
Meeting Notes

Kick Off Meeting

Present:

Clem Smith, Mari-Anne Harstad, Vincent Jasper – Medway Council; Paulius Kulikauskas, Lead Expert; Andrius Baranauskas - Kaunas City; Kevin Borg - Malta; Liliann Bjerstrom, Claes-Åke Kindlund – Karlskrona Kommun; Petr Schneider – Opava City; Peter Ros – New Dutch Waterline; Thomas Werner, Andreas Schubert – Rostock; Jean-Loup Drubigny – URBACT Secretariat.

Apologies received from:

Thessaloniki - Konstantinos Marinidis
Charente Maritime – Michel Gallice, Laetitia Fayemendy
Florence - Roberto Melosi, Marco Toccafondi

Mari-Anne Harstad (MAH) welcomed this unexpected visit from Jean-Loup DRUBIGNY, Head of URBACT Secretariat and introduced him to the group and invited him to address the group.

Jean-Loup explained that we is very to have the opportunity to meet us all and that he tries to attend as many meetings as possible – for his own interest and to gather more information for future development.

JLD continued by explaining that URBACT is not an investment programme - it is designed to exchange knowledge and experience to develop integrated “sustainable development”.

JLD informed us that there was strong competition among the applicants and that we should feel proud to have secured funding for our project. URBACT intends to produce good quality projects to ensure the integrity of the programme.

JLP addressed the subject of phasing and that REPAIR has successfully passed from phase 1 to phase 11 and is now ready to begin the project actions with assistance from Lead Expert and Thematic Experts in the Thematic Pole.

JLD informed us that URBACT aims to encourage project outcomes to make impact on local policies with the strength to assist other European cities in making the necessary changes to policy or working practice. URBACT can demonstrate that the method works. He continued by emphasising the importance of working with the Managing Authorities – not only because they hold the investment funds and therefore the opportunity to provide funding for Pilot projects but also because it is important to align our project activity with their priorities. Managing Authorities are becoming more interested in involving themselves in the Programme as they often have problems understanding the working method between each other.

Jean Loup outlined the extent of the URBACT Programme, having 21 Thematic Poles, 253 partners and 200 or more Managing Authorities involved. Three Thematic Poles allow for cross-cutting exchange and learning opportunities.

JLD outlined some of the next steps for URBACT which include the creation of a Working Group to focus on the implementation of the Leipzig Charter in addition to Lisbon and Gothenburg Agenda. The Regions for Economic Change Conference was aimed at Managing authorities and focussed on urban issues was held in early in Feb 2009.

Plans are in progress for Local Support Group National Seminars to build capacity. These events will take place in local language. Up to now, 3 National Seminars are scheduled: 10 March - Warsaw - Poland / 18 March - Lisbon - Portugal / 17 April - Bonn - Germany / 28 May - Sweden.

We are now contacting the others Member States with the highest number of Partners in order to define the next Seminars. Anyway the whole initiative will end before July 2009. LSG members from Poland and Portugal have been invited for the two Seminars and we also informed the relevant Lead Partners.

A ULSG Tool Kit is also available online and is an excellent aid to organising a productive and successful Local Support Group.

Other events in the future include Open Seminars:

Cities and immigration - Brussels May 26

Cities, areas in crisis and economic crisis – Lyon 15 May

Call for Projects

Consultation on thematic coverage: March Call for projects June 09

Future calls for applications will be themed with main issues focused on sustainable development and invitations will be sent to relevant parties who in turn will be expected to respond directly to the call for projects.

JLD reminded us that one city can participate in a maximum of two projects at one time. The next Annual Conference will take place at the end of November 09.

MAH – Thanked to Jean Loup once again and went on to offer a warm welcome to partners present. MAH recorded apologies received from Thessaloniki, Florence and Charente-Maritime and then offered the opportunity for everyone present to make a brief (one minute) introduction.

