



## Co-operation framework to promote urban sustainable development

<b>PROGRESS REPORT NR</b>	<b>Final Technical Report</b> (December 2002 - November 2004)
<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>	<b>EMAS – Peer Review for the Cities</b> <a href="http://www.emascities.org">www.emascities.org</a>
<b>CONTRACT NR</b>	<b>SUB/02/344301</b>
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>THE UNION OF THE BALTIC CITIES (UBC), COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT SECRETARIAT</b>
<b>SIGNATURE AND DATE</b>	In Turku 25 February 2005  Mr. Risto Veivo Head of Secretariat  Mrs. Tea Nõmmann Project Co-ordinator

Co-ordinated by: **Union of the Baltic Cities, Commission on Environment Secretariat (UBC)**

Team partners: **EUROCITIES, University of the West of England (UWE), City of Newcastle**

City partners: **Athens, Barcelona, Bristol, Dusseldorf, Gdansk, Gothenburg, Jelgava, Leeds, Liepaja, Newcastle, Panevezys, Porto, Rostock, Siauliai, Sopot, Tallinn, Viljandi**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1 DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK DONE</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 ACTIVITIES AND ACTION UNDERTAKEN ACCORDING TO THE WORK PROGRAMME AND THE SCHEDULE	
TIMETABLE.....	6
1.1.1 <i>Fulfilling Objectives and Delivering Results</i> .....	6
1.1.2 <i>Fulfilling Activities</i> .....	7
1.1.3 <i>Fulfilling Events</i> .....	8
1.2 PARTICIPATION OF PARTNERS AND REPARTITION OF TASKS.....	9
1.2.1 <i>UBC</i> .....	9
1.2.2 <i>EUROCITIES</i> .....	10
1.2.3 <i>UWE</i> .....	11
1.2.4 <i>Newcastle</i> .....	11
1.2.5 <i>Partner cities</i> .....	11
1.2.6 <i>Sub-consultants</i> .....	13
1.3 ASSESSMENT OF OUTPUTS, RESULTS AND IMPACTS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH OBJECTIVES. INDICATORS. ....	13
<b>2 MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT</b> .....	<b>16</b>
2.1 ORGANISATION OF THE WORK.....	16
2.2 COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION AMONG THE PARTNERS, FEED-BACK.....	16
2.3 QUALITY CONTROL.....	17
2.4 DECISION MAKING PROCESS.....	17
2.5 MEETINGS AND RESULTS.....	17
<b>3 BUDGETARY MATTERS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
3.1 FINANCIAL ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT.....	19
3.2 FEASIBILITY OF THE BUDGET.....	20
<b>4 MAIN FINDINGS AND OUTPUTS</b> .....	<b>23</b>
4.1 PARTNER CITIES' ACHIEVEMENT AND FURTHER PLANS.....	23
4.2 PEER REVIEW METHODOLOGY.....	23
4.3 PEER REVIEW GUIDEBOOK.....	24
4.4 EMAS IMPLEMENTATION GUIDEBOOK.....	24
4.5 RESEARCH REPORT ON EMS IN EUROPEAN CITIES AND EMAS & 6EAP LINKAGES.....	26
4.6 WEB SITE: <a href="http://WWW.EMASCITIES.ORG">WWW.EMASCITIES.ORG</a> .....	26
4.7 NEWSLETTERS (1,2,3,4,5).....	26
4.8 FINAL EVENT.....	27
4.9 CERTIFICATE TO PARTNER CITIES.....	28
4.10 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROJECT.....	28
4.10.1 <i>To the European Commission:</i> .....	28
4.10.2 <i>To the National Governments in EU member states:</i> .....	29
4.10.3 <i>To the Municipalities:</i> .....	29
4.10.4 <i>To the international local government network organisations UBC &amp; EUROCITIES:</i> .....	29
4.11 EMAS IMPLEMENTATION AND EMAS PEER REVIEW TRAINING PACKAGES.....	30
4.12 REPORTS FROM PEER REVIEWS.....	30
<b>5 PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES FOUND</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>6 FUTURE POSSIBILITIES (CHALLENGES) AND DEVELOPMENT</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>7 OTHER USEFUL INFORMATION</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>LIST OF ANNEXES TO THE FINAL REPORT</b> .....	<b>34</b>

## FOREWORD

The EMAS Peer Review for Cities project has been a success! Sixteen partner cities have made further progress in their understanding and implementation of EMAS. Representatives from the cities have carried out a review of each city's progress, this has provided learning opportunities for both the cities and the review teams. It has also helped to develop a new and radical support tool to accelerate the implementation of EMAS.

As the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project concludes, it is making available a tried and tested review system to support the implementation of EMAS in municipalities across Europe. The EMAS Peer Review is a flexible, efficient, and cost-effective feedback tool. The EMAS Peer Review for Cities project has demonstrated the value of receiving a review from critical friends. It has shown how critical friends from municipalities in the same country and other countries can provide both inspiration and technical assistance.

The main output of the project is the EMAS Peer Review, a systematic and user-friendly methodology to support municipalities in the implementation of EMAS. It is available in ten languages (English, Estonian, German, Greek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, and Swedish). The EMAS Peer Review is available as guidebooks providing up-to date and improved guidance for the successful implementation of EMAS in municipalities. The EMAS Peer Review, support documents and guidance are available at the project web-site and promoted with special CD-ROM and Newsletters.

The EMAS Peer Review for Cities project has demonstrated the value of using EMAS and part of a suite of management tools that can help municipalities make progress towards Sustainable Development. It provides the opportunity to learn from others, share costs, co-operate in finding solutions to common problems and build new partnerships.

We commend the idea of EMAS Peer Review and now hope that municipalities across Europe will recognise its value and support each other in its use and development. For the project team this would in our eyes be the best reward for all the hard work by so many on the project over the last two years.

Warmest Thanks to all partners, supporters and co-funders of the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project!

The project team,

Tea Nõmmann, Risto Veivo and Mikko Jokinen (Union of the Baltic Cities)

Massimiliano Rumignani and Eva Banos (Eurocities)

David Ludlow and Mark Webster (University of the West of England)

Allen Creedy (City of Newcastle)

## INTRODUCTION

This Final Technical Report is summarising the progress and outcomes of the “EMAS-Peer Review for the Cities” project during the whole project period from December 2002 to November 2004. It combines selected key materials also from previous six-month progress reports and Interim Technical Report.

The Final Report is focusing on the progress, achievements and deliverables. The work has been carried out based on the Work Plan (Annex 1), which describes more thoroughly the project background and general vision and aims. The project summary is attached to Annex 2.

In addition to technical report the Final Financial Report for the whole project period has been compiled and it is presented as a separate document.

This technical report follows the structure suggested by the European Commission DG Environment.

## BACKGROUND

The main focus of the project was on developing and extending the use of EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) in local authorities. The EMAS Peer Review method as an innovative approach was used to encourage cities to work together. The project built upon previous experiences in the framework of LIFE projects, including the EURO-EMAS project and the Municipal Environmental Audit (MEA) project and also aimed to assist in delivering actions in the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP.

It was planned that cities would broaden their tools and skills in relation to improving their own capacity to manage the environmental impacts of their public services and policies and be good example for local private companies. With the help of EMAS the local authorities could have higher leverage to develop their public procurement processes and purchasing criteria to promote and favour companies, which have environmental management systems and environmentally friendly products and services.

A special focus was given to channelling the EMAS experience to the cities from then Accession Countries to the EU. Meanwhile all these cities have become full members of the EU. The environment sector remains one of the most challenging areas to implement existing EU legislation and develop new one to provide citizens a high quality of the environment. The EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) has important potential to deliver the 6EAP and its Thematic strategies.

