

1.3. Workplan Tables - Detailed implementation

1.3.1. WT1 List of work packages

WP Number ⁹	WP Title	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	Person-months ¹¹	Start month ¹²	End month ¹³
WP1	Concepts and models of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity	3 - UNEW	22.00	1	46
WP2	Mapping patterns of inequality and change	5 - NORDREGIO	25.00	1	36
WP3	Territorial governance structures and practices	4 - SU	28.00	3	46
WP4	The Local, Spatial Justice and Cohesion Policy	7 - CERSHAS	28.00	3	46
WP5	Longitudinal studies of territorial inequality	8 - TU Delft	39.00	4	36
WP6	Case Studies	2 - ILS gGmbH	216.00	13	46
WP7	Regional Autonomy and Spatial Justice	10 - UL	25.00	12	46
WP8	Coherence and Scenarios	11 - ULodz	38.00	19	46
WP9	Policy Considerations	1 - UEF	25.00	1	48
WP10	Dissemination and Impact	9 - MCRIT, S.L	35.00	1	48
WP11	Project Management	1 - UEF	26.00	1	48
WP12	Ethics requirements	1 - UEF	N/A	1	48
Total			507.00		

1.3.2. WT2 list of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D1.1	Conceptual framework for the project	WP1	3 - UNEW	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	6
D1.2	Revisiting conceptual framework for the project	WP1	3 - UNEW	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	36
D2.1	Review report on regional disparities and inequalities	WP2	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Public	12
D2.2	State of data availability to determine indicators and geographical level of analysis	WP2	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	24
D2.3	Update report on regional disparities and inequalities	WP2	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Public	36
D3.1	Initial framework to identify governance arrangements and relevant policy models	WP3	4 - SU	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D3.2	Two typologies of governance arrangements and relevant policy models	WP3	4 - SU	Report	Public	24
D3.3	Summary of case study findings on governance structures and practices	WP3	4 - SU	Report	Public	32
D4.1	Preliminary framework for case study work	WP4	7 - CERSHAS	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	20
D4.2	Summary of case study findings - spatial	WP4	7 - CERSHAS	Report	Public	32

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
	justice at various levels					
D5.1	Availability of longitudinal microdata and scales of inequalities in EU countries	WP5	8 - TU Delft	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	10
D5.2	Report on multi-scalar patterns of spatial inequalities	WP5	8 - TU Delft	Report	Public	20
D5.3	Location and context-analysis of spatial inequalities at different geographical scales	WP5	8 - TU Delft	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	30
D6.1	Methodological framework for case studies	WP6	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	15
D6.2	National case study reports on place-based development and participatory cohesion	WP6	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	30
D6.3	Stakeholder interaction report 1	WP6	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	30
D6.4	Cross-comparative analysis of country perspectives on spatial justice	WP6	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	40
D6.5	Stakeholder interaction report 2	WP6	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	44
D7.1	Empirical findings from case studies on regional autonomy and spatial justice	WP7	10 - UL	Report	Public	32
D8.1	Methodological framework for developing scenarios of case study regions	WP8	11 - ULodz	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	24
D8.2	Synthesis report re-conceptualizing spatial justice (based on	WP8	11 - ULodz	Report	Public	36

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
	results achieved in WP3-4)					
D8.3	Report on alternative scenarios for case study regions (based on findings from research on case studies (WP6) and interviews with experts)	WP8	11 - ULodz	Report	Public	42
D9.1	Case study toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and civil-society representatives	WP9	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D9.2	Policy Brief 1	WP9	1 - UEF	Report	Public	24
D9.3	Policy Brief 2	WP9	1 - UEF	Report	Public	30
D9.4	Policy Brief 3	WP9	1 - UEF	Report	Public	44
D9.5	Report on policy recommendations and good practices for promoting spatial justice	WP9	1 - UEF	Report	Public	46
D10.1	Project Website and Intranet	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	1
D10.2	Data Management Plan	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	6
D10.3	Dissemination Plan	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	3
D10.4	Newsletter 1	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	3
D10.5	Working Paper Series 1	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	12
D10.6	Newsletter 2	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	12
D10.7	Interim Dissemination Report	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	24
D10.8	Working Paper Series 2	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	24

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D10.9	Newsletter 3	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	28
D10.10	Newsletter 4	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	36
D10.11	Working Paper Series 3	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	36
D10.12	Newsletter 5	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	44
D10.13	Working Paper Series 4	WP10	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	48
D11.1	Monitoring Plan	WP11	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	3
D11.2	Project Progress Report 1	WP11	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	10
D11.3	Project Progress Report 2	WP11	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	18
D11.4	Project Progress Report 3	WP11	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	32
D11.5	Project Progress Report 4	WP11	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	36
D12.1	POPD - Requirement No. 1	WP12	1 - UEF	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D12.2	H - Requirement No. 2	WP12	1 - UEF	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the	12

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
					Commission Services)	

1.3.3. WT3 Work package descriptions

Work package number ⁹	WP1	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	3 - UNEW
Work package title	Concepts and models of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity		
Start month	1	End month	46

Objectives

Objectives. The objectives of this WP are to undertake a critical review of the literature and develop a theoretical framework for the project, examining the links and tensions between territorial cohesion, sustainable development and spatial justice in Europe at times of crisis and the role of regionalism and localism in this context.

The WP directly addresses the call's emphasis on exploring 'links and tensions between territorial cohesion, sustainable development and spatial justice in Europe at times of crisis', on 'different concepts of spatiality ... inter alia in the light of their institutional contexts', on exploring 'conceptual connections between social and economic cohesion, the European Social Model and human rights'. In collaboration with WP 3, it also addresses the conceptual relationship between two dimensions of the call: 'territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity in Europe' and 'regionalism'. In particular, its objectives are:

- Develop a theoretical framework for the project through a critical review of the concepts and models of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity
- Critical review of the concepts of spatiality, spatial justice, territorial cohesion, sustainable development, and solidarity
- Critical examination of the links and tensions between these concepts and models in Europe
- Critical examination of the links and tensions between these concepts and the concepts and models of regionalism and localism in Europe
- Develop a conceptual framework for the project, directly supporting WP 2 to 7.

Description of work and role of partners

WP1 - Concepts and models of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity [Months: 1-46]

UNEW, UEF, SU, NORDREGIO, CERSHAS, TU Delft, UL

Task 1.1. Critical review of the concepts of spatiality, especially in different institutional contexts. The concepts of spatiality vary widely in different contexts, with direct implications about how policies are developed and implemented. These differences, therefore, need to be well understood.

Task 1.2. Critical review of the concepts of social and spatial justice, particularly in relation to the European Social Model. The European Social Model has been a central concept in the development of European Union and the recent call for its reform make it imperative that the impact of any reforms on social and spatial justice be examined.

Task 1.3. Critical review of the concepts and models of territorial cohesion and their relationship with the conditions of inequality in Europe. The recent economic crisis and longer term economic restructuring have led to growing inequality within and between the regions. The links and tensions between territorial cohesion concepts and the growing inequality need to be analysed.

Task 1.4. Critical review of the concepts and models of sustainable development, especially when economic development concerns take central stage. The call specifically invites attention to sustainable development. In the context of the economic crisis, attention has been focused on economic recovery. What are the links and tensions between the economic emphasis and sustainable development?

Task 1.5. Critical review of the concepts of solidarity, especially in the conditions of economic crisis that tests the limits of solidarity. European solidarity has been the glue with which the construction of the European project has been made possible. The economic and migration crises, however, have challenged the existing patterns of solidarity. The conceptual foundations of solidarity, and the way it may be addressed in the context of these challenges will be critically studied.

Task 1.6. Examining the relationship between the concepts and models of territorial cohesion, spatial justice, and sustainable development. This task brings together the key aspects of the first dimension of the call, drawing on tasks 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5.

Task 1.7. Examining the relationship between the concepts of territorial cohesion and spatial justice with the concepts and models of regionalism and localism. This task provides a conceptual link between the two dimensions of the call: territorial cohesion and regionalism. This task will be coordinated with WP 4.