MAH sought agreement from partners for a re-schedule of the programme due to the delay at start and to appoint a Chair person for the meeting to relieve Lead Partner from this duty, whilst making presentations - Andrius Baranauskas accepted the opportunity and the meeting continued.

MAH outlined the **Activities and expectations of the partnership** (slide 4) and re-focused the project aims we plan to achieve these. MAH continued by outlining issues around the:

Policy Framework - A 'Starting Point' / draft document will be completed, Working groups and Consultation & Review Process will be undertaken.

Local Action Plans and mini-LAPs – May 2009 Working Group 1 covering Pillar II – Preservation

Peer Review process will be included to test the plan before it is taken forward.

Thematic expert team will review and comment on these plans and engage with LSG to ensure the completed LAP includes all four MLAP, which will then be evaluated.

Jean Loup affirmed the need to respect the agenda and to use the mutual interest available through a Peer Review.

Peter Ros asked about the format of the LAP. This was clarified by MAH.

Managing Authorities: Involving the Managing Authorities is very important, although generally considered to be very difficult to achieve. Mari-Anne explained how in Medway we have begun to work more closely.

Pilot Regeneration Projects will be selected from all partners proposals but only 2 sites will be selected to be pushed forward.

Evaluation of the project by Thematic Experts

Progress reports

Whats new. (slide 5)

MAH outlined changes to the project start / end date which are now: **21 Jan 09 to 21 July 2011**. As a result activity schedule changes include the **Kick off meeting Feb 2009, Pillar I WG moved to March 2010, Thematic Expertise meeting Jan 2009**.

Doodle - has been used as an effective meeting scheduler and will continue throughout the project.

UAI Conference. Project REPAIR was represented by MAH and CAK and a presentation was made by MAH, which was received very well. Approval and assessment sheets distributed. No comments

Jean Loup intervened by explaining about how Thematic Experts are funded and that they are contracted and paid directly by URBACT Programme. Travel and accommodation is paid by project.

JLD explained that the URBACT Programme wanted to see modifications to the allocation days, particularly to the Lead Expert. Clem Smith explained how the combination of the three Experts will compliment each other. Paulius has the skills to take the project to the end with his cultural heritage background. Liz Mills has great

deal of knowledge of the Gothenburg Agenda and Good Practice examples across Europe and will act in a Policing role on development to ensure that the process adheres to the Sustainable development.

Hen has the expertise in management of European Regional Development programmes provides the opportunity top transpose high level to derive tangible benefits on the ground in our communities. Hen will take a leading role in developing the P R Actions. We want to get the best out of the qualities available.

Jean Loup replied by saying the Lead Expert should have the Central role and is expected to have the largest share of days – 100.

MAH responded by outlining the Repair Thematic Expertise activity breakdown. Clem Smith added an analogy of Medway where there are experts formulate policy and those who deliver the policy in practical day-to-day ways.

PK is the Policy maker, Hen the on the ground worker and Liz and additional overview provider. Kevin and Liliann expressed support for the idea of a combination of Expertise and this was accepted around the table.

The subject of the selection of Thematic Experts continued between partners and Marianne explained the process of selection. Petr asked if we have contracts with these experts yet. The answer is not yet. The Thematic Expertise subject was left at the point where a review will be made after the Kick Off meeting.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

Clem Smith set the scene as to why the project is so important to Medway. Spare capacity of land in the area and €140 million spent in preparing the 900 hectares of land.

25 years anniversary of closure of the dockyard and collapse of the economy as a result many people suffer immense deprivation. Some of the poorest neighbourhood are situated 1 km away from some of the wealthiest.

A major increase in population is projected in the next 25 years.

40% of the work force commutes each day and this has an impact of traffic congestion as well as taking that economic benefit away from the area daily.

