



The European Union's Evaluation of Euromed Heritage II Programme

EC Lot 7 Framework Contract Number 2006/ 126302

FINAL REPORT

London
January, 2007

Dr. June Taboroff and Pam van de Bunt

Public Administration International



The Project was implemented by
Public Administration International



This Project was
commissioned and funded by
the European Commission



This Project forms part of
the European
Commission's Lot 7
Framework Contract

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed by the consultants during this evaluation do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission. All efforts have been made to consult widely during this evaluation however some project stakeholders have inevitably been omitted. The consultants have endeavoured to accurately record the views given by interviewees. The consultants have provided an objective assessment from their observations and through interviews and these are reflected in the findings and conclusions.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Executive Summary	6
Introduction and Methodology	6
I. Introduction and Methodology	10
1.1 Euromed Heritage II and its Objectives	10
1.2 Collaboration as a Key to Regional Programmes	10
1.3 Evaluation Methodology	10
1.3.1 Beneficiaries of the Evaluation	11
1.3.2 Scope of Evaluation	11
1.4 Methodology	12
II. Summary of the Performance of Five Euromed Heritage II Projects	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Relevance: Design and Thematic Content	13
2.2.1 Coherence with Barcelona Objectives and Programme Priorities	13
2.2.2 Design Factors	15
2.2.3 Thematic Focus	15
2.3 Efficiency: Costs and Value for Money	16
2.3.1 Comments on the Allocations	18
2.4 Effectiveness: Achievements, Partnerships and Audience	19
2.4.1 Projects Achievements	19
2.4.2 Unforeseen Outputs and Outcomes	20
2.5 Training and Workshops	21
2.6 Project Partnerships	23
2.7 Management Structure of Projects	26
2.8 Audience, Access, and Public Awareness	26
2.9 Sustainability: Institutional Capacity and Financial Health	27
2.9.1 Institutional Capacity	27
2.9.2 Ownership	28
2.9.3 Socio-Cultural Factors	29
2.9.4 Financial Sustainability	29
III Project Assessments	31
3.1 Delta	31
3.1.1 Objectives	31
3.1.2 Size and duration	31
3.1.3 Partners	31
3.1.4 Achievements	31
3.1.5 Organization	31
3.1.6 Project management	32
3.1.7 Criteria:	32
3.2 MediMuses	34
3.2.1 Objectives	34
3.2.2 Size and duration	34
3.2.3 Partners	34
3.2.4 Achievements	34
3.2.5 Organization	34
3.2.6 Criteria:	35

3.3 MedVoices.....	37
3.3.1 Objectives	37
3.3.2 Size and duration.....	37
3.3.3 Partners.....	37
3.3.4 Achievements	37
3.3.5 Organization	38
3.3.6 Criteria:.....	38
3.4 Patrimoines Partages	40
3.4.1 Objectives	40
3.4.2 Size and duration.....	40
3.4.3 Partners.....	40
3.4.4 Achievements	40
3.4.5 Organization	40
3.4.6 Criteria:.....	40
3.5 Temper	42
3.5.1 Objectives	42
3.5.2 Size and duration.....	42
3.5.3 Partners.....	42
3.5.4 Achievements	42
3.5.5 Organization	42
3.5.6 Criteria.....	42
IV. The RMSU: Delivering Technical Assistance and Monitoring.....	45
4.1 Introduction to RMSU and their role	45
4.1.1 Staffing and Staff Mix.....	45
4.2 Delivery of Technical Assistance	45
4.2.1 Monitoring	46
4.2.2 MedMonitoring.....	47
4.3 Visibility	48
4.4 Assessment	48
V. Recommendations for Future Euromed Heritage Programmes.....	50
5.1 Recommendations to the EC on procedures and management	50
5.2 Recommendations at the Project Level	51
5.3 Recommendations for Thematic and Regional Consideration	51
5.4 Recommendations for Fostering Collaboration	52
Annex 1	53
Annex 2	57

Tables

Figure 1 Projects and Their Coherence with Programme Objectives	14
Figure 2 Project Budget Allocations. Real spent figures on main budget lines in euros (based on RMSU figures).....	17
Figure 3 Training and Venues.....	22
Figure 4 Type of Partners	23
Figure 5 Geographic Spread of Partners	25
Figure 6 Project Audiences.....	27
Figure 7 Meetings with Project Partners and Stakeholders.....	53

List of Abbreviations

CD	Compact Disk
CULTNAT	Centre for Documentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage
DG	Director General
EC	European Commission
EH	Euromed Heritage
GIS	Global Information System
IT	Information Technology
MEDA	Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
PAI	Public Administration International
PMU	Project Monitoring Unit
RMSU	Regional Management and Support Unit
UK	United Kingdom
UNESCO	United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organisation

Executive Summary

Introduction and Methodology

Launched in late 2000 with a budget of 30 million euros, Euromed Heritage II declared the following priorities:

- Promote knowledge. Development of research, communication and inventories of material and immaterial heritage.
- Human resources. Development of innovative training systems and exchange of know how.
- Development (in the field of cultural heritage). Integrated management of heritage, awareness of heritage in related economic sectors, and public and private investment.

Euromed Heritage II follows on from Euromed Heritage I, with some adjustments in such features as grant size (maximum EUR 3,000,000), percentage of costs covered by the by Community funding (80%), and geographic spread of applications (at least two European Union countries and the largest possible number of Mediterranean partners).

The evaluation is based on an intensive analysis of five sample projects: selected for the review with the intention of learning from their successes. It is expected that the Regional Monitoring and Support Unit will issue a compendium of recommendations to avoid failure in managing projects. For intangible heritage, the projects are MediMuses and MedVoices; for tangible heritage, Patrimoines Partages and Temper; and for territorial (regional) cultural systems, Delta. In addition, it examined the performance and activities of the Rome based Regional Monitoring Support Unit (RMSU), with attention to their delivery of technical assistance and monitoring of projects.

Summary of the Performance of the Five Euromed Heritage II Projects

The five projects that form the basis for the Evaluation demonstrate a strong coherence with the objectives of the Barcelona Third Chapter: understanding and appreciating a common heritage. Patrimoines Partages and Temper are designed around elements of common architectural and archaeological heritage, in Patrimoines Partages, 19th and 20th century urban architecture, and in Temper, prehistory. MedVoices developed the premise of a shared urban history while Delta aimed to show the Mediterranean wide challenge of using cultural heritage for regional economic development. MediMuses focused on the Mediterranean music tradition as a form of shared cultural expression. Each of the projects has made a substantial contribution to deepening the understanding of elements of Mediterranean heritage through research and investigative activities and to appreciating that heritage through concerts, documentaries, publications, Heritage Days and other fora that have improved access. Development of heritage in a broader developmental and economic context was integral to some of the projects such as Delta.

In regard to programme priorities, the projects are aligned to the three areas of intervention. Each contributes to the development of important fields of shared Mediterranean knowledge. The projects were all knowledge based and in most cases were devoted to elements of cultural heritage that have been under-valued due to insufficient research and attention. Therefore each is highly relevant to the objective of increasing knowledge. Each produced a website and some form of publication. The human resources behind these areas of inquiry were the subject of attention in each of the projects. As the individual project summaries point out (see Chapter 3), technical assistance, training, and development of new skills was a key feature in MedVoices, Patrimoines Partages, and Temper and was supported in Delta. The related sector development was strongly

boosted by the project design of Delta, MedVoices, and Temper due to the involvement they created with other stakeholders including local government, cultural institutions, and NGOs. The scale and ambitions of the projects under review showed considerable differences. They ranged in total budget from 1.392.377 euros (Temper) to more than 3,600,000 million each for Delta, MedVoices, and Patrimoines Partages. The total number of partners ranged from 14 for MedVoices, to 6 for Temper, and the number of MEDA partners from 5 for MedVoices to 2 for Temper (Turkey, Israel).

Assessing efficiency and value for money requires that the variables of scale, composition of partnership, and institutional make up are also taken into account. Efficiency depends as well on the commitment and working style of the partner organizations. The share of project funds dedicated to professional fees shows a very wide range: from as low of 38% for MediMuses to a high of 77% for Patrimoines Partages. Administration costs varied from a high of 7% for MedVoices, the project with the largest number of partners, to 3% for Patrimoines Partages. None of the projects disbursed all funds available, ranging from 85% to 91% of funds allocated, suggesting that projects were either too ambitious or budgets too general.

Some projects were more modest in scope, others were more ambitious from the outset. In general all projects achieved to a great extent what they proposed to do. The choice of partner organizations was a key factor in achieving results. Overall, the projects also had impacts at the level of policy, practice, and institutional development including: identification of policy needs; demonstration of good practice; exchange of information and practice on conservation and management; support for new or young institutions; and creation of a cadre of staff trained in management disciplines.

All projects devoted part of their activities to training and workshops. It is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of those training activities took place in EU countries, only a small number took place in the MEDA countries. Many project partners (both from the EU and the MEDA countries) indicated they would have appreciated more training and workshops in the MEDA countries.

A number of project partners have successfully institutionalized some of the project results.

The Evaluation text gives detailed assessment of each of the project with information on: objectives; size and duration; partners; achievements; organization; project management; and criteria. Each project was reviewed for innovation.

The RMSU: Delivering Technical Assistance and Monitoring

The RMSU demonstrates highly satisfactory overall performance. It was hampered at the outset by the very late start date, and therefore was in a position of rectifying a serious backlog of problems.

Relevance: There was a very high need for the RMSU by project partners as many had problems in terms of reporting and clarifications on budget related issues. Due to their own project management experience and the needs assessment the RMSU carried out they delivered training and tools that raised the capacity of the project groups. The RMSU continuously emphasized the importance of the Barcelona Declaration and dialogue, for example holding a workshop in Barcelona to discuss and confirm the importance of the Barcelona principles.

Efficiency: RMSU made a strong effort to use their staff and other resources to a maximum effect, demonstrating considerable flexibility and imagination. Due to the evolving nature of the

programme, with some projects coming to an end and others beginning, they successfully adjusted their own work programme in order to respond to the needs of the project partners.

The RMSU guidelines for project management, *promoted a professional project management*, an area of weakness in many heritage organisations.

Effectiveness: In general the RMSU can be considered as innovative, responsive and committed. They demonstrated a service oriented approach, informed by analysis of needs and continuously updated by information on website use, field visits and interaction with the partners.

Sustainability: As the project implementation period of the RMSU is soon coming to its end, special efforts need to be made by the EC in order not to lose the data, guidelines, manuals and other documents that were collected or developed by the RMSU. *Special arrangements also need to be made in order to ensure continuation and updating* of the Euromed Heritage website as not to lose a very important reference point for stakeholders involved in cultural heritage in the region.

Recommendations for Future Euromed Heritage Programmes

The Euromed Heritage II projects under review have succeeded in meeting most of their central objectives, but there is considerable scope for improvement in definition of audience and outreach, support for MEDA countries as lead partners, involvement of a broader group of European countries, finding a balance between carrying out research and applied heritage management, and strengthening the overall programme by increasing interactions among the various projects. The four country consultations conducted by the RMSU and the beginning of a strategy document are steps in the direction of a more comprehensive understanding of the sector's needs and opportunities, which has been largely missing in both Euromed Heritage I and II. As no needs assessments were carried out prior to Euromed Heritage II, the projects under review represent agreement by experts on knowledge gaps.

In comparison with Euromed Heritage I, the projects are more focused and project management is stronger. For Euromed Heritage II greater selectivity is apparent in the choice of partners. Some of the projects show a higher degree of participation from the partners. The support and training on project management given by the RMSU has been a factor in increased skills levels. The EuroMed Heritage II projects under review are generally more effective than those of Euromed Heritage I.

Recommendations are organized into four subsets: recommendations to the EC on procedures and management; at the project level; for thematic and regional consideration; and for fostering partnership.

Among the key overall recommendations are:

- Put more effort in promotion of the programme.
- Ensure coordination between various EU programmes in the MEDA region (EUMedis, SMAP, Transport programme etc.).
- Make provisions for a smooth hand-over of the institutional and programme memory build up by the RMSU.

At the Project Level:

- Consider smaller budget projects.
- Involve more partners from Northern Europe.
- Divide the tender phase in two steps; a project concept phase followed by a selection of complete project proposals.

- Expand the working languages. Projects need to put more emphasis on the use of Arabic for their project outputs.

For Thematic and Regional Consideration:

- Carry out a systematic needs assessment of the heritage sector to determine critical needs and new opportunities, including institutional strengthening measures and leadership support. Balance the needs of research with management and conservation. Of the projects under review, a substantial share was focused on research with little applied results.
- Explore intangible culture. The majority of the Euromed Heritage projects focus on tangible heritage issues like architecture, cultural sites etc. More attention should be paid to intangible heritage which could include music, dance and oral heritage.
- Involve museums. Museums play an important role in promoting cultural understanding and improving standards of exhibition design, object conservation, childrens' education and other museological issues.
- Greater emphasis on education components, particularly childrens' education. Carry out more project activities in MEDA countries. According to figures of the RMSU 90% of the Euromed activities took place in EU countries.

For Fostering Collaboration:

- Structure cross-fertilisation of projects. Euromed Heritage II did not provide enough interaction opportunities between projects..
- More opportunities for face to face meetings. For most projects it would be useful to organize more face to face meetings in order to enhance dialogue, share of best practices and smooth project implementation.