Task.1.8. Development of a conceptual framework for the project. This task will be the result of all the work that has been so far conducted in this work package. The conceptual framework will be directly supporting the rest of the work packages.

Task 1.9. Summary of WP results

Lead partner and roles of participants: Reviews and analysis carried out by the lead partner in consultation with other partners through their suggestions and comments. Task 1.7 will be coordinated with WP 4 on regionalism. Task 1.9 will be coordinated with WP 8 on the synthesis of the project.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP1 effort
1 - UEF	2.00
3 - UNEW	10.00
4 - SU	2.00
5 - NORDREGIO	2.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	2.00
10 - UL	2.00
Total	22.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D1.1	Conceptual framework for the project	3 - UNEW	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	6
D1.2	Revisiting conceptual framework for the project	3 - UNEW	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	36

Description of deliverables

D1.1 Conceptual framework for the project (Month 6)
 D1.2 Revisiting conceptual framework for the project (Month 36)
 D1.1 : Conceptual framework for the project [6]
 Provision of conceptual framework for subsequent project work
 D1.2 : Revisiting conceptual framework for the project [36]
 Updated conceptual framework

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS1	Conceptual Framework for the project drafted.	3 - UNEW	5	Kick-off Workshop with entire consortium, internal report on intranet and Newsletter 1, Monitoring Plan for the Project drawn up, Conceptual framework for the Project drafted
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP2	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	5 - NORDREGIO
Work package title	Mapping patterns of inequality and change		
Start month	1	End month	36

Objectives

The overall aim of the work package is to measure and describe regional inequalities across Europe and over time, and in this way provide a better understanding of the linkages between regional conditions and socio-economic outcomes. This work package responds to the call by exploring socio-economic disparities at the regional level making use of existing data sources to provide an overview of patterns and changes in spatial inequalities at the level of EU regions. The specific objectives of this work package are to:

- Define a methodology to measure and analyse territorial cohesion and measure and map territorial developments at different regional scales;
- Measure, analyse, and map spatial inequalities over time at the level of EU regions, with an emphasis on the recent period since the 2008 economic crisis;
- Analyse patterns of social and economic of regional disparities across Europe and within countries across a number of indicators
- Provide input to WP 6: Case Studies, to guide in the selection of different types of regions to be included

The results of this work package will provide input to WP 3, 4, 5, and especially to WP 6 in the selection of case studies.

Description of work and role of partners

WP2 - Mapping patterns of inequality and change [Months: 1-36]
NORDREGIO, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Task 2.1. Review data and literature on disparities and inequalities at the economic and societal levels in the EU to serve as the basis for analysis of regional disparities. Based on this review, select the most important geographic (e.g. location, accessibility, infrastructure, population size and concentration), economic (e.g. economic structure, income, employment and unemployment, innovation), and social disparities (e.g. population change, infant mortality, life expectancy, educational levels) to be used in the analysis.

Task 2.2. Review current state-of-the-art measures for analysing and visualizing regional disparities and select the most appropriate (among the sources to be consulted are ESPON TIPSE - Territorial Dimension of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe, ECR2 - Economic Crisis: Resilience of Regions, ESPON 2013 Database).

Task 2.3. Assess regional data from Eurostat and the EU national statistical offices to determine the most robust set of indicators that can be used for the analysis and mapping of regional inequalities and determine the lowest level of geography for which the analysis can be done at the EU level and national levels.

Task 2.4. Analyse geographic, economic, and social trends in regional disparities (relative differences) regional inequalities (absolute differences) across the EU, likely at the NUTS3 level. Measures such as standard deviations, weighted standard deviations, and the Theil index will be computed over time. Models using principle component analysis will be developed to determine which factors are most important to regional standards of living.

Task 2.5. Produce maps and other geo-visualization products to depict trends regional disparities (relative differences) regional inequalities (absolute differences) across the EU, likely at the NUTS3 level.

Task 2.6. Provide input to WP 6 (Case studies) by guiding the selection of regions through the creation of typologies of regions and by providing background information on those regions.

Task 2.7. Make an assessment of those EU countries where analysis of regional disparities can be done at finer geographic levels such as LAU1, LAU2, FUA, or other administrative levels at which sufficient indicators are available. Because of the difficulties of measuring income inequality across the EU, Eurostat typically uses a national perspective on inequality. Thus, what matters for individuals is their relative income position within their own country. Income inequality in EU reached a low in 2009 because of growth in the lower-income periphery countries. However, within-country disparities appear more significant than between-country disparities. Thus, analysing within-country disparities is appropriate.

Task 2.8. Analyse geographic, economic, and social trends in regional disparities (relative differences) regional inequalities (absolute differences) for selected countries where data are available at finer geographic levels such as LAU1, LAU2, and/or FUA.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP2 effort
1 - UEF	2.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	2.00
4 - SU	2.00
5 - NORDREGIO	9.00
6 - HUTTON	1.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	1.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	1.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	25.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D2.1	Review report on regional disparities and inequalities	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Public	12
D2.2	State of data availability to determine indicators and geographical level of analysis	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	24
D2.3	Update report on regional disparities and inequalities	5 - NORDREGIO	Report	Public	36

Description of deliverables

D2.1 Review report on regional disparities and inequalities (Month 12)
 D2.2 State of data availability to determine indicators and geographical level of analysis (Month 24)
 D2.3 Update report on regional disparities and inequalities (Month 36)

D2.1 : Review report on regional disparities and inequalities [12]
 Review Report on regional disparities and inequalities

D2.2 : State of data availability to determine indicators and geographical level of analysis [24]
 State of data availability to determine indicators and geographical level of analysis

D2.3 : Update report on regional disparities and inequalities [36]

Update Report on regional disparities and inequalities

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP3	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	4 - SU
Work package title	Territorial governance structures and practices		
Start month	3	End month	46

Objectives

Work package 3 explores policy frameworks and coordination mechanisms that aim at territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity across Europe. To that end, two European typologies will be developed: One will provide an overview about what (sort of) public policies, programmes and projects are formulated and implemented with a specific focus on the local and regional level. It will explore two issues: a) What sort of policies, programmes and projects are packaged and aimed to be delivered? b) What kinds of local/regional development models can be detected? The other typology will focus on the prevailing territorial governance arrangements. This means that the first task looks at how public policies, programmes and projects are formulated and implemented with regards to the co-ordination of actions of actors and institutions, the integration of policy sectors, how stakeholder participation is mobilised, how adaptive to changing contexts the governance arrangement is and to what extent place-based/territorial specificities are realised (such as local/regional cultures/identities). A specific focus will be laid on the multi-level interplay of various policy levels in order to understand the scope for re-scaling (i.e. power shifts among these levels).

For both typologies an indicative list of information to be collected will be developed. All partners in the consortium will gather this information based on the countries of their expertise. This will imply examples of ‘real cases’ (at the local/regional level) that are documented in the available (national) literature. Consequently, this WP intends to identify various types of ‘local and regional policy models’ as well as ‘territorial governance cultures’ across Europe. A specific focus will be laid on their differences, dynamics and directions of change. The findings will thus allow cross-country comparisons of different concepts of local/regional development and territorial governance across Europe to address challenges related to spatial justice, territorial cohesion and solidarity.

The results of this WP will feed into the selection of case studies (WP 6) and will, at a later stage, help to contextualize the findings from the case studies. In addition, the two typologies and the collected information (see above) will deliver contextual information to WP 4 and form the base for the study of alternative ‘regional development and governance models’ (WP 7). A better understanding of how the territorial governance arrangements and practices at hand (as explored in the case studies) are able to address challenges related to spatial justice, territorial cohesion and solidarity (here the various policies, programmes and projects) will help to identify the potential scope for a) local/regional distinctiveness, b) level of local/regional autonomy/dependency and/or c) (de)centralisation and their interrelations.

Description of work and role of partners

WP3 - Territorial governance structures and practices [Months: 3-46]
 SU, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Task 3.1. Literature review of local and regional policy models concerned with the delivery of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity.

Task 3.2. Literature review of territorial governance arrangements concerned with the delivery of territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity.