EMAS Implementation Guidebook and EMAS Peer Review Guidebooks, developed by this project, are very valuable and useful tools to further promote EMAS in European Cities to improve environmental quality of our public services and policies.

The project has been carried out during the period December 2002 - November 2004. The project, co-ordinated by the Union of the Baltic Cities (UBC) Commission on Environment, was a joint initiative of the UBC, Eurocities, University of the West of England and the City of Newcastle. They together formed a project team.

The project partner cities - Athens, Barcelona, Bristol, Düsseldorf, Gdansk, Göteborg, Jelgava, Leeds, Liepaja, Newcastle, Panevezys, Porto, Rostock, Siauliai, Sopot, Tallinn and Viljandi - have contributed an important share of their various resources to start and further develop the use of environmental management systems during and beyond the project.

In addition to the project partners the project has been co-funded by the European Commission DG Environment under the European Community framework for co-operation to promote sustainable development and the Finnish Ministry of Environment. Project was developed to help

to deliver the following priority theme identified in the framework of the Call for submission of proposals:

Part A. Information and exchanges of information on sustainable urban development and local agenda 21 and improvement of environmental quality in areas where environmental problems occur alongside socio-economic problems.

- Developing tools for training, information and awareness-raising for professionals, target groups, local policy-makers and the general public including for local authorities wishing to initiate projects to improve their environmental performance;
- Supporting, transferring and disseminating good practices and the results of demonstration projects in areas where environmental quality problems occur alongside socio-economic problems, including to local authorities which are not involved in networks covered by the Decision of the call.

# 1 DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK DONE

## 1.1 ACTIVITIES AND ACTION UNDERTAKEN ACCORDING TO THE WORK PROGRAMME AND THE SCHEDULE TIMETABLE

The project has been successful and met all the objectives set at the beginning of the project. All project team and city partners have accomplished a very good work during the whole project period and main activities have been executed and key outputs have been delivered.

### 1.1.1 Fulfilling Objectives and Delivering Results

The following table summarises the main delivered results as compared to the objectives set in the project. Further comments below in the report.

Objectives	Results
The overall objective of the project is to support sustainable urban management in European cities.	Training, guidebooks, promoted and used peer review method contribute to sustainable urban management in European Cities.
To start and extend the use of Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) in selected units of 16 local authorities, with special emphasis on accession countries (8 cities from accession countries).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 5 cities (Leeds, Newcastle, Gothenburg, Rostock and Bristol) maintained their registrations and extended the EMAS in their city</li> <li>2) 4 cities have concrete plans: Gdansk decided to go for EMAS registration in 2005, Jelgava and Liepaja decided to integrate ISO14000 with existing ISO9000. Barcelona has decided to go for EMAS registration in short term.</li> <li>3) 7 cities have mid to long term goals to go for EMS: Düsseldorf, Porto, Sopot, Siauliai, Panevezys, Tallinn and Viljandi</li> </ol> (Annexes 3 and 4)
Make EMAS more feasible to implement in cities by develop EMAS guidance and toolkit (the workbook) for local authorities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) EMAS Implementation Guidebook (Annex 5)</li> <li>2) EMAS Peer Review Guidebook (Annex 6)</li> </ol> Both guidebooks (in 10 languages: English, Estonian, German, Greek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish) accessible on CD-ROM (Annex 7) and project web-site: <a href="http://www.emascities.org">www.emascities.org</a>
Develop and apply in practice EMAS Peer Review method (based on city co-operation and evaluation between colleagues) to lower the threshold for implementing EMAS in local authorities.	Peer Review method was tested in 16 cities (Annex 4) and guidance has been recorded in the EMAS Peer Review Guidebook Cities received CERTIFICATE for participating in the development of and carrying out EMAS Peer Review. (Annex 15)
Provide feedback to the European Commission on the potential of EMAS in implementing the thematic	Research report (Full and Summary) (Annexes 8 and 9) and Survey. (Annex 10) Survey results reported to EU Working Group on Environmental Management Plans and Systems,

strategies of the Sixth Environmental Action Plan of the European Union (based on research and pilot testing).	preparing the Urban Thematic Strategy of the EU 6 <sup>th</sup> EAP. Recommendations from partners based on project experience.(Annex 11)
Raise awareness of EMAS and the Peer Review method among European cities and responsible bodies in national administrations.	Project five newsletters (Annex 12) and CD-ROMs sent to EMAS responsible bodies in Europe. Closer liaison with EMAS responsible bodies in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland – attended also project events. Project progress and results regularly reported via Project newsletter to UBC and EUROCITIES members and other stakeholders in the network. Final Event (Annex 13) was organised to all partners and experts and EMAS Competent bodies were invited. All participants shared their lessons learned, discussed about the needs and challenges (Annex 14) as well as draw list of recommendations to the EU, National governments, Municipalities and International local government networks.

### 1.1.2 Fulfilling Activities

The following table summarises the main activities carried out as compared to the activities planned in the project. Further comments below in the report.

<b>Main ACTIVITIES planned in the project</b>	<b>Main ACTIVITIES carried out in the project</b> Accomplished Yes/No & comments
1) Developing EMAS implementation and peer review workbook	Yes, both guidebooks have been produced and translated to 10 languages of project partner cities: English, German, Swedish, Spanish, Greek, Portuguese, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Polish. (Annex 7) All city partners took part in testing, developing and evaluating Guidebooks (Annex 18)
2) Provide city partners with knowledge and skills to implement and peer review EMAS in cities	Yes, two training sessions on EMAS Implementation (Annex 16) and Peer Review method (Annex 17), both for two full days, have been organised.
3) Research and test in pilot cities the linkages of 6 <sup>th</sup> European Environmental Action Plan and EMAS	Yes, Research report on Environmental Management Systems in European Cities and EMAS delivering 6EAP has been produced.
4) Assist and provide guidance for cities to implement and peer review EMAS	Both guidebooks helped to implement EMAS and carry out peer reviews. Project team provided direct guidance and feedback to cities when needed. Peer reviews by the city and team expert provided further insights and guidance.
5) Share and disseminate knowledge and results from the project and partner	Five Newsletters were published and disseminated to UBC and EUROCITIES

cities to other European cities	<p>networks, to all project partner cities, National EMAS Competent Bodies.</p> <p>Project Web-site: <a href="http://www.emascities.org">www.emascities.org</a> has been set up and up-dated.</p> <p>Project results on EMAS implementation on Peer Review have been presented by team partners during various events during project lifetime stakeholder meetings, conferences as well as academic events (Annex 19) and will be extensively promoted beyond the project end. Partner cities had disseminated experiences locally and national level.</p> <p>Sub-consultants from new member states are promoting results on their training, web and consulting work.</p> <p>Final Event was organised to disseminate the information and experience.</p>
6) Reporting to the European Commission: six-month progress reports, interim and final reports.	Yes, 1 <sup>st</sup> progress report June 2003, Interim and 2 <sup>nd</sup> progress report January 2004, 3 <sup>rd</sup> progress report June 2004 and Final report February 2005

### 1.1.3 Fulfilling Events

The following table summarises the main events carried out as compared to the events planned in the project. Further comments below in the report.

