



## **MEDGOVERNANCE**

### **ACTION: 3.1 - ANALYSIS OF EUROMED GOVERNANCE**

### **GUIDELINES FOR A COMMON ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK**

*Document prepared by the Institut de la Méditerranée*

*Version of 4<sup>th</sup> June 2009*

**CONTENT**

**MEDGOVERNANCE.....1**

**ACTION: 3.1 - ANALYSIS OF EUROMED GOVERNANCE.....1**

**GUIDELINES FOR A COMMON ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK.....1**

**CONTENT.....2**

**INTRODUCTION.....3**

**GENERAL PRINCIPLE: A COLLABORATIVE ENQUIRY.....4**

**A 3 STEPS APPROACH.....4**

**SUMMARY PRESENTATION.....7**

**TIMING.....8**

**ANNEX 1 – PROPOSED SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES.....9**

**ANNEX 2– STANDARD FRAMEWORK FOR CASE STUDY ANALYSIS AND  
STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWS.....12**

## INTRODUCTION

Governance can be defined as **the coordination system existing between government, local and regional authorities, multilateral organisations but also private actors, companies and NGOs allowing to produce public policies, decisions and projects.** Coordination between this plurality of actors can be either institutionalized or ruled by procedures and even informal rules.

The objective of the Medgovernance project is to promote the role of regional authorities in a Euro-Mediterranean multilevel governance framework through:

- Coordinated action of Mediterranean regional authorities
- Cooperation between regional authorities with national and European institutions
- Cooperation with different stakeholders: civil society organisations, enterprises, ...

In this framework, the 3-1 activity is defined as follows in the Medgovernance application form:

*“This task is coordinated by the IMED, as leader of the Scientific Committee and it is aimed to define a common analysis of the systems of Euromed governance through the creation of 5 interregional and multilevel working groups A case study methodology is applied to the following priorities: Environment, Innovation, Competitiveness, Transport & Energy, Migration & Mobility and Culture, in coherence with the priority mentioned in the O.P. In this phase, the project will concentrate on Mediterranean projects initiated at EU or transgovernemental state level (top down approach). The state of the art in Euromed Governance for 5 priorities is described in a final work paper. The task is directly propaedeutic to action 3.2. and 3.3.”*

*Deliverables: 5 transnational working groups; 4 case studies; 1 working document concerning the state of the art in euromed governance for five priorities*

More specifically, the activity aims at:

- Identifying the main characteristics of the governance framework in each participating countries on the project priority: strengths, weaknesses and the role eventually played by regions;
- Analysing common Mediterranean governance procedures/institutions at top down level;
- Prepare the next step of the Medgovernance project and elaboration of common strategy for regional actors through a document to be prepared by CRPM during the 3-3 activity.

In this perspective, a minimum level of harmonisation of the 5 investigation processes is required. However, the present document only provides the Medgovernance partners with guidelines. Priority Leaders are the main responsible to lead the investigation process for their Priority as they wish.

## GENERAL PRINCIPLE: A COLLABORATIVE ENQUIRY

The 3-1 activity will rely on a **case-study approach**: in each priority<sup>1</sup>, each research institute will analyse case studies, meaning *in vivo* experiences that will allow to highlight the main characteristics of the governance system: policy objectives, multi-actor, multi-level, internal and external relationship structure, topics/contents, organisation and procedures, budget/financing...

This case study approach is also a **collaborative approach** involving all the partners of the Medgovernance project: each research institute shall contribute to each priority, not only on "their" priority. The 3-1 activity will also allow the identification of also aims at **including stakeholders** in the overall Medgovernance process. These stakeholders are key actor at the local, regional, national and transnational level in each Priority.

## A 3 STEPS APPROACH

### Step 1 - Identification of case studies and stakeholders

#### Activities

First of all, the **Priority Leaders** are requested to **propose 1 or 2 case studies**. A final list of case studies is then selected by the Institut de la Méditerranée and validated by the Technical Scientific Committee of the project.

As stated in the Medgovernance application form, the case studies should be "*Mediterranean projects initiated at EU or transgovernamental state level (top down approach)*" they should also share the following characteristics.