I. Introduction and Methodology

1.1 Euromed Heritage II and its Objectives

Launched in late 2000 with a budget of 30 million euros, Euromed Heritage II declared the following priorities:

- Promote knowledge. Development of research, communication and inventories of material and immaterial heritage.
- Human resources. Development of innovative training systems and exchange of know how.
- Development (in the field of cultural heritage). Integrated management of heritage, awareness of heritage in related economic sectors, and public and private investment.

Euromed Heritage II follows on from Euromed Heritage I, with some adjustments in such features as the minimum grant for a project of EUR 500,000 and the maximum grant of EUR 3,000,000. The maximum proportion of project costs to be covered by Community funding is 80%. Maximum duration of projects is not to exceed 36 months. Applications were required to come from at least two European Union countries and a group of Mediterranean organizations covering the largest possible number of Mediterranean partners.

1.2 Collaboration as a Key to Regional Programmes

In many domains, including business, collaboration is being recognized as a key to effectiveness, knowledge sharing, and innovation. According to one business leader, “Those who work alone can only accumulate, but those who collaborate intelligently can multiply.” An effective collaboration process can also enable cross-pollination of ideas among stakeholders. The goal of achieving a result that is greater than the sum of the individual parts – the multiplication effect – is implicit in Euromed Heritage II as it gives an opportunity for regional collaboration in the field of heritage conservation.

Successful collaborative relationships exhibit characteristics that are relevant to an assessment of Euromed Heritage. These characteristics are:

- Clearly visible performance objectives agreed by all participants;
- Joint planning and systems supported by a free-flow of information;
- Frequent interactive, open communications across all levels of organizations;

Cross border collaborative efforts pose many challenges and risks, though. Success is more likely if the collaboration is part of a sound overall strategy and if the strategies of partners are compatible. Moreover, cultural difference needs to be managed carefully, requiring sensitivity on all sides.

1.3 Evaluation Methodology

In conformity with the Terms of Reference (Decision 2000/003-961), the B & S Europe/ Public Administration International team has carried out an evaluation of Euromed Heritage II, the second phase of the Euromed Heritage programme. It assesses the extent to which the global objectives of the Barcelona Declaration promote and improve perceptions between the cultures throughout the Mediterranean region as understood by the Barcelona Conference have been translated into action. Specific questions were raised by EC that are incorporated into the

assessment. It further provides the EC with practical recommendations for the possible future phase, based on the performance of the programme and lessons learned.

The Evaluation took as its starting point the global objectives of the Barcelona Declaration:

“The participants recognize that the traditions of culture and civilization throughout the Mediterranean region, and dialogue between these cultures and exchanges of human, scientific and technological level are an essential factor in bringing people closer, promoting understanding between them and improving their perception of each other.”

It refers to the guidance provided in the Call for Proposals SCRE/111577/C/G Euromed Heritage II, issued by the European Commission for projects financed by the European Community (2001/C 11/08) as follows:

“Projects should be aimed at launching regional cooperation projects in the field of Euro-Mediterranean cultural heritage. Their specific objectives should be to increase the capacity of Mediterranean countries to manage and develop their cultural heritage. Priority should be given to processes of learning, exchanging experience and experimenting, in view of creating favorable conditions for the conservation and development of cultural heritage.”

1.3.1 Beneficiaries of the Evaluation.

The primary audience of the Evaluation is the Europe Aide office Unit A/3, as well as the Euromed Heritage II projects and Regional Management Support Unit (RMSU).

1.3.2 Scope of Evaluation.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the evaluation assesses the following key issues:

- Relevance: the extent to which project designs are coherent with the Barcelona third chapter objectives and with priorities of the programme as well as with sector needs such as protection of cultural sites, integration of heritage into urban planning, development of linkages with local economic development, training of heritage workers, or improved access to information about heritage
- Efficiency: costs and value for money, including the performance of the RMSU
- Effectiveness: in achieving programme objectives (general/specific as defined in the Call for Proposals and related to projects purposes
- Sustainability: likelihood of continuance of positive outcomes after the end of the project

The achievements of the different projects in regard to communication and information, and training are also traced. The analysis of the use of communication and information includes an assessment of the use of IT and websites to communicate project activities, the various communication materials, and to what extent the projects were able to raise public awareness about cultural heritage. Local communication activities and communication between partners are also assessed.

The evaluation is based on an intensive analysis of five sample projects: considered by the EC to be among the more successful projects and selected for the review with the intention of learning from their successes. For intangible heritage, the projects are MediMuses and MedVoices; for

tangible heritage, Patrimoines Partages and Temper; and for territorial (regional) cultural systems, Delta. The EC plans to issue a compendium of lessons about project shortcomings as well.. In addition, it examined the performance and activities of the Rome based RMSU, with attention to their delivery of technical assistance and monitoring of projects. Special attention has been given to the monitoring and coaching of the RMSU, the reports of the MedMonitoring, and the visibility of the programme.

Recommendations cover needs and priorities for a future heritage programme, for a call for proposals, and preferred implementation method. These recommendations draw upon ideas proposed by the Euromed Heritage II partners, the RMSU, as well as cultural heritage sector leaders and experts.

1.4 Methodology

The methodology includes analysis of existing documentation, development of questionnaires for lead groups and projects, interviews with key stakeholders in the programme, site visits, and practical focus groups (as in the Istanbul Forum). Visits were made to the five Lead Partners where key staff were interviewed. Missions were undertaken to at least two subprojects per project in all MEDA countries except Morocco and Syria. The Euromed Heritage II conference in Istanbul provided an opportunity to speak with partners from these countries. Furthermore the RMSU was visited and extensively interviewed and all their deliverables were reviewed.

The Evaluation builds on documentation produced by the five projects and the RMSU. It also makes use of available project monitoring reports produced by the MedMonitoring group and the RMSU. The evaluators also referred to relevant documentation on aspects of heritage management.

The Logical Framework approach informed the investigation, together with the questions raised in the Terms of Reference. Discussions with the lead groups reviewed the initial log frame and its relationship to final project outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Indicators include, inter alia, indicators for: costs and budgets; training in project design and management; institutional capacity; dissemination of information and visibility; change in dialogue; new working relationships as a result of the partnerships; and leveraging of public or private funds.

The consultants have also met with other Mediterranean heritage experts and stakeholders in order to gain their views on possible future programmes. These include directors of museums, national heritage organizations, heads of foreign research institutes, heads of university cultural heritage management programmes, and practitioners.

II. Summary of the Performance of Five Euromed Heritage II Projects

2.1 Introduction

The Evaluation looked at a sample of five projects selected by the EC that covered a range of subject areas: Delta, MediMuses, MedVoices, Patrimoines Partages, and Temper. Intangible heritage is represented by MediMuses and MedVoices, tangible heritage by Patrimoines Partagés and Temper, and the development of territorial cultural systems by Delta. These projects are seen by EuropeAid as among the more successful of the Euromed Heritage II projects in regard to their contribution to knowledge of heritage and overall project management.

2.2. Relevance: Design and Thematic Content

This section focuses on the extent to which the design of the projects are coherent with Barcelona third chapter objectives and with the three main priorities of the programme as stated in the Call for Proposals. The three areas of intervention are

- Knowledge: development of research, communication and inventories of material and immaterial heritage;
- Human resources: development of innovative training systems and circulation of know-how;
- Development: integrated management of heritage, awareness of heritage in related economic sectors, public and private investment.

2.2.1 Coherence with Barcelona Objectives and Programme Priorities

The five projects that form the basis for the Evaluation demonstrate a strong coherence with the objectives of the Barcelona Third Chapter: understanding and appreciating a common heritage. Patrimoines Partages and Temper are designed around elements of common architectural and archaeological heritage, in Patrimoines Partages, 19th and 20th century urban architecture, and in Temper, prehistory. MedVoices developed the premise of a shared urban history while Delta aimed to show the Mediterranean wide challenge of using cultural heritage for regional economic development. MediMuses focused on the Mediterranean music tradition as a form of shared cultural expression. Each of the projects has made a substantial contribution to deepening the understanding of elements of Mediterranean heritage through research and investigative activities and to appreciating that heritage through concerts, documentaries, publications, Heritage Days and other fora that have improved access.

In regard to programme priorities, the projects are aligned to the three areas of intervention. Each contributes to the development of important fields of shared Mediterranean knowledge. The human resources behind these areas of inquiry were the subject of attention in each of the projects. As the individual project summaries point out (see Chapter 3), technical assistance, training, and development of new skills was a key feature in MedVoices, Patrimoines Partages, and Temper and was supported in Delta. The related sector development was strongly boosted by the project design of Delta, MedVoices, and Temper due to the involvement they created with other stakeholders including local government, cultural institutions, and NGOs.

The projects were all knowledge based and in most cases were devoted to elements of cultural heritage that have been under-valued due to insufficient research and attention. Therefore each is highly relevant to the objective of increasing knowledge. Each produced a website and some form of publication. Patrimoine Partages resulted in a series of 16 commercially published works or CDs on Mediterranean architectural and urban history and Temper has prepared a volume of

essays based on the project experience to be published by Cambridge University Press. Many also financed posters, brochures and other forms of information leaflets. MedVoices also produced videos and exhibits which were intended to disseminate project findings and raise awareness among a broader public. MediMuses prepared two important volumes, one on “Theory of Mediterranean Music” and the other on “History of Mediterranean Music” (in publication).

In regard to development of human resources through training and sharing of knowledge, each of the projects provided different activities. Delta carried out several training sessions for participants. MediMuses was very successful in organizing a great number of Master Classes, open for all musicians in the region, that were an excellent form of training that greatly contributed to the musicians’ skills. MedVoices used interactive workshops as a means to raise skills and design project activities. This proved to be a highly effective way of delivering training in the collection and use of oral history. Patrimoines Partages did not deliver formal training, but the coordinators worked with participants to give them guidance in research techniques and preparation of their texts for publication. Temper provided formal training to participants as well as several on site workshops in which site management planning was discussed. The two-week course at Oxford Brookes University was an intensive investigation of issues related to site management.

Development of heritage in a broader developmental and economic context was integral to some of the projects but not all. Delta was dedicated to setting cultural heritage in its broader economic and regional (territorial) setting and intersectoral working relationships were fostered at the local level in the participating countries. There was considerable attention to theoretical and philosophical questions, with only limited resources for implementation of the pilot activities. The MediMuses project gave musicians in the region new economic opportunities by way of better public exposure which eventually resulted in more (paid) concerts in the region. Apart from this it cannot be said that MediMuses contributed to the development of heritage in a developmental or economic context. MedVoices made an original contribution to the development of the heritage sector by using oral histories as a means to understand urban history and the dynamics of migration. Patrimoines Partages examined the architecture and urban development of important southern Mediterranean cities in the 19th and 20th century. It did not look at the economic underpinning, but individual studies such as the work on Ottoman architects document the economic impulse behind new building. This theme could be developed further. Temper’s work at three prehistoric sites, which are located in isolated rural areas, highlighted the importance of cultural assets for rural communities as a means of economic development. It also pointed out the need for careful planning in order to protect the sites from agricultural intensification and expansion.

Figure 1 Projects and Their Coherence with Programme Objectives

Project	Barcelona Objectives	Knowledge	Human Resource Development	Sector Development
Delta	H	H	M	H
MediMuses	H	H	H	M
MedVoices	H	H	H	H
Patrimoines Partages	H	H	H	M
Temper	H	H	H	H

H- High M -Moderate L- Low

It is important to comment that there is considerable tension in the projects and programme as a whole between the *research objectives* and *on- the- ground conservation and management activities*. In some projects, such as Delta, partners were frustrated because of the academic approach and lack of funding to carry out pilot activities. Similarly in Patrimoines Partages, partners expressed the need for practical guidelines for rehabilitation of buildings.

2.2.2 Design Factors

Each of the projects utilized a different type of design, determined by the preferences of the Lead Partner, the number and types of partners, and the objectives of the project. The main features of the project design for the five projects under review are:

- Research, case studies, and field activities: - Delta
- Research and performance, publication: - MediMuses
- Programmatic approach that involved definition of broad objectives followed by decisions on activities to be carried out: - MedVoices
- Research and production of a publication series: - Patrimoines Partages
- Applied research: with three field sites and training: - Temper

Two projects developed generic models of regional economic or site planning that were then tested in the field, Delta at the regional level and Temper, at prehistoric archaeological sites. Delta was a complex project with site specific and thematic research, accompanied by the development of action plans and pilot activities. The project design of Temper was based on a close and coherent integration of research on site management plans, design of site management plans for three sites, and provision of educational services for children at two of the sites. Patrimoines Partages followed the design of large research and publication projects. It set up an Advisory Board. The MediMuses project was to a large extent built around the research component that resulted in the two volumes. Activities like the Master Classes and concerts resulted in the publication of a number of CD's aimed at the general public. The programmatic approach taken by MedVoices in which the objectives were established at the outset but project activities were identified by means of intensive working sessions with partners, was seen as a risk by the Commission, but resulted in high sense of ownership among the partners and solutions that were tailored to local circumstances. One of the partners described the MedVoices approach using this metaphor,

“A caravan gets organized as it proceeds” Turkish proverb

2.2.3 Thematic Focus

The evaluation was asked to comment on whether “real problems” were clearly and accurately identified in sector themes. In addressing this question it is important to realize that cultural heritage conservation involves many sectors, including education, infrastructure, urban, finance, and public institutions. Because Euromed Heritage II was not preceded by an analysis of problems or solutions, comments on the identification of “real problems” can only be based on comparative information and analysis known to the evaluators from their own work in this sector. Several of the projects were strongly research oriented with little or no application of findings as part of project design and therefore are a step removed from realities. Other projects though made an important effort to raise awareness on so far often ignored issues of cultural heritage.