Task 3.3. Supporting development of the analytical framework for case-studies based on results from task 3.1 and 3.2. This will include the identification of characteristics/indicators with regards to the capacity of the prevailing territorial governance frameworks as well as the detection of relevant policies, programmes and projects. Based on these characteristics/indicators a number of key questions will be formulated (that will be added to the analytical framework of the case studies). They shall help to guide the search for practices, structures, mechanisms etc. that can be identified as either ‘promoters’ or ‘inhibitors’ for delivering territorial cohesion, spatial justice and solidarity.

Task 3.4. Survey 1: local and regional policy models across Europe (with support of all partners in the consortium). Based on task 3.1 and 3.2 a list of key dimensions (around ten) as well as a number of distinctive questions (around ten) will be developed that shall guide the collection of information by each partner in their respective country of expertise. This includes literature surveys (academic, policy papers, assessment studies) as well as short interviews with key informants. The idea is to look at two to three well documented cases in those countries that are covered by the more in-depth case studies within WP 6. However, the idea is not to choose the same cases, since the typology shall allow for a more generic picture in order to compare and differentiate various types of local and regional policy models in this respect as well as to contextualise (and position) the findings of the more in-depth case studies (WP 6). Task

3.5. Survey 2: territorial governance arrangements across Europe (with support of all partners in the consortium). Same approach as described for task 3.4
 Task 3.6. Synthesizing results from both surveys – developing two typologies
 Task 3.7. Examining the relationship between the two typologies with the help of (preliminary) results from case-studies which may allow feed-back loops into ongoing case-study work
 Task 3.8. Identifying a matrix that shall inform about the potential scope for a) local/regional distinctiveness, b) level of local/regional autonomy/dependency and/or c) centralization/decentralisation and their interrelations which will be validated/revised within WP 7. This matrix shall support the ongoing work within WP 7.
 Task 3.9. Revisiting the two typologies after finalisation of case studies (WP 6) Task 3.10. Summary of WP results

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP3 effort
1 - UEF	2.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	1.00
4 - SU	9.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	1.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	1.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	6.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	28.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D3.1	Initial framework to identify governance arrangements and relevant policy models	4 - SU	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D3.2	Two typologies of governance arrangements and relevant policy models	4 - SU	Report	Public	24
D3.3	Summary of case study findings	4 - SU	Report	Public	32

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
	on governance structures and practices				

Description of deliverables

D3.1 Initial framework to identify governance arrangements and relevant policy models (Month 12)
D3.2 Two typologies of governance arrangements and relevant policy models (Month 24)
D3.3 Summary of case study findings on governance structures and practices (Month 32)
D3.1 : Initial framework to identify governance arrangements and relevant policy models [12] Initial framework to identify governance arrangements and relevant policy models
D3.2 : Two typologies of governance arrangements and relevant policy models [24] Two typologies of governance arrangements and relevant policy models
D3.3 : Summary of case study findings on governance structures and practices [32] Summary of case study findings on governance structures and practices

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4,

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
				Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP4	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	7 - CERSHAS
Work package title	The Local, Spatial Justice and Cohesion Policy		
Start month	3	End month	46

Objectives

The focus here is on the analysis of the present and potential role of municipalities and other local-level actors in the development and implementation of cohesion policies. As part of this general objective, WP 4 will illustrate through a cross-national comparison the main challenges involved in promoting a greater place-based and locally oriented emphasis within European Cohesion Policy. This work package thus contributes to an extensive review and assessment of the research background in preparation of case studies, too and will elaborate studies from the gathered the case study material. The specific objectives are:

- Explore and analyse EU and national cohesion and rural development policies impacting territorial and social inequalities (as components of spatial injustice);
- Analyse EU and national spending on selected policies and welfare relevant from the point of view of social justice;
- Investigate capabilities and limitations of local actors to release their potentials for development and social inclusion through the combination of own and EU concepts and resources with specific reference to the context of post crisis austerity. (In close co-operation with WP 6);
- Explore, confront and analyse how policy makers and stakeholders at various levels of government conceive spatial justice and how do they wish to enhance fairness through increasing effectiveness of development policies in releasing local potentials and social inclusion in the context of austerity.

WP 4 addresses directly the demand formulated in the Call text (p1) when reappraises “existing cohesion policies and instruments, as well as the essential role of public services and make recommendations for their continuation under conditions of austerity“

Description of work and role of partners

WP4 - The Local, Spatial Justice and Cohesion Policy [Months: 3-46]
CERSHAS, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Task 4.1. Place and Cohesion Policy
 Place and place-making as theoretical background selecting elements of theoretical and research discussion on place for their applicability to the RELOCAL questions and perspective. This research task will also trace conceptual change in the “political” language of Cohesion Policy and relate it to shifting contextual conditions of European enlargement in collaboration with WP 1.

Task 4.2. The State of Critical Debate, synthesis and operationalization of policies
 Observations on the problems facing a greater local role, for example in influencing rather than merely receiving EU support, will be offered based on a review and synthesis of existing research and analysis of cohesion and rural development policies relevant from the point of view of spatial justice. This research and the stemming operationalising exercise will serve to focus case study methodology by contributing to the template for empirical work in case studies, specification and narrower definition of WP 6 research questions.

Task 4.3. Confronting rhetoric with realities
 Analysis and mapping of financial allocations of EU member-states at various tiers of governance on policy areas relevant from the point of view of spatial justice and welfare.

Task 4.4. Assessing the Role of Locally Provided Services of General Interest
 This research task will as part of a review of the policy research background contribute to identifying local-level bundles of services that promote spatial justice and socio-economic as well as the actor groups central to their provision.

Task 4.5. Foreseen themes of empirical research to be conducted within WP6 (Case Studies)
 -Revealing and confronting perceptions, desires and visions in relation to spatial justice at various levels of government with emphasis on social protection, employment and locally available public services.
 -Exploring local perceptions and needs in relation to available resources for maintaining and enhancing the position of locality on the scale of spatial justice with specific attention on the consequences of the crisis (This themes will be investigated in close co-operation with WP3, WP6 and WP7)

-Inquiring, and analyzing how policy makers and stakeholders at various levels of government conceive spatial justice and translate to interventions in policies aimed at enhancing fairness through increasing the effectiveness of development policies in releasing local potentials and social inclusion. Impact of the financial crisis and austerity measures will be assessed with care.

-Assessing experiences, practices, concepts, development programs (and their impacts) to mitigate ‘spatial injustice’ of segregated neighbourhoods with specific emphasis on access to services of general interest in the context of austerity. People’s access to participation, selforganizing capacities will also be looked at.

Task 4.6. Summary of WP results Investigate capabilities and limitations of local actors in releasing their potentials for development and social inclusion through the combination of own and EU concepts and resources. (In -co-operation mainly with WP 1 WP 3, WP 6 and WP 7)

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP4 effort
1 - UEF	4.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	2.00
3 - UNEW	2.00
4 - SU	2.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	1.00
7 - CERSHAS	9.00
8 - TU Delft	2.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	1.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	28.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D4.1	Preliminary framework for case study work	7 - CERSHAS	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	20
D4.2	Summary of case study findings - spatial justice at various levels	7 - CERSHAS	Report	Public	32

Description of deliverables

D4.1 Preliminary framework for case study work (Month 20)
 D4.2 Summary of case study findings - spatial justice at various levels (Month 32)
 D4.1 : Preliminary framework for case study work [20]
 Preliminary framework for case study work
 D4.2 : Summary of case study findings - spatial justice at various levels [32]
 Summary of case study findings - spatial justice at various levels

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP5	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	8 - TU Delft
Work package title	Longitudinal studies of territorial inequality		
Start month	4	End month	36

Objectives

The overall aim of WP 5 is to demonstrate how spatial inequalities can be measured over time using microdata (i.e. individuals, households). This work package builds on the work carried out in WP 2 using existing data sources to provide an overview of spatial inequalities at the level of EU regions, and goes beyond it to address the spatial scale of inequalities with methods that do not depend on predetermined regions. The latter is important because the efficiency of specific policy interventions directed towards spatial inequalities is scale-dependent and hence it should be based on well-defined and meaningful measures of spatial variation in living conditions. However, most current measures of spatial inequality are based on statistical aggregates for fixed geographical sub-division such as countries, NUTS-regions, municipalities, or census tracts. This is problematic since measures based on such sub-divisions are sensitive to how the boundaries of the areas have been drawn. In the literature this phenomenon is called the Modifiable Area Unit Problem (MAUP) and it has been demonstrated that measures of spatial inequality can be more strongly influenced by how the geographical units have been constructed than by the underlying spatial variation. The aim of this work package is to make advances towards the development of more spatially flexible measures of spatial inequalities that do not depend on predetermined regions.

