
Minutes Project Management Committee PMC C-SCOPE, Ostend 16-17 February 2012

Present: Kathy Belpaeme (KB-chair), Ken Buchan (KCB), Ness Smith (NS), Sofie Vanhooren (SV), Hannelore Maelfait (HM – on Friday), Ann-Katrien Lescrauwaet (AKL-on Friday), Heidi Debergh (HD – on Friday)

Thursday 16 Feb 2012 – Location: Oostende

1. Welcome and apologies (minutes by LP); agree on agenda

2. Minutes of 29 Nov and review actions

Action 1: Ness to work on both reports (add Dorset input, restructure). Send draft to PMC by 10 February. – ok. See point 3a on agenda

Action 2: DCF to look at opportunities to conduct stakeholder interviews (contact Bournemouth university). Check timing and budget. See point 3b on agenda.

Action 3: DCF to check if lay-out of the end-reports can be done in house. - Ok. See point 3a on agenda.

Action 4: LP: translation of flyer to Dutch and French. Action to be taken after finishing joint report(s).

Action 5: DCF to propose programme for excursion on 13 June by 16 Feb. - Ok. See point 3b on agenda.

Action 6: DCF to propose draft programme for end conference by end Jan and propose a location. - Ok. See point 3b on agenda.

Action 7: Oliver to contact Eduoard Gatineau for closure statement at end conference. See point 3b on agenda.

Action 8: LP to flag up underspend of DCF to JTS. DCF will draft an e-mail with motivation. Ok. See email dd 24/1/2012 under point 5c on agenda.

3. Work plan 2011 for joint products

a. End reports

- Motivation: why 1 report instead of 2 (stakeholder participation & MSP process): to avoid doubling up and repetition of information. The 2 issues will be woven together, stakeholder participation is also an important part of the MSP work. Think carefully about the title.
- Structure of report: Ness will structure the report gradually. Elements to include:
 - Compare governance of the 2 countries. Easy understanding by using tables.
 - Scale/methods: approach and scale of both study areas
 - Lessons learned
 - Influences at national scale of C-SCOPE

- Focus on aspects:
 - Sustainability appraisal: highlight the benefits from doing this
 - Mention the importance of TOR's (Terms of Reference): Belgium introduced this for the first time, Dorset was an example for them.
 - Marine planning can become attractive when showing concrete cases, such as the sandbank of Heist

ACTION 1: HM to go through the report and add cross references (e.g. links to other projects), drawing European parallels.

ACTION 2: KB will check if there is a map of the Belgian marine plan online available. *Follow-up: not available online.*

ACTION 3: KB to explain dominance and the need for counterbalancing of certain stakeholders.

ACTION 4: KB to confirm area in km² of Belgian marine area. OK

- Further timing:

Draft by end March.

LP to revise in april.

Report ready 10th May. => start translation of summary leaflet + start lay-out and print.

ACTION 5: NS to work further on report & send final draft by the end of March.

- Lay-out and printing by Dorset:

ACTION 6: The number of copies will be decided in function of budget.

ACTION 7: Summary + leaflet will be translated in French and Dutch. Number of leaflets in colour copies will be decided in function of price (e.g. 500 copies ENG, less Dutch and French).

- Complement report with interviews?

- DCC will contact university of Bournemouth again on this matter. Current proposal involves high price. To negotiate if lower price is possible. If positive:
- Belgium takes care for his area and can use the UK model. Other option is to add these interviews as a bonus for the conference.
- 5 stakeholders for each partner

ACTION 8: NS to contact Bournemouth university for the interviews.

b. End conference: programme + excursion

A draft program was sent before the meeting.

Discussion:

- Program end conference + evening program:
 - Still searching for key note speaker

- Introduction: why 2 partners started this project

ACTION 9: KCB: write script for introduction

- 1st part: achievements of 3 actions in C-SCOPE, to be told as a story, no dry presentations
- 2nd part:
 - To include lessons learned
 - Importance of C-SCOPE
 - Why is marine management important + global perspective
 - Suggestion to add 'question time panel' (30'), with experts
 - JTS: What's innovative about C-SCOPE, how can a project be successful

Evening: wine reception + talk on the impact of the Olympics in Dorset.

ACTION 10: DCF: to establish an attractive agenda of the end conference to send out to the participants.
Deadline: 1 March.

- Programme excursion

ACTION 11: DCF to establish more detailed program to send out to the participants by the 1st of March.

ACTION 12: DCF/Belgium: to match people around the table for dinner

ACTION 13: KB to send a list of topics which carries away the interest of the Belgian participants to DCF, so DCF can appoint members to discuss these topics during the wine reception (end of 2nd day).