The five selected projects developed areas of knowledge that were previously overlooked. Each theme, whether material or immaterial heritage, is an important expression of Mediterranean culture:

- 19th and 20th century architecture and urban planning – Patrimoines Partages
- Prehistoric archaeological sites, site management planning, childrens’ education - Temper
- Regional (territorial) development and cultural heritage - Delta
- Oral history for definition of local urban history - Med Voices
- Mediterranean musical traditions - MediMuses

Each of these projects clearly identified its chosen theme and worked in an area which is relatively under represented. Within the particular theme, the projects under review looked at some of the problems. For example Patrimoines Partages assembled and published studies. This knowledge is a pre-condition for conservation but the project did not address the need to revise legislation and enact the necessary supporting regulations nor look at practical issues of reuse. Temper focused on prehistoric archaeological sites in three countries and prepared site management plans and in two cases, educational materials and activities. It did not address issues related to conservation of the sites or how the management plans would be implemented or financed. Delta highlighted the need for integrated regional economic planning and worked with groups to define an action plan. Very little financing was made available to operationalise the action plans nor was there attention to developing financing strategies. MedVoices used an oral history lens to explore the history of a selection of urban settlements in the Mediterranean region. Through a series of activities including films, exhibits and publications, it made accessible the findings to local audiences. The size of the project did not permit it to do more work to reduce urban alienation or improve the situation of new emigrants. MediMuses made an important effort to raise awareness on a common musical tradition in the Eastern Mediterranean but failed to institutionalize these efforts for example by institutionalizing this at Conservatoriums in the region.

While these are worthwhile initiatives, there are many areas of need in the heritage sector in the Mediterranean Basin, and it should not be assumed that these projects address the most critical of these needs.

2.3 Efficiency: Costs and Value for Money

The scale and ambitions of the projects under review showed considerable differences. They ranged in total budget from 1.392.377 euros (Temper) to more than 3,600,000 million each for Delta, MedVoices, and Patrimoines Partages. These three projects were therefore almost 2.5 times larger than Temper. As discussed in the following sections, the total number of partners ranged from 14 for Med Voices, to 6 for Temper, and the number of MEDA partners from 5 for MedVoices to 2 for Temper (Turkey, Israel). The type of institutions making up the consortia also varied: some were exclusively universities, others were Ministries of Culture and national or local government organizations such as the Office for the Protection of the M’Zab Valley.

When assessing efficiency and value for money, it is important that these variables of scale, composition of partnership, and institutional make up, are taken into account. Efficiency depends as well on the commitment and working style of the partner organizations. Where the partners are highly motivated, as in the case of the Algerian partners of Patrimoines Partages, the project is likely to achieve its objectives, and more. Nevertheless, an analysis of project budgets provides another optic on project efficiency. It is instructive to examine the proportion of budgets allocated for the principal categories of professional fees, administration, per diems and travel, conferences and publications. Projects also spent money on other items, such as evaluation and other miscellaneous expenditure. It should be noted that very little was allocated for evaluation, 12,000 euros for Delta, 25,000 euros for both a conference and evaluation for MedVoices, and none for Patrimoines Partages or Temper. MediMuses has allocated 10,000 euros but not used the amount.

Figure 2 Project Budget Allocations. Real spent figures on main budget lines in euros (based on RMSU figures)

Project	Total Project Budget	Professional fees	%	Administration	%	Per diems & travel	%	Conferences	%	Publications	%	% spent of total budget
Delta	3.644.870	1.932.305	60%	200.207	6%	345.032	11%	117.119	3%	118.446	3%	88%
MediMuses	3.747.739	1.260.620	38%	179.286	5%	210.848	6%	948.377	25%	455.868	12%	88%
MedVoices	3.427.514	1.558.757	50%	209.757	7%	126.758	4%	870.920	28%	160.835	5%	91%
Patrimoines Partages	3.308.938	2.222.025	77%	96.721	3%	100.198	3%	102.677	3%	215.068	6%	87%
Temper	1.392.377	750.582	64%	76.617	6%	81.497	7%	79.74	7%	85.514	8%	85%

2.3.1 Comments on the Allocations.

The share of project funds dedicated to professional fees shows a very wide range: from as low of 38% for MediMuses to a high of 77% for Patrimoines Partages. A closer analysis of the Patrimoines Partages budget of 2.222.025 euros shows that the majority of the researchers and project staff were paid for a full 36 months at a part time share, while in the case of other projects they were paid for short term inputs. Delta also had a large allocation for professional fees, 60% of its budget and a total of 1.932.305 euros. Temper was perhaps the most modest in its funding for experts. An average percentage of total project expenditure for professional fees among the five projects is 57.8%. Projects with very high costs for professional fees generally spent relatively little on conferences and publications, with potential negative implications for sharing and dissemination of results.

Administration costs varied from a high of 7% for Med Voices, the project with the largest number of partners, to 3% for Patrimoines Partages. This must also be seen in the context of the high amounts the project spent on professional fees (more than 2 million euro).

For per diems and travel, again there is considerable variation, with Patrimoines Partages spending only 3% of its budget on travel and Delta 11%. Amounts spent on travel ranged from a high of 345.032 euros for Delta to a low of 81,497 euros for Temper (the project with the least number of partners). In general, the more partners, the higher the per diems and travel budget.

Conferences were an important budget item for MedVoices, using some 28% of their budget. This financed two large meetings in which the films produced in the project were screened. MediMuses also spend a large share of its budget, 25% on conferences and the highest amount, some 948.377 euros. Delta and Patrimoines Partages each spent 3% on conferences but neither held a final conference.

Publications were produced by all projects, with MediMuses spending 12% or 455.868 euros of its budget for this purpose. It should be noted here that the most important output of MediMuses, the publication of the volumes, has not been printed or distributed. The average spend on publications for the five projects was 207,146 euros. The publications costs are often costs for researchers. This is the case for MediMuses which to date has only made a printout of the books. This is not the case for Patrimoines Partages which separated costs for publications from those for researchers (budgeted on human resources budget lines).

None of the projects disbursed all the funds available. Temper disbursed only 85% of its total budget, while MedVoices disbursed 91%. The average percent spent for the projects was 87.8%. It is unclear why more than 10% of budgets were not disbursed; it would be worthwhile for future programmes to analyze this further suggesting that projects were too ambitious in activities and some made rough budget estimation.

The question of value for money requires that each project be assessed in regard to objectives, achievements, and impacts and outcomes. Could these projects achieve the same production, learning and dissemination with smaller budgets? Could staffing have been leaner? For example, the budget of Patrimoines Partages, which produced 16 publications, can be equated to some 225,000 euros per publication which is considerably higher than comparable costs for Euromed Heritage II projects such as Manumed or Corpus. MediMuses produced Master Classes, concerts, CD's and two volumes of essays (yet to be published) for a cost of over 3 million euro. In fields where basic research has not been undertaken, as for example oral urban history, 19th and 20th architecture of the southern Mediterranean, or Mediterranean musical traditions, what is the value

of the knowledge gained? In the context of the economy of culture in the Mediterranean region, the argument can be made that such investments are likely to generate new jobs and revenues.

It should be noted by means of comparison that a number of World Bank heritage projects have been carried out in the MEDA countries and in Eastern Europe and Central Asia with total budgets of US\$5 million. Their objectives have been improved heritage management, and they have modernized national inventories, rehabilitated major cultural sites, assisted the handicraft industry, and supported national institutions. Their multi-sectoral approach and use of small grant funds for community groups (ranging in size from US\$500 to \$30,000) are among the factor of success.

2.4 Effectiveness: Achievements, Partnerships and Audience

The specific objective of the Euromed Heritage Programme is “to increase capacity of Mediterranean countries to manage and develop their cultural heritage. Priority should be given to processes of learning, exchanging experience and experimenting, in view of creating favourable conditions for the conservation and development of cultural heritage.” The analysis of the five selected projects indicates that in terms of achieving the programme objectives, the effectiveness of the projects vary from project to project but overall is reasonable and in some cases outstanding. Each of the selected projects acted to *validate* its chosen area of activity as a legitimate element of Mediterranean heritage.

2.4.1 Projects Achievements

Some projects were more modest in scope, others were more ambitious from the outset. In general all projects achieved to a great extent what they proposed to do. The choice of partner organizations was a key factor in achieving results.

The visited project achievements are summarised as follows:

Delta: Developed a methodological guide for the development of Territorial Cultural Systems. This guide is now available in English and French for the use of project partners in current and future development of territorial cultural systems. Action plans for each of the pilot projects were developed and pilot activities were selected and in some cases implemented as in Morocco. National information days were held by project partners in order to raise awareness. For school children special educational kits were developed by a number of project partners.

MediMuses: Aimed at music in the Eastern Mediterranean through research and the promotion of common musical heritage in the region. It organized a number of concerts, master classes, seminars and symposia. It also worked on the publication of two volumes, one on theory of the Mediterranean music and one on the history of Mediterranean music. At the time of this evaluation these volumes are completed but have not been published and distributed. The concerts and master classes were highly successful and managed to reach a great number of people interested in Mediterranean music.

MedVoices: Conducted original, in-depth research into the cosmopolitan oral and social histories of 13 cities across the Mediterranean region with a special focus on oral history within urban settings. Among the final outputs were documentaries, exhibitions and events and awareness raising activities. It also created a unique oral history database that includes a great number of materials on the 13 cities.

Patrimoines Partages: Focused on the 19th and 20th century architectural and urban heritage of selected Mediterranean cities and architects. Global Information System (GIS) was used as the

basis for the research, in some instances the first introduction to this technology applied to heritage inventories. A total of 16 publications and CDs were produced, including city profiles, key elements of rehabilitation and documented guidebooks. The project was effective in developing a share methodology for this inquiry and in developing good practice guidelines for the study of recent urban architecture and its rehabilitation.

Temper: Aimed to strengthen the concept of a common Euro-Mediterranean heritage through pre-history and tried to make pre-history more accessible to the general public with a focus on school children. The project developed three management plans for three pilot sites and organised on-site training workshops in the Turkish, Greek and Maltese sites as well as a two week training course in the U.K. In Turkey, the project partner produced an outstanding series of educational materials on the Catalhoyuk site and prehistory, including booklets, games and posters, for school children which were tested in schools.

Overall, the projects had impacts at the level of policy, practice, and institutional development. To summarize, these impacts are as follows:

- Identification of policy needs: Through analysis carried out by projects, policy gaps were identified such as adaptive reuse of historic buildings in Egypt; recognition of 19th and 20th century architecture in listing procedures; protection of intangible heritage; documentation and IT management; educational provision for children; and tourism and heritage planning.
- Demonstration of good practice: Through project activities, good practice was shown as follows, methods of collecting oral history and its analysis; peer reviews for architectural studies; IT for heritage management including GIS; design and preparation of educational programmes for schoolchildren.
- Exchange of information and practice on conservation and management: This included exchanges in regard to museum exhibits; comparisons of site management plans; bibliographies of 19th and 20th architecture and architects; and compendiums of Mediterranean music.
- Support for new or young institutions. Euromed Heritage II gave an opportunity for new institutions to expand their competence, as for example CultNat in Egypt, the OPVM in Algeria, and the new University of Tizi in Algeria.
- Creation of a cadre of staff trained in management disciplines. Through the RMSU's training courses in project management, many participants in the programme have been exposed to basic management disciplines and procedures, most for the first time. As management expertise is sorely needed in the heritage sector, these courses are very valuable.

2.4.2 Unforeseen Outputs and Outcomes

In addition to meeting their initial objectives, the projects also resulted in a number of unforeseen outputs and outcomes. There include:

- Documentation: Publications, CDs, documentary films, brochures;
- Cultural events: Film festivals, Heritage Days, concerts, and other events;
- Legislation: Turkey now requires site management plans, for which Temper provided a model;
- Policy changes: for example, better integration of intangible heritage into heritage management and better recognition of 19th and 20th architecture in conservation planning;
- Change of practice: Delta provoked a more comprehensive integration of cultural sites into regional economic development in Israel, Temper in Turkey started with management plans, use of GIS in Morocco, MedVoices archiving of oral history, Patrimoines Partages access to historical documentation;

- New partnerships: partners working together on other programmes or projects as in the case of MedVoices and Patrimoines Partages partners;
- New educational programmes: Patrimoines Partages and MedVoices directly influenced programmes in universities in the region;
- Public value: Better appreciation of intangible heritage, 19th and 20th century architecture, pan-Mediterranean musical traditions.

2.5 Training and Workshops

All projects devoted part of their activities to training and workshops. It is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of those training activities took place in EU countries, only a small number took place in the MEDA countries. Many project partners (both from the EU and the MEDA countries) indicated they would have appreciated more training and workshops in the MEDA countries. Most training workshops however, were highly valued by the project partners and participants and were seen as crucial elements of the projects.