Use of the former military heritage sites is a clear strategic direction to ensure that all strategic bench mark achievement against minimum standards and principles. Translate the Gothenburg AGENDA INTO THE policy framework

Local strategies to develop urban development and day to day delivery. The policy framework provides the definition required

The Medway Sustainable Development Strategy is just about to begin and we see the

REPAIR project as key to ensuring the transnational partners work together and provide cast iron examples of good practical delivery at military sites.

Some areas will be selected as Pilot Regeneration actions and will respond to the Local Action plan. So that regeneration delivery pilots become the delivery agent.

Who will benefit – Policy makers at local level, who will learn what policy means at the operational level on the ground. Urban local development planners and military site owners who should be thinking outside the box.

The 4 pillars should be of great interest to energy developers, transport planners, development Gothenburg is a check against the Lisbon agenda therefore in practical terms it is about reduction of traffic, or maximising local jobs for local people etc.

CAK – referred to the Leipzig Charter and that his local Swedish Urbact members have no idea about it. Other partners and Jean Loup agreed and stated that it was constructed by member states but it is not known publicly. Leipzig Charter must be incorporate into the project as Cities implementing the Leipzig Charter will be a focus in the near future. (Leipzig)

Paulius Kulikauskas made a presentation about his role and how he will develop the “Starting Point” for the Policy Framework from the work undertaken in the Base Line Study, State of the Art and the Synthesis. His immediate priority is preparation for Working Group 1. He referred to the a process used to asses the body of work and a diagram to demonstrate the principle.

PK continued by saying that we are not a think tank. It is not about our expertise it is about our role. What role can we play in the network. The work we undertake is about demonstrating its relevance and providing Proof of success (or failure) we can not play across the whole field of knowledge but a smaller sample.

It will not be possible to exclusively concentrate on one pillar at one meeting because each of the Four Pillars are related to each other by real life issues. Therefore we can talk about cross cutting concepts such as Sustainable Development or Community development.

He continued by saying that before we arrive in Medway in May we should have developed a kind of matrix which provides a check list of what is likely to come up and what is relevant to each partner and where is there proof.

AS asked if we should expect contact from Lead Expert for additional Base Line Information to which Paulius responded that we will work forward, therefore he may revert to partners for details he may not completely understand or for clarification.

MH mentioned the domino effect – we cannot fix all problems in one go but a cascade will follow.

VJ - Animation of Urbact Local Support Groups (slide 10)

A lot has already been discussed but there are some important parts that need to be repeated.

- Each partner has responsibility to develop a local action plan / local support group it is an essential part of the project.
- LAP and ULSG must be and will be relevant to your particular issues.
- Selling your project to your MA – think more about not what can they do for us but how can our project help them 'what can Repair do for your managing authority' use this as a basis for building up communication channels with your managing authority
- ULSG tool kit, you must read this as it contains useful information that will help you to engage with your ULSG. Also holds some key messages and helpful advice in managing groups in terms of composition and the number of meetings you hold.
- Use existing groups and try to build in this project to the already established groups and benefit from their effective team working.
- Develop your local action plan concepts

CAK – there are regulations of what is possible, should this work group work more freely and tell us what should be done, or should they work with what is already decided?

VJ- Partners should be driving forward the programme according to how you feel it should be going bearing in mind the priorities of your organisation and / or ULSG (stakeholders) Ask who should be interested in this topic and how can I get them involved e.g. land owners, law-makers. What should go into your action plan is what needs to happen in your city and the how you can begin to make this change

JLD – you have experience with the participation programme and we want to use it. It is clear we are working within a political framework and there is no revolution inside. Sorry when you are financed with European money you must work with people outside the organisation. Create a new composition so there are no rules of procedures and use this to develop / influence new policy.

Four pillars are different topics and so you may have a core group and increase this with the necessary extra people/stakeholders.

VJ – make the best use of existing resources.

Local Action Plans will be a mixture of short, mid or long term goals some examples were provided on the slide. Here some examples. Once again use the ULSG Tool Kit for guidance but the final shape of your LAP is up to you and your support group to decide.