- Hotel accommodation

ACTION 14: DCF to check on prebooking rooms in RLNI Poole for 15-20 people by the end of March.

4. Project Management issues

c. Progress Report 6

The progress report has been finalized beginning of January and will be submitted together with the financial report.

d. Risk register: follow-up project progress

To add for the Belgian partner: leaving of staff: Valerie Vanhecke (project assistant C-Scope) left the Coordination centre on 14 November 2011, Sofie Vanhooren will leave on 29 February. Staff costs are for this reason under spent, to add to 3.9.

The remaining tasks will be further executed by Hannelore Maelfait and Kathy Belpaeme. It is unlikely that it will be possible to have new staff for the remaining months of C-Scope.

e. Admin closure of project – info JTS on closure report

Once the project reaches its last semester of implementation, the project will have to provide an overview of project and partnership achievements at the moment of closure (both in terms of finance and content) and the potential durability of these achievements.

The Final Report is therefore a key set of documents for communication and capitalisation purposes and represents the project business card.

The documents required at the end of a project are the followings:

1. Last regular **Progress Report** (within 2 months after the end date of the project's activities = end August 2012)
2. **Closure Report** (within 2 months after the end date of the project's activities = end August 2012)
3. **CD-rom** (within 2 months after the end date of the project's activities = end August 2012)
4. **Administrative Closure Checklist** (within 2 months after the end date of the project's activities unless an additional Financial Report is requested by the project, in which case, this checklist shall be submitted within 5 months = end November, after the end date of the project's activities)
5. **Additional Financial Report** for the +3 months (within 5 months after the end date of the project's activities)

The documents related to the project (invoices, accounting documents, controls and audits' reports, project results, etc.) have to be kept and must be accessible at least until the **31st December 2025**.

Project administrative closure

1. The Joint Technical Secretariat monitors all components of the Closure Report, such as the description of activities, the report on achievement of the planned activities, results and outputs.

The achievement of the planned results and outputs are monitored in relation with the content of the Application Form. If the information delivered in the report is insufficient, the Joint Technical Secretariat will ask for further information or clarification from the Lead Partner.

Once the check is completed, the Certifying Authority (CA) effects the payment to the Lead Partner. The latter is informed about the payment by means of a payment notification letter (e-mailed). Together with the notification, the LP will receive a closure declaration completed by the JTS. This document is only for information and needs no action from the LP. This document must be archived and kept by the project together with all other relevant documentation necessary to ensure the project audit trail. The closure declaration is the document attesting the administrative closure of the project.

2. The payment should be transferred to the Lead Partner bank account in one to two weeks.

The Lead Partner is then responsible for internal allocation or further disbursement of grants to the Project Partners. The Lead Partner should ensure that ERDF co-financing is forwarded to Project Partners in time and in full. No amount shall be deducted or withheld and no specific charge or other charge with equivalent effect shall be levied that would reduce these amounts for the Project Partners.

What we need to describe: some elements can be found in previous reports, but some questions are very specific for this report, e.g.

- What we were **trying to achieve**: We still agree with what was said in the application: "The C-SCOPE project partners from Belgium and the United Kingdom wish to achieve a seamless, integrated approach to land and sea planning and management. The purpose of the project is to provide the foundation for strong, vibrant and sustainable coastal economies, which are in harmony with the environment.

C-SCOPE is a unique project which involves all maritime sectors. Delivery through a 'bottom- up' approach will inspire a sense of stewardship for the coast and ownership of the project outputs, resulting in fewer conflicts and more opportunities for the various sectors."

- Please **review how your project has contributed to the EU policies on equal opportunities and environmental sustainability**.

- **What will happen to the projects results** now that your project is coming to an end? Will there be institutional structures that will maintain, use & / or disseminate the project's results? Have results led to long lasting effects?
- **What will happen to the partnership** after the closure of the project? Will the partnership continue to cooperate on this issue or another?
- Do you have any plans to **follow-up your project**? If so, will you apply for other external funding, develop a follow-on project in a future Cooperation Programme or will you self-finance the activity? What do you wish to keep alive as a result of this project and how will you do this?
- Do you think your project **contributes to the EU 2020 Strategy**?
- Do you think your project contributes to the **Integrated Maritime Policy**?
- **What has been achieved** that you would not have been able to achieve if you hadn't worked with partners in another country with a common border. Please be concrete and provide with some examples.
- **Synergies with other 2 Seas cooperation projects and/or other EU cooperation projects/programmes?**
- Do you feel your **project is an example of good practice**? + motivation
- Please tell us if it was **worth all the effort** and what you would like to be differently.