In the table below an overview can be found of types and venues of training.

Figure 3 Training and Venues

Project	Type of training	Venues
Delta	6 different thematic workshops including: Development of a Mediterranean Cultural Identity, Integration of material and immaterial culture, Culture and economical development	Seville, Spain, Rhodes, Greece, Arles, France, Fes, Morocco, Malta, Syracuse, Italy
MediMuses	A total of 75 visiting lecturers, organized in 22 groups	Thessaloniki (6), Amman (4), Tunis (2), Beirut (3), Istanbul (2), Larnaca, Cairo (2), Athens
MedVoices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initial training in web design (by website designers Motiongrafik) in an IT and media workshop in London, to enable material to be captured locally and remotely uploaded to the Med-Voices site. ▪ Further training organized in response to the emerging project requirements. Consortium meetings used to identify further training needs. Training held in diverse locations around the network so as to devolve responsibility for organization as far as possible to the local host partner. ▪ Second IT training session in Nicosia (again delivered by Motiongrafik). ▪ Training workshop on documentary filmmaking, delivered in Beirut by professional ethnographic and documentary filmmakers, for recording of visual material ▪ Training in mounting and designing exhibitions held in London, with the participation of professionals from the Museum of London, the Imperial War Museum, and London's Jewish Museum, which make innovative use of sound archives and intangible heritage in the interpretation of their collections. ▪ The Scientific Committee convened in Bethlehem in September 2004 for a three day working session analysing and evaluating the research findings of the project and planning the final project conference. 	London, Nicosia Beirut, Bethlehem
Patrimoines Partages	Informal exchange of experience and methodologies	
Temper	Scientific workshop on management plans Scientific workshop on interpretation and education	Greece Malta

2.6 Project Partnerships

Number and types of partners varied from project to project but compared to Euromed Heritage I, more partners come from the non-governmental sphere. In general project partners indicated they were happy with the geographic spread of partners but some indicated they would have liked to see more partners from the northern part of Europe. Some southern participants were disappointed by the low levels of interest among northern Mediterranean experts and institutions, remarking that they would like to have more northern partners come to their country to see realities for themselves. In Euromed Heritage II most partnerships were confined to Mediterranean partner countries only.

The number of partners varied from 6 partners for the smallest project (Temper), to 14 partners for MedVoices. The Temper project included only two MEDA partners: Turkey and Israel. While smaller projects may be more efficient, the restricted number of partners means that they have a more limited field of influence. Many partners involved sub-partners for different parts of the implementation of the project. This ensures a greater effectiveness of the project and ensures project results are more widely distributed.

In the tables below overviews can be found of the various types of partnerships.

Figure 4 Type of Partners

Project	Ministries of Culture	Universities & Research institutes	Museums	Local Authorities	NGOs	Private Sector	Others
Delta	X	X		X	X		
Medi Muses		X			X		
Med Voices		X	X		X		
Patrimoines Partages	X	X			X		
Temper		X	*		X		

*Temper worked with museums in Turkey but they were not official partners.

In comparison to Euromed Heritage I, Ministries of Culture played a much smaller role in Euromed Heritage II. They were officially partners in only two of the projects under review: Delta and Patrimoines Partages. In general, government ministries were seen as insufficiently flexible and too bureaucratic to be effective in executing project activities. In some areas of heritage management, however, they are legally responsible so must be included in projects. All of the projects involved civil society through the participation of NGOs. This is a marked shift from Euromed Heritage I and an important indication of outreach to new audiences. The private sector has not been an explicit partner in any of the projects, although Patrimoines Partages developed working relationships with several commercial publishing houses.

Figure 5 Geographic Spread of Partners

Project	Nr. EU partners	Morocco	Algeria	Tunisia	Egypt	Jordan	Israel	Palestine	Turkey	Syria	Lebanon
Delta	7	1	1				1	1			
Temper	4						1		1		
Patrimoines Partages	10	1	1	2	1					1	
MediMuses	5					1					1
MedVoices	10				1			1	2		1

The Maghreb countries were represented in only two of the five projects: Delta and Patrimoines Partages. The Mashreq countries were partners in Delta, Temper, MediMuses, and MedVoices. Jordan and Syria had only one project each. Each of the projects had many more EU partners than MEDA partners.

2.7 Management Structure of Projects

Each of the five projects reviewed by this evaluation showed a somewhat different kind of management. Projects that had different project managers or more people that were ‘in charge’ were generally less effective in taking decisions and project management.

Most project partners were pleased with the bottom-up approach of project management (specifically in the case of MedVoices). MedVoices employed a project manager and a project coordinator (in the last phases of the project, full time) who worked closely with the partner groups. A series of working meetings were organized in the first year of the project to define the project activities, develop the research tools, and allocate partner budgets. One of the project objectives was to hold the training in diverse locations around the network, and to devolve responsibility for their organization as far as possible to the local host partner.

Delta’s project management focused on delegation of tasks. Some of the Delta partners saw this as quite effective but other partners perceived the same project management structure as very top-bottom with little authority for the partners itself. They were also critical about lack of budget involvement in the pilot activities.

Patrimoines Partages was managed by an arm of the CNRS in Orleans. It benefited from a full time project coordinator and a full time project manager with complementary expertise and experience of MEDA architectural heritage and EC project management. The Lead Partner was in close touch with the partner groups as they carried out their research. The project benefited from a Conseil Scientifique. In general the structure was top down, with little horizontal interaction among the partner groups.

Temper had a full time project coordinator, and the backup of Cambridge University’s legal department to steer the project. Unfortunately the contract of the project coordinator ended with the official end of the project, not the end of work on the project, which has entailed considerable pro bono work. The working groups and workshops ensured a good exchange among the project partners.

A stable project coordinator, available full-time with multi language skills has proved to be vital for smooth and effective project management.

Internal monitoring and evaluation structures and procedures were not established in the projects under review although Delta (€ 12,000), Medvoices (€ 25,000 for both a conference and evaluation) and MediMuses (€ 10,000) included a budget line for evaluation. These amounts were not used. Patrimoines Partages and Temper had no evaluation budget. The projects did keep track of their progress and took on the responsibility of quality control but it was done informally. They received Med Monitoring missions at least twice yet were only provided with the reports through the RMSU so were not able to learn from them directly. Further reflections on monitoring are given in the chapter on the RMSU.

2.8 Audience, Access, and Public Awareness

Most projects were quite aware of their specific audiences. Outstanding examples of an awareness of their audience were MedVoices (general public) and Temper (youth). MediMuses focused on a small target group of practicing musicians. The wider public, however, was also reached by this project through the production of CD's and concerts. Patrimoines Partages aimed at an audience of fellow researchers and students, schools of architecture, and the "larger public" including visitors to Mediterranean cities.

Through Information Days (Delta) and exhibitions (MedVoices) efforts were made in order to reach the wider general public. Most of the projects had their specific audiences in mind while producing the main project outputs. Question marks however can be placed to what extent some main project outputs (like the Theoretic Volumes of MediMuses and the Methodological Guide of Delta) will be used beyond a very small group that has specific interest in the themes.

It also should be taken into account that most of the project deliverables were produced in English or French and sometimes also Italian or Greek. Arabic, the language used by the majority of the MEDA partners was too often ignored. Access for many target groups would have been made easier if final products would have been in Arabic too.

Some projects made good use of websites as professional information tools. MedVoices is a good example of this. However it should be taken into account that in many MEDA countries access to the internet is sometimes difficult (in countries like Tunisia and Algeria) and in other cases still slow (and therefore often expensive). Projects should take this into account while developing their website in order not to make it too heavy and easily accessible.

In the table below an overview can be found of different project audiences

Figure 6 Project Audiences

Project	Academics	Practitioners	Government	Private sector	General public	School children
Delta	X	X	X		X	
MediMuses		X			X	
Med Voices	X	X		X	X	X
Patrimoines Partages	X	X	X			
Temper	X	X	X	X	X	X

We note that all projects addressed the audience of practitioners, and four out of five academics and the general public. The private sector and school children were reached in only two of each of the projects.

2.9 Sustainability: Institutional Capacity and Financial Health

2.9.1 Institutional Capacity

A number of project partners have successfully institutionalized some of the project results. Some MedVoices partners have developed teaching or PhD programmes around the theme of oral

history. Local museums that were involved in the programme have set up exhibits based on the work of MedVoices. The Delta partner in Israel is now using the methodology developed by Delta also for a number of other sites, including the territorial approach among a great number of local stakeholders. The Algerian Delta partner has strengthened its relationships with other agencies at the local and national level through the project and is continuing these links.

Temper worked through an NGO in Turkey that in turn had links with universities and primary schools. It developed and tested educational activities for school age children in a group of schools, both public and private in Istanbul and at the Catalhoyuk site. The public schools in both Istanbul and the site, however, do not have resources to continue with the activities, while the private schools do.

For Patrimoines Partages, the project activities in Sfax, Tunisia are being put to use in the development of the plan for the city and planning guidelines. The municipal authorities, with the Association de la Sauvegarde de Medina, worked cooperatively to develop a GIS inventory of historic buildings.

For one of the lead partners however, the project was so big that it took up almost all of their institutional capacity. In the case of the MediMuses project, the lead partner En Chordais, basically became MediMuses. It seems that in such cases project management and financial risks with regard to institutional capacity have not been analyzed beforehand. Lead partners should be obliged to demonstrate prior experience in running multi-million euro projects.

Despite the above mentioned positive examples there is still a considerable rigidity in national institutions like Ministries of Culture to take into account these aspects of heritage and develop the necessary conservation and management mechanisms. In order to develop sustainable cultural heritage management it is crucial that Ministries also start to take up this responsibility.

Positive highlights though are the training and workshops offered by the RMSU as well as by the various projects themselves. Capacity building at the level of project partners is a step in the right direction to develop the necessary management skills like project design, project management and project reporting. For many of the partners this was their first exposure to Project Cycle Management and all admitted these newly acquired skills will help them immensely in enhancing their activities in the preservation of cultural heritage.

2.9.2 Ownership

For those projects under review that had a more horizontal management approach there was a stronger sense of ownership among the different project partners than for the projects that had a more vertical or top-bottom style of management. The horizontally managed projects in turn demonstrated evidence of ongoing working relationships after project completion. This was particularly the case in the MedVoices project. Project management of these projects was primarily based on joint decision making which helped very much in creating project ownership by all project partners.

In the cases of a more top-bottom management approach, as was especially the case in MediMuses project, partners complained about 'receiving orders' and 'no room for accommodating suggestions.' After the closure of the project, these project partners have not been in touch with each other and no follow-up activity has been developed by any of them.

Delta falls in between the top down and more horizontal approach. The project partners commented that they were instructed to carry out Action Plans and define Pilot Activities, yet

there were opportunities for exchange of experience so there is some ongoing contact among groups, as for example the Moroccan and Algerian partner groups.

Temper worked with known partners in only two MEDA countries and Malta. The Turkish partner was highly involved in the project, but there has been little follow up. The Lead Partner commented that there are existing networks for pre-history so that it was not judged necessary to create another.

2.9.3 Socio-Cultural Factors

Sometimes due to late involvement of some projects partners, as in the case of MediMuses, local needs were not always taken into account in the project proposal which created reluctance to real project commitment among some of the project partners.

In contrast, the activities of MedVoices were determined during the course of the project through intensive consultation and exchange of views with local partners. Delta also made a considerable effort to tailor activities to local needs.

Local social and cultural factors were met in the Temper project in Turkey, where local groups expressed severe reservations about the teaching of evolution. The partner group was able to diffuse a potentially difficult situation.

Project partners, especially from MEDA countries, raised the fact that all lead partners were based in EU countries. This is for a substantive part, but not entirely, due to institutional and financial requirements. A number of project partners also indicated that they would have appreciated more South – South cooperation. According to figures of the RMSU, 90 % of all Euromed II activities took place in EU countries!

As raised earlier, the use of more Arabic as one of the project languages, apart from English and French, would also have helped to break down social and cultural barriers.

2.9.4 Financial Sustainability

There is some limited evidence of leveraging of additional resources. One example is the support from the Koc Foundation that complemented Temper's work at Catalhoyuk. MedVoices gained considerable local support, particularly for its exhibits and film showings. Delta also succeeded in obtaining additional support, as in the case of the project partners in Ghardaia who obtained funding from both local and national government agencies to begin their pilot activities.

Some projects show good continuous dissemination of results. The CD's produced in the framework of MediMuses can now be found in record shops in many countries. In the case of print publications, the use of commercial publishing houses ensures a continuous distribution. The Patrimoines Partages publications are a good example of this. The Lead Partner made efforts to select publishing houses with broad distribution networks.

Much – perhaps too much - is left though to the partners' goodwill and initiative and there does not seem to be a current active distribution of, for example, the main outputs of Delta (the methodological guide). In the case of MediMuses, the volumes are still awaiting publication and the methods of distribution after publication are so far unknown. This is worrying in a project of well over 3 million euros.

A number of projects showed the ability to raise additional funds in order to continue a number of project activities or start off other activities based upon former project activities. A good example of this is Patrimoines Partages that was able to interest CNRS to provide ongoing support for their website. MedVoices is currently in the same process with UNESCO. Some project partners signed up in different groups and managed to get financing for different projects under different EU or other donor funded programmes. Patrimoines Partages is currently continuing activities under a new EU programme and several MedVoices partners are working together under various EU and bilateral funded programmes.