The work will evaluate the extent of spatial variation in socio-economic inequalities (e.g. poverty, educational attainment, employment, income) across individuals, regions, and countries in Europe by combining individual level data with more aggregate data (from WP 2). It has three objectives:

- Identify the spatial patterns of inequality at different geographical scales in order to show how the Modifiable Area Unit Problem (MAUP) can lead to inaccurate interpretation of spatial inequalities (and consequently policy interventions);
- Propose standardised tools for the analysis of spatial patterns of inequality at more appropriate geographical scales and how such tools can be applied in countries with different access to detailed geographical data;
- Assess how spatial inequalities at different geographical scales affect individual level outcomes across their life-course.

WP 5 will provide input to WP 6 (case studies) by informing about the spatial scale (i.e. neighbourhoods, cities, regions) and the driving factors to be considered in the case study analyses.

Description of work and role of partners

WP5 - Longitudinal studies of territorial inequality [Months: 4-36]
TU Delft, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Task 5.1. Assessment of availability of longitudinal microdata (i.e. individuals, households) and the spatial scale(s) of inequalities in EU countries (covering at least project partner countries) with respect to poverty levels, educational attainment, employment, labour force participation, and income. (Task leader: TU Delft with support from UStockholm, Hutton and HAS CERS) This work package will consider both existing (i) EUROSTAT longitudinal microdata surveys and (ii) country-specific longitudinal microdata surveys to evaluate the possibility for individual level analysis and scale analysis of inequality (using more aggregate data obtained from WP 2). This task will acknowledge substantial differences in data availability across member states. On the ‘high end’ of this spectrum, Sweden, the UK and the Netherlands have individual level, geo-referenced register data. On the ‘low end’, several countries (e.g. Spain) have to work with cross-sectional survey data. Differences in robustness of the data and hence the analyses will be taken into account and explained.

Task 5.2. Development of standardised tools for the analysis of spatial patterns of inequality at different geographical scales. (Task leaders: Delft, UStockholm) Increasing availability of individual level, geo-referenced, data in combination with the increasing processing speed of computers, and the development of new software for processing geo-coded data have made it possible to largely circumvent the aforementioned Modifiable Areal Unit Problem (MAUP) by constructing statistical aggregates for individualised, multi-scalar, ego-centric neighbourhoods. This can be done by constructing a buffer around every individual location until the buffer contains a predetermined number of neighbours, before computing statistical aggregates for the population contained in the buffer. With his approach, measures of spatial variation will no longer be linked to a specific geographic subdivision but instead capture the accurate underlying variation. Such derived measures are independent of existing geographical sub-divisions and are essential for a correct assessment of spatial inequalities.

Task 5.3. Inequality and people and place effects: Analyse how spatial inequalities at different geographical scales affect individual level outcomes over the life-course. (Task leader: Hutton) Individual inequalities in the level of socio-economic achievement (e.g. employment, wages, education, etc.) result both from differences in the characteristics of individuals (e.g. education, skills) and differences in location and contextual effects (e.g. city or rural area, poor connectivity). To reduce inequalities it is therefore important to understand the relative importance of individual (i.e. ‘people’) effects and contextual (i.e. ‘place’) effects. The task will develop empirical models based on individual longitudinal data to measure how much of the differences in individual’s socio-economic outcomes are due to changes in location or changes in individuals own characteristics. EUROSTAT microdata as identified in Task 5.1. and national level surveys will be used to address these issues.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP5 effort
1 - UEF	2.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	1.00
4 - SU	6.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	7.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	14.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	1.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	39.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D5.1	Availability of longitudinal microdata and scales of inequalities in EU countries	8 - TU Delft	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	10
D5.2	Report on multi-scalar patterns of spatial inequalities	8 - TU Delft	Report	Public	20
D5.3	Location and context– analysis of spatial inequalities	8 - TU Delft	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the	30

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
	at different geographical scales			Commission Services)	

Description of deliverables

D5.1 Availability of longitudinal microdata and scales of inequalities in EU countries (Month 10)
 D5.2 Report on multi-scalar patterns of spatial inequalities (Month 20)
 D5.3 Location and context– analysis of spatial inequalities at different geographical scales (Month 30)

D5.1 : Availability of longitudinal microdata and scales of inequalities in EU countries [10]
 Availability of longitudinal microdata and scales of inequalities in EU countries

D5.2 : Report on multi-scalar patterns of spatial inequalities [20]
 Report on multi-scalar patterns of spatial inequalities

D5.3 : Location and context– analysis of spatial inequalities at different geographical scales [30]
 Location and context– analysis of spatial inequalities at different geographical scales

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
				empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP6	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	2 - ILS gGmbH
Work package title	Case Studies		
Start month	13	End month	46

Objectives

Comparative case studies allow us to investigate spatial justice and fairness as they are defined and pursued at local-regional level. Based on concepts, hypotheses and macro- and micro-data analyses in the previous WPs, the selected cases focus on understanding and explaining, through a bottom-up perspective, how social needs and equality demands are articulated and pursued on the local-regional level and how factors on local, regional, national or European level condition goal achievement. At the same time, the locations of the case studies are the concrete places, where links to stakeholders on various scales are established and local and regional practice partners get interested for and involved in the project through dialogue events with stake holders.

The specific objectives of this work package are:

- Establish links to local and regional practice partners and get them involved in the project
- Empirically analyse trajectories of local strategy development and the impact, benefits and limitations of place-based development models from the perspective of territorial cohesion and spatial justice in (33) localities, on the basis of a rigorous methodological framework
- Empirically analyse the themes as relevant for WP 3, 4 and 7 on the basis of conceptual work and hypotheses developed in these WPs
- Synthesise empirical results in national and cross-comparative reports

This WP relates to the demand of the call text to study a “representative number of divergent spatial entities in Europe”, “survey empirically existing and emerging spatial and territorial inequalities and evaluate them normatively from perspectives of justice and fairness”, and consider cross-country comparisons of concepts of regional development (with particular emphasis on north-south divide in Europe).

Description of work and role of partners

WP6 - Case Studies [Months: 13-46]
ILS gGmbH , UEF, UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Based on the overall aim of the proposal to resituate the role of the local in promoting territorial cohesion and spatial justice, our focus in case study research is on localities (ranging from regions to smaller urban areas). We empirically study 33 cases, focusing mainly on disadvantaged places and the respective local strategy development, with selected reference studies (1-2 cases per welfare regime) in formerly lagging, now consolidated or well-to-do places. Starting from the local level, analysis will expand to incorporate the multiple territorial and governance levels in which selected cases are embedded.

Participants

- Lead partner ILS and co-lead partner HAS: coordinating case study work and activities and their reporting in national reports; with input of WP 3, 4 and 7 leaders: developing the methodological framework
- All partners: selecting cases, case-based work and reporting findings in national reports

Tasks and methods

Task 6.1. Methodological framework for case study work. The aim of this task is to provide partners with a conceptual framework for carrying out fieldwork, including data, indicators and key variables suitable for cross-comparative analysis, guidelines for collecting data in the chosen countries, hypotheses and research questions to guide empirical work. The final case study localities will be chosen on the basis of typologies and hypotheses developed in WP 3, 4 and 7 and in discussion with all partners.