ACTION 15: NS will give input for the progress and closure report by the 1ste week of June.

- Financial report to LP: third week of July
- The partners agree that the lead partners will claim hours after June, for the administrative closure of the project..

5. Financial issues

a. Financial report & questions

The Financial report of West-Flanders was finalized on 19 January 2012. The report of DCF was received on 10 Febr electronically. The LP is currently working on the consolidated claim.

b. Current status common costs

Estimate budget so far for lead partner: € 19.670,38. For DCF: € 27450,30.

The final calculations will be made after the end conference.

Settlement of common costs: the Belgian accountancy suggests to settle the costs mutually after closure of the project. This means that DCF will pay for the end conference, and settle the costs in their last claim. Half of the difference will be refunded by Belgium to DCC.

Action 16: LP to compare common costs after end conference, and check if arrangements need to be made for transfer between the partners.

c. Current status budget/underspend

Current status of spending (incl. claim 6):

- ⇒ 65,30% spending for DCF, 76,45% for West-Flanders.

The staff costs of West-Flanders will be lower than anticipated, as 2 members of staff have left the team.

Follow-up (mail Ken Buchan dd. 24/1/2012):

When putting the project bid together, DCC took an average exchange rate from over the previous four years to calculate our budget, this being around 1.4 Euros to the Pound Sterling. However, the exchange rate has been nearer 1.1 Euros for the

last 3 years. The result of this discrepancy is that the expected income from funding partners and our expenditure has reduced. Currently, the underspend for DCF is projected at around 144,000 Euros.

6. Work plan for project activities:

a. Activity 1: Developing a framework for integrating terrestrial and marine planning

Dorset

The Marine Plan is ready and currently in consultation.

The MMO showed a great interest in the Marine Plan, they asked many questions on approach, objective setting,... which is very positive. Involvement of DCF in several workshops organised by the MMO.

The seascape assessment has influenced to planning process in a significant way. It is the baseline for what the actual character of the area is. It the translation of a landscape character assessment and integrates a lot more processes than marine planning, in this way being an important tool for ICZM, taking all aspects into account: what type of development would we accept in that specific area?

Belgium:

Process paper/long term vision Heist MMA is sent to all departments involved and the Minister of Public Works Presentation on T&F group 'Flemish Bays', who is dealing with defence of the entire Belgian coast and all development projects related to this. The long term vision has been discussed; as well as the different visions of the stakeholders; the sensitive issues; remaining procedural, juridical, scientific questions

The long term vision/process paper within C-SCOPE is now ready for translation into action. The Flemish government (minister of public works) will now take over the process, within their T&F group 'Flemish Bays'. This proves that the work done within C-Scope has been appreciated and will be valuable for future visions on the coast.

There is also great interest of other organisations/administrations as regards to the Bay of Heist process. The Coordination Centre was asked to present to long term vision on the T&F group of the coastal impulse programme (November), who sees possibilities to subsidy concrete actions of the long term vision in the Heist MMA. The vision serves as a framework for evaluation. In December, the long term vision was presented to the heads of department of Knokke-Heist, so the entire administration of the municipality was informed on the result of the 2 year during process related to the Bay of Heist. Best practices in the Heist MMA process to be further shared within the Interreg project 'Coastal Communities' and its project partners. Presentation of Heist process on their PMC in December.

b. Activity 2: Tools for achieving sustainable coastal economies and environments

i. sustainability indicators: workshop 17/2/2012

Dorset:

Currently working on GIS. Proposal for design for the website is ready.

The structure has been discussed:

Spatial information -> related policy -> needed licensing and regulations to respect

The MMO offered to check if licensing and regulations mentioned on Coastal Explorer are correct.

Belgium:

Nothing specific to report on the Coastal Atlas.

c. Activity 3: Achieving commitment to ICZM through stakeholder engagement

Dorset:

A new web application will be developed for iCoast: iCoast mobilewebapp

To investigate for iCoast:

- Is it a product worth commercializing it?
- The actual use is going down very quickly -> important to know how and why people use iCoast. A test will be set up.