<b>Main EVENTS planned in the project</b>	<b>Main EVENTS carried out in the project</b> Accomplished Yes/No & comments
1) EMAS implementation training workshop	Yes, in May 2003, Tallinn, Estonia
2) EMAS peer review training workshop	Yes, in October 2003, Barcelona, Spain
3) Sixteen EMAS Peer reviews carried out in the partner cities	Yes, during January – July 2004, in 16 partner cities
4) EMAS & 6EAP research seminar	Yes, back to back with Peer Review Training seminar in Barcelona
5) Publishing 5 newsletters	Yes, 1 <sup>st</sup> in May 2003, 2 <sup>nd</sup> in October 2003, 3 <sup>rd</sup> in April 2004, 4 <sup>th</sup> in September 2004, 5 <sup>th</sup> in November 2004
6) Developing and maintaining project own web-site	Yes, web address: <a href="http://www.emascities.org">www.emascities.org</a>
7) Final Dissemination Event	Yes, in November 2004, Gdansk, Poland
8) Project 5 team meetings	Yes, January 2003 in Turku, April 2003 in Brussels, December 2003 in Brussels, May 2004 in Turku, September 2004 in Bristol

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION OF PARTNERS AND REPARTITION OF TASKS

The project was divided into 5 work packages:

- WP1 Management & Co-ordination;
- WP2 Developing EMAS Workbook, Research;
- WP3 EMAS and Peer Review Training;
- WP4 Implementation of EMAS & Peer Review;
- WP5 Dissemination

- UBC Commission on Environment Secretariat – has been responsible in overall project management and co-ordination and reported to the European Commission. The UBC has had the main responsibility in WP1, WP4 (co-ordinating the tasks in 8 accession country cities), WP5 Dissemination. Additionally UBC has contributed to WP3 and WP2.
- EUROCITIES – has been the main co-responsible in WP4 (co-ordinating the tasks in 8 EU member country cities). They have also contributing to WP1, WP3 and WP5.
- UWE – has had the main responsibility in WP2, WP3 and WP5 concerning project web-page development and maintenance. They have also contributing to WP1, WP4 and WP5.
- Newcastle – contributed to WP2, WP3, WP4 and WP5.
- The 16 cities have been the main actors to implement the project (and EMAS) in their city, thus their main contribution has been in WP4. They all have been taking part in training sessions (WP3), using and contributing to EMAS toolkit development and research (WP2) as well as dissemination of the project and the results (WP5).

### 1.2.1 UBC

UBC was the co-ordinator of the project and more could be read under the heading 2 “Management”.

During the project implementation the UBC was responsible of and involved in the following:

- (a) Management and co-ordination of the whole project (more in chapter 2). Revising project initial work plan and budget. Contractual matters with team partners and partner cities. Tendering and contracting local consultants from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. Organising meetings, co-ordinating evaluations, co-organising training seminars and final event.
- (b) Co-ordination of activities in 9 UBC member cities (Tallinn, Viljandi, Jelgava, Liepaja, Siauliai, Panevezys, Sopot, Gdansk, Rostock).
- (c) Co-ordinated EMAS Implementation Training, Peer Review Training and Final Event.
- (d) Contribution to co-ordinating EMAS Peer Reviews in all partner cities + additional promotion with competent bodies, associations of local authorities, regional authorities.
- (e) Participated in Peer Reviews in the following cities: Jelgava, Liepaja, Panevezys, Gdansk, Gothenburg, Tallinn and Viljandi (brief overview in Annex 4)
- (f) Contribution to developing research questionnaire and commenting Research Report
- (g) Contribution to guidebooks development (commenting) and organising translation to Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Polish.
- (h) Design and development of CD-ROM
- (i) Participated in the EU Working group on Management Plans and Systems as well as the EU Expert Group on the Urban Environment.
- (j) Responsible in publishing altogether 5 Newsletters (Annex 12).
- (k) Project has been promoted during the following events:
  - Baltic 21 SOG meeting on April 2003 in Turku, Finland (UBC)
  - CEMR General Assembly, LA EMAS Side Event on May 15, 2003 in Poznan, Poland. 50 Newsletters were disseminated. (UBC)

- EU ITWS on Sustainable Urban Management (Campaign seminar). 20 Newsletters were disseminated (UBC)
  - "Ocean Monarch: Symposium V: Baltic Sea: "A Common Heritage, A Shared Responsibility" 4.06-06.06.2003; UBC General Conference in Klaipeda, 9-11.10.2003; UBC Environment Commission meeting in Sundsvall April 22-24;
  - Åalborg+10 Conference, June 9-11 2004;
  - EMAS Peer Review for Cities project experience presentation on The 5th Global Conference on Environmental Taxation on 9-11 September 2004, in Pavia, Italy.
  - Presentation at the First Forum of EMAS Registered Authorities, in Ludwisburg , Germany 15.10.2004.
  - EMAS Implementation Strategy for Estonian, seminar organised by Estonian Ministry on Environment, October 19, 2004 in Estonia;
  - several smaller meetings and visits during the project.
  - during peer reviews project was introduced by local media.
- (l) Information was provided to up-date the Web-site (maintained by UWE)
- (m) Organising Final Event in November in Gdansk, Poland in co-operation with the City of Gdansk and other team partners.
- (n) Additional liaison has been carried out especially with competent EMAS authorities in new member states of project cities. The representatives were invited and attended also EMAS Implementation and Peer Review Training sessions, the Peer Reviews in Tallinn, Jelgava, Panevezys and Siauliai as well as the Final Event in Gdansk.
- (o) Reporting to and communication with the Commission has been active.

## 1.2.2 EUROCITIES

During the project implementation EUROCITIES has been involved in the following:

- (a) Co-ordination of activities in EUROCITIES eight member cities, who have progressed well. Only exemption is Athens who has not delivered peer review documents and needed information during the second and third six-month period, thus there was no peer review carried out in Athens.
- (b) Co-Organised 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> team meetings in Brussels in April and December 2003.
- (c) Participated in all 5 team meetings.
- (d) Co-organised the Peer Review Training in Barcelona, October 2004.
- (e) Contribution to co-ordinating EMAS Peer Reviews in partner cities.
- (f) Participated in Peer Reviews in the following cities: Leeds, Düsseldorf, Barcelona and Porto (brief overview in Annex 4). There was no peer review visit to Athens as no documentation was been received.
- (g) Contributed to development of Guidebooks.
- (h) Organised the Guidebooks translations to Spanish, Greek, German, Swedish and Portuguese.
- (i) Contributed to development of Training Packages as well as delivering both training sessions.
- (j) Contributing to articles in Newsletters. EUROCITIES disseminated 450 Copies to member cities and participant at Åalborg+10 Conference.
- (k) Project has been promoted during the following events:
  - EUROCITIES Environment Committee meetings,
  - Åalborg Conference
  - Other EUROCITIES organised events and meetings.
- (l) Information was provided to up-date the Web-site (by UWE)

### 1.2.3 UWE

During the project implementation of the main tasks and outputs have been the following:

- (a) Developed EMAS Implementation and Peer review training sessions.
- (b) Prepared training packages for the both training sessions (Annexes 16 and 17).
- (c) Developed Guidebooks for cities to Implement EMAS and carry out Peer Review (Annexes 5 and 6)
- (d) Carried out and report on a research about EMAS and 6EAP linkages (Annexes 8 and 9). Through pilot studies and Europe wide Survey (Annex 10).
- (e) Participated in Peer Reviews in Bristol and Newcastle.
- (f) Contributed to all Newsletters.
- (g) Developed and maintained Web-site: [www.emascities.org](http://www.emascities.org)
- (h) Developed and produced a CD-ROM on Guidebooks and Project information.
- (i) Participated in all team meetings and project events.

### 1.2.4 Newcastle

During the project implementation period Newcastle has contributed to the following activities:

- (a) Provided valuable insight on Peer Review methodology based on experience from PRESUD project.
- (b) Contributed technical expertise to EMAS Implementation and Peer Review training sessions.
- (c) Contributed to workbooks and peer review development and evaluation
- (d) Participated in all team meetings, project training events and Final event.
- (e) Carried out Peer reviews in Düsseldorf and Rostock.
- (f) Contributed to survey questionnaire.
- (g) Dissemination of project in different occasions.

### 1.2.5 Partner cities

All 16 partner cities have progressed well in the implementation of EMAS with the help of guidebooks, team experts, partner cities and sub-consultants. The sizes of the cities and the units, which are participating, are different as well as the goals of the cities have different ambition, which has an impact also on the progress. The main determinant is still the commitment, support and availability of resources.