Task 6.2. Empirical work in (33) case study localities Based on the guidelines provided in T6.1, partners will start empirical work- Analysis will focus on key structural factors and key (agency) factors which promote or limit the impact of place-based development and participatory cohesion. Aspects to consider in case study work include: – pre-crisis situation and effects of crisis on the (economic and social) position of the study areas; locality-specific patterns of development, quality of social infrastructures – spatial segregation and social mobility, analysis of these patterns in a wider context and development over time – local institutions, levels of civil society engagement and performance, levels of participation – locality-specific governance models; stakeholders and their dispositions; – (place-based and people-

based) policies targeting cohesion, their integration into the wider institutional environment and development over time – local policy making and implementation at the crossroads of top-down measures and bottom up initiatives, – quality of multilevel relations, linkages and division of labour between EU, national, regional and local level for achieving territorial cohesion, – analysis of variables limiting and promoting the impact of place-based approaches out of a spatial and social justice perspective.

Task 6.3. Co-ordinating and synthesizing empirical work. As a technical task, this involves co-ordination between case study partners and synthesising case study research with WP 3, 4 and 7 tasks.

Task 6.4 National reports on case study findings. The findings from case study work (up to 4 cases per country) are reported in (11) national reports, including a cross-comparative analysis of case study results out of a national perspective, and a summary.

Task 6.5 Cross-comparative report on case study findings. The main results of empirical work are documented here out of a cross-European perspective. The report includes chapters that synthesize empirical results against conceptual outlines of WP 3, 4 and 7 and chapters which synthesize the main findings from national reports (with specific input of P12 on social inclusion)

Task 6.6. Local Seminars and Stakeholder interaction. This tasks aims at organising feedback, input and involvement of relevant stakeholders on various scales, but specifically the local and the regional level. Focus group discussions and workshops are mechanisms promoting this involvement. This task is linked to WP 8 and 9.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP6 effort
1 - UEF	12.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	24.00
3 - UNEW	12.00
4 - SU	6.00
5 - NORDREGIO	6.00
6 - HUTTON	6.00
7 - CERSHAS	30.00
8 - TU Delft	12.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	24.00
10 - UL	12.00
11 - ULodz	24.00
12 - Desire	24.00
13 - UTH	24.00
Total	216.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D6.1	Methodological framework for case studies	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the	15

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
				Commission Services)	
D6.2	National case study reports on place-based development and participatory cohesion	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	30
D6.3	Stakeholder interaction report 1	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	30
D6.4	Cross-comparative analysis of country perspectives on spatial justice	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	40
D6.5	Stakeholder interaction report 2	2 - ILS gGmbH	Report	Public	44

Description of deliverables

D6.1 Methodological framework for case studies (Month15)
D6.2 National case study reports on place-based development and participatory cohesion (Month 30)
D6.3 Stakeholder interaction report 1 (Month 30)
D6.4 Cross-comparative analysis of country perspectives on spatial justice (Month 40)
D6.5 Stakeholder Interaction report 2 (Month 44)

D6.1 : Methodological framework for case studies [15]
Methodological Framework for Case Studies

D6.2 : National case study reports on place-based development and participatory cohesion [30]
National case study reports

D6.3 : Stakeholder interaction report 1 [30]
Stakeholder Interaction Report 1

D6.4 : Cross-comparative analysis of country perspectives on spatial justice [40]
Cross-comparative analysis of country perspectives on spatial justice

D6.5 : Stakeholder interaction report 2 [44]
Stakeholder interaction report 2

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
				Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications studied in the case study regions
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP7	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	10 - UL
Work package title	Regional Autonomy and Spatial Justice		
Start month	12	End month	46

Objectives

The overall aim of this WP is to investigate the possible link between regional autonomy and spatial justice, thus answering directly dimension 2 “Regionalism, a question of political and social equality” of the call text. To do so, the results from the case studies in view of the quality of the territorial governance of cohesion policies (WP 3) will be re-considered. This shall help providing an analysis of territorial governance models and regionalism arrangements. More concretely the promoters and inhibitors will be filtered out in order to develop a matrix that informs about what works under which conditions. With this information a set of alternative ‘territorial governance models’ for coordinating and implementing policies targeted at spatial justice will be elaborated. These sets of alternative territorial governance models will be presented to groups of practitioners from each welfare regime, inviting them to (in)validate and deepen empirical results. This will allow the research team both to reinforce its empirical results and to increase the impact of the project towards practitioners. The specific objectives of this WP are:

- Bring together the results on regional autonomy and governance (WP 3, 4 and 7) on the one hand and results on spatial justice and territorial inequalities on the other hand (WP 2, 5).
- Based on the framework drawn in WP 4 and on empirical results gathered in WP 6, analysing the role of locale as a locus of spatial justice and as an essential element of multi-level cohesion policies.
- Develop sets of alternative territorial governance models to be tested with groups of local stakeholders in each welfare region, thus contributing both to policy related results (WP 8) and supporting the discussion of policy-relevant considerations with stakeholders at EU level (WP 9).

Description of work and role of partners

WP7 - Regional Autonomy and Spatial Justice [Months: 12-46]
 UL, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Task 7.1. Developing a matrix bringing together governance patterns (e.g. local/regional autonomy) (WP 3, 4) and spatial inequalities (WP 2, 5), thus allowing to filter out what governance model works under which conditions (lead and co-lead). The matrix guides empirical work in WP 6.

Task 7.2. Validating policy-relevant insights regarding the role of locale. Developing a set of alternative regional development and territorial governance models for coordinating and implementing policies targeted at spatial justice for each identified welfare regime (liberal, state based, society-based, family-based and mixture of models), (lead, co-lead + support from lead of WP5)

Task 7.3. Confronting these sets of alternative territorial governance models with key practitioners from each welfare regime (in form of focus groups bringing together local up to EU practitioners depending on the governance models). This will allow them to (in)validate and deepen the different alternative governance models and reinforce the concrete impact of the project towards local-national practitioners (lead, co-lead with support of all other WP leaders)

Task 7.4. Presenting the results of task 7.4 into a ‘discussion workshop’ in Brussels together with policymakers from various EU-related institutions (esp. Committee of the Regions, DG REGIO, MEPs in charge of regional policy, permanent representations of national and regional institutions in Brussels). This final “empirical step” will help cross-checking findings from task 7.4 with perceptions that key practitioners in Brussels might have of what sort of local/regional autonomy (here in terms of institutional setting, territorial governance structures and prevailing practices) can help to deliver social equality/spatial justice in more efficient ways (lead and co-lead supported by all partners).

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP7 effort
1 - UEF	1.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	1.00

Partner number and short name	WP7 effort
4 - SU	5.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	1.00
7 - CERSHAS	1.00
8 - TU Delft	1.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	9.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	25.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D7.1	Empirical findings from case studies on regional autonomy and spatial justice	10 - UL	Report	Public	32

Description of deliverables

D7.1 Empirical findings from case studies on regional autonomy and spatial justice (Month 32)
 D7.1 : Empirical findings from case studies on regional autonomy and spatial justice [32]
 Empirical findings from case studies on regional autonomy and spatial justice

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
				studied in the case study regions
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP8	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	11 - ULodz
Work package title	Coherence and Scenarios		
Start month	19	End month	46

Objectives

The objective of this work package is to integrate results achieved in previous work packages by linking the theory (WP1), empirical quantitative and qualitative research (WP2-6) to policy debates (WP7) by:

- re-conceptualising spatial justice described widely within different contexts: in a theoretical context in WP1, in a policy, governance and practice context in WP3-4, and empirically in WP2 and WP5-6,
- formulating alternative scenarios for spatial justice of specific types of European regions and typologies whose representatives were the subject of case studies research in WP6.

Scenario methods are qualitative methods used by researchers representing various disciplines and practitioners - planners, strategists, experts and consultants to present key drivers (in the identified spheres) for a certain phenomenon or process (for RELOCAL: spatial inequalities, spatial injustice) according to opinions from several experts. Selected people participate in the survey to determine the impact and probability of occurrence of a certain factor in an upward, downward and stabilization trend. The averaged results allow identifying and assessing the strength of the impact of analysed circumstances and the probability of the certain trend (Ringland, 1998). Scenario methods are mainly used in development strategies and planning of enterprises, organizations and various business ventures. However they became popular also in drawing prospects for different territorial units on local and regional level. Research programs involving scenario methods, for example VISIONS focusing on the relationship between the processes of socio-economic and environmental factors and their implications for the development of Europe (Gough, 1999) or PRELUDE analysing alternative scenarios for the use of land and landscape have been financially supported by international institutions. Spheres and factors (key drivers for change) taken into account in scenarios for the case study regions will be considered in parallel to research carried in WP1-7 and a methodological framework as well as practical guidelines for carrying surveys with experts should be completed in parallel to empirical studies of WP6.

