

Final report for INTERREG I I C operations

Index	3W0097N
Acronym	SRN
Title of the Operation	Effective Use and Delivery of Structural Funds and Regeneration Programmes in Sub-Regional Areas
Lead partner institution	Bristol City Council
Lead partner country	UK
Start date	01/09/2004
End date	30/11/2007

1. Summary of the operation's activities

1.1 Please provide an overview of the main activities undertaken during the lifetime of your operation. The description should develop the information already provided in the last progress report. It should also cover issues related to management/coordination and dissemination. (maximum 3000 characters)

References:

Last progress report, II. Activity Report 1. Summary of the operation's activities so far

The delivery of the SRNeurope network project has been very successful and the objectives of the project and network partners (12 cities and regional development agencies from 7 countries) have been achieved.

The network partners, representing diverse experience across Europe, organised a series of workshops and exchanges. These have enabled sharing of information between partners and identification of transferrable good practice in the effective use and delivery of Structural Funds and other regeneration programmes in cities and other sub-regional areas.

The SRN Network was established in September 2004 and with the support of the INTERREG I I C programme, has performed solidly and produced inspiring results, until November 2007 when agreed network funding expired. The network was led by Bristol City Council, guided by an international Network Steering Group comprised of representatives of all network partners. The network was assisted in drawing together it's findings by Dr Liz Mills & Richard Essex.

The network's website (www.SRNeurope.net) has been continually updated and contains many resources for the use of the partners and interested parties, including regeneration professionals and decision makers from across Europe.

Key publications produced by the network in order to disseminate 'best practice', available from the website, include:

- Good Practice Guide – published June 2007
- Top Ten Tips – published July 2007
- Early Findings report – published May 2006
- Position Statement – published June 2006

The www.SRNeurope.net website also includes case studies, background documents, and minutes and reports from meetings supporting the partners shared experiences of structural fund and regeneration delivery practices. This site has translations in Catalan and Spanish that detail the work of the network. The networks' early findings report had some influence on the development of National Strategic Reference Framework documents in Member States .

The network has disseminated its findings through the publication of a Good Practice Guide and other associated publications. The network has also hosted and contributed to a range of conferences and dissemination events, including in Brussels, Bristol, Barcelona, and Santa Cruz De Tenerife.

1.2 Please describe any major changes/problems in the implementation of activities that may have occurred during the operation's lifetime and the reasons/solutions/impacts of these changes/problems. (maximum 2000 characters)

References:

Progress reports, II. Activity Report 7. Problems encountered and solutions found / proposed

All of the activities of this network have been carried out as planned.

There have however been a number of operational difficulties, none of which have had a significant impact on the implementation of activities:

i) One of the original network partners, TEDKN from Greece, withdrew from the network at the commencement of the operation. This was due to capacity issues within TEDKN following the unfortunate death of a key employee. With no appropriate to replace TEDKN, the Lead Partner proposed a restructuring of the network based on 12 rather than 13 partners. An 'Application For Change' was approved by the INTERREG West Zone JTS for this slightly smaller network and commensurate budget reduction.

ii) Part way through the operation two partners, SVIM Ancona (Italy) and Barcelona (Spain) requested a reduction in the agreed operational budget to be spent on co-ordination of the network ('core costs'), with a commensurate increase in the budget available for individual partners for their staff time, travel and accommodation. This change was agreed by the Network Steering Group, but resulted in the modest central coordination budget, already diminished by the loss of the Greek partner's contribution, being diminished still further. As a result, the central coordination of the network was not as comprehensive as originally anticipated.

iii) There has been some difficulty in receiving appropriate and timely progress, financial and audit reports from all partners. Particular problems have been experienced in receiving audit certificates

from the Italian Ministry of Finance, and one partner, SVIM, has yet to submit a progress report. These delays have impacted upon the ability of the Lead Partner to submit timely claims to the JTS.

1.3. Please assess the participation of all partners in the operation. Describe any major changes/problems in the partnership that may have occurred during the operation's lifetime and the reasons/solutions/impacts of these changes/problems. Were your partners active? Did they attract other regional actors to the operation events? (maximum 2000 characters)

References:

Progress reports, II. Activity Report 6. Involvement of partners

All partners of the operation actively participated in the work of the network, with the exception of TEDKN who withdrew from the network at the outset.