The overview on partner cities initial goals for the project, their focus on EMAS (participating department) and their experiences as well as achievements are summarised in Annex 3.

#### Peer reviews

During the project 16 peer reviews were carried out (Leeds, Jelgava, Liepaja, Panevezys, Siauliai, Gdansk, Sopot, Newcastle, Bristol, Barcelona, Tallinn, Viljandi, Düsseldorf, Rostock, Gothenburg and Porto). From the table below the timing of these peer reviews is presented and also what cities formed the peer review pairs. In all peer reviews there was at least one expert present from the project team.

The following peer reviews were carried out:

Peer Reviewer	Host City	Team Expert	Date (in 2004)
Barcelona	Bristol	Eurocities	Week 13, March
Bristol	Jelgava	UBC	Week 11, March
Düsseldorf	Tallinn	UBC	Week 20, May
Gdansk	Newcastle	UWE	Week 20, May
Gothenburg	Leeds	Eurocities	Week 4, January

Jelgava	Panevezys	Newcastle	Week 12, March
Leeds	Göteborg	UBC	Week 19, May
Liepāja	Siauliai	Newcastle	Week 12, March
Newcastle	Gdansk	UBC	Week 16, April
Panevezys	Rostock	Newcastle	Week 13, March
Porto	Barcelona	Eurocities	Week 14, March
Rostock	Düsseldorf	Newcastle	Week 12, March
Siauliai	Sopot	Newcastle	Week 17, April
Sopot	Liepāja	Bristol	Week 11, March
Tallinn	Viljandi	UBC	Week 21, May
Viljandi	Porto	Eurocities	Week 28, July

In addition to peer reviews above the following additional arrangements were agreed:

- 1) Leeds and Bristol were peer reviewing each other and this did not have any additional costs to the project.
- 2) The following cities: Athens, Jelgava, Liepāja, Siauliai and Tallinn, had a chance to join additional peer reviews (led by some other project city in the table above) to gain experience from EMAS advanced city as they conduct peer review in another beginner city in neighbouring country or even in the same country. As the costs are very low in this case, one trip to more advanced city was found to be feasible and very useful for the city.

<b>Peer Reviewer</b>	<b>Host City</b>	<b>Team Expert</b>	<b>Date or week</b>
Leeds	Bristol	Eurocities	Week 13, March
Bristol	Leeds	Eurocities	Week 4, January
Jelgava as observer	Bristol	UWE	Week 13, March
Liepāja as observer	Bristol	UWE	Week 13, March
Tallinn as observer	Göteborg	UBC	Week 19, May

The brief overview of the peer reviews is in Annex 4.

### **Used staff time**

The cities have also recorded the time used for the project and implementation of the EMAS. According to the reports cities have spent altogether around 55 man months of work during the project. Per city it varies from 0.7 to 6.5 man months. In initial proposal it was estimated that cities would contribute their time about 41 man months (ca 2,6 MM average) during the project. Actual staff time has been higher by 14 man months.

It is important to mention that cities have considered differently what time is used for the project and implementing EMS. As results show the cities that have already EMAS in place are showing rather low staff time as they consider implementing EMAS as their routine work and report basically only time used for this project. While cities that have started the project and implementation of EMS are reporting usually all the time they use as for this project. In this case there are also differences as some cities record time of people dedicated to the project and others have recorded the times of other staff involved in some internal meetings.

The following table summarises the time used by cities during the project (man months).

City	Time used 1-6 months	Time used 7-12 months	Time used 13-18 months	Time used 19-24 months	Total (man months)
Athens	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.0	<b>0.7</b>
Barcelona	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.5	<b>6.5</b>
Bristol	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.5	<b>1.7</b>
Düsseldorf	0.7	1.6	1.5	0.5	<b>4.3</b>
Gdansk	0.4	1.7	0.7	2.8	<b>5.7</b>
Göteborg	0.1	0.5	0.8	0.9	<b>2.3</b>
Jelgava	0.5	0.8	1.1	0.5	<b>2.9</b>
Leeds	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.3	<b>1.6</b>
Liepāja	0.5	1.0	1.1	0.5	<b>3.1</b>
Newcastle	1.0	1.1	1.8	0.6	<b>4.4</b>
Panevezys	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.4	<b>2.3</b>
Porto	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.8	<b>1.9</b>
Rostock	0	0.3	1.5	0.8	<b>2.5</b>
Siauliai	0.4	0.6	1.4	0.2	<b>2.6</b>
Sopot	0.1	1.1	2.3	2.8	<b>6.3</b>
Tallinn	0.9	1.2	1.8	0.7	<b>4.7</b>
Viljandi	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.4	<b>1.6</b>
<b>Altogether</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>54.9</b>

### 1.2.6 Sub-consultants

Local consultants in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland have been active in providing help and guidance in the cities. They all participated in EMAS Implementation and Peer Review training sessions, in respective peer reviews in their country and final event.

Consultants were responsible in translation and proof reading guidebooks into Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Polish languages.

Consultants also participated in peer review and guidebooks evaluation, providing useful comments and suggestions.

Consultants reported their fulfilled tasks to the UBC. Their work was carried out very well.

### 1.3 ASSESSMENT OF OUTPUTS, RESULTS AND IMPACTS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH OBJECTIVES. INDICATORS.

Expected Impacts :
<p>1) Impacts in the cities – it is expected that all partner cities will have EMAS implementation in different stage in their selected unit and some partner cities will decide to aim at registration of environmental management system after the project end. It is also expected that some cities will decide on the bases of this piloting project to expand EMAS implementation in other local authority units as well. In addition we expect that project cities will continue collaboration after the project end.</p> <p>2) Impact in the countries – it is expected that EMAS responsible authorities as well as national local authority organisation will find EMAS Peer Review Workbook (translated into project languages) as a very useful tool to promote to the other cities in their countries to improve the management of environmental matters in municipalities. In accession countries it is expected that local consultants involved in the project will use their experience in further educating and advising new local</p>

authorities to implement EMAS.

- 3) Impact at European level – it is expected that EMAS Peer Review Workbook, if translated into more languages would be very helpful also for other European cities.
- 4) Impacts of the methodology – it is expected that EMAS workbook and Peer Review methodology (two cities collaborating) will ease and lower the threshold to start the process of implementing EMAS in public authorities.

During the project several evaluations were carried out:

- (a) Evaluation of the Pre-Training Web Based Workbook 1 was carried out after EMAS Implementation training, end of 1<sup>st</sup> six-month period (1<sup>st</sup> progress report).
- (b) Evaluation of the EMA Implementation Training was carried out during EMAS Implementation training, end of 1<sup>st</sup> six-month period (1<sup>st</sup> progress report).
- (c) Evaluation of the Peer Review Training was carried out during training, 2<sup>nd</sup> six-month period (Interim / 2<sup>nd</sup> progress report).
- (d) Evaluation of Workbooks 1 and 2 was carried out after both training session and extensive use of these workbooks, end of 2<sup>nd</sup> six-month period (Interim / 2<sup>nd</sup> progress report).
- (e) Evaluation of Web-site was carried out end of 2<sup>nd</sup> six-month period (Interim / 2<sup>nd</sup> progress report).
- (f) Evaluation on Management and Dissemination of the project was carried out end of 2<sup>nd</sup> six-month period (Interim / 2<sup>nd</sup> progress report).
- (g) Evaluation of the EMAS Peer Review Guidebook (called workbook 3 during the development process) and process was carried out after peer reviews, end of 3<sup>rd</sup> period (3<sup>rd</sup> progress report) (Annex 18).
- (h) Evaluation of cities work (for example progress in Workbooks 1&2) was carried out during peer reviews by peer reviewers – the feedback was communicated directly to the host cities. After the peer reviews some additional feedback was given to UWE concerning workbooks and these were taken into account during finalising and improving the workbooks.