III Project Assessments

3.1 Delta

3.1.1 Objectives

The project aimed at the development of “territorial cultural systems.” Development is defined as balanced growth combined with competitiveness and aimed at social cohesion. Systems refers to linkages between national level agencies responsible for local development and culture, and local organizations. Existing cultural resources are used as a lever for development. Analysis, development of Action Plans and Pilot Activities are carried out by partner groups in the MEDA countries.

3.1.2 Size and duration

The budget was 3.644.870 euros with an EC contribution of 80%. A total of 3.203.695 euro was spent. The project began on 15/01/02 and ended on 14/11/05

3.1.3 Partners

The Delta consortium is made up of ten partners from nine Euro-Mediterranean countries. There are other associate members of the consortium, from both the public and private sectors, which form two different networks. The first network concentrates at the level of the Euro-Mediterranean region, and developed the theory of “territorial cultural systems.” The second network is represented by local institutions which coordinate with local stakeholders. Their task was to carry out an analysis of local assets and conditions, and develop an Action Plan with pilot activities.

The MEDA partners are: Algeria, Minstere de la Culture, Direction du Patrimoine Culturel and the Office for the Preservation of the M’Zab Valley, Ghardaia; Israel, Israeli Antiquities Authority, Conservation Department, Jerusalem; Malta, foundation for International Studies, Valletta; and Palestinian Authority, Centre for Cultural Heritage Preservation/Bethlehem 2000.

3.1.4 Achievements

The project experimented with a territorial (regional) approach to linking heritage conservation with economic development. The IMED team produced guidelines for the project. Each of the four MEDA partners produced two major reports: an assessment of assets and an action plan with proposals for pilot activities. These organizations established local networks to bring together institutions with responsibility for aspects of local economic development linked to heritage. Achievements remain largely conceptual as the project financed only a few investment activities at the local level.

3.1.5 Organization

The project was a complex effort, composed of four work packages divided into different sub-projects. There were also three horizontal activities, also divided into sub activities, and one vertical activity that was focused on coordination and internal project monitoring as well as several publications and other deliverables. The project also established an expert advisory committee.

3.1.6 Project management

The Project was managed by IMED. A serious weakness in project design and management was that the Partners did not have decision-making power over the budget for Pilot Activities. There was a serious misunderstanding on their part that some project funds would be available for implementing the agreed upon activities. In the case of Algeria, despite having submitted five Pilot Activities, they were not informed about funding decisions and received only a small amount of funding, less than a third of the amount provided to the Moroccans.

3.1.7 Criteria:

Relevance. The overall objective of using culture as a tool of development at the territorial (regional) level is highly pertinent in the Mediterranean context. The academic and abstract language, “territorial systems,” however, tended to create obstacles to understanding at the local level in the MEDA countries. As one partner group commented, “Too much philosophy and too much theory.” The choice of partners enhanced impact of the project: national Ministries of Culture were the primary partners, each of which selected a local partner. In the case of Algeria, the choice of the M’Zab Valley, a World Heritage Site, and the Office for the Preservation of the M’Zab Valley was another demonstration of relevance.

Efficiency. The complexity of project design was a challenge to efficiency and the project was extended by 10 months (total of 46 months). IMED managed the project in a very professional manner and the different project components were clearly differentiated. The IMED structure was also complex, with a Project Director, Technical Coordinator, and Project Manager, resulting in multi-tiered decision making. Efficiency gains would have been achieved if the project objectives and the form of pilot activities had been conveyed in more accessible language.

Effectiveness. Project effectiveness was compromised for several reasons. The project had difficulty in explaining its objectives in a non-technical manner which reduced its potential impact. Neither the Med Monitoring reports nor the RMSU summary volume, for example, succeeded in clearly articulating project objectives or mechanisms. In regard to IMED, one can question the large number of publications (counted in units which is very confusing) and whether this increases understanding of the underlying issues and project achievements. More opportunities for exchange between the partners would have encouraged greater sharing of experience and cross fertilization. Within a project of nearly 3 million euro, it is surprising that very little financing was made available for the pilot activities, which were the culmination of the project. It is also questionable that these funds were not distributed equally among the MEDA partners, for example the Algerian partners received 29,000 euros for one activity while the Moroccans received more than 97,000 for three. It should be noted that the website has not been updated.

The Algerian partner achieved a high degree of effectiveness, due its committed staff and the active dialogue it established with the key government agencies, including the Ministry of Small and Medium Enterprises and Handicrafts, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Environment etc. It obtained funding from the Ministry of Culture to begin to carry out elements of the pilot activities.

Sustainability. IMED is in the process of establishing a post-Delta network which will help to maintain some momentum but it is not yet operational. At the local level, particularly in the M’Zab Valley, the process of integrated planning has gained acceptance and the responsible agencies are working in a coordinated manner to build on their unique cultural, environmental and social assets.

Public Information.

Delta's efforts at dissemination of its results were modest. It was very late in the project that IMED provided copies of the reports to the RMSU. In contrast, the local partners, namely the Algerians, made notable efforts at increasing public awareness. This was achieved through radio programmes, posters, an exhibit and seminars. The Delta handbook is only available through IMED which restricts access. The heritage day in Ghardaia was an effective way to increase public interest and could be extended nation wide in the future.

Innovation

This is the only Euromed Heritage project that links national authorities, local government, civil society, the private sector, and heritage experts in a common endeavour. This is an important contribution to highlighting the public value of heritage, which is essential if it is to achieve the support it needs from government, the private sector and civil society. Delta adopted an intersectoral, integrative approach to regional development that in the longer term is necessary for the sustainability of heritage. Validation of this approach, however, depends on creating successful culture based activities that improve the economic prospects of communities.

3.2 MediMuses

3.2.1 Objectives

The project aimed to research and recompose the elements of a common Mediterranean musical heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean region. It demonstrated that local national traditions in the field of music, despite their autonomy and special characteristics, are all part of a common music of the Mediterranean. Although the project was mainly addressed to musicians, researchers, musicologists and music teachers it also aspired to reach broad sections of the general public.

3.2.2 Size and duration

The total project budget was 3.747.739 euro to which the EC contributed 80% . The spent amount was 3.203.695 which is 88% of the project budget. The project ran from 01/02/02 through 31/07/05

3.2.3 Partners

From the outset the project had eight project partners. Most of them were European based, Associazione Culturale Scuola di Musica Antica, Venezia, Italy, Centro Flamenco Paco Pena, Spain, The Byzantine Festival of London, and the Lazarus School of Byzantine Music in Cyprus. Three were from the MEDA countries, the El Hefny Centre for Music in Cairo, the Jordanian National Music Conservatory and the Lebanese National Higher Conservatory. During the project period two partners, ECUME from France and Centro Flamenco Paco Pena from Spain, dropped – out for reasons of discontent with project management and not being able to finance 20% own contribution.

3.3.4 Achievements

The project was very effective in organizing high quality master classes for musicians. It also organized a number of concerts and produced various CD's. Another main output however, the production of two volumes on "History and Theory of Mediterranean Music," are not yet published. The material of these volumes has been gathered during the course of the project but publication and distribution of these volumes have not taken place during project implementation period. In principle the project was aimed at professionals in music but through the concerts and CD's enough efforts were made to involve the public at large.

3.3.5 Organization

The aim of lead partner Enchordais is to involve musical heritage into current and present music and music education. Enchordais got involved in the Euromed Heritage II programme after they were contacted by a consultant who not only told them about the Euromed Heritage tender but also supported them in order to develop the proposal. Due to the many different activities that had to be organized, the project was logistically quite difficult. This was further complicated by the fact that the first project manager changed after a few months and the second project manager after one year due to bad performance. When the third project manager took over, management improved and this manager stayed until the end of the project. Project partners indicated that the project was mainly managed from top-to-bottom with none or very little room for suggestions and negotiations. The vast number of activities that were to be implemented might have contributed negatively to this management style. Furthermore, the project was so large for the lead partner

Enchordais that the MediMuses project was led by Enchordais instead of Enchordais leading the MediMuses project.

3.3.6 Criteria:

Relevance. Due to a lack of borders and states in history, until the 19th century, music in the Eastern Mediterranean was considered to originate from the whole Eastern Mediterranean region. But with the emergence of national states, music became 'nationalised' and each country tried to distinguish itself with their own national traditions. The project tried to raise awareness on a common musical heritage through improving awareness on a common musical tradition. Through a great number of musical exchanges it also tried to establish dialogue between different musicians in the region. No real needs analysis took place before the project but the project was based upon an already existing plan of Enchordais which aimed at developing cooperation between musicians within the Eastern Mediterranean region.

Efficiency. The project was too big in size for Enchordais which led to organizational stress to implement all activities in time. In this case, a more moderate budget and consequently less activities would have caused less pressure on the lead partner and would have probably resulted in a more partnership oriented approach of the project management.

Effectiveness. This project had many outstanding results in the form of concerts, master classes and CD's. The CD's can still be found in record shops around the region. Communication within the project took mainly place at the steering committee level. Project partners complained that their specific wishes were not taken enough into account. The cooperation of musicians from countries such as Turkey and Greece can be seen as a clear expression of the Barcelona declaration.

Sustainability. The fact that most partners were not involved in the design of the project, created problems later with regards to ownership of the project. Ownership by project partners was never really established during the project implementation period. Consequently there are still very few contacts between the various project partners and follow up activities have not taken place. No effort was made to find additional funding for the continuation of some of the project activities.

Due to the fact that Enchordais is a very small organization, 95% of the Enchordais staff have only worked for the project and many of them had to leave the organization upon completion of the project. The current activities of Enchordais however are a natural continuation of the activities of the project and soon Enchordais will publish a book about Arabic music.

Public Information

The main target groups of the project were people involved in music and music students, children involved in music as well as the general public. The general public was mainly targeted through the concerts and the CD's. The project produced an enormous amount of information material in the form of posters, brochures and leaflets, mainly in order to advertise the concerts. Promotion was done for each activity by the different partners, according to guidelines provided by the lead partner. Promotional activities and information material included printed material, television material, trailers and radio spots. Public awareness was raised through the concerts and the media attention they received.

Innovation

Concerts and CD's are not very innovative per se. The greatest innovation of MediMuses lies in the fact that for the first time so many musicians in the region worked effectively together and exchanged views and experiences.

3.3 MedVoices

3.3.1 Objectives

MedVoices is an ethnographic investigation into the cosmopolitan of oral and social histories of 13 historic cities across the Mediterranean region, and particular urban quarters within them.

The project has five principal aims:

1. To work collectively within a network of partners in order to carry out the research
2. To integrate the basis of the Euro-Mediterranean common heritage from an ethnographic and oral history perspective;
3. To challenge the customary emphasis given to monumental heritage and to emphasize its relationship to intangible cultural heritage;
4. To promote an awareness of cosmopolitan and multi-ethnic aspects of Mediterranean urban cultural heritage;
5. To further understanding and encourage respect for pluralism, tolerance and peaceful co-existence between the many peoples who inhabit the Mediterranean urban environment.

3.3.2 Size and duration

The grant size was 2,829,771 euros. The project began on 15.05.02 and ended on 31.03.06.

3.3.3 Partners

The MEDA Partners were: Egypt, Library of Alexandria, Alexandria; Lebanon, American University of Beirut; Malta, University of Malta, Department of Management –FEMA, Msida; Palestinian Authority, Centre for Cultural Heritage Preservation, Bethlehem; Turkey, The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey, Istanbul.

The project also had partners in Cyprus, Greece, Italy, and Spain

3.3.4 Achievements

The project documented oral histories of 13 Mediterranean cities, among them the great cosmopolitan cities of Alexandria, Beirut, Istanbul, Marseilles, and London. The project provided opportunities for its partners to create cultural dialogue and exchange regionally, locally, and internationally. It produced a range of recordings, films, publications, exhibits, a website, and a major conference held at the Biblioteca Alexandrina in Alexandria, Egypt. The partners developed secondary school oral history programs. The project worked successfully in five local languages: English, Spanish, Turkish, Greek, and Arabic.

The project considered five types of urban centre: Marseilles, Ancona and Alexandria, all port cities and important transit zones for the Mediterranean; Nicosia, Beirut and Bethlehem, cities emerging from or embroiled in years of conflict; Istanbul, Chania and Granada, whose cosmopolitan pasts contrast with a more homogeneous contemporary culture; Ciutat de Palma, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria and Valleta, where tourism encroaches on established communities; and London, a major centre of the Mediterranean diaspora.

3.3.5 Organization

The project was managed by London Metropolitan University. Their approach was highly participatory, with intensive sharing of ideas and experience among the groups as a prelude to finalizing specific subproject tasks. This was achieved by working meetings that brought together various partners, held in different Mediterranean locations. The budget was decentralized so that each of the partners had decision making responsibility for the activities. Training was provided for the partners in techniques of oral history, including a session at the Museum of London.