All partners attended Network Steering Group meetings, workshops and network conferences. All partners delivered presentations at workshops and conferences and contributed to the findings of this network.

All partners brought regional actors/decision makers to network events.

2. Summary of the operation's achievements

2.1 Please describe the main achievements of your operation. Please explain to what extent the overall objective and sub-objectives of the operation have been achieved? (maximum 3000 characters)

References:

Application form, 1.3 Objectives of the operation,

Progress reports, II. Activity Report 2. General progress of the operation towards the set objectives and sub-objectives

The SRN operation, through the establishment of a new transnational network and structured events, has successfully identified best practice in the management and delivery of structural funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional (less than NUTS 2) areas. This 'SRNeurope' network has shared this good practice both within the network and through disseminating the good practice findings across Europe. Briefings and a good practice guide have been produced to support this dissemination. to improve investment performance and influence future policy (local, regional and EU).

All of the sub-objectives of the operation have been achieved: 1) The 'SRNeurope' network was established to identify current national/regional/sub-regional context, and Structural Funds/regeneration programmes delivery practice; 2) The SRNeurope network has evaluated and identified successful and good practice elements of programme management and delivery in accordance with regional and sub-regional priorities to optimise effectiveness, environmental and social benefit (including equalities), and economic competitiveness; 3) The SRNeurope network has produced and disseminated best practice guidance. This has been in order to influence policy development and practice in order to make the delivery of Structural Funds and other regeneration initiatives more effective, thus enhancing regional and sub-regional economic competitiveness.

2.2 How has interregional cooperation contributed to these achievements? (maximum 2000 characters)

Interregional cooperation has been essential to the achievements of the operation. Without the successful interregional cooperation embodied by this network, it would not have been possible to identify the range of national/regional/sub-regional contexts, and the range of Structural Funds/regeneration programmes delivery practice being implemented across Europe. Interregional cooperation has also been necessary to gain the Europe-wide perspective on transferable good practice, necessary to ensure the robustness of findings and to seek to inform DG REGIO's Structural Funds policy and regulations.

2.3 What other benefits / lessons learnt / added value did you obtain through interregional cooperation? (maximum 2000 characters)

It has been a great opportunity to share experiences in the delivery of Structural Funds programmes and see examples of projects funded in different Member States - providing inspiration and ideas for partners. The friends and contacts made through the network have also enabled some collaboration outside the formal sphere of the INTERREG funded project.

3. Finance

3.1 Please assess the budget of the operation. Describe any major changes/problems in the budget implementation that may have occurred during the operation's lifetime and the reasons/solutions/impacts of these changes/problems. Was your budget forecast appropriate for the activities you planned? Did you use all funds you were granted? If not, please summarize the reasons. (maximum 3000 characters)

References:

Application form, AIV.0 – AIV.4
Progress reports, III. Financial Report
Progress reports, III.0 Financial Report by partner
Progress reports, AIII.1 – AIII.3

Part way through the operation two partners, SVIM Ancona (Italy) and Barcelona (Spain) requested a reduction in the agreed operational budget to be spent on co-ordination of the network ('core costs'), with a commensurate increase in the budget available for individual partners for their staff time, travel and accommodation. This change was agreed by the Network Steering Group

There has been some difficulty in receiving appropriate and timely progress, financial and audit reports from all partners. Particular problems have been experienced in receiving audit certificates from the Italian Ministry of Finance, and one partner, SVIM has yet to submit a progress report. These delays have impacted upon the ability of the Lead Partner to submit timely claims to the JTS.

In retrospect the budget forecast prepared for the operation when the original funding bid was being prepared was inadequate. Inadequate funds were allocated, particularly for travel and accommodation and accommodation costs for network partners, and for financial management and dissemination costs for the Lead Partner associated with network management. When writing the original bid I found it difficult to estimate these likely costs. It would have also been helpful to have been able to afford to employ a full-time Network Coordinator.

However, we have managed to successfully administer this operation within the agreed overall budget

4. Detailed description of the operation's achievements

4.1 Summary of the outputs

Please name and describe the main outputs of your operation, using the structure of the list below.