When assessing **project progress in relation to the objectives** then we can state that it is in line. Cities have started and expanded the process of implementing EMS, though, the level of initial ambition and actual progress has been varying.

Workbooks have been useful in helping cities in this process. Workbooks were further revised based on feedback from cities/users. Peer Review method has been very valuable. Cities have appreciated the visits/reviews and recommendations by another city and EMAS experienced expert. Cities have also valued a lot the possibility to visit another city and learn new and different ways of handling similar matters.

Project team has been in close communication with the DG ENV and participated in the process of and contributed to developing Urban Thematic Strategy of 6EAP. Research results have been shared during consultation process.

We have informed both EURO CITIES and UBC members about the project progress and explained the peer review method. In our Newsletters project cities have been sharing peer review experiences with readers from municipalities across Europe. EMAS competent bodies from new member states know the project and they have participated in project training events, peer reviews and final event.

When assessing **project progress in relation to the expected impacts** we can state that it is also generally in line. As project and its deliverables impacts within the countries and at EU level depend on the ready Guidebooks from the project, the project impact could be properly seen only after the end of the project. EMAS Implementation and Peer Review guidebooks on CD-Rom are sent to all EMAS competent bodies in EU member states. CD-Roms are sent to the National Local Authorities associations at least in new member states, local consultants

from new member states will further promote and use Guidebooks to increase the EMAS and Per Review skills in other cities in the countries as well.

In partner cities the impact of the project, its training sessions, peer review method and produced guidebooks can be followed based on partner cities achievements and further commitments beyond the project. Please see summary table on cities plans in part 4.1. and annex 3. All partner cities gave presentations during the Final Event on their achievements, experiences, challenges and further plans. Please see Annex 14.

Peer Review methodology and peer reviews have been found very useful by cities. It is important to emphasise that peer review was used in different stages of EMAS implementation process.

Project partners have also been active in ensuring the follow-up of the project activities and new project proposal was submitted in the end of March to the DG Environment.

## 2 MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT

### 2.1 ORGANISATION OF THE WORK

The UBC is overall responsible for technical, financial and administrative co-ordination of the project.

A project management team is drawn from key staff in each of the partners co-funding the project (UBC, UWE, EUROCITIES, Newcastle).

As there are 17 cities in the project the UBC is responsible of closer co-ordination of work in 8 accession country cities and EUROCITIES is responsible for closer co-ordination of 8 cities from member states.

The work has been organised according to work packages:

- WP1 Management and Co-ordination
- WP2 Developing Workbook and Research
- WP3 Training
- WP4 Implementation of EMAS and Peer Review
- WP5 Dissemination

More detailed Work plan and roles are described in Revised Work Plan (Annex in the First six-month Progress Report, June 2003)

During the project there has not been any change in the organisation of the work.

Timing of the tasks across the project period has been followed rather well. There have been slight changes, which have been discussed and agreed during project team meetings. For example, UWE was responsible for many parallel activities: preparing training packages and carrying out training sessions, developing workbooks and conducting a research. Thus, the research was finalised later than initially planned.

During the project there were no problems with **contractual matters** and all partners have fulfilled their tasks (except City of Athens). In addition to 17 partner cities contracts there were 3 additional contracts about co-organising the training sessions and final event (Tallinn, Barcelona, Gdansk).

Concerning budget and payments please see chapter 3.

### 2.2 COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION AMONG THE PARTNERS, FEED-BACK

During the project the communication and dissemination of information among partners has been good. The main communication channel was e-mail and for further clarification or urgent matters the telephone and teleconferencing was used.

The main challenges during the period were the 16 peer reviews in partner cities. This included all three phases of the peer review. At first organisational arrangements for the peer reviews, preparing and delivering in time needed materials for the pre review desktop study. Then during the peer reviews it meant checking the information received, mapping the status in the host city, communicating main findings to local team as well as to local press in some cases. Finally, the challenge has been finalising the peer review reports after the peer reviews. Some cities did not manage to send in their finalised recommendations, which they did present end of the peer reviews in host cities (Düsseldorf about Tallinn, Barcelona about Bristol, Gdansk about Newcastle). Main reason has been everyday workload of peer reviewers.

The peer review conclusions were drawn with the help of Peer Review Guidebook, which helped a systematic review of host cities EMAS Implementation process.

Peer Reviewers reports, which main focus has been on recommendations from peer reviews, have been prepared in different formats. The selection of the type of the report was left on the peer reviewer taking into account the situation and wishes in the host city. Recommendations were always presented on last meeting during the specific peer review. These recommendations and findings have been recorded in the form of slide presentation and press release (Rostock and Düsseldorf), overview of review (Viljandi, Gothenburg), minutes of peer review (Leeds, Porto, Barcelona), summary of recommendations and further action points (Jelgava, Liepaja, Panevezys, Siauliai, Gdansk and Sopot).

We can conclude that generally the communication and organisation of peer reviews in 16 cities has been good. Cities were asked to fill in “project impact evaluation form” before the final event and also all partner cities gave a presentation during the Final Event to summarise their experiences, challenges and further plans and commitments. Their feed back is summarised in Annex 3 and slide presentation from Final Event compiled in Annex 14.

Internal communication and reporting between the team and partner cities has been good.

Sub-consultants were reporting their activities and fulfilled tasks during the period.

## **2.3 QUALITY CONTROL**

Quality of the project activities and deliverables was evaluated across the project life span. Please see part 1.3. for the overview of evaluations carried out.

## **2.4 DECISION MAKING PROCESS**

Decisions concerning work plan were discussed and made by the project team during the meetings or through the e-mails or telephone. Decisions concerning cities were made after consultations with them.

## **2.5 MEETINGS AND RESULTS**

During the whole project period the following management meetings were carried out:

- The 1<sup>st</sup> team meeting was organised in UBC Office in Turku in January 2003. All team was presented (Tea Nõmmann, Risto Veivo, David Ludlow, Allen Creedy, Massimiliano Rumignani). The meeting focused on revising and detailing the work plan proposed in the proposal. Meeting confirmed the tasks and timetables. Project budget was discussed and as Newcastle city did not have its own budget it was agreed to start budget revision process. All partners agreed to give up some of their budget. Project revision process was consulted with the Commission and new budget was approved and contracted ammended by August 2004.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> team meeting was organised in EUROCITIES office in Brussels in April 2003. All team was presented (Tea Nõmmann, Risto Veivo, David Ludlow, Mark Webster, Allen Creedy, Massimiliano Rumignani). The meeting focused on final preparations for the First EMAS Implementation Training in Tallinn as well as development of Guidebooks.
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> team meeting was organised in EUROCITIES office in Brussels in December 2003. All team was presented (Tea Nõmmann, Risto Veivo, David Ludlow, Mark Webster, Allen Creedy, Massimiliano Rumignani). The meeting focused on evaluating the progress during interim period and detailed plans for the remaining period.
- The 4<sup>th</sup> meeting was organised in May 2004 in Turku. The meeting focused on questions raised in the letter from the Commission about Interim report; discussed changes/improvements for the Workbooks 1-3 based on evaluation and feed-back during

peer reviews; agreed survey questionnaire to be sent out and detailed actions following it; discussed and agreed on final event arrangements, revised timing of tasks for the remaining period. Consultation process of urban thematic strategy was discussed and project contribution to the process was covered.