#### Characteristics of a "good" case study

- *Mediterranean projects, programmes or policies initiated at EU or transgovernamental level (top down approach)*
- *Multilevel and multitissue projects, programmes or policies combining different level of action (local, national, European, Mediterranean) and combining different dimensions of public actions.*
- *Mesoscale projects, programmes or policies that is broad enough to embrace the governance issue of the priority and narrow enough to have a dynamic and prospective approach;*
- *Topical and innovative projects, programmes or policies in terms of governance*
- *Well functioning systems*
- *Transregional, transnational, European or Mediterranean dimension*
- *Presence of stakeholders willing to get involved.*

#### **Nota Bene:**

*Once the final list of case study is validated, Priority Leaders are responsible for launching the research activities and for asking other research institutes for their contributions. In this perspective, Priority Leaders might prepare and send to the research institute a detailed work*

---

<sup>1</sup> The 5 priorities defined in the Medgovernance application form and the Priority Leaders (PL) are the following: environment (PL: CeSPI); culture (PL: Tres Culturas); transport & energy (PL: Institut de la Méditerranée) ; innovation and competitiveness (PL: Iemed); migration and mobility (PL: Istituto Paralleli).

*programme for their case studies.*<sup>2</sup>

### **Deliverables**

- A **list of case studies** (1 or two for each priority) including a brief “sketch” of the case, a primary evaluation according to the above criteria and a primary list of potential stakeholders to be interviewed.

### **Schedule**

- **5<sup>th</sup> June 2009:** each Priority Leaders send a set of proposed to the Institut de la Méditerranée;
- **19<sup>th</sup> June 2009:** the Institut de la Méditerranée send an integrated list of case study.

## **Step 2 – Working group implementation and case study analysis**

### **Activities**

Each Priority Leader is coordinating the implementation of a **transnational working group** leading to the elaboration of a **Thematic Report**. Each Thematic Report is based on the transversal analysis of **regional contributions** prepared for each case study in each region by research institute.

#### 1 –REGIONAL CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

For each priority, research institutes contribute to the are requested to analyse how the proposed case studies<sup>3</sup> are being implemented in its region.

As underlined above, the objective of case study analysis is both to highlight the regional governance framework for each priority and to involve key stakeholders at different levels (local-regional, national, European-multilateral level). in the analysis process and in Medgovernance project.

In this perspective, the research institutes can either:

- Implement individual interviews with stakeholders on the basis of the standard questionnaire<sup>4</sup> ;
- Implement working group through Delphi group or other networking methodological means.

However the research institute should assure the involvement of the different stakeholders in exchanging ideas.

In each region, the results of regional contribution to the case study analysis in presented in a **Regional Case study Contribution**. This document has an average length of 10 pages and consists in the results on how the case study in being implemented at regional level notably based on the stakeholders interviews.

#### 2 – IMPLEMENTATION OF THEMATIC TRANSREGIONAL INTEGRATION

On the basis of the Regional Case Study Reports prepared in each region, each Priority Report develop a thematic transregional analysis embedded in a Thematic Report. This document has an average length of 40 pages.

---

<sup>2</sup> This activity is optional

<sup>3</sup> 1 or 2 by priority, according to the case study selection process during Step 1

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 2

A draft report is first produced by the Priority Leaders and then validated by each research institute in close coordination with the interviewed stakeholders.

***Nota Bene:***

*According to their agenda and according to stakeholder availability, the process of transregional integration might include the organisation by Priority Leaders of “stakeholders priority workshop”.*

**Deliverables**

- **Individual interviews** of the case study stakeholders produced for each case study in each region;
- **Regional Case Study Contributions** (approximately 30, that is about 5 contributions prepared by each research institute) ;
- **5 Thematic Reports** (1 for each priority) prepared by Priority Leaders.

**Schedule**

- **June –October 2009:** interviews of stakeholders and/or organisation of working group meeting and elaboration of **Regional Case Study Contributions** by research institutes;
- **October – November 2009:** production of a draft **Thematic Report** by each Priority Leaders;
- **December 2009:** validation of the **Thematic Reports** by the stakeholders and production of the final Thematic Report.