Description of work and role of partners

WP8 - Coherence and Scenarios [Months: 19-46]
ULodz, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, Desire, UTH

Task 8.1.Re-conceptualise spatial justice following results of empirical research starting from the local level (neighbourhoods) through regional level (inside regions, among neighbouring local hubs) up to national and European level of analysis (U Lodz lead, Hutton co-lead partner and University of Newcastle).

Task 8.2.Identify key drivers for regional change and develop the methodological framework for scenarios based on theoretical and empirical background (WP1-5) and findings from case studies (WP6) (U Lodz lead and Hutton, co-lead partner).

Task 8.3. Empirical work on formulating alternative scenarios for specific types of European regions being subjects of case studies, involving experts such as: local and regional stakeholders, people responsible for local and regional strategies and planning and journalists interested in these issues. The task aims at 1) selecting opposing key drivers to generate a range of different but plausible scenarios 2) developing scenario ‘stories’ and identifying impact of alternative scenarios on regions as the final key stage of scenario building (all partners).

Task 8.4. Co-ordinating and synthesizing empirical work to prepare alternative scenarios for the future spatial justice / injustice of specific types of European urban regions (U Lodz lead and Hutton co-lead partner).

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP8 effort
1 - UEF	2.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	2.00

Partner number and short name	WP8 effort
3 - UNEW	2.00
4 - SU	3.00
5 - NORDREGIO	2.00
6 - HUTTON	5.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	2.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	2.00
10 - UL	2.00
11 - ULodz	10.00
12 - Desire	2.00
13 - UTH	2.00
Total	38.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D8.1	Methodological framework for developing scenarios of case study regions	11 - ULodz	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	24
D8.2	Synthesis report re-conceptualizing spatial justice (based on results achieved in WP3-4)	11 - ULodz	Report	Public	36
D8.3	Report on alternative scenarios for case study regions (based on findings from research on case studies (WP6) and interviews with experts)	11 - ULodz	Report	Public	42

Description of deliverables

D8.1 Methodological framework for developing scenarios of case study regions (Month 24)
 D8.2 Synthesis report re-conceptualizing spatial justice (based on results achieved in WP3-4) (Month 36)
 D8.3 Report on alternative scenarios for case study regions (based on findings from research on case studies (WP6) and interviews with experts) (Month 42)
 D8.1 : Methodological framework for developing scenarios of case study regions [24]

Methodological framework for developing scenarios of case study regions

D8.2 : Synthesis report re-conceptualizing spatial justice (based on results achieved in WP3-4) [36]
 Synthesis report re-conceptualizing spatial justice (based on results achieved in WP3-4)

D8.3 : Report on alternative scenarios for case study regions (based on findings from research on case studies (WP6) and interviews with experts) [42]
 Report on alternative scenarios for case study regions (based on findings from research on case studies (WP6) and interviews with experts)

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications studied in the case study regions
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP9	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	1 - UEF
Work package title	Policy Considerations		
Start month	1	End month	48

Objectives

The main objective of WP 9 is to consolidate the overall scientific insights gained from the preceding research work into concrete policy recommendations at various levels of government and governance in the EU. The aim is specifically to distill the most crucial messages with regard to social justice and its spatial manifestations and trends into brief and easy to read and easy to digest messages for those people making the decisions that have relevance and impact. The results will be delivered, as part of the Dissemination activities, to the European Commission, the wider public, civil society, social entrepreneurial stakeholders and policy research community. In line with the overall approach of the project, the policy considerations and messages will, on the knowledge gained from the in-depth case studies, pay due attention to the diversity of regional/local environments, but will provide clear messages on how to deliver better policies promoting territorial cohesion and spatial justice, including socio-economic well-being clear, in times of decreasing budgets and austerity.

Specific objectives are:

- to trigger and get engaged in an interactive dialogue with the local-regional and relevant national stakeholders in each case study region during the research project
- to provide iterative and bipartite information on the project and its findings for the relevant actors and institutions

Description of work and role of partners

WP9 - Policy Considerations [Months: 1-48]
 UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Building on input provided by the Policy Advisory Board and Project Partners, this Work Package will develop, first, stakeholder participation and input for each case study and, second, consolidate the scientific results of the different Work Packages into policy-relevant messages. Integration between these two dimensions will be carried out at the later stages of the entire project. The overall work content will be operationalized through the following Tasks:

Task 9.1. Development of toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and citizens (their civil-society representatives) during case study implementation carried out as part of WP6 Case Studies. The toolbox will be continuously supplemented by the exchange of information and knowledge during the fieldwork (WP 6).

Task 9.2. Identification of relevant stakeholders in cooperation with WP 6 and WP 7 and organization of small dialogue events (i.e. learning sets, workshops and individual labs) for each case study.

- Validation of RELOCAL findings in terms of regional implementation environment and regional deployment of Cohesion Policy, with specific regard to the spatial dimension of justice and fairness
- Valorisation of RELOCAL outputs in terms of possible transfer of good practices in territorial cohesion and spatial justice (in order to increase the impact of RELOCAL)

Task 9.3. Synthesis Through desk research, consolidation of the scientific results of the different Work Packages into policy-relevant messages (also taking into account the results from Task 9.2.)

Task 9.4 Organisation of Policy Seminars and Conference: Two Policy Discussion seminars and one full conference will be organised in order to discuss and disseminate policy messages

Task 9.5 Policy Recommendations To suggest policy implications based on the outcomes of the research and suggest good practices for promoting spatial justice and fairness. To suggest different policy options based on different local conditions and scenarios developed in WP 8

Task 9.6 Preparation of Report on the Policy Messages of integrating the experiences from stakeholder events in the case study regions at the end of the project and continuous short policy briefs along the project timeline.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP9 effort
1 - UEF	8.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	2.00
4 - SU	3.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	2.00
7 - CERSHAS	1.00
8 - TU Delft	1.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	1.00
11 - ULodz	2.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	25.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D9.1	Case study toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and civil-society representatives	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D9.2	Policy Brief 1	1 - UEF	Report	Public	24
D9.3	Policy Brief 2	1 - UEF	Report	Public	30
D9.4	Policy Brief 3	1 - UEF	Report	Public	44
D9.5	Report on policy recommendations and good practices for promoting spatial justice	1 - UEF	Report	Public	46

Description of deliverables

D9.1 Case study toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and civil-society representatives (Month 12)
D9.2 Policy Brief 1 (Months 24)
D9.3 Policy Brief 2 (Month 30)
D9.4 Policy Brief 3 (Month 44)
D9.5 Report on policy recommendations and good practices for promoting spatial justice (Month 46)

D9.1 : Case study toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and civil-society representatives [12]
Case study toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders and civil-society representatives

D9.2 : Policy Brief 1 [24]

Policy Brief 1
D9.3 : Policy Brief 2 [30]
Policy Brief 2
D9.4 : Policy Brief 3 [44]
Policy Brief 3
D9.5 : Report on policy recommendations and good practices for promoting spatial justice [46]
Report on policy recommendations and good practices for promoting spatial justice

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications studied in the case study regions

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP10	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	9 - MCRIT, S.L
Work package title	Dissemination and Impact		
Start month	1	End month	48

Objectives

WP 10 is devoted to boost and facilitate awareness and knowledge of scientific and policy-oriented results of RELOCAL. The intention is to implement throughout the project cycle well-designed and effective measures for communication and dissemination (cf. chapter 2.4). As to the dissemination of policy-relevant results, a specific dissemination plan will be developed and its application supervised by the specifically set dissemination group. The specific objectives of WP 10 are:

- opening the results of RELOCAL for discussion in a wider context, including stakeholder and research communities
- to further contribute to the development of a research strategy and future research demand by exchanging research progress
- to encourage a public debate about concept of Europeanisation and participation in European, national and regional policy context

Description of work and role of partners

WP10 - Dissemination and Impact [Months: 1-48]
MCRIT, S.L, UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

Successful elaboration, adoption and implementation of new evidence-based knowledge and tailored policy communication and engagement strategies in WP8 are in close connection with communication activities. WP 8's main target is to valorise the RELOCAL's products and outputs among the policy makers and stakeholders. In WP 10, the various strands of research and debate in the RELOCAL project will be summarized and condensed in a way communicable to the relevant research and stakeholder communities.

