarding Euromed Heritage II and III projects

Need or reason for adjustments	Initiator	Result
Elimination from the M-Portfolio (not meeting the monitorability criteria)	AIDCO/A3	Elimination of the following Euromed Heritage Projects: - Euromed Heritage II IKONOS - Euromed Heritage II TEMPER
Too early stage for a monitoring visit	AIDCO/A3	Rescheduling from the 1st Regional Mission (May 2005) to the 3rd Regional Mission (October 2005): - Euromed Heritage III Byzantium – Early Islam - Euromed Heritage III QANTARA
Second visits required	AIDCO/A3	The need has occurred through the consultation of the M-Team with the AIDCO/A3, for second visits to the following Euromed Heritage Projects in MED countries: - Euromed Heritage II DELTA - Euromed Heritage II Filières innovantes - Euromed Heritage II Navigation du savoir - Euromed Heritage III QUANTARA - Euromed Heritage III REHABIMED

This process resulted in the following projects to be monitored in 2005:

Euromed Heritage II:

- Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts, CRIS No 54764
- DELTA, CRIS No 54757
- Filières innovantes, savoir-faire locaux et partenariat Euro-Méditerranéen, CRIS No 54761
- Medimuses, CRIS No 54755
- Mediterranean Voices, CRIS No 54763
- Navigation du Savoir, CRIS No 54762
- Patrimoines Partages: Savoir-faire appliques au patrimoine architectural & urbain, CRIS No 54760
- PRODECOM, CRIS No 54754
- RMSU, CRIS No 74677
- UNIMED Cultural Heritage II, CRIS No 54758

Euromed Heritage III:

- Byzantium - Early Islam, CRIS No 76566
- Discover Islamic Art, CRIS No 74955
- QANTARA Patrimoine Méditerranée CRIS No 93421
- REHABIMED, CRIS No 75468

The above process resulted in the following plan for the monitoring of Euromed Heritage II and III projects in 2005:

Table 3:   Portfolio of projects and monitoring plan of Euromed Heritage II and III projects in 2005

#	Coordinator	Project	CRIS Number	Contract	End date planned	Committed Budget	Category	MAR	DZA	TUN	EGY	LBN	SYR	JOR	PAL	ISR	MLT	AUT	BEL	ESP	FRA	GER	GRE	HOL	ITA	UK	n/a
EUROMED HERITAGE II																										
1	ESP	Euromed Heritage II: Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts	54764	26/12/02	31/03/07	2.343.093,00	B													REG1							
2	ITA	Euromed Heritage II: DELTA	54757	17/12/01	14/11/05	2.915.896,00	B		DZA2																REG1		
3	ITA	Euromed Heritage II: Filieres innovantes, savoir-faire locaux et partenariat euro-mediterraneen	54761	21/12/01	01/02/06	3.000.000,00	B		DZA1																REG1		
4	GRE	Euromed Heritage II: Medimuses	54755	04/12/01	01/08/05	2.998.192,00	B																REG1				
5	UK	Euromed Heritage II: Mediterranean Voices	54763	17/04/02	14/11/05	2.829.771,00	B																			REG1	
6	MLT	Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir	54762	11/07/00	01/10/05	3.000.000,00	B										REG1				REG2						
7	FRA	EuroMed Heritage II: Patrimoines Partages: Savoirs/savoir-faire appliques au patrimoine architectural & urbain	54760	27/12/01	31/12/05	2.603.423,00	B														REG1						
8	FRA	Euromed Heritage II: PRODECOM	54754	03/12/01	30/06/05	643.637,00	B														REG1						
9	ITA	Euromed Heritage II: RMSU	74677	10/12/03	15/12/06	3.500.000,00	C																		REG1		
10	ITA	Euromed Heritage II: UNIMED Cultural Heritage II	54758	10/12/01	01/07/05	1.516.890,00	B																		REG1		
EUROMED HERITAGE III																										
11	GRE	Heritage III: Byzantium - Early Islam	76566	16/12/04	09/01/08	990.175,00	B																REG3				
12	BEL	Heritage III: Discover Islamic Art	74955	14/05/04	01/06/07	2.676.241,00	B												REG1								
13	FRA	Heritage III: QANTARA Patrimoine Mediterrannee	93421	17/12/04	18/12/07	2.934.811,00	B	MAR2													REG3						
14	ESP	Heritage III: REHABIMED	75468	22/07/04	01/09/07	2.743.501,00	B	MAR2													REG1						

Legend: Remonitored once (yellow) — Remonitored twice (green) — Remonitored 3 times (cyan)

In December 2005, all the above monitoring missions including visits to Euromed Heritage II and III projects have been successfully implemented according to the schedule.

Upon completion of the monitoring visit to the coordinator of "Euromed Heritage II – Navigation du Savoir" in Malta (University of Malta) in the framework of the 1st Regional Mission, and upon request of the AIDCO/A3 (Task Manager in charge of the Project), the M-Team widened the monitoring of the project to another project partner (UNESCO). This visit has been implemented within the framework of the 2nd Regional Mission. Furthermore, the second monitoring visit to the project "Euromed Heritage II – Filières Innovantes", which has been monitored during the 1st Regional Mission, was agreed with AIDCO/A3, and, in particular, that this second visit would be implemented in the framework of the 1st Mission to Algeria, in order to provide AIDCO with a wider vision of the implementation of the project in a MEDA country.

The main data of the Monitoring Missions in the frame of which Euromed Heritage II and III projects were monitored in 2005 are presented in the following Table.

Table 4:   Monitored projects in 2005

N°	Mission	Period	Projects monitored	Reports produced
1	Regional 1	11 May – 07 June	- Defence Systems, Spain - DELTA, Italy - Filières Innovantes, Italy - Medimuses, Greece - Mediterranean Voices, UK - Navigation du Savoir, Malta - Patrimoines Partagés, France - Prodecom, France - UNIMED II, Italy - RMSU, Italy - Discover Islamic Art, Belgium - REHABIMED, Spain	12
2	Algeria 1	13 – 23 June	- Filières Innovantes	1
3	Regional 2	27 June – 14 July	- Navigation du Savoir	1
4	Algeria 2	04 – 15 September	- DELTA (2nd visit)	1
5	Regional 3	12 – 28 October	- QANTARA, France - Byzantium – Early Islam, Greece	2
6	Morocco 2	27 November – 10 December	- QANTARA (2nd visit) - REHABIMED (2nd visit)	2

An overview of the monitoring activity in end 2005 is presented in the Table below:

Table 5:   Overview of the Monitoring Activity in 2005

Statistics of the Monitoring Activity in 2005			
N° of projects monitored	14	N° of monitoring operations	19
N° of specified sectors covered (at the level of CRS code)	1	N° of monitoring reports (including Monitoring Notes)	19
N° of missions undertaken	6	Million € covered (All projects monitored)	35.38
N° of Countries visited	9	Average size of Project monitored (mio €)	2.52

4. INSIGHTS OF THE PROGRAMME

4.1. Programme Performance by Monitoring Criteria

The following table presents the average performance of the Euromed Heritage II projects, which have been monitored in 2005. The performance of the project is calculated as the average of the five monitoring criteria (Quality of project design, Efficiency of implementation to date, Effectiveness to date, Impact prospects, Potential sustainability). For the calculation of the average, the grades a, b, c, d have been replaced by scores 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively.

Table 6: Average ratings per each main criterion (Euromed Heritage II)

Criterion	Average rating	Number of projects	Number of reports
Quality of project design	2,70	14	18
Efficiency to date	2,95	14	18
Effectiveness to date	2,94	14	18
Impact Prospects	2,85	14	18
Sustainability	2,82	14	18
AVERAGE	**2,85**	**14**	**18**

NOTE: The Average of all reports produced for each project was calculated first and then the Average at Programme level (i.e. of all projects) was calculated).

In end-2005, the following projects (monitored in 2005) are considered as successes (projects with ratings "a" and/or "b" for all criteria):

- Euromed Heritage II: Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts
- Euromed Heritage II: Medimuses
- Euromed Heritage II: Mediterranean Voices
- Euromed Heritage II: Patrimoines Partagés
- Euromed Heritage II : Prodecom
- Euromed Heritage II : RMSU

The following projects are considered as the least successful one, currently being at a critical stage (two or more "d" ratings):

- Euromed Heritage II: Filières Innovantes
- Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir

4.2. Projects Performance by Monitoring Criteria and Prime Issues

Table 7: Average ratings for main criteria and prime issues

Code	Criterion	Euromed Heritage II: Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts	Euromed Heritage II: DELTA	Euromed Heritage II: Filieres innovantes	EuroMed Heritage II: RMSU	Euromed Heritage II: Medimuses	Euromed Heritage II: Mediterranean Voices	Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir	EuroMed Heritage II: Patrimoines Partages	Euromed Heritage II: PRODECOM	Euromed Heritage II: UNIMED Cultural Heritage II	Euromed Heritage III: Byzantium-Early Islam	Euromed Heritage III: Discover Islamic Art	Euromed Heritage III: QANTARA	Euromed Heritage III: RehabiMed	Average
M1	**Quality of project design**	**3,30**	**3,12**	**1,22**	**3,30**	**3,30**	**3,00**	**2,00**	**3,00**	**3,00**	**2,30**	**3,00**	**2,30**	**2,05**	**2,94**	**2,70**
M11	Actual Relevance	4,00	3,00	1,22	4,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,17	2,80	2,94
M12	Feasibility & flexibility	3,00	3,17	1,22	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	2,60
		0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
M2	**Efficiency to date**	**4,00**	**3,37**	**1,18**	**3,40**	**3,40**	**3,40**	**2,00**	**3,60**	**3,60**	**2,40**	**2,20**	**3,00**	**3,03**	**2,68**	**2,95**
M21	Input availability	4,00	3,00	1,11	4,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	2,67	3,00	2,84
M22	Activity timeliness	4,00	3,00	1,22	4,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	2,83	3,00	2,93
M23	Results achievement	4,00	3,83	1,11	3,00	4,00	4,00	2,00	4,00	4,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	2,20	3,01
M24	Partner contribution & involvement	4,00	3,17	1,33	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,67	3,00	2,94
M3	**Effectiveness to date**	**3,50**	**2,42**	**2,06**	**3,70**	**3,90**	**3,30**	**1,00**	**3,80**	**3,70**	**2,30**	**3,00**	**2,90**	**2,37**	**3,18**	**2,94**
M31	Accessibility of results	4,00	3,17	2,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,08
M32	Use of results	4,00	2,33	2,00	3,00	4,00	4,00	1,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	4,00	2,00	3,60	3,00
M33	Project Purpose achievement	3,00	2,17	2,11	4,00	4,00	3,00	1,00	4,00	4,00	2,00	3,00	2,00	2,17	3,00	2,82
M34	Status of previous key observations	3,00	2,17	2,11	4,00	3,00	3,00	1,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,95
M4	**Impact Prospects**	**3,45**	**2,58**	**1,22**	**3,55**	**4,00**	**3,45**	**1,00**	**3,55**	**3,10**	**2,00**	**3,00**	**3,10**	**3,00**	**2,90**	**2,85**
M41	Ensuring of impact achievement	3,00	2,17	1,22	3,00	4,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,80	2,73
M42	Wider planned effects	4,00	3,00		4,00	4,00	4,00	1,00	4,00	3,00	0,00	0,00	3,00	2,50	2,00	2,46
M43	Status of previous key observations	3,00	0,00	0,00	4,00	0,00	3,00	1,00	4,00	4,00	0,00	0,00	4,00	0,00	0,00	1,64
M5	**Sustainability**	**3,20**	**2,70**	**2,51**	**3,40**	**3,00**	**3,40**	**1,25**	**3,22**	**3,30**	**3,00**	**2,43**	**2,56**	**3,02**	**2,43**	**2,82**
M51	Economic viability	3,00	2,33	2,11	3,00	2,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	1,80	2,45
M52	Local ownership	4,00	2,33	2,89	4,00	4,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	2,20	2,89
M53	Policy support	3,00	2,33	2,11	3,00	3,00	3,00	1,00	1,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	0,00	2,80	2,30
M54	Institution building	3,00	3,17	2,11	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	2,83	2,20	2,74
M55	Socio-cultural adequacy	3,00	3,17	3,00	3,00	4,00	4,00	1,00	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,17	1,60	3,14
M56	Gender equality	4,00			4,00	3,00	4,00	0,00	0,00	4,00	0,00	0,00	3,00	0,00	0,00	1,57
M57	Technology appropriateness	3,00	3,17	2,67	4,00	4,00	4,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	0,00	3,00	3,17	4,00	3,07
M58	Consideration for environ. protection	3,00	3,17	3,00	4,00	0,00	4,00	0,00	4,00	4,00	4,00	0,00	0,00	2,50	3,20	2,49
	TOTAL AVERAGE	**3,49**	**2,84**	**1,64**	**3,47**	**3,52**	**3,31**	**1,45**	**3,43**	**3,34**	**2,40**	**2,73**	**2,77**	**2,69**	**2,83**	**2,85**

The overall project performance is deemed as good (overall score 2,85/4,00 which is higher than 2,51/4,00 – or "b"). Most of the projects have already implemented a good share of foreseen activities but still suffer in the field of demonstrating significant impact and sustainability prospects. A short analysis of the situation for each project follows hereafter:

Byzantium – Early Islam:

The project is still trying to finalise the consortium composition and there are some delays met with respect to the execution of the foreseen timetable. The project LFM is in bad shape but the Project Co-ordinators have made some good efforts to replace it with a new one. In general the Project Co-ordinators as well as the involved partners are capable organisations, committed to the production of concrete results. Project effectiveness is adequate –taking into consideration the delays initially met- but additional efforts should be put in order to catch up with the plan. The project has a strong scientific and training component, which is expected to attract participants from the recipient countries. Partners should make sure that the profile of the participants complies with the requirements set by the project.

Defence Systems:

Following a period of re-organisation, the project restarted in December 2004, with a strong commitment from the side of the co-ordinator and the partners to attain results in the short run. The project prospects remain good both from the impact and sustainability points of view, but partners still have a long way ahead, mainly including the time-consuming procurement of services. Attention is to be given on minimising any further delays. It has to be mentioned that the scores for this project refer to the assessment of its performance to date.

DELTA:

Delta is a complex endeavour in terms of size and concept. Partners have had many problems in understanding the scope and objectives of the project and eventually contributing to it. The project is in good track as per the implementation of activities. The co-ordinators do a professional and motivated work. They should though pay close attention to the current impact of the project, as it seems that their efforts are not really effective in achieving a broader effect.

Discover Islamic Art

The project builds on previous achievements of same partners in another EH I Programme Project, benefiting from a dynamic coordination and the past experience of joint work, but its design is formally poorly presented. One year after its kick-off (at the time of its monitoring in May 2005), the project seems to be on track, and its global network of partners and beneficiaries is being set up as planned.

Filières Innovantes:

This is a huge and over-ambitious project, which has had problems with the animation of local stakeholders. The prospects are not optimistic at all. Partners are making final effort to save the situation, which seems already doomed.

MEDIMUSES:

A very successful project, run by an experienced co-ordinator. The consortium is small and very flexible, comprising interested and committed partners. Focus should be put on the sustainability of partners' efforts.

Mediterranean Voices:

The project has experienced some delays with respect to the commencement of services. Currently the overall picture of the project is average to good. Partners should make sure that no more delays are met during implementation.

Navigation du Savoir:

A project suffering from serious administrative difficulties; it has never managed to overcome internal problems. The outcome so far is very limited and its prospects are not very optimistic. In fact it seems that the project will not manage to produce any more results, as most of the partners have totally lost visibility and faith.

Patrimoines Partagés:

This is a fairly nice project, implemented by an experienced co-ordinator. The project has demonstrated significant progress and good impact and sustainability prospects. In general it is considered as a successful case.

PRODECOM:

Despite some delays in partners' inputs and several administrative difficulties, the project is delivering good results and is characterised by adequate effectiveness. Impact and sustainability prospects remain good as well, rendering the project successful.

QANTARA:

The project is run by a capable co-ordinator but several steps should be taken, in order to improve the quality of its design and elaborate a concrete LFM that could serve as a tool for creating a common language among partners and increasing the understanding of the project objectives. Despite the awkwardly prepared LFM, it seems that partners share a common vision of the requirements, needs and scope of the project. At this stage, the activities take place as envisaged, within the foreseen time / cost frame. The recent adaptation of the contract duration may enhance the project's success prospects. Currently project effectiveness remains low, as the Project Portal is not yet operative. The operation of the Site will improve the promotion and the visibility of the project and ensure the reinforcement of its potential impact. In general the dissemination component of the project should be enhanced, as it constitutes a critical success factor.

REHABIMED

This project also builds on the achievements of a previous EH I Programme project (CORPUS) and has met initial difficulties in building up and consolidating the institutional partners' network due to certain political issues proper to south-south MEDA relations. Although it has been incepted as planned, its sustainability needs appropriate attention in order to render the project results accessible and applicable by final beneficiaries.

UNIMED:

It is a project of narrow focus on the methodological aspects of restoration. The project has put efforts to reinforce the effectiveness and efficiency of services but the outcome is still average. The complex technological and methodological aspects involved in the project have created difficulties with the partners, whose inputs are delivered with serious delays. The co-ordinators are committed and conscientious but should focus very much on the delivery of foreseen results. The project prospects of sustainability are rather low.

4.3. Performance of Projects over Time

As mentioned before, in 2005, a total of 14 projects of Euromed Heritage II and III have been monitored this year. The average performance at Programme level, as it results from the findings of the monitoring visits, is presented in the Table below, together with the respective average performance identified in 2004 by the Monitoring Team.

Table 8: Performance of projects over time

Criterion	2004	2005	All years
Number of Reports	10	18*	28
Quality of project design	2,91	2,70	2,80
Efficiency to date	2,70	2,95	2,82
Effectiveness to date	2,75	2,94	2,85
Impact Prospects	2,87	2,85	2,86
Sustainability	3,05	2,82	2,93
AVERAGE	**2,86**	**2,85**	**2,85**

* The total number of reports in 2005 is 18 including the monitoring note for the project "Navigation du Savoir", after the visit of the project partner in Malta.