**Step 3 – Mediterranean integration**

**Activities**

The Institut de la Méditerranée shall make a transversal analysis of the contributions sent by the project partner and present it within a **Mediterranean Governance Report**.

The **Mediterranean integration seminar** will allow to present and discuss with the case study stakeholders the main conclusions entailed within the Mediterranean Governance report.

As far as possible, this seminar shall be articulated with political bureau of the CPMR inter-Mediterranean commission provisioned early 2010.


**Deliverables**

- Draft and final **Mediterranean report** by the Institut de la Méditerranée

**Schedule**

- **January 2010:** production a draft Mediterranean report;
- **January - February 2010:** presentation and discussion of the Mediterranean report during the Mediterranean integration seminar;
- **February 2010:** production of the final Mediterranean report by the Institut de la Méditerranée.

# SUMMARY PRESENTATION



## TIMING

	june	july	aug	sept	oct	nov	dec	jan	feb	march	april	may
Step 1	■											
Step 2		■	■	■	■	■	■					
Step 3								■	■			

## ANNEX 1 – PROPOSED SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES

This document aims at proposing a framework for the presentation of proposed case studies by Priority Leaders.

First of all, the **Priority Leaders are requested to propose 1 or 2 case studies**. A final list of case studies is then selected by the Institut de la Méditerranée and validated by the Technical Scientific Committee of the project.

As stated in the Medgovernance application form, the case studies should be “*Mediterranean projects initiated at EU or transgovernamental state level (top down approach)*” they should also share the following characteristics.

This document has to be filled in and send to the Institut de la Méditerranée before **5<sup>th</sup> June 2009**.

<b>PRIORITY LEADER</b>	
<b>Case Study 1</b>	
<i>Brief sketch (5 lines)</i>	
<i>Brief evaluation according of the process according to “good case study” criteria:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Transregional, transnational, European or Mediterranean dimension</i></li> <li>- <i>Multilevel and multissue</i></li> <li>- <i>Mesoscale</i></li> <li>- <i>Topical and innovative</i></li> <li>- <i>Well functioning systems</i></li> </ul>	

<i>Stakeholders willing to get involved</i>	Stakeholder 1 (name, institution, type of involvement)  Stakeholder 2 (name, institution, type of involvement)  Stakeholder 3 (name, institution, type of involvement)  ...
<b>Case study 2</b>	
<i>Very brief description (5 lines)</i>	
<i>Brief evaluation according of the process according to “good case study” criteria:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Transregional, transnational, European or Mediterranean dimension</i></li> <li>- <i>Multilevel and multissue</i></li> <li>- <i>Mesoscale</i></li> <li>- <i>Topical and innovative</i></li> <li>- <i>Well functioning systems</i></li> </ul>	
<i>Stakeholders willing to get involved</i>	Stakeholder 1 (name, institution, type of involvement)  Stakeholder 2 (name, institution, type of involvement)  Stakeholder 3 (name, institution, type of involvement)

	...
--	-----

## **ANNEX 2– STANDARD FRAMEWORK FOR CASE STUDY ANALYSIS AND STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWS**

Policy framework: how is defined the policy? What policy initiatives?

Legal and regulatory framework at national international/intergovernmental, European/Mediterranean level

Institutional framework: main competences and major stakeholders involved at local, regional, national, European/Mediterranean, international/intergovernmental level

Policy framework: European/Mediterranean, national and/or local programme, main topics and initiatives, vision, mission

Financial framework: who's paying at local, regional, national, European/Mediterranean, international level?

**The governance of the plan/programme/project itself**

Operative level: how is the preceding policy framework implemented? Who do participate? Where? When?

Technical and expertise background

Coordination process between public and private actors, between European, national and local actors, at the following stage of the project:

Preparation

Decision taking

Implementation

Evaluation

If necessary, highlight the participatory procedures implemented in order to involve citizens and civil society components at the various stage of the project.

**The specific role of regional authorities**

Specific competences inserted in the top down plan/programme/project

Contribution to the plan/programme/project

Existence of regional strategic planning correlated to the plan/programme/project

Local debate and participation to the transnational debate activated by the plan/programme/project

Involved actors at regional level

Difficulties and success encountered by regional authorities during the process.

**Evaluation of the case study/cross cutting assessment**