3.3.6 Criteria:

Relevance. The theme of Mediterranean urban history as derived from oral histories is very relevant. Equally relevant is the underlying theme of migration, perhaps the single most contentious issue facing the European Union. In many of the partner countries, there had been little sense of local history, only a national history. Moreover, oral history has not been systematically exploited in most of the partner countries. The Turkish partner, the History Foundation, carried out an excellent project activity at a secondary school in an area of Istanbul composed of second generation arrivals to the city.

Efficiency. The project was slow to disburse, as it devoted nearly a year to project formulation. Once the partners agreed on the specific project elements, activities were carried out as planned. Due to the creative process of project design, additional activities were proposed and implemented, including films, events etc. At project completion, Med Voices was one of the most productive of the projects having made eight documentary films on a variety of subjects, held the MedVoices Film Festival in Malta, created a roving regional exhibition *Shared Spaces in Times of Crisis*, organized a music festival in Crete and carried out many outreach activities.

Effectiveness. Although the project was slow to disburse – and was nearly cancelled as a result- it is one of the most effective of the projects in view of the range of activities it supported and the high quality of the individual activities. The partners were well connected to local institutions and civil society, thereby ensuring an audience for their activities. In Istanbul, for example, the MedVoice exhibition and publication (translated into Turkish) was very popular. In some of the exhibitions, individuals who had been interviewed to give their personal histories participated in the exhibitions. The project facilitated cultural exchange through the participation of project partners in each other's public local events, thereby stimulating creative approaches to common issues.

Sustainability. The project has developed strong sustainability, through its collaborative working method, the design of its website, the ongoing commitment of its partners to continue their local history activities, and the proposed establishment of an association. A number of the project partners have begun new joint activities and are using the oral history skills and experience that they gained through the project in their own institutions.

Public Information.

Public information activities were outstanding. They were varied, numerous, and designed for local audiences. All partners focused on engaging segments of the population not conventionally targeted in, or drawn towards, organized cultural activities. Audiences targeted by partner groups included school groups, intergenerational groups, marginalized people, rural migrants, and the wider public. Activities included exhibits, publications, films, a website, and events. Each of the products attracted a large audience.

Innovation

MedVoices is a highly innovative project. Its focus on the oral history of Mediterranean urban centres is a first for Euromed Heritage and for the heritage sector as well. It is innovative in its programmatic approach to project design and delegation of responsibility to project groups. Its website is perhaps the most innovative of any of the Euromed Heritage II projects, as it allows interactive operations. The project gave care to develop outreach to segments of society that are typically ignored in organized cultural activities. The exhibits were also innovative as they included photos, artwork, and in some cases the presence of individuals who provided their personal histories.

3.4 Patrimoines Partages

3.4.1 Objectives

The objective of the project was to develop a shared knowledge and know-how of the 19th and 20th century urban architectural heritage of the Mediterranean,

The work of the project was composed of two elements:

- Knowledge and acknowledgement of the values of 19th and 20th century architecture;
- Dissemination of effective tools and practices for the protection and re-valuation of this heritage.

3.4.2 Size and duration

The project grant was 2,603,423.55 euros. It started on 02.01.02 and ended on 01.01.06

3.4.3 Partners

Fifteen partners from nine countries took part in the project. They represented different subject areas and institutions: universities, and research institutes.

The MEDA partners included: Algeria, University Mouloud Mammeri de Tizi-ouzou, Department of Architecture; Egypt, CULTNAT, Centre for Documentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage, Giza; Morocco, Ecole Nationale d'Architecture Mdidnat Al Irfane, Rabat; and Syria, University of Tishreen, Lattacia, Architecture and Urbanism Unit; and Tunisia, Institut National du Patrimoine and Association Sauvegarde de la Medina, Tunis.

3.4.4 Achievements

The project produced the joint publication of some 16 books and CD roms, the cost of which was paid for by the project and publishing houses. The publications are expression of an awareness-raising programme with profiles of Mediterranean cities and architects and documented guidebooks, and good practice, with bibliographies and examples of best conservation practice etc.

The project exposed the lack of knowledge and research on 19th and 20th architecture in the MEDA countries, in contrast to that in the European countries. By carrying out research in national, municipal and private libraries and archives, the project partners have documented potential sources for future research.

3.4.5 Organization

The project was managed by CNRS which set up a Conseil Scientifique. Each of the partners had at least one coordinator, in some cases a national coordinator in others a scientific or technical coordinator or an activities coordinator. In addition, each of the partner organizations received financial support for a secretariat, project coordination and GIS expertise.

3.4.6 Criteria:

Relevance. The architecture of the 19th and 20th century has received little attention in the MEDA countries, in some cases because of its negative colonial connotations. The project convincingly demonstrated that this architecture is a *shared inheritance*, with many commonalities in

architectural form and function, but elements of local style and adaptation. The project has opened a new forum for debate in the region.

The project revealed tensions between the priorities of university researchers and heritage managers. Some of the partners expressed frustration that the project remained a research project as they considered that the application of research as an urgent need.

Efficiency. The project was well managed by CNRS, with a Project Director and Project Manager who made great efforts to facilitate the work of the partners. They drew on the extensive experience of CNRS in managing EC projects. The Memorandum of Understanding that Patrimoines Partages drew up was well done and later adopted by the RMSU as a model for other projects.

Commercial publishers gave added value to direct project financing as they were able to provide a more efficient distribution of the publications among the various target groups: students, experts in architecture and heritage and researchers. They also guaranteed wider access via catalogues, internet purchase etc.

Effectiveness. The project succeeded in publishing all but one of the proposed studies. It did not produce a film as originally intended. The published volumes are well designed and researched. The Tunis volume is already out of print, and other volumes are being used as teaching material in universities.

The project was welcomed by researchers as an opportunity to complete long standing research and see it published.

Sustainability. The Lead Partner was conscious of ensuring sustainability and put into effect a number of shorter and longer term measures. Among the shorter term measures are: Musomed, a project of the FP6 framework; an Association of Patrimoines Partages. Mid term actions included: the introduction of a Master in Heritage Program at the ENA Rabat; creation of a PhD research unit for historic towns at the University of Manouba; finance for a research project in Italian architecture overseas coordinated by the University of Naples etc. Longer-term actions are requested for collaboration in rehabilitation projects with MEDA partners.

Public Information

Patrimoines Partages was concerned primarily with university and academic audiences. To a lesser extent it provided information for cultural tourists to Mediterranean cities such as Tunis and Port Said. The dissemination of public information was limited and would have benefited from further development and testing of innovative methods.

Innovation

The project was innovative in its choice of subject matter and the agreements it made with commercial publishing houses. It encouraged original research on new subjects related to 19th and 20th architectural heritage.

3.5 Temper

3.5.1 Objectives

Temper focused on prehistoric archaeological sites, their management and educational programs for school children and visitors to raise awareness of the nature of prehistoric remains.

The aims of the project were:

- To strengthen the concept of a common Euro-Mediterranean heritage using pre-history;
- To make Mediterranean prehistory accessible to all, from local school children to tourists and a wider international audience;
- To develop and understanding of how prehistory contributes to our cultural heritage.

3.5.2 Size and duration

The project had total budget of 1,113,902 euros. It began on 02.01.02 and was completed in 34 months.

3.5.3 Partners

Temper involved six partner institutions and five prehistoric archaeology sites across Europe and the southern Mediterranean.

The two MEDA partners were: Israel, Israeli Antiquities Authority, Jerusalem; and Turkey, Economic and Social History Foundation, Istanbul.

3.5.4 Achievements

During the course of the project, integrated management plans were developed at five pilot sites. Educational programmes were developed at three of the sites: Catalhoyuk, Turkey; Paliamblea, Kolinros, Greece, and Kordin III, Malta. Training programmes accompanied the development of management plans. Two on-site training workshops and an intensive three week residential course provided training in heritage management and disseminated the results of the Temper subprojects. Research conducted as part of the Temper project identified gaps in the provision of planning guidance for prehistoric sites: a lack of specific legislative protection for prehistoric sites and a general emphasis on built heritage and standing architecture. These research findings are being used to revise legislation in Turkey.

3.5.5 Organization

The project was well managed by a Coordinator from the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge. A leading pre-historic archaeologist and director of the Catalhoyuk archaeology project served as the Project Director. The project also benefited from the teaching and research services of Oxford Brookes University.

3.5.6 Criteria

Relevance. The relevance of the project is high in view of the low recognition of prehistory in the region, the importance of site management plans to guide the conservation and visitor experience of sites, and the focus on using the sites as an educational opportunity for school children. The

project also provided on-site training workshops and an intensive course to disseminate the methodologies developed by the Temper project for prehistoric sites and best practice in heritage management.

Efficiency. The project was well designed and efficiently implemented. The coherence of the project sub-components was strong and the programme of work realistic. With four partners, of which Turkey was the only MEDA country (Malta was also in the project), the logistics were significantly less complex than in larger projects. All of the partners had previous working relations with the Lead Partner, so that the risks of poor performance were low. In three of the four countries, foundations were selected as partners and they showed considerable flexibility in their approach. Only in Israel was the partner a government body. It was completed (with the exception of a book that was not part of the original project proposal) on time and at budget.

Effectiveness. The project was modest in scale (only two MEDA countries) and very much a pilot project. The training workshops were scheduled early in the project to provide an injection of knowledge and skills to inform the teams during the development phase of the site management plans. Location of the workshops on or near the sites enabled the participants to use the sites as case studies, an effective method to explore the issues involved. Sharing of experience among the partners and the Lead Partner team increased the effectiveness of design phase of the site management plans. The children educations' component was less consistent across the partners.

In Turkey, due to the excellent work of its partner, the History Foundation, it was able to develop teaching materials and offer site visits to school children from four schools. The private schools have continued to use the materials, but the state schools did not have funds to do so as it involved school facilities for art projects, museum visits, a space in the curriculum etc. The site management plan developed for Catalhoyuk is one of the first in Turkey. The Ministry of Culture has subsequently enacted a law requiring site management plans for major archaeological sites, and has used the Catalhoyuk plan as a model. In several countries, particularly Israel and Turkey, the project served to raise the profile of prehistoric sites and their special conservation and presentation needs.

Sustainability The sustainability of the project is mixed. On the one hand, it demonstrated the site management plan process but did not include investment funds to ensure that the plans were implemented. The educational programmes for schoolchildren were piloted for one season. In some countries, they were repeated the following year. In Turkey, the public education system did not have adequate funds or flexibility to continue the programme. Although successful, the activity was not replicated in other MEDA countries.

The project merits expansion to other prehistoric sites in the region, over a longer period of time and with funding for implementation of the site management plans.

Public Information

One of the aims of the project was to raise awareness and interest in pre-historic sites. Through programmes for schoolchildren, as in Turkey, the project succeeded in raising interest in prehistory and the Catalhoyuk site. The programmes were very popular with schoolchildren.

Innovation.

The project incorporates several innovative features. Preparing site management plans for pre-historic sites was new for the four partner countries. To the extent possible, the plans incorporated the results of consultations with local government and key stakeholders. The project focus on educating young people about prehistory and was also innovative and one of the few projects that

acknowledged the importance of youth for the future of heritage. The educational programme for prehistoric sites in Turkey was very well designed. It was both imaginative and pedagogically sound. In Turkey it involved carrying out surveys to compare the knowledge of prehistory of school pupils before and after the programme and consultation with teachers about their reaction to the teaching materials. Classroom based workshops, museum visits, and site visits where children had the opportunity to participate in excavations were the basis of the programme; teaching materials were prepared, according to age group. Teacher training materials were also produced. This project component should be replicated for other sites, but unfortunately was not.

IV. The RMSU: Delivering Technical Assistance and Monitoring

4.1 Introduction to RMSU and their role

A Regional Management and Support Unit (RMSU) was set up for Euromed Heritage, to assist partners and beneficiary countries in achieving project objectives. The role of the RMSU is to ensure coherent implementation, full exploitation of opportunities, regional co-operation, project ownership and sustainability, exchange of information and results.

According to their Terms of Reference,

“The function of the Contractor is to ensure that the implementation of the programme components (individual projects, bodies responsible for national follow-up, etc.) conforms to the context of the Financing Proposal (Annex C), the objectives of specific projects and agreed contractual requirements, as reflected on management strategies and practices. The *qualitative and quantitative content of the RMS activities* relates directly to the issues to be addressed and presented under each expected result.” The primary RMSU activities concern:

1. Enhancement of follow-up mechanisms related to overall programme management and administration, implementation and targeted support to the programme partners.
2. Facilitation of networking among the various stakeholders
3. Promotion of effective mechanisms for information dissemination and visibility
4. Promotion of programme sustainability and impact

Located in Rome, the RMSU works together with the EuropeAid Co-operation Office and benefits from the scientific and logistic support of the Italian Institute for Catalogue and Documentation (Rome), and from the technical know-how of the International Centre Cities on Water (Venice).

4.1.1 Staffing and Staff Mix

The RMSU team consists of a core of eight people, as specified in the Terms of Reference. This includes: a Coordinator; two Project Managers; an Information Manager; a Financial Officer; Financial Assistant; an Administrator, and an Office Assistant

The senior staff are all very experienced in project management and in the case of the two project managers, in heritage conservation. The Coordinator had led other EU regional programmes and is very familiar with EC procedures. The Information Manager had extensive experience of public information. The RMSU also took on younger staff as a way to expose them to heritage management and train them for future positions of responsibility.