4.4. Strong and Weak Points by Criterion in 2005

The strengths and the relative weaknesses of the monitored projects are presented in the Table below:

Table 9: Strong and weak points per main criterion and sub-criterion

Strong & Weak		P1: Defence Systems	P2: DELTA	P3: Filières innovantes	P4: RMSU	P5: Medimuses	P6: Mediterranean Voices	P7: Navigation du Savoir	P8: Partimoines Partagés	P8: PRODECO9	P10: UNIMED	P11: Byzantium	P12: Discover Islamic Art	P13: QANTARA	P14: REHABIMED	TOTAL
Project-visits		1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	18
Strongest	Main Criterion	M2	M2	M5	M3	M4	M4	M1 M2	M3	M3	M5	M1 M3 M4	M4	M2	M3	M2
	Sub-criterion	M21 M22 M23 M24	M23	M55 M58	M31 M33 M34	M41 M42	M23 M32 M42 M55 M56 M57 M58	M11 M12 M21 M22 M23 M24	M32 M33 M34	M31 M33 M34	M55 M58	M11 M12 M31 M32 M33 M34 M41	M32 M43	M24	M32 M41 M57	M23 M31 M55 M57
Weakest	Main Criterion	M5	M3	M2	M1	M5	M1	M3 M4	M1	M1	M4	M2	M1	M1	M5	M1
	Sub-criterion	M51 M53 M54 M55 M57 M58	M33 M34 M41	M21 M23	M12	M51	M11 M12	M31 M32 M33 M34 M41 M42 M43	M11 M12 M53	M11 M12	M12 M23 M24 M32 M33 M41 M53 M54	M21 M22 M23 M51 M54	M12 M33 M51 M52	M12 M16	M51 M55	M12 M42 M43 M51 M53 M56

4.5. Analysis per Country

The following section provides a country-specific outlook of the situation regarding the implementation of the Euromed Heritage Programme in the region. It also presents a synthetic view of MEDA partners as per their technical, financial and institutional capacity to support the proper implementation of project activities, maintain an adequate level of efficiency and effectiveness, promote the overall

project effect over the beneficiary areas and undertake the appropriate actions to secure its long-term viability.

It should be noted, without neglecting the importance of the national factor, that the key aspect affecting project performance is the capacity, experience and motivation of partner institutions, rather than their origin and/or the general political environment. It is possible, though, to identify specific recurring patterns, characterising partners originating in the same country, area or region, that tend to influence project implementation in a variety of occasions throughout the Euromed Heritage Programme. More specifically:

Algeria

Bearing a highly important cultural background, Algeria constitutes a valuable partner, participating in the majority of the Euromed Heritage projects. Unfortunately, the country -followed by the other two Maghreb states- meets specific problems in securing its smooth participation in the projects, mainly due to a number of administrative difficulties, including the absence of a flexible accounting mechanism that could secure proper reimbursement of funds and maintain an essential level of regular cash-flow to project partners. Following the recent devastating earthquake (May 2003) near Algiers, the country has faced difficulties in complying with contractual responsibilities in several projects within the Euromed Cultural Heritage Programme.

The main problems, faced by Algerian partners are:

1. **Administrative difficulties**: Algerian partners meet difficulties in securing their envisaged budget as all funding is/should be controlled by the National Treasury. In several cases partners have revealed complications relating to the reimbursement of common project costs such as flights, accommodation and per-diems. In all cases partners are seeking ways to bypass obstacles by fashioning tailor-made solutions, not always successful. As funding becomes essential for keeping partners working on the project, the Algerian case should be dealt with in the near future. Affected projects (so far): Serious problems with **Navigation du Savoir,** some problems with **Patrimoines Partagés**, **Defence Systems**, **DELTA, UNIMED & Filières Innovantes**).

2. **Organisational Problems**: Most of the Algerian project-components are implemented with the patronage of a respective high-level authority, the Ministry of Culture and Communications. Although high-level involvement is rather limited concerning technical tasks, it might prove intensive as per the organisational and administrative project arrangements. In principle the Ministry would acquire a decisive role on project issues, without deeply entering into real implementation needs. This provides national representatives with significant authority but affects project efforts in the technical field. This seems to be a key philosophy, opting for the reinforcement of national representation instead of participation. Affected projects (so far): **All**.

3. **Technical problems**: in several cases Algerian partners are not able to avail themselves of conventional IT tools, such as desktop PCs and Internet. Access to Internet is somehow restricted to public servants, rendering the simplest type of communication (e-mail) a hard task. This has significantly influenced the effectiveness of projects, based on the creation of portals and respective IT applications. Affected projects (so far): Significant problems with **DELTA, UNIMED** and **Navigation du Savoir**; Some problems with **Defence Systems**.

4. **Other Issues**:

   - Language barriers – Algerian partners are strongly in favour of using French as a working language. In the case of English-speaking co-ordinators, Algerians meet significant difficulties even in understanding the concept of the project, interpret contractual terms and clarify administrative responsibilities.

   - Visa problems – As many other Arab partners, Algerians find sometimes hard to acquire visas, without a prior notice of at least 30 days.

   Affected projects (so far): **All**.

Cyprus

Cyprus, no more a MEDA partner, has a fair involvement in Euromed Heritage Programme, participating in four projects. In general Cyprus' representatives do not meet any significant problems with respect to their participation to the projects and the execution of their foreseen tasks. Partners in Cyprus are in general characterised by adequate capacity, good organisational structures and administrative arrangements. They are fluent in English and computer skills and quite experienced

with EU procedures and regulations. In principle the projects implemented in Cyprus can be considered as successful, with the exception of **Navigation du Savoir**, for which partners in Cyprus have had serious cash flow problems and a general dispute with project co-ordinators over their budget share.

Egypt

Egypt has been one of the most unpredictable MEDA partners. Project performance in Egypt is highly affected by the capacity of the involved partner. In several cases Egypt's participation remains fair **(UNIMED, Filières Innovantes**). In general Egyptian partners appear committed and devoted to their projects, working quietly, without inducing serious problems to the consortiums. Despite some technical problems met during project implementation (lack of respective IT infrastructure), Egyptian partners manage to sustain an adequate quality level of the projects they are involved in.

Israel

The country is cautiously participating in a small number of projects, generally involving "neutral" MEDA partners such as Turkey, Malta, Cyprus and Maghreb countries. Their involvement is in general professional and is characterised by commitment, good organisation and adequate technical skills. There are no problems met with their participation in any of the projects. On the contrary, they have demonstrated very good samples of work, especially in the case of **Temper**, due to the effective collaboration of local partners.

Jordan

Jordan appears as a modest project partner, not so much in terms of effectiveness but rather in terms of networking and overall presence in the Euromed Heritage Programme. Indeed, although Jordanian partners have always been very capable of carrying out their role in the framework of MEDA projects, they seem quite reluctant (or unsuccessful?) in extending their participation in other projects throughout the Region. Jordanian partners mostly rely on existing partnerships in order to enter new consortia; they are in general very motivated, committed and easy-going consortium members. They demonstrate considerable interest in the projects, especially in training & dissemination activities, as they are in favour of involving university partners. Their administrative and organisational capacity is adequate but there are cases (e.g. **PRODECOM**) in which Jordanian partners have had some co-operation problems with the rest of the consortium.

Lebanon

There are no serious problems related to the execution of projects in Lebanon, but there are no success stories either. Lebanon is modestly participating in the projects without inducing any major problems, risks or delays to the projects' work-schedule. Following a fragile in-country balance among ethnic/political parties, Lebanese partners have had some problems in forming strong administrative structures. At some point they faced organisational problems, especially related to the involvement of high-level authorities in the projects. This is not just the case with Euromed Heritage projects, but with other programmes as well. Visa difficulties have also been experienced for Lebanese partners for their travel abroad.

Malta

This new EU member state is a case quite similar to Cyprus: a small but rather significant partner, in terms of cultural richness, Malta constitutes an effective partner, especially taking into consideration the size and location of the country. In some cases Malta has demonstrated very efficient project partners, but has as well been charged with two unsuccessful stories, **IKONOS** and **Navigation du Savoir**, in which Maltese partners have been the co-ordinating authority.

Morocco

This country is very close to Algeria, both in terms of spatial proximity and troubled project participation. Morocco has been participating, as did Algeria, in almost all projects. Almost all the problems faced by their neighbours are also common for the partners from Morocco; in several cases partners from Morocco have demonstrated a significant reluctance to carry out their tasks, posing several risks to the implementation of the projects themselves. Indicative examples: **Defence Systems**, where the consortium has had serious co-operation problems with the Moroccan representative as well as **DELTA** and especially **UNIMED**, where Moroccan input has been rather limited.

Palestinian Authority

Through an era of turmoil, Palestine is participating in the Euromed Heritage programme with an honest interest and admirable commitment to their projects. Although no major events have been taking place in the territories, Palestine representatives prove very active and efficient with respect to carrying out their foreseen tasks.

Syria

The country is trying to prove itself as a capable partner of the MEDA co-operation and -in most cases- their efforts are successful. In general Syrian partners have never had serious problems with respect to their participation in the projects. In most cases their participation remains at an adequate level, mostly representing an average performance (not too good, nor too bad). No major issues have been identified so far for Syria.

Tunisia

Tunisia has been facing the already mentioned Maghreb problems but at a milder degree. The general comment for Tunisia is that they demonstrate a rather passive approach concerning their commitment, pro-activity and motivation in the projects. Tunisian partners would be expected to be more active and constructive within the consortiums. Their participation in **Navigation du Savoir** has been quite deceiving and in **UNIMED** and **Patrimoines Partagés** it has been quite limited. The limited Internet access in this country remains a serious problem.

Turkey

The country is adequately represented in the Programme, participating in almost half of the implemented projects. There are no specific issues or critical problems reported with respect to the involvement of Turkish partners so far. In general they are characterised by adequate capacity and administrative flexibility. The majority of partners, including high-level representatives as well as technical and administrative staff are fluent in English and well acquainted with EU regulations and procedures.