JLD – There is training available and you can use your ULSG budget to access it.

CS in terms for responding to the Paulius questions should be the local support groups themselves. Therefore we would like to see the ULSG operational in each area so that dialogue can begin in good time for the May meeting. Provide a very clear framework for discussion. So that each group is responding to the same questions and the results will be coherent.

CS- you talked earlier about the need for us to provide you with proof of the need for success and I think it is important to set that in the theme of pillar II – preservation of military heritage site that all about retaining the integrity of our sites that what we share in common. What I suggest is what we need is firstly we need some examples of how we have achieved this. Specific examples about how we have done this, is the reuse of the building a reuse which assists the long term preservation of that building. If you have successful examples then we should be asking why they are successful and this will partly set the context for this pillar.

The second element sustainable preservation techniques, are they are that have been so successful and why they have been successful. There may be techniques, which are good practice examples.

2 sides the economic impact and the technical side.

PK – everyone should look at where we are and I will create this but I will ask you three questions

- 1) What is your action plan area (Location)?
- 2) ?
- 3) ?

CS – The objective has got to be a) for every partner to own and contribute to the workshop. Own the concept and contribute to the solution in terms of what the workshop will achieve. So the workshop has to happen in such a way that we can deliver. One example of how we could manage the Working groups would be to sub-divide our group into small groups which are facilitated by a group of experts and lead partner where each individual breakout group addresses a particular aspect of workshop discussion and the facilitators move round in carousel so each facilitator represents a specific theme.

Ultimately the project is about defining solutions, therefore the policy framework must be a definition of what the solutions are to the challenges presented by the Gothenburg and Lisbon Agenda and the Leipzig Charter.

AS – suggested that LP and PK work together to develop further the concept and the policy framework concept and announce in a fast way on a letter head so we are able to book cheap tickets. (Official invitations).

PR – lets not forget to use the ASCEND MMF

VJ/MH the ASCEND MMF will form an integral part of the Policy Framework

CS – we have to establish the needs and at the workshops we need to define the solutions.

PK – It will be too much to have 11 presentations at the Work Group so lets use posters/panels to illustrate situations from partners

JLD – If you have someone who wants to speak you cannot stop them and use must admit that otherwise they will never come.

VJ – We have a proposed structure for the Working Group 1 please lets take a look at it and try to agree the format. The proposed dates are 18 – 21 May 2009.

MH – the event coincides with 25 yr anniversary of the dockyard closing and we will provide a briefing note for your politicians and include this on the invitations.

The proposed dates for the event were challenged due to the European Ascension Holiday period. After debate meeting dates confirmed as Sunday 17 – Wed 20.

MH – outlined the Presage process and the need to complete Phase 1 first before we can input the project in Presage.

Would you like guidance notes so that we can inform you which line to enter the expenditure. Petr – asked for a guidance sheet

MAH - Please don't leave the entry of costs onto Presage till the last minute.

Common cost expenditure was deleted from the agenda to be followed up later.

Certifying Body – first level controllers. Partners must pursue this process.

Managing budgets – Need to enter costs as soon as possible to avoid high pressure at key pints in the project. We will want to review the budget and have the capacity to improve the budget lines by +/- 20%

Communication

AS – action partners to offer suggested parties to be invited to Pillar II event.

Create one database of contacts – PK invite ministry of defence from

PS – separate meeting for MA exchange experience at the May Publicity event would be a good idea.

CS the mid term review is due in 2010 REPAIR should aim to have something to say for this review. PS said this a good topic for discussion at the May event.

VJ – suggested that a letter highlighting the mid Term review should be sent by partners to their managing authorities to help to engage them with our project. Logos are available in different formats ideal for printing and will be sent out in a week or so. Press releases need to be sent out soon, a template is available for you to amend. Webpage will be updates shortly with a lot more information.

Project forum will be available