References:

Application form, 1.4 Expected outputs, results and impacts of the operation,

Application form, AIII.1 – AIII.5,

Progress reports, II.0 Indicators,

Progress reports, II.1 – II.5 Activity Report

Outputs	No	Description
Interregional events to exchange and disseminate experience		
- Conferences	1	67 people attended the Final Conference in Bristol (UK) on 26 & 27 June 2007. In addition, the SRNeurope network participated in conferences organised by network partners in Barcelona on 21 st April 2006 and Tenerife on 2 nd December 2005.
- Seminars / workshops / meetings	15	There have been fifteen interregional events organised by the network. Events have been held in Bristol (UK), Lille (France), Ancona (Italy), Modena (Italy), Hranice (Czech Republic), Santa Cruz de Tenerife (Tenerife), Barcelona (Spain), Klaipeda (Lithuania), Turku (Finland) and Langhe Monferrato Roero (Italy). Workshops have been held in, Ancona, Modena, Hranice, Tenerife, Barcelona, Klaipeda, Turku and Alba. Steering Group meetings were held in Ancona (12 Partners), Lille (10 partners), Modena (11 partners), Tenerife (12 partners), Hranice (11 partners), Barcelona (12 partners) and Turku (10 partners). A seminar was held in Santa Cruz, Tenerife in December 2005
- Staff exchange	0	N/A

<p>- Study visits</p>		<p>The partners toured a series of projects organised by some of the partners. These included study visits in the Modena region, Finland, and Bristol, identifying working examples of 'good practice' initiatives funded by Structural Funds designed to benefit the local economy.</p>
<p>- Other events</p>		<p>A display on this INTERREG IIIC network was mounted at a regional event in Exeter, England on 19th October 2005, and brief presentation given in Birmingham, England, on 28th October 2006. On 28th/29th November, Cumbria delivered a presentation which illustrated the work of this network at a Lead Partner conference in Brussels.</p> <p>Presentations on the findings of the SRNeurope network were delivered in 2006 and 2007 as a part of the Brussels 'OPEN DAYS' week of Cities & Regions.</p>
<p>Identification of good practices...</p>		
<p>- ...related to the management/ coordination of the operation</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>There were 8 Steering Group meetings</p>
<p>- ...related to the content/theme of the cooperation</p>	<p>6</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good practice in 'Vertical Partnership' : Regions and sub-regions working together (Turku perspective) 2. Good practice in 'Horizontal Partnership' : Working with Stakeholders and Citizens (Hranice perspective) 3. Good practice in Using Different Funds (the perspectives from Tenerife, Lille and Tampere) 4. Lisbon and Gothenburg Agendas (Anona Perspective) 5. Evaluation of the achievement of the Lisbon Strategy objectives through INTERREG: the ALSO Project (Ancona Perspective) 6. Good practice in the implementation of the Lisbon and Gothenburg Strategy through the Structural Funds (Bristol perspective)

- ...related to		
Project specific outputs:		
- Training courses		
- Good practice guides / handbooks	200	Copies of the Good Practice Report were posted out to key players and decision makers across Europe by Network Partners. Some were also distributed at events.
- Policy recommendations		Initial Network Findings include: 1. There is a strong case, based on the experience of the Network partners, to press for the decentralisation of significant elements of project and programme management and delivery to appropriate levels of sub-regional territorial governance. 2. There are no disadvantages in achieving decentralisation to this level, subject to there being capacity and competence to meet performance targets in a cost effective manner.
- Studies / surveys / analyses	25	25 Case Study were presented by the partners.

<p>- Web / IT tools</p>		<p>A designated website has been established eventually containing 78 pages. There is an average of 9910 hits per month, a steady increase from its launch in March 2005. It is translated into English, Spanish and Catalan. The website can be found at: www.SRNeurope.net & www.SRNeuropa.net</p>
<p>- Methodologies</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p>- Other outputs</p>		<p>Ongoing progress reviews were undertaken throughout the duration of the programme, a total of eight. Opportunities for further collaboration between partners were explored. All partners submitted audited regional reports.</p>

4.2 Summary of results and impacts by partner

For each partner, please define the main results and impacts of the INTERREG IIIC operation. Use the structure of the list below to answer the following questions: Have existing regional policy methods or approaches been improved? Have new regional policy methods or approaches been introduced? Have political and institutional structures related to regional policy been changed? These results/impacts should be related to improvements of the effectiveness of policies and instruments, expanded effects of Structural Funds interventions, solved problems, exploited potentials, etc.