The following Table summarises the situation of projects in the various countries, as illustrated through the monitoring activity:

Table 10: Situation of projects in various MED countries

Country	P1: Defence Systems	P2: DELTA	P3: Filières innovantes	P4: RMSU	P5: Medimuses	P6: Medit. Voices	P7: Navigation du Savoir	P8: Partimoines Partagés	P9: PRODECOM	P10: UNIMED	P11: Byzantium	P12: Discover Islamic Art	P13: QANTARA	P14: RehabiMed
Algeria	☺	☹	☺				☹	☺		☺				
Cyprus					☺		☹							
Egypt			☺							☺				
Israel														
Jordan					☺				☺					
Lebanon					☺									
Malta						☺	☹							
Morocco	☺	☺								☹			☺	☺
Palest. Authority														
Syria														
Tunisia			☺				☹	☺		☺				
Turkey					☺									

Key: ☺ Good, ☺ Room for Improvement, ☹ Problems

4.6. Analysis per Type of Partner

Euromed Heritage projects have already attracted a large number of multi-disciplinary partners, spanning a wide spectrum of technical, administrative, financial and scientific capacities. Partners are mainly falling under the following generic categories:

- National Authorities

- Universities

- Public Sector Institutions

- NGOs

- Private Sector entities

Depending on the scientific, technical and business project context, the involvement, motivation and effectiveness of each partner type may vary significantly, also depending on the capacity of each individual partner institution.

An analysis is provided below of the performance and attitude of each partner type group, as observed through the monitoring of the implementation of the EU-MED Cultural Heritage projects.

National Authorities

Ministries and Municipal Services are the main National representatives involved in the Euromed Heritage Programme. In almost all cases the Ministry of Culture / Tourism / Communications is the higher-level representative of each partner country. Their presence and support in a project is always essential, especially for facilitating procedures that could otherwise consume a large amount of time and effort to implement. In most of the cases National Authorities are not directly involved in the execution of technical tasks but rather undertake administrative & organisational roles. The main theme of participation is to carefully represent the country by assigning the right people to the right place and securing that all resources are made available to the project. In general they have considerable capacity (advanced IT infrastructure, skilful personnel, administrative efficiency), especially compared to other Public Sector Institutions, as well as a prestigious institutional "weight", but clearly lack motivation and enthusiasm. Public servants, following a long-lasting corporate culture, are rarely interested in being efficient of effective in what concerns the projects-related tasks. The only exceptions include staff members driven by personal interest or motivation, with a view to obtaining a higher status or rank as a result of their participation in the project. There are cases where the involvement of a high level authority (Jordan, Palestine and Turkey are indicative examples) can be beneficial to the project. In extreme cases though, the paternalistic attitude of this type of Partners towards the rest of national partners may distract project focus by promoting political priorities, in lieu of technical / scientific needs.

Universities

Maybe the most valuable partners for a project of technical nature, Universities are centres of excellence for a variety of occasions. Their capacity is normally quite high and staff skills very advanced. In most cases they possess a significant volume of knowledge critical to the project. University members are rich in resources, efficient, effective, knowledgeable and motivated. In general they are well aware of EC procedures and have the administrative capacity to carry out project tasks. As they usually constitute a most-wanted partner for the majority of projects, the involvement of universities also bears a number of drawbacks. Due to their strong academic focus, universities are not really able to provide the project with adequate practical expertise and tackle real life problems. In several cases the approaches followed by university partners are somehow "classroom-oriented" without the scent and brunt of an experienced market partner. Universities are easy to approach, motivate and co-operate with, but their participation should be moderated by the equal presence of experienced business partners, when applicable.

Public Sector Institutions

Public sector institutions include state controlled National Tourism Organisations, Museums, Conservatoires, Chambers of Commerce, Port Authorities and other bodies directly or indirectly involved in the tourism / culture sector. This type of Institutions has sometimes demonstrated a considerable commitment and efficiency during their participation in the Euromed Cultural Heritage Programme. In most cases the personnel is experienced, conscientious and open to new knowledge, with a strong will to learn and benefit from their participation to the project. Their work and the professional skills of their staff allow them to be in general efficient, effective and good team players. One of the issues worth mentioning in relation to their participation in the Programme is a frequent turnover of staff, something common in the MEDA region, which sometimes undermines the capacity building efforts of the projects and dilutes the knowledge and experience gained throughout their implementation.

NGOs

The involvement of NGOs in projects has rather controversial effects. In a variety of occasions NGOs, based on their experience and strong networking in the region, are able to provide and secure the necessary level of co-operation and visibility of project efforts in the beneficiary area.

NGOs are ideal for motivating local stakeholders, promoting the project and effectively dealing with local populations. A potential risk in NGOs participation is the limited administrative capacity and means, the lack of experience in project management and the emotional / theoretical approach to existing needs. This may result in a poorly organised project, with sometimes ill-defined scope and objectives. It is therefore essential that NGOs efforts be combined with the knowledge and managerial experience of other types of partners (either private or public).

Private Sector entities

The private sector constitutes, most of the times, the driving force behind the EU-MED Programme. Independent firms and consulting companies are usually able to conceive, design and execute projects of original concept and good quality. Private sector entities have the required resources and experience to carry out all steps included in the typical PCM approach. In almost all cases they have the required administrative capacity and experience to smoothly run EC projects without major deficiencies. Unlike all other partners, though, private entities are mostly driven by a purely business instinct, usually putting the overall usefulness and sustainability of efforts at lower priority. One of the key issues, frequently met in projects run by private entities, is their limited sustainability prospects and the rapid devaluation of their benefits. Private firms normally focus on short-term benefits, usually involving the capitalisation of project momentum mainly within its life cycle. This calls for a broad participation of public institutions and stakeholders during the project design phase, so that the project vision remains high and long-term effects to the targeted populations are secured.

5. SPECIAL ISSUES

5.1. Deconcentration

The deconcentration of the Regional Programmes has not affected yet the Euromed Heritage Programmes, which are still managed by the AIDCO in Brussels.

5.2. Follow up on Recommendations

Recommendations to project partners are included in the Monitoring Report and directly given, in more detail, during the Monitoring Mission. There are numerous points on which a Monitor can focus, remark or comment. Based on the PCM principles and the relevant monitoring templates, the monitor has a large arsenal of assessment criteria at his/her disposal, from which he/she formulates his/her questions and eventual recommendations. Monitors' comments cover the five broad criteria for each project (design / efficiency / effectiveness / impact / sustainability), but are also aimed towards specific emerging project issues. The majority of recommendations aimed at the co-ordinators, falls into the following broad categories:

- Comments on project Design (LFM / Organisation / Structure);

- Comments concerning general implementation issues, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact (quality of deliverables / outcome, partner's input, delays, etc.);

- Comments on the Sustainability prospects;

- Comments on ad-hoc issues (funding problems / replacement of partners / administrative difficulties / equipment procurement / preparation of riders, etc.).

As most of the recommendations are aimed towards critical project issues, the majority of them are being adopted either directly or indirectly, as a result of a relevant notice of the Task Manager. In most of the cases the comment given by the Monitors confirms and even reveals project issues that may pose risks in the near future and undermine success. In critical cases, recommendations are rapidly filtered by respective EC services and reach the project co-ordinator in order to take the required actions. Indicative examples of recommendations made by the Monitors on Cultural Heritage projects that have been adopted and applied is provided below:

Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts – The project has been re-designed and restarted in December 2004, following EC concerns and respective recommendations from the Monitor's side in previous Monitoring Reports.

Delta – Responding to a request form the EC services, following a recommendation of the Monitors, the co-ordinators strengthened their strategy for the implementation of the Pilot Projects and undertook a serious effort to manage the content of the Project Portal, in an attempt to secure the achievement of the project's broader impact.

Filières innovantes – Access to the restricted project area of the website has been granted to concerned monitoring bodies, following a respective request from the Monitor's side.

Patrimoines Partagés – A Logical Framework Matrix has been elaborated for the project, following the Monitors' remarks during the previous reporting periods.

PRODECOM – Project design has been significantly improved as a result of relevant comments for the elaboration of a correct LFM.

UNIMED – Efforts have been made by the co-ordinators to elaborate an LFM for the project. The matrix has been discussed in extent during the latest monitoring mission.

All projects – The EC services have provided assistance to partners meeting administrative difficulties, following respective recommendations of the Monitoring Team. Specific guidelines / templates and explanations have been given, in order to facilitate partners' efforts to comply with EC rules.

In several cases recommendations not concerned with critical project issues are not given adequate attention or -although adopted- are never applied. This is usually the case with comments related to the quality and design of the project, the structure of intervention logic, the elaboration of OVIs, assumptions, etc. Co-ordinators sometimes appear reluctant –or unable- to elaborate a new structure or at least prepare an LFM in a correct form. In general, recommendations concerning modifications to the original project description (new LFM, updated list of deliverables, new Gantt chart, etc) are usually neglected. This is mostly because partners do not feel the urgency of such a demand, thus perceiving post-design issues as of secondary importance, since apparently they do not link these issues to the successful implementation of the projects.

Finally there are cases where Monitors' recommendations were adopted but never applied, for various reasons, leading to poor project outcomes. This refers to the case of **IKONOS** and **Navigation du Savoir**. In both projects the monitors urged the co-ordinators to undertake actions in order to prevent projects from failing, including the reinforcement of their administrative structures, improvement of inputs and compliance to EC regulations. The projects failed to respond to the issues risen by both the EC services and the Monitors and were gradually led to a deadlock.