Tasks and methods

Task 10.1. Dissemination Plan: The Dissemination Team will elaborate and implement the dissemination plan based on the proposed dissemination strategy (see chapter 2.4.2). The dissemination plan includes a definition of relevant research and stakeholder communities, the methods of communication and the media to be used. Implementation takes place through tasks 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4.

Task 10.2. Ongoing dissemination activities: The innovative approach will be developed and transported across disciplinary boundaries continuously through a set of communicative and documentary instruments.

- Various kinds of print products about RELOCAL's content
- Project Advisory Groups, representing 6-10 stakeholders from scientific and political institutions relevant to the projects' success (two meetings, thematic and/or methodological issues, inputs for research design, application of results and dissemination)
- A project-based website, helping to distribute project aims and application-relevant results to the public and give access to the reports produced.
- Establishing RELOCAL LinkedIn group and RELOCAL Facebook community
- Network-distribution of -5 newsletters reporting on interim results of the RELOCAL
- Creating RELOCAL's Knowledge Hub, a project-based website helping to distribute projects aims and application-relevant results and project internal communication
- Publications in academic and policy oriented journals on national, European and international levels Potential journals are to be canvassed. Special issues (min 2) as well as book publications will (min 2) be produced.
- Active participation and presentation of approach and results in academic/non-academic conferences
- A number of illustrative cases will be used also to exchange the project's ideas and methods with representatives of urban areas, stakeholders and policy makers
- Discussion papers are issued to inform the scientific community and stakeholders about the project outputs

Task 10.3. Organisation of Interim and Final Conference: Three conferences will be organised to gain additional comments of the scientific community and relevant stakeholders. These Conferences will concentrate on dissemination of critical reflections on insights achieved, and knowledge generated. The Final Conference will thereafter disseminate the project outputs to a European professional public.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP10 effort
1 - UEF	6.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	2.00
3 - UNEW	2.00
4 - SU	2.00
5 - NORDREGIO	2.00
6 - HUTTON	2.00
7 - CERSHAS	2.00
8 - TU Delft	2.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	7.00
10 - UL	2.00
11 - ULodz	2.00
12 - Desire	2.00
13 - UTH	2.00
Total	35.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D10.1	Project Website and Intranet	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	1
D10.2	Data Management Plan	9 - MCRIT, S.L	ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	6
D10.3	Dissemination Plan	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	3
D10.4	Newsletter 1	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	3
D10.5	Working Paper Series 1	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	12
D10.6	Newsletter 2	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	12

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D10.7	Interim Dissemination Report	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	24
D10.8	Working Paper Series 2	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	24
D10.9	Newsletter 3	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	28
D10.10	Newsletter 4	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	36
D10.11	Working Paper Series 3	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	36
D10.12	Newsletter 5	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	44
D10.13	Working Paper Series 4	9 - MCRIT, S.L	Report	Public	48

Description of deliverables

D10.1 Project Website and Intranet (Month 1)
D10.2 Data management plan (Month 6)
D10.3 Dissemination Plan (Month 3)
D10.4 Newsletter 1 (Month 3)
D10.5 Working Paper Series 1 (Month 12)
D10.6 Newsletter 2 (Month 12)
D10.7 Interim Dissemination Report (Month 24)
D10.8 Working Paper Series 2 (Month 24)
D10.9 Newsletter 3 (Month 28)
D10.10 Newsletter 4 (Month 36)
D10.11 Working Paper Series 3 (Month 36)
D10.12 Newsletter 5 (Month 44)
D10.13 Working Paper Series 4 (Month 48)

D10.1 : Project Website and Intranet [1]
Project Website and Intranet

D10.2 : Data Management Plan [6]
Data Management Plan

D10.3 : Dissemination Plan [3]
Dissemination Plan

D10.4 : Newsletter 1 [3]
Newsletter 1

D10.5 : Working Paper Series 1 [12]
Working Paper Series 1

D10.6 : Newsletter 2 [12]
Newsletter 2

D10.7 : Interim Dissemination Report [24]
Interim Dissemination Impact Report

D10.8 : Working Paper Series 2 [24]
Working Paper Series 2

D10.9 : Newsletter 3 [28] Newsletter 3
D10.10 : Newsletter 4 [36] Newsletter 4
D10.11 : Working Paper Series 3 [36] Working Paper Series 3
D10.12 : Newsletter 5 [44] Newsletter 5
D10.13 : Working Paper Series 4 [48] Working Paper Series 4

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP11	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	1 - UEF
Work package title	Project Management		
Start month	1	End month	48

Objectives

UEF will provide overall administrative and scientific co-ordination of the project. The aim of this WP is to provide the project team with a well-functioning project secretariat enabling the project team to provide the best possible conditions for the conduct of the project work. More specifically the objectives include:

- maintaining internal coherence in the project and enabling an efficient work and communication within the project team
- monitoring of project process in order to ensure scheduled completion of milestones and deliverables
- enabling an efficient work and communication with the European Commission
- preparation of progress reports and financial reports

Description of work and role of partners

WP11 - Project Management [Months: 1-48]
 UEF, ILS gGmbH , UNEW, SU, NORDREGIO, HUTTON, CERSHAS, TU Delft, MCRIT, S.L, UL, ULodz, Desire, UTH

WP 11 Project Management will provide a structured system for administration and technical management of the project with quality control enabling efficient decision-making, rapid information flow within and from the project and internal and external consultations.

Tasks and Methods

Task 11.1. Consortium Agreement: UEF will draw up with partners a Consortium Agreement that will establish in detail the procedures on the internal management of the consortium.

Task 11.2. Reporting to Commission: The project coordinator UEF will submit progress reports and financial reports to the commission. The coordinator will deal directly with the Commission on all matters concerning the project.

Task 11.3. Overall administration of the consortium: UEF as coordinator has overall responsibility on the smooth administration and running the project. Strategic management involves continuous communication with the responsible WP leaders in different phases of the project.

Task 11.4 Monitoring Plan: UEF will draw up a Monitoring Plan to ensure the sound implementation of the project, to support the work of the individual teams and to identify problems in carrying out the work packages as early as possible in order to avoid delays.

Task 11.5 Planning and organising project workshops, 6 in total, where project progress and problems will be assessed.

Task 11.6 Facilitation of decision-making in the consortium, the coordinator will facilitate the work of the project and an Executive Committee will be established. 5 Executive Committee meetings will be held during the project period corresponding with project workshops.

Task 11.7 Securing the involvement and participation of the Scientific and Policy Advisory Boards both through face-to-face meetings (project workshops and conferences), skype meetings and email correspondence.