References:

Application form, AI.2 Relevance of the partnership

Partner	Results	Impacts
1	Bristol has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Bristol has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Bristol has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Bristol has sought to influence national and regional government's implementation of Structural Funds programmes in the UK using the findings of the SRN network. Regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers in Bristol now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives.
2	Turku has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Turku has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Turku has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
3	Barcelona has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Barcelona has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Barcelona has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
4	Santa Cruze Tenerife has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Santa Cruze Tenerife has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds

	operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Santa Cruze Tenerife has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	programmes locally.
5	Lille Metropole has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Lille Metropole has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Lille Metropole has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
6	Klaipeda has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Klaipeda has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Klaipeda has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
7	Hranice has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Hranice has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Hranice has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
8	Langhe Monferrato Roero has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Langhe Monferrato Roero has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Langhe Monferrato Roero has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
9	SVIM has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better

	identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. SVIM has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. SVIM has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
10	Modena has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Modena has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Modena has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
11	Cumbria has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Cumbria has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Cumbria has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
12	Tampere has contributed case studies to the network, and has contributed to the identification and dissemination of good practice in the delivery of Structural Funds and regeneration programmes in sub-regional areas. Tampere has learnt about the variety of management and delivery models in operation across Europe and has benefited from picking up good practice. Tampere has also benefited from working with new friends from across Europe.	Local regeneration practitioners and decisionmakers now have a better understanding as to how to achieve Lisbon and Gottenburg objectives, and the range of regional and sub-regional management and delivery mechanisms available to achieve optimum impact. This partner has been able to use the findings of this network to influence the development of new Structural Funds programmes locally.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		

4.3 Contribution to other EU policies

After the closure of your operation, please review how your operation has contributed to EU policies on equal opportunities, sustainable development and environment.

References:

Application form, 2.3 Contribution to other EU policies

Effect on Equal opportunities

- Main focus
- Positive
- Neutral

Effect on Sustainable development

- Main focus
- Positive
- Neutral

Effect on Environment

- Main focus
- Positive
- Neutral

Please justify the choices above and explain how these policies were reflected in your operation.
(maximum 2000 characters)

Effect on Equal Opportunities:

Equal opportunities between men and women is a key theme of European Regional Policy. The SRNeurope network focused upon improving the delivery and performance of Structural Funds to address Regional Policy. Equal Opportunity policies were adhered to. Female regeneration professionals participating in network workshops and learning from them slightly outnumbered men.

Effect on Sustainable Development and environment:

'Sustainable development' is a key EU agenda (the EU Sustainable Development Strategy - a broader and more ambitious document than the Gothenburg agenda). The SRNeurope network has examined the contribution of sub-regional organisations in environmental protection and sustainable development and how Structural Funds can effectively address these requirements.

5. Durability of the operation and its results

5.1 What will happen to the partnership after closure of the project? Will the partnership continue to cooperate on this issue? (maximum 2000 characters)

References:

Application form, 1.8 Durability of the operation's results

The partnership has explored the possibility of continuing the network and considered applying for INTERREG IVC funding. After much discussion the Network Steering Group of the partnership decided that it did not adequately meet the revised INTERREG IVC funding criteria.

The key objectives of this network: identifying and sharing best practice, building a transnational exchange, and disseminating results, have now been achieved.

The findings and results of this operation have been valuable, and had additional resources been available the network would have invested more in dissemination. The network appears to have had some influence in Europe on policy and practice, but this difficult to quantify level of influence could have been enhanced and been more effective if additional resources been available for dissemination.

Whilst partners will continue to cooperate, the network will not continue in a formal sense.