Co-ordinators usually claim not having received any notification on the Monitor's recommendations. It seems that it would be beneficial for them to officially receive at least an abstract of the final section of the Monitoring Report (Section V – Key Observations) to the extent they are concerned, or equally to receive detailed instructions for action to be taken, based on the Monitors recommendations that are adopted by the EC. This would:

- Provide them with a chance to respond to the Monitor's comments and present their own view on emerging project issues;

- Render them accountable for any pending/unresolved issues potentially identified during the following monitoring visits;

- Secure that all parties (EC, Co-ordinators and Monitoring Team) share the same amount of knowledge and concerns about demanding project issues.

5.3. Logical Framework Approach

The Euromed Heritage Programme has attracted the interest of a large number of players acting in the Culture Sector. The priorities addressed by the projects are genuine and interesting, covering a large thematic area from cultural tourism to art, to war, to history (past and present). These endeavours constitute "soft" approaches, involving various key players active in respective cultural sectors of the MEDA region. Most of the projects have been originally conceived during -or before- 2001, when most of the prospective contractors were apparently not well familiar with the PCM methodology. Setting up a project of such a size, scope and objectives could be a hard and demanding work, especially for those organisations with no prior experience on the PCM principles.

Most of the projects face design problems at various degrees. In general, project co-ordinators have had considerable problems in organising their thoughts in a structured & clear fashion so as to elaborate a correct LFM for their project. Ill-defined project structures are directly reflected to the projects' LFMs, which are either non-existent or poorly elaborated. The following problems are common to almost all Euromed Heritage Projects:

1. **Problems in the Intervention Logic**

   a. **Over-ambitious project scope**: Project partners are usually lured in preparing impressive project proposals, in an attempt to improve their chances of having their project approved. Exaggerations and over worn adjectives are common, even in the description of conventional methods or technologies. In several cases partners present a Project Purpose rather impossible to reach, while their real aims correspond to a milder and much more tangible outcome.

   b. **Unclear Objectives**: A common problem, also met in various approaches. Mostly because of their cultural origin, partners are usually having problems in clearly specifying the goals, means and requirements for their project. Their strategy remains hidden between the lines and intervention logic is loose and segmental. As a result, the project description annexed

to the contract sometimes becomes a sum of trivial phraseology, enriched with verbose expressions, vague objectives and not clearly justified goals. It would be worth considering to request partners to be very careful and specific when elaborating the project description, bearing in mind that this is an official technical document, part of a contract to be implemented.

c. **Mixing concept with detail / mixing levels**: Another common issue, met in projects with basic LFM (Logical Framework Matrix) organisation: In several cases partners mix the objectives with the tools / methods required to achieve them, thus confusing the levels of the intervention logic. A typical example is the formulation of the project purpose as a sum of results; another is the activities appearing as main results. The origins of such problems lie in the misunderstandings concerned with the elaboration of the *Problem Tree* and eventually the *Objectives Tree*. It seems that partners rarely bother to follow the steps of the analysis phase of the LFA (Logical Framework Approach). Instead, they rapidly design the project, based either on a real problem or on intuition, and then try to fit an LFM to these plans. It is the Monitors' opinion that everyone involved in the preparation of proposals should be rendered well acquainted with the PCM / LFA principles, as soon as possible.

d. **Low cohesion**: In some cases, even after the elaboration of the key elements of the intervention logic, the overall approach remains loose without a clear path leading from one level to the other. This again has to do with a partially (or wrongly) defined *Objectives Tree,* which eventually leads to a poorly defined strategy. Partners should make sure that the elements found on each level of the intervention logic suffice for the achievement of the following ones.

e. **Incomplete list of Activities**: In several cases partners omit to elaborate a comprehensive work-breakdown structure (WBS). In other cases, the list of activities presented in the LFM is incomplete. Although the LFM is not supposed to include a comprehensive list of tasks, partners should be very cautious when preparing the WBS. A proper definition of means and costs should be provided, in a clear and straightforward manner, either in the LFM or in the Project Description, annexed to the contract.

2. **Problems with Objectively Verified Indicators (OVIs) and Sources of Verifications (SOVs)**

   a. **OVIs**: In most cases, OVIs constitute one of the hardest things to conceive and elaborate. More than 90% of the OVIs appearing in the projects' LFMs are not S.M.A.R.T (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound). In fact they are not even *indicators*, in a mathematical sense. Partners are very unclear on when, where or how to use an indicator. In most cases an *activity* or *result* is being used as indicator, deprived of any quantitative (numerical) substance. The use of correct OVIs is absolutely essential for the monitoring & evaluation of a project. Partners should be encouraged to use properly elaborated OVIs and should be strictly advised to have a thorough study of the PCM Handbook on the subject.

   b. **SOVs:** The notion of the SOVs is easily understood by partners, but combined with a wrong OVI it is usually leading to a totally false statement. In some cases partners provide a vague description of potential sources (e.g. Seminars or Reports) without specifying any further details on the timeframe, availability, frequency or requirements for obtaining data.

3. **Problems with Assumptions:**

   Assumptions are meant to be decisive external conditions for securing achievements between consecutive levels of the intervention logic. In several cases partners seem to disregard their importance; they use inconsistent, unrelated or too broad assumptions, not really corresponding to real life conditions. Moreover assumptions are often repeated, with minor changes, in all four levels of the matrix, revealing a simplistic approach to the problem by the partner's side. Another problem with Assumptions is the confusion between external and internal risk factors. Sometimes partners do not really distinguish between the risks posed by the external environment and the ones falling within their control, therefore presenting them together.

In general the LFM has still not acquired the instrumental role for planning and managing projects, as it is supposed to. The majority of projects have poorly elaborated LFMs, mostly corresponding to a draft retrospective view of the project strategy.

TEMPER and **DELTA** can be considered as projects with an adequately defined Intervention Logic and properly elaborated LFM. Although partners do not seem to use the matrix for managing the day-by-day implementation of the projects, the quality of the LFM is well above average.

In other cases there is an LFM, which is more or less appropriate but <u>is not used as a project management tool</u>. In these projects, partners should improve the existing LFM and rely more on its use for the efficient management of project activities. This concerns the following projects: **Filières Innovantes, Defence Systems, Medimuses, Patrimoines Partagés, PRODECOM, UNIMED.**

There are also cases in which partners did not elaborate any LFM or the LFM was not appropriate. These include: **Navigation du Savoir** and **Mediterranean Voices**. For the latter, the lack of an LFM has not affected the execution of the project.

As a concluding remark, it would be worth considering to urge the partners to further familiarise themselves with the PCM principles and to get well acquainted with the LFA methodology. Proper training, when possible, could clarify all unclear issues, especially with respect to the elaboration of the Objectives Tree and the selection of OVIs.

6. SUCCESS STORY

A number of projects have received, in 2005, only "a" and "b" scores; they can thus be considered as successes. However, no overall success story in the real sense has been identified to date in 2005, such as could constitute an example of "best practice".

However, in 2004, the project Euromed Heritage II: TEMPER, which was not monitored this year, was an example of good practice.

6.1. Background

The project is part of the Regional Programme Euromed Heritage II, which was designed in line with the Barcelona Process in the area of Culture. TEMPER has been designed very professionally, based on a very appropriate Logframe. It represents an original and innovative approach to the prehistoric cultural heritage in the Mediterranean basin, as a joint cultural legacy of the different Mediterranean countries and nations.

6.2. Reasons of Success

The followings are the reasons of the success:

- Simple design: the planned implementation is clearly programmed and, thanks to its structure, there is a sound basis for achievement of foreseen results; significant feedback was timely provided by the partners and relevant experts on the project's design.

- Involvement of a relatively small number of partner countries (four plus the coordinator).

- Highly efficient management, keeping the project Inputs and Activities on time and at planned cost; there are no deviations from the original plans, and the results are of high quality. Furthermore, very successful handling of all issues related to the Steering Committees and the internal organisation of the project.

- Adequate institutional support and support by the public sector; efficient development of the project's network of partnership relations in the study area, by elaborating the site management plans and the needed community-driven development approach.

- Access of all planned beneficiaries to the project results; Israel: official interest is high, the conservation policy for cultural heritage in the country is being revised, including pre-history issues and taking in consideration the results of the project as they are being delivered. Turkey: 4 educational books have already been published -including findings and results of the project- and are used in schools; the training programme is revisited so as to include pre-history issues as well; the Project Co-ordinator runs a parallel project on the same site in Turkey and this enhances the impact of the results achieved so far. Malta: the educational programme has been developed. Greece: general public awareness on the pre-history issues of all involved actors has been raised.

- Good relations with similar or similarly-scoped projects, implemented by the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and GETTY, as well as exchange of ideas, data and research results so as to promote the common ground of increasing awareness and knowledge of pre-historic sites and their value in common cultural heritage.

- Implementation of the project by national experts, so that the project is fully embedded in the local structures, through the process undertaken in the frame of the development of the local partnership platform and of the preparation of meetings with the stakeholders.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Overall Conclusions on Euromed Heritage Programme, as Implemented

The Cultural Heritage Programme is a multidisciplinary endeavour, bringing together various actors, holding key roles in the cultural sector of the MEDA region. Most of its interventions are soft approaches, seeking to identify common cultural elements along the basin, in numerous sectors of human activity: art, urban development, tourism, war on land and sea, past and present.

Prepared and run by entities activated in the cultural field, the projects bear all the advantages (originality, value, importance) and drawbacks (ambiguity, lack of technical precision, subjectivity, over-optimism) met in similar endeavours.