- The 5<sup>th</sup> team meeting was organised at UWE in September 2004 in Bristol (Tea Nömmann, Mark Webster, David Ludlow, Allen Creedy, Steve Ransom). Main issues dealt were: finalisation of Guidebooks, developing CDROM, organising Final Event, Research results and findings. Ideas and plans on EMAS promotion and implementation after the end of the project.
- Other meetings related to project tasks and deliverables:
  - Guidebooks development meeting at UWE in March 2003 in Bristol (Tea Nömmann, Mark Webster, David Ludlow, Jon Maire)
  - Research and Guidebooks development meeting at UWE and EUROCITIES in July, both in Bristol (Mark Webster, Allen Creedy, David Ludlow, Tea Nömmann) and in Brussels (Tea Nömmann, Massimiliano Rumignani)
  - Meeting on planning follow-up activities for the project was organised on February 5-6, 2004 in Turku. This process concluded with submitting new project proposal to the Commission. The proposal “Managing Urban Europe” aims at expanding EMS use covering the whole the urban territory and looks into further developing EMS tools to manage sustainable matter in cities.

### 3 BUDGETARY MATTERS

#### 3.1 FINANCIAL ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Union of the Baltic Cities (UBC) Commission on Environment Secretariat, as the applicant, was responsible for the financial management of the project. Budgetary matters were discussed within the team of contributing partners (co-ordinating body) of the project at team meetings and via e-mails.

UBC transferred and will transfer the CEC Grant to partners. Payments arrangements have followed the set up of payment arrangements in Grand Agreement between UBC and CEC (30% in advance, 40% after acceptance of Interim report and balance after acceptance of this Final report). The partners were responsible for appropriate use of the funds, and they reported to UBC. For the interim financial report, the partners were internally audited. The UBC interim financial statement was externally audited.

For the final financial report partners' financial statements have been audited as follows: UBC financial statement has been externally audited, EUROCIITIES financial statement has been prepared by an independent accountant, the UWE financial statement has been internally audited, and the City of Newcastle financial statement has been externally audited. Actually, the City of Newcastle underwent an external audit for the total project period, and submitted one final report for the project. The overall EMAS Peer Review for Cities project final financial statement has been externally audited by the same auditor as UBC, PriceWaterhouseCoopers.

UBC made contracts with the 16+1 city partners (contract with the City of Rostock was signed after it was clear that Athens would not properly proceed with project implementation), to ensure that the project tasks are carried out properly and that the travel and accommodation costs would be covered for cities. The cities were planned to be paid maximum up to 4000 EUR in two tranches, an advance payment (2000 EUR) and a balance payment (for Rostock advance payment was 1000 EUR). All cities were liable to report the time spent on project and costs for travelling and in-kind working time to the UBC.

UBC made also contracts (after a tendering procedure) with four sub-consultants to ensure the local EMAS assistance in 8 accession country cities and organise translation of Workbooks into Estonian, Latvian Lithuanian and Polish languages. The payments were arranged as following: 30% advance, 40% after interim report and balance after fulfilling their tasks.

The initial project budget needed a revision due to couple of reasons: (1) one of the project partners, City of Newcastle, was mistakenly left without a separate budget; and (2) due to changes in the Commission Financial Regulations. As there was no more a "contingency" budget heading, the project co-ordinator was advised by the financial expert of the DG ENV to reallocate the sums from this budget heading to other budget headings.

All budget revision related documents were submitted to the Commission in December 2003. The Interim financial report was made already based on the revised budget as agreed with the Commission. The procedure for request of budget changes due to inclusion of Newcastle as a formal team partner with own budget was finalised in September 2004 when the new annex to the contract was signed.

**Payments arrangements.** UBC has received from the Commission Advance payment and the Second payment (23.5.2003 respectively 6.7.2004). These allowed executing the payments to team partners, which depended on the Advance and Second payments from the Commission. The final payment to the team partners will be made after the acceptance of the Final Technical and Financial Report and after receiving the balance payment from the Commission.

City partners used their budgets wisely and remained within the limits of their budgets. UBC executed final balance payments to 11 cities. Some cities did not use up all the advance payment for their travel and accommodation costs and they have been invoiced to transfer the remaining money back to the UBC (6 cities). This was mainly because UBC paid directly for cities accommodations costs during 2 training sessions (Tallinn May 2003, Barcelona October 2003) and Final Event (Gdansk November 2004).

UBC had contracts with four sub-consultants to ensure the local EMAS assistance in 8 accession country cities and organise translation of Workbooks into Estonian, Latvian Lithuanian and Polish languages. All consultants have received all their payments, including also the final balance payments, which were based on the reports on fulfilled tasks.

### 3.2 FEASIBILITY OF THE BUDGET

The Final Financial Report (overall cost statement of the project and per partner) of the two project years has been prepared and it has been audited in a separate document submitted together with this Technical Report. Thus, further detail, please see separate Final Financial Report.

The Final Financial Report shows that the project has during the two years period spent totally an amount of 535.530 €, which represents 91 % of the total eligible costs budgeted for the project. All in all, the project spending enabled the high quality of work and reaching the ambitious goals of the project

According to the different budget headings, the financial situation at the end of the project 30.11.2004 is as follows:

- A. **Staff** – During the whole project period the staff costs were 280.581 €. Overall, the project salary costs were according to the budget, but there were differences between the partners. The City of Newcastle needed more than budgeted to carry out their tasks, whereas EUROCITIES used less. These sums are rather equal, balancing the overall project eligible staff costs.
- The UBC staff costs amounted up to 130.363 €, being only slightly (1,7 %) higher than budgeted. The project involved following persons: Mrs. Tea Nõmmann, project co-ordinator, Mr. Mikko Jokinen, co-chairman of the UBC Commission on Environment and Mr. Risto Veivo, head of secretariat, as steering group members and advisers, Ms. Sari Bowie, publication officer, Mrs. Sanna Erkko, financial manager, and Ms. Elina Rantanen and Mr. Sakari Saarinen project assistants.
  - EUROCITIES salary spending was 56.357 €, which was 81 % of the budgeted. One of the reasons is the fact that out of 8 EUROCITIES member cities 5 (Leeds, Newcastle, Gothenburg and Bristol) had earlier experience with EMAS and Environmental Management Systems generally (Barcelona ISO 14000) and did not need the same amount of guidance in EMAS implementation as well as EMAS peer review. From the remaining 3 cities Porto and Düsseldorf were active and also needed assistance. The City of Athens was somewhat active during first year, attending the training seminars, but remained passive during the second year. In addition more project events were organised in the new member states (then accession countries), which reduced the need for EUROCITIES co-organisation tasks. The project involved Mr. Massimiliano Rumignani, policy officer, Mrs Catherine Parmentier, CEO, Mrs. Claudine Frisher, financial director, Ms. Eva Banos de Guisasola, policy officer and Nicole Daels, financial assistant.
  - UWE staff costs amounted to 70.999 € and met the budget exactly. The following persons were involved in carrying out the project tasks for UWE: Mr. David Ludlow, Mrs. Clare Mitchell, Mr. Mark Webster, Mr. Marcus Grant and Mr. Jon Mair.
  - The City of Newcastle has doubled the staff costs in order to fulfil all the agreed tasks. Still, the proportion of their salary costs represents only 8 % of the total project staff cost, and their role was considered so critical, that the increase was accepted. The staff costs for the

City of Newcastle totalled up to 22.862 €. From the City of Newcastle Mr. Allen Creedy was involved in the project.

**B. Travel expenses** – During the whole project period, travel costs totalled to 96.700 €. The total travel cost remained below the budgeted total eligible project travel cost by 32.830 €, i.e. 25 %. This is mainly due to the environmental friendly and economical practices in organising project events. Thus, none of the project objectives were rendered although the spending on travels was reduced to a minimum. Two of the altogether three project events were organised in new member states, in Tallinn (Estonia) and in Gdansk (Poland) and one in old member states, in Barcelona (Spain). Also the Peer Reviews city pairs were planned to minimise the need to air transportation, which had a decrease in travel costs as an impact. For example, Liepaja and Jelgava (Latvia) peer reviews were carried out during the same week, thus needing only one travel from Bristol, UK. Siauliai and Panevezys (Lithuania) peer reviews were organised the same way, resulting only one travel from Newcastle, etc.