Task 11.8 Assuring data management and open access standards set out in the Consortium Agreement

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name	WP11 effort
1 - UEF	14.00
2 - ILS gGmbH	1.00
3 - UNEW	1.00
4 - SU	1.00
5 - NORDREGIO	1.00
6 - HUTTON	1.00
7 - CERSHAS	1.00

Partner number and short name	WP11 effort
8 - TU Delft	1.00
9 - MCRIT, S.L	1.00
10 - UL	1.00
11 - ULodz	1.00
12 - Desire	1.00
13 - UTH	1.00
Total	26.00

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D11.1	Monitoring Plan	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	3
D11.2	Project Progress Report 1	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	10
D11.3	Project Progress Report 2	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	18
D11.4	Project Progress Report 3	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	32
D11.5	Project Progress Report 4	1 - UEF	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	36

Description of deliverables

11.1 Monitoring Plan (Month 3)
 11.2 Project Progress Report 1 (Month10)
 11.3 Project Progress Report 2 (Month 18)
 11.4 Project Progress Report 3 (Month 32)

11.5 Project Progress Report 4 (Month 36)

D11.1 : Monitoring Plan [3]
 Monitoring Plan to ensure the sound implementation of the project, to support the work of the individual teams and to identify problems in carrying out the work packages as early as possible in order to avoid delays

D11.2 : Project Progress Report 1 [10]
 Project Progress Report 1

D11.3 : Project Progress Report 2 [18]
 Project Progress Report 2

D11.4 : Project Progress Report 3 [32]
 Project Progress Report 3

D11.5 : Project Progress Report 4 [36]
 Project Progress Report 4

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
MS1	Conceptual Framework for the project drafted.	3 - UNEW	5	Kick-off Workshop with entire consortium, internal report on intranet and Newsletter 1, Monitoring Plan for the Project drawn up, Conceptual framework for the Project drafted
MS2	Inception phase reached	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2,

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
	and engagement achieved			Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications studied in the case study regions
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

Work package number ⁹	WP12	Lead beneficiary ¹⁰	1 - UEF
Work package title	Ethics requirements		
Start month	1	End month	48

Objectives

The objective is to ensure compliance with the 'ethics requirements' set out in this work package.

Description of work and role of partners

WP12 - Ethics requirements [Months: 1-48]
UEF
 This work package sets out the 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with.

List of deliverables

Deliverable Number ¹⁴	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary	Type ¹⁵	Dissemination level ¹⁶	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷
D12.1	POPD - Requirement No. 1	1 - UEF	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12
D12.2	H - Requirement No. 2	1 - UEF	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	12

Description of deliverables

The 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with are included as deliverables in this work package.

D12.1 : POPD - Requirement No. 1 [12]
 - Copies of opinion or confirmation by the competent Institutional Data Protection Officer and/or authorization or notification by the National Data Protection Authority must be submitted (which ever applies according to the Data Protection Directive (EC Directive 95/46, currently under revision, and the national law).

D12.2 : H - Requirement No. 2 [12]
 - Details on the procedures and criteria that will be used to identify/recruit research participants must be provided.
 - Detailed information must be provided on the informed consent procedures that will be implemented for the participation of humans. - Copies of ethics approvals for the research with humans must be submitted.

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months)	Means of verification
---------------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------

1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones

Milestone number ¹⁸	Milestone title	WP number ⁹	Lead beneficiary	Due Date (in months) ¹⁷	Means of verification
MS1	Conceptual Framework for the project drafted.	WP1, WP11	3 - UNEW	5	Kick-off Workshop with entire consortium, internal report on intranet and Newsletter 1, Monitoring Plan for the Project drawn up, Conceptual framework for the Project drafted
MS2	Inception phase reached	WP11, WP2, WP3, WP5, WP6, WP9	8 - TU Delft	12	Workshop 2 among partners, Inception phase implemented, Newsletter 2, Progress Report 1, Technical and Financial Report 1
MS3	Methodological frameworks achieved	WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP5, WP6, WP9	4 - SU	17	Workshop 3 among partners, Project Conference 1, methodological frameworks for case studies reached
MS4	Empirical phase 1: policy implementation achieved	WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP8, WP9	7 - CERSHAS	28	Organising Policy Seminar 1 and Project Conference 2 with wider participation, Workshop 4 among partners, Newsletter 3, Policy Brief 1, Progress report 2, Empirical phase in the selected case studies started
MS5	Empirical phase 2: policy deployment and engagement achieved	WP1, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	2 - ILS gGmbH	36	Workshop 5 among partners, Policy Seminar 2, Policy Brief 2, Technical and Financial report 2, Progress report 3, Progress report 4, Newsletter 4, Second empirical phase in the selected case study areas
MS6	Coherence scenarios and policy implications developed	WP11, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	11 - ULodz	44	Workshop 6 among partners, Policy Conference 1, Policy Brief 3, Scenarios and policy implications studied in the case study regions
MS7	Synthesis and summarised evidence compiled	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	1 - UEF	48	Final conference, Final report, Technical and Financial report 3, Newsletter 5, Synthesis of Project results and compiling evidence, Dissemination of policy recommendations

1.3.5. WT5 Critical Implementation risks and mitigation actions

Risk number	Description of risk	WP Number	Proposed risk-mitigation measures
1	Loss of key personnel due either to long-term sickness or quitting	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Performance of tasks in cooperation of two or more partners Strategic decision by the PEG in case of delay or failure to delivery
2	Lack of necessary skills to undertake the project activities	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Experienced key personnel of the consortium & assignment of qualified personnel. Supervision by key personnel of each consortium partner
3	Ambiguity of roles and responsibilities within the project	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Clarification of roles and responsibilities during the formulation of the consortium agreement Kick-off and work package coordination meetings to clearly allocate roles and responsibilities
4	Disagreement during decision making processes	WP11	Close cooperation of all partners from the very beginning of the project Disagreement in strategic issues will be handled by the PEG
5	Failure or non-delivery of financial reports	WP11	All consortium partners are familiar with EU projects and well-experienced in related reporting procedures In serious cases, exclusion of partners; related tasks assigned to other consortium partners and funds re-allocated based on the decision of the PEG
6	Single tasks and/or complete WPs exceed the estimated delivery time	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Continuous monitoring of status of the project activities by the Project Coordinator Major plan adjustments are dealt with by the PEG
7	Failure in or incomplete delivery of assigned deliverables	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Two or more partners jointly fulfil most tasks and the WP Leaders as well as the Project Coordinator will monitor delivery The PEG will make strategic decisions in cases of delay or failure in delivery on an individual basis.
8	Insufficient quality of scientific reports or fieldwork with its specific methodological approaches	WP1, WP10, WP11, WP12, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9	Definition of a common multi-approach analytical framework describing in detail the applied proceeding for each method; The PEG will assure the scientific quality of project activities and results WP Leaders assure quality by monitoring application of defined methodologies and related reports Project Coordinator will report to the PEG which will make a strategic decision
9	Mobilising a critical mass of resources in terms of collaboration, or involvement of stakeholders is not achieved	WP10, WP11, WP6, WP8, WP9	The consortium offers broad access and networks related to the thematic fields Continuous stakeholder dialogue throughout the project term The Project Coordinator monitors dissemination, collaboration with external partners and stakeholder

1.3.6. WT6 Summary of project effort in person-months

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7	WP8	WP9	WP10	WP11	WP12	Total Person/Months per Participant
1 - UEF	2	2	2	4	2	12	1	2	8	6	14		55
2 - ILS gGmbH	0	1	1	2	1	24	1	2	1	2	1		36
3 - UNEW	10	2	1	2	1	12	1	2	2	2	1		36
4 - SU	2	2	9	2	6	6	5	3	3	2	1		41
5 - NORDREGIO	2	9	1	1	1	6	1	2	1	2	1		27
6 - HUTTON	0	1	1	1	7	6	1	5	2	2	1		27
7 - CERSHAS	2	2	2	9	2	30	1	2	1	2	1		54
8 - TU Delft	2	1	1	2	14	12	1	2	1	2	1		39
9 - MCRIT, S.L	0	1	1	1	1	24	1	2	1	7	1		40
10 - UL	2	1	6	1	1	12	9	2	1	2	1		38
11 - ULodz	0	1	1	1	1	24	1	10	2	2	1		44
12 - Desire	0	1	1	1	1	24	1	2	1	2	1		35
13 - UTH	0	1	1	1	1	24	1	2	1	2	1		35
Total Person/Months	22	25	28	28	39	216	25	38	25	35	26		507

1.3.7. WT7 Tentative schedule of project reviews

Review number ¹⁹	Tentative timing	Planned venue of review	Comments, if any
RV1	13	Brussels	Exact Month and Date TBC
RV2	33	TBC	Exact Month and Date TBC
RV3	48	TBC	Exact Month and Date TBC