Belgium:

We have introduced a new item for awareness raising during the last period. The Coastal Forum is quickly gaining success and the number of participants increase each year. However, there is no time to tackle topics in much detail during the forum evening programme. In order to allow for more detailed discussions, the team decided to experiment with organising a debate on a specific topic. The topic this time was 'mobility' as this one was mentioned many times by the stakeholders. This first "try out" of the debate was a success, and the team decided to continue with this formula in the future. The coastal forum is on the 29th of Feb. Speakers and themes are defined, the debates will be on 2 themes: 'the beach of the future' and 'nature at the coast'. The first one will be on how our beaches will look tomorrow, wider, and a different concept compared to today. We'll talk about possible theming of the beach, the future wishes of different users, privatising the beach etc. The second debate will be on how far we should open nature reserves for recreation, the carrying capacity of nature, etc. The yearly news publication, to be presented on the forum, is ready. The sustainable coastal projects who won an award in 2012, will also be presented. The award competition for sustainable coastal projects is taking place each 2 years.

7. Communication and dissemination

- a. Communication actions by partners and follow-up communication plan

Dorset:

At the launch of iCoast there were:

- 15000 visits
- 20900 page visits
- 1,38 pages/visit

Suggestion is to have several people to have a look at the website and to ask them to evaluate the website.

DCF has been asked for presentations of their activities on:

- The North-West Coast Forum (MMO event) in May
- Interreg project BLAST (land-based, protected landscape with coastal links)
- Road Island, US

Publicity will be made for iCoast

- at the Olympic Games
- press release in local paper
- on websites of respective organisations
- at the field trip of the master students of Plymouth University

2 awards won for the landscape assessment.

Belgium

There was an extended mailing on the Belgian Coastal Explorer and book version: all coastal communities, all libraries, schools and visitor centres. The Explorer and book was also further announced using e-newsletters and the websites of the partners.

The Belgian Coastal Explorer has been presented at several occasions:

- at a meeting of river basin of the Bruges polders in September (40 participants);
- to the Province of North Holland (whom are interested to develop a similar tool);
- to students of Erasmus Mundus MSC for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation; at a symposium for coastal guides (120 participants; 17th of December).

The activities on stakeholder involvement during the C-SCOPE project arose the interest of several organisations. Best practices on stakeholder participation experienced in C-SCOPE were shared during

- a Brussels workshop of the FP7 AWARE project on the 20th of October (25 participants)
- during a workshop of the Interreg project Coastal Communities 2150 (CC2150) on the 14th of December (30 participants).

In both workshops, all participants showed great interest in the lessons learned in the C-SCOPE project, and have the intention to work further on the experience built as to stakeholder participation.

With the installation of a new Federal government for Belgium, a new minister for the North Sea was appointed. The gives excellent opportunities to promote the work done within C-Scope on Marine Spatial Planning. The inventory and position paper, both C-Scope products, have been brought to the attention of the minister soon after he started. The LP was contacted by his cabinet to share ideas on MSP and marine policy.

b. Project website

Discussion on figures (see preparatory document)

- In December 2011, when the documents were put on the website, the number of visits doubled: 277 -> 580 visitors
- Top 10 pages December + January 2012: December: Marine Plan on place 1, 2 and 3. January: Belgian coastal forum on 1,2 and 3.

ACTION 18: All: are all necessary documents on the C-SCOPE website?

c. Webstats of kustatlas.be (including results of poll), iCoast and Coastal Explorer, C-Scope.

Belgium:

In order to be informed on the user profile of the visitors of the Belgian Coastal Explorer website, a poll was launched on the website. This enabled to have a better idea on who visited the website and why. This input is useful to maintain the website. Since the launch of the Belgian coastal explorer in June:

- the website has 1436 visitors each month
- about 70% new visitors each month
- The average of pages per visit is 4,51.

The results of the poll show that people mainly look for: general info on the coast, the interactive mapping tool and touristic information (= top 3) and that the profile of the visitors is very divers. This is positive, as clearly all different sorts of people find their way to the website: coastal inhabitants, students, tourists, officials, scientists, educational users, cultural organisations, guides, ...

d. To place on the memory stick: logos + slogan, websites

8. AOB

Messages for other EU projects:

- CC 2150:
 - Focus on stakeholder engagement strategies
 - Integrated vision for the coast
 - Next workshop end March
- CAMUS: integrated strategy for the channel. Drafts for comments are ongoing, no plan of the C-SCOPE partners to get engaged.

- Valmere: detailed socio-economic assessment
 - Values of natural environment
 - Develop wider tools to value ecosystems
 - To feed in wider project: opportunity to participate for Dorset
- LICO: DCC is not a partner, but hosts one of the CA officers, providing their expertise
- Belgium is further involved in BLAST, SUSCOD (developing ICZM assistant)
- FP7 project MESMA on MSP: still in starting phase.

ACTION 19: SVH to ask MESMA to put link to coastal explorer on their site

9. Date for next meeting

End conference: 13-15/6/2012. Foresee time for brief PMC meeting for closure of project.