This section summarises key issues met and identified during the implementation of the projects:

▪ **Design / Implementation Ambiguities**

One of the most common issues, met almost in all projects, is the absence (partial or complete) of a concrete and structured description of the projects' technical context. In most cases partners have failed to express their objectives, purpose and plan of work in purely technical terms, as indicated in the LFA methodology. Instead, the Logframes present a vague picture of the project and a simplified version of the work-packages, without linking results to any detailed and justified list of activities (work-breakdown structure). Project descriptions, as annexed to the contracts, are usually dotted with trivial and/or verbose expressions, driving attention away from critical information. Useful detail is sometimes lost within generalisations, together with other valuable technical information.

Design faults are directly reflected in the projects Logframes, which, sometimes, does not directly correspond to what is written in the project description. The quality of the LFM is, in most of the cases, average to low. Partners seem to reverse the Project Design Cycle by elaborating the LFM at the end. Apparently they are not yet persuaded of the value of the LFA methodology as a planning and management tool. The lack of OVIs in a correct form complicates things even further. Partners rarely include meaningful OVIs in their LFM. In the majority of cases (above 95%) OVIs are not S.M.A.R.T. and have no real value to the Monitoring function. This, combined with the fact that partners rarely quantify the envisaged outcome, creates serious difficulties in assessing progress and effectiveness in projects and allows for flexible downsizing of goals or partners' obligations.

Attention should be also drawn to the fact that partners usually overlook the importance of elaborating (or of presenting existing ones?) critical management tools, such as:

1. Detailed list of activities (Action Plan)

2. Detailed list of deliverables (Connected to the Action Plan)

3. A respective network diagram (Gantt chart)

These tools are not only complementary to each other for a proper design framework, but also essential for day-by-day management and control of the project. Partners usually present a simplified tabular version of the project design, including some major milestones, outcomes and tentative deadlines. This form of presentation does not suffice for managing the project and is not compatible with the LFA / PCM methodology. LFA clearly states that during the *Design Phase* partners should prepare a complete work breakdown structure, a resource plan and a budget, clearly connected to the elaboration of the LFM.

As a result, monitoring of activities during implementation becomes quite hard, as the goals and expected outcome are not clear in quantified terms. In some cases this may allow partners to downsize original project expectations, despite the over-ambitious description of project objectives, and deliver an outcome of lower quality and value. A typical example of this is the notion of "cataloguing" of cultural artefacts / structures and the creation of respective databases. In almost all cases partners have never provided a clear idea on what *cataloguing* actually means, in terms of quantity, variety, origin, level of detail, etc.

Pilot Projects are another sore case and an indicative example of ill-defined project design. In several projects, partners have included in their Action Plans a number of demonstrative actions, the so-called

Pilot Projects (PAs). Of course PAs have been included in the budget lines, based on the assumption that they are well defined and will be executed as planned. Unfortunately very few, if any, of these projects have ever been presented in the Technical Annexes. Partners present a draft idea of their objectives and possible areas of intervention. Their exact scope, technical details, target groups and deadlines are not really illustrated even at project inception phase. In the case of failure (e.g. PAs not being implemented) it is very difficult to cope with the situation, i.e. what has been lost, how project value has been affected, what sort of budget should be reshuffled, etc.

- **Originality versus Replication**

In most cases the Cultural Heritage projects have an original objective, setting interesting thematic priorities in the cultural sector of concerned areas. Their approach, though, is sometimes characterised by lack of innovation and adherence to conventional tools and methods. The replication of ideas in projects, irrespectively of their thematic area (e.g. development of Portals, creation of Catalogues, Databases, Creation of associations, etc.) leaves room for effective horizontal co-operations and clustering activities and should be examined in the near future as a means of minimizing duplication of efforts and increasing project effectiveness and efficiency. It is a pity that almost all projects have spent resources on developing IT tools (portals) and building respective capacity, while this could have been done centrally, by a single co-ordinator, using a common logo, template and interface for all Cultural Heritage projects. Cataloguing is another field of possible co-operations. Although the theme may vary from project to project (structures, artefacts, music, etc), the underlying idea remains the same. Partners' work would have been much more efficient if done under a participatory scheme, bringing projects of similar interest together and exploiting previous good practices and technologies.

Replications also appear not only in the methodological approach or the use of technology but in the project context as well: **PRODECOM** and **Filières Innovantes** could be seen as exploring overlapping areas of traditional artistic sectors. Participating countries are also common for the two projects. **Defence Systems** and **Navigation du Savoir** are also on the same path with the latter being more sea-oriented.

Such cases could also be examined for potential clustering activities, in order to increase their efficiency, reinforce synergies and maximize expected project impact.

- **Project Footprint and Impact**

The expected project Impact is affected by a combination of multiple parameters. Proper design, commitment and enthusiastic implementation are two decisive factors. Impact is somehow connected to targeted project footprint, the initially designed project impact area. There are cases in which projects have had a narrow focus on the cultural landscape, addressing issues of exclusive interest or complicated technical concept, not really reaching the broad public (**DELTA, UNIMED, Mediterranean Voices**). Others have been extremely generalized, overextended and vague, therefore losing focus among the public (**Filières Innovantes**). There were also cases (**Navigation du Savoir**) which could have very well attracted the interest of stakeholders but eventually failed to do so for various reasons, as analysed in the Monitoring Reports. Of course there are projects with a "normal" impact so far and, apparently, some successful cases (**Medimuses**) running smoothly up to now.

Impact, as mentioned before, is also a matter of implementation, motivation and commitment. In this respect we should seek whether the project partners have actually put all efforts to achieve the foreseen project purpose and whether they managed to contribute to the achievement of the projects' overall objectives. A close look at the intervention logic of the projects reveals a rather unhappy situation. In most cases partners have exaggerated with respect to the expected magnitude and impact of their endeavours. Therefore one should try to interpret the statements into something more tangible and realistic and on this basis assess the situation concerning project impact. In this respect:

- The projects that seem to have good chances in reaching good levels of impact are: **Defence Systems**, **Medimuses**, **Patrimoines Partagés** and **PRODECOM**. **DELTA** is about to gain some momentum towards this direction, as well.

- Projects that require some more detailed work with respect to maximizing their potential impact are: **Mediterranean Voices** and **Islamic Art**.

- **UNIMED** and **Filières Innovantes** are putting very sincere efforts to enhance their overall effect but require much more work in order to present a persuasive outcome.

- Finally, **Navigation du savoir** has had all the potential to become a success story but several administrative difficulties prevented it from crossing the line.

▪ **Sustainability Prospects**

Project partners seem to have focused too much on capitalising short-term project results, having totally forgotten about the sustainability of their efforts. In many cases the projects have not presented –at least to date- any complete plan (a sort of Business plan) indicating *who* and *how* will take over after the project completion. A number of issues are currently open:

- What are the costs required for maintaining project momentum?

- What happens to the project Internet portals? Who maintains them and updates their content?

- What does the project leave behind? Which are the institutional structures created by the project?

All these questions should be answered as soon as possible and anyway before project completion, or the projects should state that further work is required (e.g. through a follow-up project) to achieve adequate sustainability. It would be worth considering the idea of the projects preparing a Phase-Out Strategy, comprising a sustainability plan explaining (with figures and numbers) how they have planned to secure the sustainability of project results.

▪ **Usefulness – Value / Money**

The question of the usefulness and the value-for-money rate of the projects is essential. In this sense, the budgets requested versus the results and impact achieved so far should be carefully considered. The overall picture of the programme at the level of analysis allowed by the monitoring work is not very satisfactory, but this is something expected for projects of similar scope and objectives.

Considering the overall outcome produced so far, the cost of the projects seems rather high. In some cases the only tangible results include a Project Internet portal, some training activities and a series of guidelines, based on partners' inputs, of average quality. Partners in general have not presented a persuasive list of achievements and the proof of a robust technical work, to justify the money spent on the project. Project portals are of good quality but their development, anyhow, has already become extremely easy thanks to the open source era. Training and dissemination activities are usually addressed to small audiences, of limited expertise or motivation. Evaluation sheets are rare and the same applies for the training reports. The technical reports are in many cases of medium quality and, most often, they constitute a "patching" of partners' inputs, not a synthesis of these. A 3 Mio € project creates high expectations, for impressive IT systems, exceptional technical reports and massive & intense training on innovative technologies, even if taking into account the real, existing difficulties of the projects' implementation environment. It seems that partners should further reinforce their efforts to reach an even better level of technical excellence.

Of course there are exceptions to the above, mostly in the cases where co-ordination is carried out by experienced (external) firms and the number of project partners remains low.

7.2. Lessons Learnt

The experience gained through the monitoring of the Programme has shown the following:

▪ **Proper design is key to success**. Partners should abide by the principles of LFA with no exception. A careful consideration of requirements, risks and costs should be made before going on with the project. Project description should be short and clear and supported by project management tools (Gantt charts, List of deliverables, Deadlines).

▪ **Efficient management for effective operations**. The consortia led by experienced co-ordinators are more likely to succeed: "experienced" not in the cultural sector (which seems mandatory anyway), but in the PCM principles. This is no conventional wisdom: in most of the success cases

of the Programme, leadership has been assumed by partners with both technical and managerial skills.

- **Flexible structures**. Large consortia are bound to enter into administrative trouble. The number of partners should be kept as small as possible, always securing the participation of entities with complementary skills and capacities. Pre-existing synergies may also prove effective for future endeavours. Such schemes could use inputs of specialised –local- experts or entities as and when appropriate.