- The UBC travel budget headings includes also city partners travel costs. UBC travel costs for project management and implementation totalled up to 24.608 €.

- Project partner cities' travel and accommodations costs for the whole project period have totalled to 46.661 €. Actual cities travel and accommodation costs remained below the budget by 17.339 €, i.e. 27%. As discussed above, this is mainly due to the environmentally friendly and economic way of organising the project events.

All in all, the travel costs for UBC amounted up to 71 269 €, which equals 76 % of the budget.

- EUROCIITIES. The project involved less travels for EUROCIITIES as planned and budgeted, for instance because two team meetings took place in Brussels and the two of their Peer Reviews were carried out during one travel (by Mrs. Lynne Walker from the City of Newcastle). EUROCIITIES peer review to Düsseldorf needed only train trip. During the project, the EUROCIITIES spent an amount of 6.520 € for travels, which is 48 % of the budgeted.
- UWE used an amount of 11.756 € for travels, which is 86 % of the budgeted.
- The City of Newcastle spent 7.154 € for travels, which represents 84 % of the budgeted.

**C. Purchasing of equipment** – During the whole project period purchasing cost of equipment was 1.931 €. The cost includes a laptop and a mobile phone to the project co-ordinator during the two-year project. Actual equipment costs are equal to budgeted costs.

**D. Consumables** – During the whole project period cost of consumables were not reported. In the budget, there was an allocation of 485 € for EUROCIITIES, but no costs occurred that would be eligible in the project.

**E. Cost of printing, publication, translation and interpretation** - During the whole project period printing and translation costs totalled up to 59.587 €. The actual publication and translation costs remained below the budgeted costs by 8.613 €, i.e., 13 %. The actual printing and publication costs amounted up to 46.988 €, which is 9 % higher than budgeted, whereas the actual translation costs were only 66 % of the budgeted, totalling up to 12.598 €.

**F. Subcontracting** - During the whole project period subcontracting costs were 46.469 €. The subcontracting includes costs of consultants 43.138 € and auditing 138 € for UBC and 3.193 € for accounting for EUROCIITIES. The difference between budgeted and actual costs was 12 %, the actual costs being lower than budgeted.

**G. Other direct costs** - During the whole project period other direct costs were 15.225 €. The cost of organising events and team meetings were recorded under this budget heading, and the other direct costs were 16 % lower compared to budget. For UBC, the amount spent, 14.268 €, was rather similar with budget, but the other partners, EUROCIITIES and UWE reported 57 % respectively 79% less costs, since the responsibility to organise events was mainly on UBC.

**H. Justifiable indirect costs (7%)** – Total Indirect costs amount to 35.034 € during the whole project period.

**In-Kind Contribution** - In addition to the project Total Eligible Costs (incl. team partners own contributions and CEC grant) it was estimated that all project partner cities would contribute to the project “in-kind” in terms of their working time while implementing EMAS in their city (ca 124 720 € during the project). Based on reports from the cities their in-kind contributions during six-month periods have been as following: 1<sup>st</sup> period 20 663€, 2<sup>nd</sup> period 35 771€, 3<sup>rd</sup> period 61 119 € and 4<sup>th</sup> period 35 537 €. Amounting to total 153 090€, thus more than in planned budget by 28 370€, i.e. 18,53%.

## 4 MAIN FINDINGS AND OUTPUTS

Main outputs & results:
1. 16 cities have started and further extended the implementation of EMAS in their cities.
<b>Public Outputs:</b>
2. EMAS Implementation Guidebook in 10 languages (on the web and on CD-ROM)
3. EMAS Peer Review Guidebook in 10 languages (on the web and on CD-ROM)
4. Research report on EMS in European Cities and EMAS & 6EAP linkages (on the web)
5. Web site: www.emascities.org
6. Newsletters (1,2,3,4,5)
7. Final Event
8. Recommendations from Project
<b>Outputs for the project partners:</b>
9. Certificates to Partner Cities
10. EMAS implementation training package
11. EMAS peer review training package
12. Reports from peer reviews

### 4.1 PARTNER CITIES' ACHIEVEMENT AND FURTHER PLANS

The following table summarises the project partner cities plans beyond the project in most of the cases based on new knowledge, skills and experience from the EMAS Peer Review for the cities project.

EMAS "experienced cities" - Leeds, Newcastle, Gothenburg, Rostock and Bristol - maintained and gained their EMAS registrations and extended EMAS to new units and are committed to continue.	
EMAS "beginner cities" aimed mainly at getting experience, but also at EMS registration:	
Gdansk	- maintain ISO9000 and EMAS registration by end of 2005
Sopot	- maintain ISO 9000 and aim at EMS registration in medium term
Barcelona	- maintain ISO14000 and aim at EMAS registration
Jelgava & Liepaja	- integrate ISO 9000 & ISO 14000 systems
Tallinn & Viljandi	- EMAS implementation in medium/long term plan
Siauliai	- EMAS registration in medium term
Panevezys	- extend EMAS in municipality, registration in mid-term plan
Düsseldorf & Porto	- EMAS implementation continues, registration not decided

Partner cities' goals, experiences on EMAS Implementation and Peer review are described in Annexes 3 and 4.

### 4.2 PEER REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The peer review methodology is an objective evaluation carried out by 'a critical friend'. The project used peer reviews to evaluate the progress being made by municipalities in the implementation of EMAS. It demonstrated that peer review **can be used at any stage in the implementation of EMAS**. It demonstrated how to identify strengths and weaknesses in the progress being made by municipalities and how the review team can provide support from their personal experiences. Municipalities face many barriers and obstacles in the implementation of EMAS. The project demonstrated **how a review can lower the threshold for municipalities to start the process** towards successfully registering to EMAS. Peer Review is also very useful to use between EMAS forerunner cities as **it is a great opportunity to share experiences, learn**

**new and different solutions and practices.** EMAS forerunners do not feel alone and maintain their motivation for continual improvement.

Numerous project cities reported how the **peer review helped to raise the awareness and the importance of EMAS amongst politicians and staff.** The peer review can be used between cities across national borders, between cities in the same country or region as well as inside the city between different municipality departments and organisations. It can provide benefits in municipalities with 50,000 employees and also for those with only 200! (Annex 18 about peer review and guidebook evaluation)

Please see also Newsletters 4 and 5 for summarised peer review experience from partner cities. (Annex 12)

### 4.3 PEER REVIEW GUIDEBOOK

The EMAS Peer Review Guidebook has been translated into 10 languages. It is available to all European cities through project web-site: [www.emascities.org](http://www.emascities.org) and disseminated on special CD-ROMs (Annex 7).

The EMAS Peer Review Guidebook can be adapted to be used for a peer review at any stage of EMAS implementation and has been designed specifically to be used for a peer review where a host municipality has completed some stages of EMAS, has some experience, and is perhaps 12 months into the work.

Main steps where peer review can be used are:

- 1) during the scoping stage and before the decision is taken whether, where and how to adopt and implement EMAS;
- 2) during the implementation stage, checking whether implementation is meeting expectations and is on target to be fully integrated into the management of the organisation;
- 3) during auditing to provide feedback on how the system meets the EMAS regulation and potentially to guide the municipality to an external verification;
- 4) to help maintain the verification to the regulation, and share practices between EMS verified municipalities. It will also allow the municipality to refine their consideration of indirect environmental aspects and to prepare for future European Union environmental policy and legislation.

The peer review method encourages cities to work together and critically review progress in establishing and implementing various environmental management systems (Annex 6).