They work well as a team, with a good sharing of responsibility and tasks. There is a high level of exchange of viewpoints of the staff, leading to insightful analysis of project performance and innovative solutions to various challenges. The staff members are committed to the project and there has been little staff turnover.

4.2 Delivery of Technical Assistance

The training delivered by the RMSU to the various project partners can be considered as one of the main tasks of the RMSU. A total of ten courses were delivered in the field of Project Design, Management and Communication & Information. The workshops were conducted in English and French, mostly for four days each and for 25 participants. Workshops took place in Rome, Alexandria and Mohammedia.

There was a high demand by the project for these training courses with sometimes up to 80 requests for 25 places. Before training was delivered, a needs analysis was carried out by the RMSU. The results were used in order to draft the detailed programme and qualified STE's were used to complement RMSU staff for delivering the training. The RMSU head was present at all training sessions and furthermore there was active involvement of key RMSU staff. This was helpful in creating the feeling among partners that they were all working in a broader framework, the Euromed Heritage II programme, than their individual projects only.

The vast majority of partners interviewed in the framework of this evaluation indicated that the training workshops were very useful and gave them the opportunity to acquire important skills, not only for their current Euromed Heritage project but for any project to be delivered in the future. They also indicated that the communication skills they gained could be directly applied during the Euromed Heritage II project. The same counts for the project design and management skills. These skills also proved to be of high value when organisations had to prepare other projects for either other programmes or for follow up funding.

After being involved as a partner in the RMSU training in Morocco, the Moroccan University Mohammedia began their own project management course, based upon the RMSU model. This can be considered as an unexpected, as well as sustainable result of the RMSU training.

Other Technical Assistance of the RMSU mainly concerned guidance of project partners and providing them with support for reporting, rider requests and budget allocations. The RMSU also developed a number of useful project management tools including a Protocol of Communication, the Project Implementation Track, and Guidelines for Project Monitoring. The RMSU furthermore translated the EC Project Cycle Management Manual into Arabic. All these tools are available on the website and still have high numbers of downloads.

Apart from the training workshops the RMSU organized two general Euromed H seminars, one in Rome in 2004 and one towards the end of the programme in Istanbul in October 2006. Both forums gave project partners ample opportunity to network, learn from each other and exchange views on Cultural Heritage Management and Preservation. Furthermore a meeting in Amman was held on Heritage in times of armed conflict and in Barcelona on the occasion of "10 years Barcelona."

4.2.1 Monitoring

By means of various monitoring tools, the RMSU has been able to develop a good picture of the progress of projects. The Project MIS Synopsis is the primary tool for monitoring. Seven indicators are tracked: contract implementation; reporting; payments; timing of the activities; quality of the activities; management of the partnership; and publicity dissemination. It is updated on a regular basis by the Project Manager in charge using the criteria set out in the monitoring guidelines. A system of green, yellow and red flags was introduced as an easily understandable way to signal project performance.

In their 10th Quarter Technical Report, a table tracing the evolution of project performance is presented. At inception, of 77 indicators only 27% were judged to be green (satisfactory) and 42% were red (unsatisfactory). At the 10th report, 77% were green and only 9% were red. The indicators with the lowest scores are reporting and payments. This suggests that compliance has increased significantly over the course of the RMSU's life. It should be noted that the RMSU was charged with both capacity building and monitoring so these scores represent an internal rather than external point of view.

The RMSU also defined project “hot issues” as a way to highlight project difficulties and resolve them.

In addition to monitoring the projects, the RMSU developed systems to monitor its own performance against its own agreed Log Frame. It rates itself against implemented activities: 1) management, administration and monitoring mechanism is defined and applied in each project; 2) stakeholders are able to share information, best practice and human resources via consolidated networks; 3) strategy and effective mechanism for programme information, dissemination and visibility are established and implemented; and 4) southern partners are able to start new programmes related to cultural heritage.

Under the first activity, the following sub-activities were carried out: RMSU set up; working relations established with on-going projects; administrative procedures harmonized; monitoring missions carried out; training activities carried out; and closure of the contract. For activity 2, the following were carried out: technical assistance and network reinforced; launching event; organization of regional workshops. For activity 3, sub-activities were: setting up of information and communications strategies; support to access information related to cultural heritage issues; and implementation of capacity building measures in information collection and use of information systems. For activity 4, sub-actions include: training on project design and fundraising and internships; institutional support; and closing event.

A Management Board meets on a regular basis to review RMSU performance.

Through monitoring, discussions with project groups, and site visits, the RMSU identified several issues in project performance:

- Preparation of Final Project Reports. They recognized the difficulties faced by the projects and recommended to the EC that a grace period of 6 months for completion of the Final Report was not helpful.
- Logical Framework restricted to an administrative tool. Based on training course questionnaires, only 58% of respondents used the Log Frame for assessing performance. It recommends greater attention to the Log Frame at project selection and regular reference during project implementation.
- Loose project internal monitoring procedures. Only 44% of respondents confirmed that internal evaluation was taking place.

4.2.2 MedMonitoring

Euromed Heritage was also monitored by MedMonitoring at the beginning of the project activity and towards the end. The monitors do not have sector expertise and focus strictly on management issues. These reports, while based on site visits, are for an internal EC readership and the results are not shared with the projects themselves. Therefore there is no direct learning from this exercise, which is costly in terms of the time that projects are required to devote to the monitoring mission.

There is also some overlap with the monitoring undertaken by the RMSU, without adequate coordination by the EC or possible RMSU. Med Monitoring is a MEDA wide monitoring programme which concentrates on management issues. It does not have cultural heritage expertise. In contrast the RMSU monitoring efforts were informed by sector specialists. It is suggested that this double monitoring be clarified and streamlined, with a view of maximizing the learning outcomes for both the project teams and the EC.

4.3 Visibility

In order to improve the visibility of the Euromed Heritage II programme, the RMSU developed the Euromed Heritage website www.euromedheritage.net. This website paid much attention to issues like accessibility, also for users with slow internet connections, and usability. The content of the website was regularly updated which ensured that visitors kept coming back to the site. During the course of the programme the website became an important information tool for both project partners and the general public and still has a high number of visitors. During 2005 the website had an average rate of 50.000 visitors per month. This number is a good indication of the importance of this website. An impressive indication of effectiveness is that 'Cultural Heritage' is searched on Google, the Euromed Heritage website still comes up first!

A number of publications were also developed in order to raise awareness on the programme. These included booklets and brochures as well as a newsletter. The booklets like 'Euromed Heritage 2002 – 2006' were mainly aimed at stakeholders while the brochure as well as the website targeted at a wider public.

In order to raise media attention, and consequently a greater visibility of Cultural Heritage, a Euromed Heritage Journalistic Award was also developed for young print journalists writing on issues of Cultural Heritage in the Euromed region. The selected journalists were sent to project sites to write articles as part of their prize, thereby giving greater visibility and prestige to programme partners.

4.4 Assessment

The RMSU demonstrates highly satisfactory overall performance. It was hampered at the outset by the very late start date, and therefore was in a position of rectifying a backlog of problems. Many of the projects were in an unsatisfactory state of implementation when the RMSU began.

Relevance: There was a very high need for the RMSU by project partners as many had problems in terms of reporting and clarifications on budget related issues. Unfortunately there was a lack of synchronization by the EC in the timing, which contributed to the late start of the RMSU. For some of the projects the RMSU only started half way through their project implementation period so the help the RMSU could provide was necessarily restricted.

Due to their own project management experience and the needs assessment the RMSU carried out they delivered training and tools that raised the capacity of the project groups. The RMSU staff all had excellent language and social skills which facilitated communication with the project groups. They also made an effort to travel regularly to each of the partners or project activities.

The RMSU continuously emphasized the importance of the Barcelona Declaration and dialogue. At the 10th anniversary of the Declaration they held a workshop in Barcelona to discuss and confirm the importance of the Barcelona principles. The meeting proceedings were published in a booklet.

Efficiency: RMSU made a strong effort to use their staff and other resources to a maximum effect, demonstrating considerable flexibility and imagination. Due to the evolving nature of the programme, with some projects coming to an end and others beginning, they successfully adjusted their own work programme in order to respond to the needs of the project partners. For example, they prepared a strategy document and initiated the 'Adopt a Mediterranean Heritage', both activities intended to increase the participation of MEDA countries and enhance the sustainability of Euromed Heritage II.

The working relationship of the RMSU with consortium partner Citta d'Acqua worked well and operated on the basis of division of duties according to expertise. The latter was responsible for conference organizing, publications and their distribution.

The RMSU developed several guidelines for project management, all of which are posted on the website with frequent downloads. These were important as they *promoted a professional project management*, an area of weakness in many heritage organisations. The RMSU also decided to translate the EU Project Cycle Management manual into Arabic. The website tracking system indicates that this manual has been very frequently consulted, and in fact may draw new users to the Euromed Heritage II website.

The project monitoring tools are well designed to give clear indications about the progress of the projects. Record keeping by the RMSU is excellent. It is thorough and highlights issues and their possible solutions. For each project a MIS record was developed that noted all communications between the project and the RMSU with comments and recommended action.

Effectiveness: In general the RMSU can be considered as innovative, responsive and committed. They demonstrated a service oriented approach, informed by analysis of needs and continuously updated by information on website use, field visits and interaction with the partners. Towards the end of the programme the RMSU felt it was necessary to develop a strategy and they successfully took this up.

At their own initiative, they carried out four national level consultations, in Egypt, Israel, Morocco, and Syria bringing together government authorities, cultural heritage experts and other stakeholders in order to define a strategy for future Heritage and cultural programmes in the region. The results of the focus groups served as a basis to draft the strategy, consolidated by EC and presented it during the Istanbul Forum in October 2006.

The RMSU was in close and regular communication with the Lead Partners who expressed appreciation at having someone at the end of the phone or Email who was able to respond promptly and professionally to various queries. Other partners indicated that they specifically benefited from the training programmes. They had an important role in facilitating the processing of technical and financial reports. At the time of the RMSU arrival, some projects had come to a stand still due to reporting and management problems which in turn halted project payments by the EC. The RMSU was vital in resolving many of these problems.

The RMSU systematically reviewed the project log frames and where needed worked with the projects to revise them to ensure that indicators were relevant and achievable.

Sustainability: As the project implementation period of the RMSU is soon coming to its end, special efforts need to be made by the EC in order not to lose the data, guidelines, manuals and other documents that were collected or developed by the RMSU. *Special arrangements also need to be made in order to ensure continuation and updating* of the Euromed Heritage website as not to lose a very important reference point for stakeholders involved in Cultural Heritage in the region.

Considering the RMSU conception and start up period as well as the time necessary to get acquainted with project partners and stakeholders, three years of project implementation can be considered as short. It might be better to give more time to a project monitoring unit like the RMSU in order to ensure maximum benefits of such an institute.

V. Recommendations for Future Euromed Heritage Programmes

The Euromed Heritage II projects under review have succeeded in meeting most of their central objectives, but there is considerable scope for improvement in definition of audience and outreach, support for MEDA countries as lead partners, involvement of a broader group of European countries, finding a balance between carrying out research and applied heritage management, and strengthening the overall programme by increasing interactions among the various projects. The four country consultations conducted by the RMSU and the beginning of a strategy document, are steps in the direction of a more comprehensive understanding of the sector's needs and opportunities, which has been largely missing in both Euromed Heritage I and II. There was no formalized needs analysis undertaken for Euromed Heritage II despite the recommendation of the Euromed Heritage I Evaluation. Rather these projects represent agreement among the experts concerned that these were gaps in knowledge.

In comparison with Euromed Heritage I, the projects are more focused and project management is stronger. For Euromed Heritage II greater selectivity is apparent in the choice of partners. Some of the projects show a higher degree of participation from the partners. The support and training on project management given by the RMSU has been a factor in increased skills levels. The EuroMed Heritage II projects under review are generally more effective than those of Euromed Heritage I.

The following are key recommendations of this Evaluation to be put into effect before a next call for proposals under the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership or under the new European Neighbourhood Policy. The recommendations draw upon the ideas of the partners of the five projects reviewed under this evaluation as well as on discussions with the RMSU and key stakeholders in the field including the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO, ICCROM, the British Museum, English Heritage, university head of cultural heritage programmes, head of foreign research institute (Cairo), and heritage experts.

5.1 Recommendations to the EC on procedures and management

- Put more effort in promotion of the programme. Even after five years of Euromed Heritage, not all stakeholders are aware of this programme and funding opportunity. Therefore the programme needs to be better promoted, either through EU delegations, the media (probably also through advertisements) as well as through important stakeholders and organizations in the field
- Ensure coordination between various EU programmes in the MEDA region (EUMedis, SMAP, Transport programme etc.). Much can be learned from those programmes experiences in the field of PMU's, calls for proposals, partnerships. So far there has been very little or no coordination between those different EU programmes who all fall under the same Directorate General (DG) at the Commission.
- Explore ways of developing synergies between relevant DG's (DG Education and Culture and DG Research). Better cooperation should be established between different DG's in order to ensure sharing of best practices and to avoid overlaps.
- Establish EU Information points or EU liaison offices for projects and other funding opportunities.
- Encourage EU delegations to give more priority to regional programmes like the Euromed Heritage Programme. Involve EC delegations in promotion of the programme at national level.
- Examine benefits of the RMSU. It might be more efficient if the RMSU or PMU operates for more than three years. The current maximum for the RMSU is three years, but it takes time to start up a unit and only in the last year the RMSU is consolidating on the work of the first one

to two years. It might be better to extend the maximum period of three years to, for example, five years in order to guarantee continuity of the programme.