- **Clustering for efficiency**. A single contractor could have saved the Programme from spending resources for individual creation of Internet portals. Nowadays the implementation of such a tool is cheap and easy. With the same amount of resources, one experienced institution could have created an awesome and seamless application for all the Programme's projects, bearing not only the logo of the Euromed Heritage Programme but a full set of distinctive and unique characteristics, rendering it a powerful Cultural Forum. Each partner could then add his own elements, based on the work plan foreseen in his project.

- **Plan with the end in mind**. Sustainability is one of the first things to be considered. Partners should elaborate a concrete plan for making operations viable long after the completion of the project.

- **Administrative Traps**. Many projects have suffered fatal problems, related to unforeseen administrative difficulties stemming from the need to apply EC rules & regulations. Clear instructions should be given by the coordinators to all involved partners at an early stage, before it is too late for the project.

7.3.   Recommendations

Following the above analysis, the following recommendations are presented for the consideration of the relevant EC Services:

1. Projects should be asked to submit a correct Project Description. The text should be simple, short and clear, avoiding verbose expressions. It should include among others:

    a. A properly elaborated LFM, based on the PCM principles, including meaningful OVIs.

    b. Complete and detailed list of activities / work-break down structure, as indicated in the LFA methodology.

    c. Complete list of deliverables, not only major outcomes.

    d. Gantt chart or any other network diagram, depicting the relations between tasks and respective deadlines.

    Partners should be strongly advised to explicitly clarify and quantify the project outcome, in terms of scope, form, time, cost and quality. Especially in the cultural field any vagueness in the description of expected results may lead into uncontrolled reductions of the project's added value.

2. Further guidance should be given to partners in order to improve the quality of reporting. In their technical reports, progress should be clearly specified, not only in tabular form; it should be self-assessed against the detailed plan of activities that has been prepared by the project. Partners are also advised to fully respect their contractual obligations concerning Reporting.

3. Projects should be asked to prepare a number of important Plans including:

    a. A "Phase-Out Strategy" explaining their strategy for securing project sustainability. The strategy could be based on tailor-made or standard business plan templates easy to be found in literature;

    b. A "Dissemination Plan", explaining how and when they plan to promote the project in the concerned areas.

    In all cases partners should be given templates, in order to secure homogeneous and proper preparation of Technical Documents.

4. Partners should always receive an abstract of the Monitor's recommendations addressed to them. This way they are given the opportunity to respond to the Monitor's comments but also be accountable for non-taking corrective actions.

5. Projects should be asked to provide full reporting on training activities, as these sometimes constitute a significant part of the project intervention logic. Specifically, partners should be asked to provide a detailed schedule of foreseen activities as well as analytical reporting on the implemented ones. This includes a full list of participants, completed evaluation sheets, information on courses and curriculum. Moreover on the training issue, partners should be prompted to perform at least one more evaluation round, six to twelve months after the training event. This would allow for assessing the effectiveness of the training efforts as well as for tracing the career path of former trainees.

6. Proper guidelines should be prepared, covering key project issues, especially the ones with hidden administrative difficulties, as indicated above.

ANNEX I

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	Action Points
				Project Data				Monitoring Data				Conclusions			
1	54764	Euromed Heritage II: Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts	SPAIN	2.343.093	31/03/07	Centro de Investigacion Para el Desarrollo	2	10149.03	Sakis Galigalis	b	a	b	b	b	General: The project was redesigned and restarted last December. Coordinator/MEDA Partners/Task Manager: Heavy services procurement is ahead, posing a real threat for long delays. Coordinator: Contact EC Delegations in MEDA countries and seek support in dissemination.
2	54757	Euromed Heritage II: DELTA	ITALY	2.915.896	14/11/05	Instituto per il Mediterraneo (IMED), Italy	2	10079.07	George Kostaras	b	b	c	c	c	1. Co-ordinator : a) Explain your exact strategy with respect to the implementation of the Pilot Projects. Provide detailed action plans. Prepare a small report –a sort of gap analysis- explaining what your original plans have been and what will be lost as a result of the current planning. b) Resolve the Portal issue and ensure that all content is made available as soon as possible, in correct form.
3	54761	Euromed Heritage II: Filieres innovantes, savoir-faire locaux et partenariat euro-mediterraneen	ITALY	3.000.000	31/01/06	Politecnico di Milano	2	10080.06	George Kostaras	d	d	c	d	c	Given the actual cancellation of initial Pilot Projects and absence of any technical activity last year, the overall intervention is radically modified and project value undermined. If the budget remains intact, project efficiency may plunge. The following should be done as soon as possible: 1. Co-ordinator: Prepare a new action plan + agreement, as per the new situation. Have partners sign it, & include full technical details on the foreseen activities, especially the Pilot Project. Elaborate a Gantt chart and a new LFM; include OVIs. Submit your report for the 2nd year. Speed up procedures for official endorsement of the new action plan. Fully justify future budget scheme: explain any changes in the project added value. 2. Co-ordinator & EC services: agree for a reasonable time extension, realistically foreseeing future needs.
4	54755	Euromed Heritage II: Medimuses	GREECE	2.998.192	31/07/05	En Chordais, Greece	2	10046.04	Athanasios Papakonstantinou	b	b	a	a	b	En Chordais, EC: Ensure maximisation of the textbooks' dissemination and perspectives for their adoption as educational material in future, consider maximising the books' production and dissemination in electronic format (CD ROMs), at the expense of printed copies. En Chordais: Presentation in the final event of proposals for future initiatives and activities similar to the ones of the project would help maintaining the momentum and the close cooperation among the involved experts and partners.
5	54763	Euromed Heritage II: Mediterranean Voices	UK	2.829.771	14/12/05	London Metropolitan University, UK	2	10093.06	Panagiotis Leventis	b	b	b	b	b	PC: Keep up the good quality of project results and guide partners to this effect. Further promote ideas for continuation of network activities. Follow guidelines for Technical and Financial Reporting allocating more resources if deemed necessary.
6	54762	Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir	MALTA	3.000.000	01/12/2005	University of Malta	2	10047.07	George Kostaras	Monitoring Note					1. A monitoring mission to UNESCO is proposed, to be implemented as soon as possible (by Jun/Jul-05), in order to allow for the collection of administrative data, concerning technical and scientific developments. At the end of the mission, a full monitoring report will be compiled, combining information gathered from both co-ordinators. 2. If not too late, a meeting, bringing together all interested parties (UNESCO, UoM and RMSU) may prove very useful for taking critical project decisions. During the meeting everyone will be able to justify his case and commit for his role in the project. The presence of the EC Task Manager would secure an adequate resolution of conflicts and provide the necessary institutional weight to the overall endeavour. 3. Partners (UNESCO & UoM) should: a. Prepare a list of remaining activities, fully justifying possible deviations from the initial plan and / or budget. b. Provide a detailed list of names of all involved partners (including their own staff) clarifying their role and effort in the project.
7	54760	EuroMed Heritage II: Patrimoines Partages: Savoirs et savoir-faire appliques au patrimoine architectural et urbain des XIX et XX siecles en Mediterranee	FRANCE	2.603.423	31/12/05	Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris (CNRS), France	2	10091.06	Panagiotis Leventis	b	a	a	a	b	PC: Try to comply with EC procedures as regards reporting in order to avoid delays of payment. Maintain high level of quality in the implemented work and project results. Follow closely project schedule. Assess the remaining budget and its possible use and timely propose further actions to the EC. EC: Facilitate the process of approving the financial reporting in order to speed up requested payments.