5.2 What will happen to the operation's results now that activities are finalised? Have you developed an action plan for maintaining results? Will there be institutional structures for maintaining and/or disseminating the operation's results? (maximum 2000 characters)

References:

Application form, 1.8 Durability of the operation's results

The partnership is still informally disseminating the findings of this operation, outside the scope of INTERREG IIC funding. For example, a presentation will be given on the findings of the SRNeurope network in Wiltshire, UK, in May 2008.

The website of the network which will continue to be hosted (for a target of another five years, funds permitting) to disseminate results and to provide a continuing resource for regeneration practitioners and policymakers.

5.3 Are any follow-up projects planned? If so, please name and briefly describe them. (maximum 2000 characters)

No follow-up projects are planned at the moment.

6. Experience gained and Feedback on the programme

6.1. Please report your experience gained with implementing your interregional operation. If possible, make proposals how you would improve procedures in a future. (maximum 2000 characters each)

➤ Project coordination and management

With the benefit of hindsight, it would have been useful for the network to have been able to employ a full-time coordinator at a suitable level, rather than just employing part-time administrative support.

➤ Implementation of activities

The implementation of activities went well and to plan. With the benefit of hindsight, a slightly bigger budget would have been useful to pay for partner's travel and accommodation, a full-time network coordinator, and enhanced dissemination.

➤ Cooperation between the partners

Partner cooperation went well with all partners making a positive contribution.

➤ Financial management / Budget / Financial plan

Costs for travel and accommodation were underestimated in the original bid. For the SRN network, this resulted in cutting back on coordination costs to increase funds for travel and accommodation. Only being permitted by the JTS to change the budget once during the lifetime of the operation was unnecessarily restrictive. Delays in receiving audited claims from Italian partners caused a number of delays and as a result significant expense was incurred by the Lead Partner (for financial management) which was not budgeted for and could not be claimed from from partners/INTERREG.

6.2. Could you name a strong and a weak point of the INTERREG IIIC programme?

Strong (maximum 1000 characters):

Weak (maximum 1000 characters):

6.3. Are you or your partners considering project ideas for a future programming period? What are the issues? (maximum 2000 characters)

Bristol is not considering becoming a Lead Partner in future territorial cooperation programmes. Aside from Bristol's financial contribution as a network partner, significant costs and risks were incurred in being Lead Partner.

A number of project partners are considering project ideas for future programmes and there has been active partner search within the existing SRN network. However, geographic/thematic restrictions prohibit all of the existing partners from working together again.

6.4. How would you evaluate the programme implementation and what changes would you propose?
(maximum 2000 characters)

6.4.1. Programme information and application (Information events, application pack and forms, consultations, availability of the JTS/MA etc)

(5 excellent, 4 good, 3 adequate, 2 poor, 1 very poor;)

5 4 3 2 1

Comments/proposals (maximum 2000 characters)

The Lead Partner failed to budget for specific participation in JTS led guidance events, as the provision of these events was not well publicised prior to the bid submission deadline. The SRN operation had one of the smallest INTERREG IIIC budgets and an extensive partnership, resulting in relatively tight budgets and an inability to take full advantage of JTS support.

6.4.2. Approval, contracting, and start-up (Conditions for approval, lead partner seminar, subsidy contract, consultations etc)

(5 excellent, 4 good, 3 adequate, 2 poor, 1 very poor)

5 4 3 2 1

Comments/proposals (maximum 2000 characters)

6.4.3. Monitoring, implementation and finalisation (Reporting, consultations, workshops and seminars, payments, final report etc)

(5 excellent, 4 good, 3 adequate, 2 poor, 1 very poor)

5 4 3 2 1

Comments/proposals (maximum 2000 characters)

6.5 Any other issues / comments / suggestions? (maximum 2000 characters)

7. Contact details

Please provide contact details for obtaining information about the operation after the official closure of the operation.

Institution: Bristol City Council
Address: 6 York Court, Wilder Street,
Postal code: BS2 8QX
Town: Bristol
Country: England/United Kingdom
Region : South West

Contact person: Paul Owens
Phone: ++44 (0)117 903 6418
Fax:
Email: paul.owens@bristol.gov.uk
Website: www.SRNeurope.net

Place, date:

.....
Name and title of the signatory

.....
Signature and stamp of the Lead Partner