- Make provisions for a smooth hand-over of the institutional and programme memory build up by the RMSU. The RMSU established a very useful database, procedure manuals, guidelines etc. Enough efforts should be made so that none of this memory will get lost due to the termination of the RMSU.
- Ensure timely start-up of the PMU programme so it can begin working with the projects from the outset. This will ensure good project management and Log Frames that are used to guide project implementation.
- Examine the costs and benefits of monitoring from MedMonitoring as well as the RMSU and ensure that monitoring reports are shared and discussed with the partners. The MedMonitoring Reports have not been shared with the partners so no learning has occurred.

5.2 Recommendations at the Project Level

- Smaller projects in terms of budget should be considered. The current budget is between 500,000 euros and 3,000,000 euros. The average budget spending of around 88% is also an indication that some projects were too big. If smaller projects are to be considered, it would also facilitate having lead partners from the MEDA countries.
- Involve more partners from Northern Europe. The majority of the EU partners come from the Mediterranean region with Italy, Spain and France in a dominant position. Scandinavian countries, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Germany are almost not present in Euromed Heritage II. More efforts should be put into finding suitable partners from those countries.
- Divide the tender phase in two steps; a project outline phase followed by a selection of complete project proposals. In this way organizations are better motivated to put more thought in their final project proposal.
- Encourage projects to employ a full-time project coordinator. The projects that did not have a full time coordinator or with several project managers in charge were not managed as well as projects that were staffed with one full-time project coordinator or manager. The RMSU produced a guidance document, “ 10 Minimum Requirements for Project Managements” which gives very sound advice.
- Communication and distribution plans for projects products and results should be made an obligatory part of the project proposal and communication experts should be included in the project staff as core or key project staff members.
- Use of languages. Projects need to put more emphasis on the use of Arabic for their project outputs. Arabic was often not used while there have been many outputs in for example Greek, Italian or Spanish.
- More effective raising of public awareness of heritage issues through individual projects. Projects should be encouraged to think beyond the distribution of printed matter and involve professional communication specialists in developing materials that are appropriate for the partner countries.
- Internal monitoring and evaluation systems need to be part of project design and management systems.

5.3 Recommendations for Thematic and Regional Consideration

- Carry out a systematic needs assessment of the heritage sector to determine critical needs and new opportunities, including institutional strengthening measures and leadership support. This should be conducted through stakeholder consultations and include a broad range of civil society, tourism industry and other interest groups.

should draw upon the issues identified in the course of the preceding Euromed Heritage programme.

- Balance the needs of research with management and conservation. Of the projects under review, a substantial share was focused on research with little applied results. Future programmes should encourage applied research with ample opportunity and dedicated budgets for on- the- ground activities.
- Exploring intangible culture. The majority of the Euromed Heritage projects focus on tangible heritage issues like architecture, cultural sites etc. More attention should be paid to intangible heritage which could include music, dance and oral heritage.
- The role of museums. Museums play an important role in promoting cultural understanding and improving standards of exhibition design, object conservation, childrens' education and other museological issues. Training sessions in country and exchange of personnel are two effective ways of building expertise.
- Understanding the links between cultural heritage management and tourism development. Prime sites in the region, such as Luxor or Petra, are already suffering from visitor management problems. Lessons on visitor management from other domains such as museums or recreational attractions should be tested at such sites.
- Greater emphasis on education components, particularly childrens' education, should be promoted by the successor to Euromed Heritage.
- More project activities in MEDA countries. According to figures of the RMSU 90% of the Euromed activities took place in EU countries. MEDA partners indicated that they would appreciate more South – South exchange opportunities in the framework of Euromed Heritage.
- Exchange programme for staff in the field of cultural heritage. Project partners emphasized the importance of exchange of personnel within MEDA countries as well as between the EU and MEDA countries.

5.4 Recommendations for Fostering Collaboration

- Structured cross-fertilisation of projects. Euromed Heritage II did not provide enough interaction opportunities between projects. Yearly or half yearly meetings between the different project directors, in the form of a Directors Forum, would facilitate cooperation between different projects which would be of benefit for all partners.
- More opportunities for face to face meetings. For most projects it would be useful to organize more face to face meetings in order to enhance dialogue, share of best practices and smooth project implementation. Many project participants commented that face to face was essential, and that Emails and virtual networks are not sufficient.

Annex 1

Figure 7 Meetings with Project Partners and Stakeholders

Name	Project	Project partner	Place
Greece			
Christos Carras	MediMuses	Enchordais, lead partner, project manager	Athens
Kyriakos Kalaitzides	MediMuses	Enchordais, artistic director	Thessaloniki
Sophia Karakostas	MediMuses	Enchordais, visibility and administration	Thessaloniki
Eleni Paphoma	Delta	Hellenic Ministry of Culture, project coordinator	Athens
Kostas Kotsakis	Temper	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Thessaloniki
Ioanna Anagnostou	Temper	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Thessaloniki
France			
Mercedes Volait	Patrimoines Partages	CNRS	Orleans
Romeo Carabelli	Patrimoines Partages	CNRS	Orleans
Christophe Terrasse	Patrimoines Partages	CNRS	
Francesco Bandarin		Unesco World Heritage Centre	Paris
Kishore Rao		Unesco World Heritage Centre	Paris
Italy			
Andrea Amato	Delta	IMED	Rome
Rossella Rusco	Delta	IMED	Rome
Carla Scaramella	Delta	IMED	Rome
Roberto Carpano		RMSU	Rome
Claudio Cimino		RMSU	Rome
Francesca Predazzi		RMSU	Rome
Matteo Malvani		RMSU	Rome
Chiara Caporilli		RMSU	Rome

Antonio Barbera		RMSU	Rome
Elena Cesati		RMSU	Rome
Mounir Bouchenaki		ICCROM	Rome
Spain			
Rafael Balanzo	Patrimoines Partages	Collegi d'Arquitectes de Catalunya, Barcelona	Istanbul Euroomed HeritageH Forum
Margaret Hart	MedVoices	Universidad de las Palmas	Istanbul ECH Forum
Marc Morell	MedVoices	Universitat de les Illes Balears	Istanbul EH Forum
Hector Saenz de la Cuesta	Delta	Andalucian Institute of Cultural Heritage	Istanbul EH Forum
United Kingdom			
Louise Doughty	Temper	Ex MacDonald Institute of Archeaology	Cambridge
Aylin Orbasli	Temper	Oxford Brookes University	Cambridge
Julie Scott	MedVoices	London Metropolitan University	London
Jonathan Karkut	MedVoices	London Metropolitan University	London
Alexandra Coxen		English Heritage	London
Neil Spencer		British Museum	London
Jonathan Williams		British Museum	London
Sheila Canby		British Museum	London
Christopher Young		English Heritage	London
Timothy Williams	Temper	Institute of Archaeology, University College	London
Malta			
Nadia Theuma	Delta	Foundation for International Studies	Valletta
Rachel Radmilli	MedVoices	University of Malta	Msida
Carmel Fsadni	MedVoices/Delta	University of Malta, Head Dep. of Management	Msida
Joseph Magro Conti	Temper	Fondazzjoni Wirt Artna	Valletta

Mario Farrugia	Temper	Fondazzjoni Wirt Artna	Valletta
Cyprus			
David Officer	MedVoices	IMCS Intercollege Ltd.	Istanbul EH Forum
Algeria			
Boussad Aiche	Patrimoines Partages	University of Tizi	Tizi
Leila Oubouzar	Patrimoines Partages	University of Tizi	Tizi
Farida Cherbi	Patrimoines Partages	University of Tizi	Tizi
Zouhir Ballalou	Delta	Office for the Protection of the M'Zab Valley	Ghardaia
Hocine Nemmour	Delta	Office for the Protection of the M'Zab Valley	Ghardaia
Noiraddine Bouroua	Delta	Office for the Protection of the M'Zab Valley	Ghardaia
Ali Benzekri	Delta	Office for the Protection of the M'Zab Valley	Ghardaia
Younes Babnedjar	Delta	Office for the Protection of the M'Zab Valley	Ghardaia
Mayor of Ghardaia	Delta	Mayors Office	Ghardaia
Tunisia			
Saloua Trabelsi	Patrimoines Partages	Ex Institut National du Patrimoine	Tunis
Semia Akrouit Yaiche	Patrimoines Partages	ASM Tunis	Tunis
Faika Bejaoui	Patrimoines Partages	ASM Tunis	Tunis
Foussan Belhadj	Patrimoines Partages	ASM Tunis	Tunis
Morocco			
Abderrahim Kassou	Patrimoines Partages	Ecole Nationale d'Architecture	Istanbul EH Forum
Jordan			
Kifat Fakhouri	MediMuses	Noor Hussein Foundation	Phone interview
Egypt			
Naguib Amin	Partimoines Partages	CultNat	EH Forum
Malak Wahba	Patrimoines Partages	CultNat	Giza
Kim Duistermaat		Director, NVIC Cairo	

Israel			
Michael Cohen	Delta / Temper	Israel Antiquities Authority	Jerusalem
Palestine			
Khouloud Daibes	Delta	Centre for Cultural Heritage Preservation	Bethlehem
Isam Juhar	Delta	Centre for Cultural Heritage Preservation	Bethlehem
Walid Sharif	Delta	Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities	Jerusalem
Syria			
Nuhad Abdallah	Patrimoines Partages	University of Lattakia	Damascus
Turkey			
Gurel Tuzun	MedVoices, Temper	History Foundation	Istanbul
Gulay Kayacan	MedVoices	History Foundation	Istanbul
Ayfer Bartu	Temper	Ex Koc University	Istanbul
Lebanon			
Samir Khallaf	MedVoices	American University Beirut	Beirut
Tawfik Kerbage	MediMuses	Lebanese National Higher Conservatory	Beirut
Charbel Rouhana	MediMuses	Musician (oud)	Beirut

Annex 2

Euromed Heritage II Questionnaire for Lead Partners

Relevance

1. *Design of projects*

- In what ways did the project meet the objectives and address priorities of Euromed Heritage II?
- Was the project based on an assessment of country or regional needs or priorities?
- How does the project meet sector needs? Are these needs a priority?
- What is the added value of the project?

Efficiency

2. *Project budget*

- How was the budget determined?
- What percentage of budget was spent on administration?
- What percentage was spent on public information and visibility?
- In retrospect, was the budget adequate to deliver expected outputs and outcomes?

3. *Project Management*

- How was the project managed?
- Describe the organization of the project and any changes over time.

4. *Technical Assistance*

- How did the RMSU help strengthen the project?
- How was the project monitored (internally and externally by RMSU and MedMonitoring)?
- How were RMSU and MedMonitoring recommendations of monitoring followed up?
- What evaluation process was put into place?
- Did the RMSU provide the project with training and monitoring tools? Comment on the quality of the training.

5. *Unforeseen outputs*

- Did any unforeseen outputs arise from the activities, mainly in terms of dialogue, new synergies etc.? Examples?

Effectiveness

6. *Results*

- In what way is the project an expression of the Barcelona Declaration? Provide examples.
- What are the most outstanding results? What are the activities that did not work well and why?
- Were planned results delivered?
- How are the results perceived by the key stakeholders?
- Have there been some unexpected outcomes?

7. *Relations with Partners*

- To what extent were partners involved in decisions about the initial objectives?
- What was the basis for selection of partners?
- Criteria – institutional, expertise, interest

- Number of partners
 - Geographic spread
 - Discuss the sharing of responsibilities and participation of the partners
 - What were the mechanisms of communication among partners?
8. *Role of RMSU*
- What role did RMSU perform in regard to training and coaching, information and visibility and partnerships.
 - What training was delivered to project groups by the RMSU? How many staff were trained? Was other training received? Was the RMSU training relevant?
 - What was the value to your project of having the RMSU?

Sustainability

9. *Ownership*
- To what extent were partners consulted on the objectives from the outset?
 - Did they remain in agreement throughout the duration of the project?
 - Was the project in tune with local perceptions of needs?
10. *Institutional capacity*
- How is the project integrated into local institutional structures?
 - Are local institutions willing and able to continue to deliver the benefits of the project after project close? How? Have responsibilities been decentralized?
11. *Financial Sustainability*
- How does the project continue?
 - Were additional funds raised for continuation of the project?
 - Continuation of dissemination of results?

Information and Communication

- Who was the target audience for the project?
- To which extent was the project addressed to a general public versus a specific public.
- Was the general public addressed? How?
- What kind of information tools have been developed?
- What information tools were used to distribute information?
- What kind of information was distributed and how?
- Comment on distribution plans
- How was the website used as a communication tool?
- What did it cost to build the website?
- Indication of costs of printed material
- Use of mass media, clippings?
- How did the project work to raise public awareness on cultural heritage

Lessons Learned

- What lessons have been learned in the course of the projects in regard to design, management, budgeting, training, public information etc.

Recommendations for future EC Heritage programmes

- What recommendations would you like to make for themes to be addressed in a new programme?

- What structures or procedures should be put in place?
- What is your preferred implementation method (with or without the services of a project unit) and why?