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	Action Points
8	54754	Euromed Heritage II: PRODECOM	FRANCE	643.637	30/06/05	Chamber of Fine Arts, Paris, France	2	10092.05	Panagiotis Leventis	b	a	a	b	b	PC and Partners: Try to follow closely the project schedule and timely conclude the project activities. Maintain the network and foresee actively for the continuation of the momentum created by the project.
9	54758	Euromed Heritage II: UNIMED Cultural Heritage II	ITALY	1.516.890	01/07/05	Universita del Mediterraneo (UNIMED)	2	10051.06	George Kostaras	c	c	c	c	b	1) Co-ordinator: Provide detailed information on the training activities that have taken place (including full list of participants,the courses provided & evaluation sheets). c) Clarify plans of acquiring software licences for 3D modelling tools. 2) EU-Services & Co-ordinator: Clarify the website situation after project completion (Who maintains it? how often is it updated and by whom?) Nota – This MR is critical on certain project's specific issues, such as design (LFM), effectiveness and impact (added value). It would be unfair not to stress that compared to certain other Euromed Heritage projects, UNIMED is one of these which suffer the least.
10	74677	EuroMed Heritage II: Management of Horizontal Activities and Support to the Programme (RMSU)	ITALY	3.500.000	15/12/06	ICCD - Ministry of Culture, Italy	2	10255.01	Panagiotis Leventis	b	b	a	a	b	PC: Keep up projects' follow-up, providing proactive support. Consider temporary unit reinforcement.
11	74955	Euromed Heritage III: Discover Islamic Art	BELGIUM	2.676.241	31/05/07	Museum With No Frontiers (MWNF)	2	10252.01	Athanassios Papakonstantinou / Violette Legrand	c	b	b	b	b	MWNF: 1. Review the Logframe in line with the EC PCM methodology; this would help the follow-up of project performance by the EC and the adequate, fair presentation/promotion of the project achievements. 2. Confirm the co-financing scheme and plan, in consultation with the project partners and sponsors. 3. Be clear and accurate in the presentation of the project activities and of the effect on its implementation and impact, distinctively from activities of other projects/initiatives which have effects on the project.
12	75468	Euromed Heritage III: RehabiMed	SPAIN	3.429.376	01/09/07	Col.legi d'Aparelladors I Arquitectes Tecnics de Barcelona (CAATB)	2	10253.01	Violette Legrand	b	b	b	b	c	- CAATB: (1)update the LF and include the updated version in the upcoming management report. (2) Plan pilot actions for communication toward local population (information, awareness building, etc.). - CAATB, RMSU: The first intermediary report (February 2005) shows weakness in its content. A better reporting (length, data included) should be prepared by the coordinator and followed-up by RMSU.
13	54761	Euromed Heritage II: Filieres innovantes, savoir-faire locaux et partenariat euro-mediterraneen	ALGERIA	3.000.000	31/01/06	Politecnico di Milano	3	10080.07	Violette Legrand	b	b	c	b	b	Confer recommandations mises dans le MR-10080.06, juin 2005 (visite du coordinateur europeen).
14	54762	Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir	FRANCE	3.000.000	01/12/05	University of Malta	5	10047.08	George Kostaras	c	c	d	d	d	There is no value in spending any more time or money on the project. The overall performance has been really disappointing. A Web Site, a Salon and a few training courses are not adequate to justify success for a 3 M€ project. Much more have been expected, especially because of the involvement of capable partners. With project leaders still trying to clarify responsibilities, while partners flee in despair, there is no future for this project. A smooth conclusion should be sought, the soonest possible, for everyone's sake.
15	54757	Euromed Heritage II: DELTA	ALGERIA	2.915.896	14/11/05	Ministère de la Culture	7	10079.08	Argyrios Georgiadis	a	b	b	b	a	EC: 1) Ensure financing of activities in due time (given project closure in mid-November 2005) 2) Consider the option to launching identical or similar projects (be it at a regional or national level); 3) Allow local management of the Algerian budget, in order to strengthen efficiency; 4) Simplify the content of deliverables (presence of numerous unnecessary details and repetitions) 5) Solve the 20% co-finaning issue, by allowing its global consideration, instead of cash payments of 20% on each section.

Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	Action Points
16	93421	Euromed Heritage III: QANTARA - Patrimoine Méditerranéen: Traversées d'Orient et d'Occident	FRANCE	2.934.811	18/12/07	Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA)	11	10284.01	Violette Legrand	c	b	c	b	b	EC: 1) grant a derogation for the equipment and make transportation easier by providing unquestionable official documents. IMA: 1) Improve the quality of the LF; 2) Make the entrance in the project easier for the Algerian partner; 3) Speed up the project's promotion/communication process. RMSU: 1) Provide support to produce a more adequate LF and improve the reports' quantitative content; 2) Prepare the project for the closure of the RMSU contract.
17	76566	Euromed Heritage III: Byzantium-Early Islam	GREECE	990.175	01/01/08	Hellenic Society for the Protection of the Environment and the Cultural Heritage	11	10285.01	George Kostaras	b	c	b	b	c	Co-ordinator and Partners: 1) Finalise the consortium composition; 2) Secure the appropriateness of the target groups; include a balanced mix of trainees (professionals, students, etc); 3) Elaborate a new LFM.
18	93421	Euromed Heritage III: QANTARA - Patrimoine Méditerranéen: Traversées d'Orient et d'Occident	MOROCCO	2.934.811	18/12/07	Ministère des affaires culturelles et de la communication	15	10284.02	Violette Legrand	c	c	b	b	b	Coordinator (IMA): 1) Give priority to clarification of financial and equipment issues with all partners at the next consortium meeting in Rabat, in order to allow for a more efficient implementation of activities and avoid delays. 2) Update the LF and improve its quality. 3) Launch Intranet, as well as QANTARA website, for a good and easier communication between all partners of the consortium. 4) Confirm dates of the Consortium meeting in Rabat. IMA and Moroccan Partner: Ensure the visibility and promotion of the project through the QANTARA/IMA website and press articles. Moroccan Partner: Build up a well qualified team to ensure good quality implementation of the project.
19	75468	Euromed Heritage III: RehabiMed	MOROCCO	3.429.376	01/09/07	Centre Méditerranéen de l'Environnement de Marrakech (CMEM)	15	10253.02	Violette Legrand	b	b	b	c	c	MP: 1) Increase project visibility for users and decision makers; 2) Focus specifically on the political sphere. Failing in reaching & sensitising this group may be strongly detrimental to the achievement of the project's overall objective, the follow-up of the pilot project, and sustainability. Coordinator (CAATB): consider creating Intranet connections for better communication among all consortium partners.

ANNEX II

Statistics of Projects Monitored

Average score per criterion per project and year

Project	Year	Number of Visits	Criterion					
			Quality of project design	Efficiency to date	Effectiveness to date	Impact Prospects	Sustainability	**AVERAGE**
Euromed Heritage II: Defence Systems in Mediterranean Coasts	2004	1	3,66	3,00	3,00	2,66	3,00	**3,06**
	2005	1	3,30	4,00	3,50	3,45	3,20	**3,49**
	Average	-	3,48	3,50	3,25	3,06	3,10	3,28
Euromed Heritage II: DELTA	2004	1	3,00	2,66	2,33	3,00	2,80	**2,76**
	2005	2	3,12	3,37	2,42	2,58	2,70	**2,84**
	Average	-	3,06	3,01	2,37	2,79	2,75	2,80
Euromed Heritage II: Filieres innovantes	2004	1	3,33	3,25	3,33	3,33	3,60	**3,37**
	2005	2	1,22	1,18	2,06	1,22	2,51	**1,64**
	Average	-	2,28	2,21	2,69	2,28	3,05	2,50
EuroMed Heritage II: RMSU	2004	1	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	**3,00**
	2005	1	3,30	3,40	3,70	3,55	3,40	**3,47**
	Average	-	3,15	3,20	3,35	3,28	3,20	3,24
Euromed Heritage II: Medimuses	2004	1	3,00	3,00	3,33	3,33	3,50	**3,23**
	2005	1	3,30	3,40	3,90	4,00	3,00	**3,52**
	Average	-	3,15	3,20	3,62	3,67	3,25	3,38
Euromed Heritage II: Mediterranean Voices	2004	1	2,66	3,00	3,00	2,66	3,00	**2,86**
	2005	1	3,00	3,40	3,30	3,45	3,40	**3,31**
	Average	-	2,83	3,20	3,15	3,06	3,20	3,09
Euromed Heritage II: Navigation du Savoir	2004	1	4,00	3,50	3,66	3,66	3,66	**3,70**
	2005	1	2,00	2,00	1,00	1,00	1,25	**1,45**
	Average	-	3,00	2,75	2,33	2,33	2,46	2,57
EuroMed Heritage II: Patrimoines Partages	2004	1	2,66	2,25	2,66	3,00	3,00	**2,71**
	2005	1	3,00	3,60	3,80	3,55	3,22	**3,43**
	Average	-	2,83	2,93	3,23	3,28	3,11	3,07
Euromed Heritage II: PRODECOM	2004	1	1,66	1,75	2,00	2,66	2,50	**2,11**
	2005	1	3,00	3,60	3,70	3,10	3,30	**3,34**
	Average	-	2,33	2,68	2,85	2,88	2,90	2,73
Euromed Heritage II: UNIMED Cultural Heritage II	2004	1	2,66	2,25	2,66	3,00	3,00	**2,71**
	2005	1	2,30	2,40	2,30	2,00	3,00	**2,40**
	Average	-	2,48	2,33	2,48	2,50	3,00	2,56
Euromed Heritage III: Byzantium-Early Islam	2004	0	-	-	-	-	-	
	2005	1	3,00	2,20	3,00	3,00	2,43	**2,73**
	Average		3,00	2,20	3,00	3,00	2,43	2,73
Euromed Heritage III: Discover Islamic Art	2004	0	-	-	-	-	-	
	2005	1	2,30	3,00	2,90	3,10	2,56	**2,77**
	Average	-	2,30	3,00	2,90	3,10	2,56	2,77
Euromed Heritage III: QANTARA	2004	0	-	-	-	-	-	
	2005	2	2,05	3,03	2,37	3,00	3,00	**2,69**
	Average	-	2,05	3,03	2,37	3,00	3,00	2,69
Euromed Heritage III: RehabiMed	2004	0	-	-	-	-	-	
	2005	2	2,94	2,68	3,18	2,90	2,43	**2,83**
	Average	-	2,94	2,68	3,18	2,90	2,43	2,83
ALL	2004	10	2,96	2,77	2,90	3,03	3,11	**2,95**
	2005	18	2,70	2,95	2,94	2,85	2,81	**2,85**
	Average	-	**2,83**	**2,86**	**2,92**	**2,94**	**2,96**	**2,90**

* For the project "Navigation du Savoir", further to the visit to France, a second visit has been implemented to the partner in Malta. For this visit a Monitoring Note was produced.

Score per project size in 2005

Criterion	<2 MEUR	2 - 3 MEUR	> 3 MEUR
Projects	3	7	4
Quality of project design	2,77	2,87	2,37
Efficiency to date	2,73	3,40	2,31
Effectiveness to date	3,00	3,17	2,48
Impact Prospects	2,70	3,30	2,17
Sustainability	2,91	3,02	2,40
AVERAGE	**2,82**	**3,15**	**2,35**