### 4.4 EMAS IMPLEMENTATION GUIDEBOOK

The EMAS Implementation Guidebook has been translated into 10 languages. It is available to all European cities through project web-site: [www.emascities.org](http://www.emascities.org) and disseminated on special CD-ROMs (Annex 7).

The EMAS Implementation guidebook assists municipalities through the first stages of implementing an environmental management system, often the most challenging parts of the process. The guidebook provides detailed support in the identification of a municipality's 'direct' and 'indirect' environmental aspects (Annex 5).

The current EMAS Regulation's classification of indirect environmental aspects was developed from the experiences of enterprises and is considered to be one of the greatest challenges. The project is suggesting an alternative classification for indirect environmental aspects to better suit the functions of municipalities and it is hoped that this will be considered in the forthcoming revision. Please see the following table for the comparison of Indirect Aspects Key in EU Regulation and as an Alternative from the project.

## Indirect Environmental Aspects classification for Municipalities:

Alternative suggested for discussion by the project	Official by EC regulation No 761/2001
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative &amp; planning decisions</li> <li>• Procurement for products &amp; services</li> <li>• Education &amp; Awareness</li> <li>• Governance / Relationships / Networks</li> <li>• Investments &amp; loans</li> <li>• Environmental performance &amp; practices of contractors, sub-contractors &amp; suppliers</li> <li>• Travel &amp; Transport (by residents and business)</li> <li>• Energy (by residents and business)</li> <li>• Waste (produced by residents and business)</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Product related issues (design, development, packaging, transportation, use and waste recovery/disposal)</li> <li>• Capital investments, granting loans &amp; insurance services</li> <li>• New markets</li> <li>• Choice &amp; composition of services (e.g. transport or the catering trade)</li> <li>• Administrative &amp; planning decisions</li> <li>• Product range compositions</li> <li>• Environmental performance &amp; practices of contractors, subcontractors &amp; suppliers</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>

The alternative Indirect Environment Aspects Key suggested by the project is further described as follows:

### Alternative Indirect Environment Aspects Key

<b>A - Administrative and planning decisions</b>	A municipality can use the planning process to influence the development of the area. Green Construction guides and enforcement of environmental principles in planning decisions can be adopted.
<b>B - Procurement</b>	Through the procurement process you are able to influence the activities undertaken by (sub)contractors and suppliers. You can specify environmental criteria in tender specifications to encourage business to provide a more environmentally friendly service.
<b>C - Education and Awareness</b>	An organisation can use its influence within the external community to raise awareness and education with respect to environmental issues.
<b>D - Governance / Relationships / Networks</b>	Some of the activities that you undertake may be with other agencies. You may be able to influence the development of regional strategies or assist other agencies to encourage their members to improve their consideration of the environment. Your level of influence may be affected by the type of partnership (formal or informal).
<b>E - Investments and loans</b>	An organisation can make investment and loan decisions using sustainability criteria. For example, by providing loans for staff to purchase annual bus passes, or LPG conversions.
<b>F - Travel and Transport (by residents and business)</b>	An organisation can influence the travel decisions by residents and business through strategic positioning of services or through education.
<b>G - Energy (by residents and business)</b>	A municipality can promote energy efficiency initiatives to business and residents.
<b>H - Waste (produced by residents and business)</b>	A municipality can promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste, and provide the infrastructure to business and residents.

<b>I – Environmental performance and practices of contractors, sub-contractors and suppliers.</b>	Once a contract/tender has been granted, a municipality needs to monitor the performance and practises to ensure that the suppliers and those acting on behalf of the municipality comply with the environmental policy within the remit of the activities carried out for the contract. They also need to ensure that those companies do not break the law, they deal with waste etc correctly and have the appropriate licenses etc whilst working on the municipalities behalf.
<b>J - Other – please specify</b>	Any other indirect aspects identified

#### **4.5 RESEARCH REPORT ON EMS IN EUROPEAN CITIES AND EMAS & 6EAP LINKAGES**

The EMAS Peer Review research, led by the University of the West of England (UWE), has examined the experience of cities in EU25 of the use of environmental management systems (EMS). The research looked also how EMAS can be used to help deliver the objectives of the 6EAP and its' Thematic Strategies.

The research methodology was designed to facilitate EU wide contact with cities via questionnaire distributed by electronic means as apposed to a more in-depth case study approach. This approach was also favoured by the special added value of the network project partners, including UBC and EUROCITIES, and ICLEI in permitting access to a critical mass of several hundred cities across EU25.

A total of 55 survey forms were completed and returned for input into a database of cities spread across nineteen countries. The greatest number of returns came from the UK (8), with 6 each also from Germany and Italy. Sweden (5), Estonia (4) and Finland (4) were also strongly represented in the sample. Three returns came from Lithuania and Poland, with one or two returns from Austria, Greece, Denmark, France, Iceland, Norway, Slovakia and the Netherlands.

For Full and Summary Reports, please see Annexes 8 and 9 as well as Newsletter 5 (Annex 12). It is available to all interested parties from web-site: [www.emascities.org](http://www.emascities.org).

#### **4.6 WEB SITE: [WWW.EMASCITIES.ORG](http://WWW.EMASCITIES.ORG)**

Project web-site was set up at the beginning of the project and it has served well the project partners, as “intra web-page” included key materials and working documents of all partners providing useful help and guidance. As the Guidebooks have been finalised they are available on public web-site. Web-site is describing the project aims and outcomes and sharing public deliverables with interested parties. Overview of project web-site (print outs) can be found in Annex 20.

#### **4.7 NEWSLETTERS (1,2,3,4,5)**

Newsletters have been introducing the project and its progress as well as introduced project partner cities and their experiences. Newsletters can be downloaded from project web-site and they have been printed as follows (Annex 12):

- NL1 – 2500 copies
- NL2 – 2000 copies
- NL3 – 2000 copies
- NL4 – 2000 copies
- NL5 – 3000 copies

All copies have been disseminated through UBC and EUROCITIES networks and contact lists as well as through other partners in the project. Only few copies of newsletters 1-4 have been left. Last Newsletter has been printed in highest number as it is summarising and promoting all project outcomes and result.

#### **4.8 FINAL EVENT**

The Final Event of the EMAS Peer Review for the Cities project took place in Gdansk 3-5 November 2004. The Event was co-hosted and co-organised by the City of Gdansk.

The final event was meant for all project partner cities, their political leaders and experts; EMAS competent bodies, National and International Local Government Organisations and other experts.

We aimed at sharing our common achievements and lessons from the project, the further plans and commitments concerning environmental management systems in cities, further collaboration between other cities and stakeholders within countries and/or a cross the border. We discussed and identified the critical needs and challenges to accomplish it. We introduced and disseminated the project main outputs. Important developments at the European level concerning Urban Thematic Strategy were described and discussed and all had an opportunity to contribute. Local TV and written press covered the Event.

The event started on November 3<sup>rd</sup> with participants arrival and registration. Then followed a meeting with partner cities on technical and managerial matters and the day ended with informal get together. For the participants who arrived earlier the City of Gdansk organised a city tour.

A full day Event took place on 4<sup>th</sup> of November. The day ended with the reception by the City of Gdansk and a Certificate Ceremony, where all partner city representatives received the Certificate proofing their active participation in the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project and that cities had contributed to developing and testing the Peer Review method that encourages and supports the implementation of the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme in European Municipalities. Our partner cities are committed to share their experiences of the implementation of the environmental management systems with other European Municipality partners.

November 5<sup>th</sup> was mainly departure day, but participants had also a chance to take part in city tour. There was also a tour to another Polish city Sopot, which locates almost next to Gdansk.

Altogether there was over 50 participants. As the event happened to be the same day with EMAS competent bodies meeting, we received several regrets that some EMAS competent bodies' representatives were not able to take part the event. For the full program and list of participants, please see Annex 13.

The Final Event and first plenary was opened by the Deputy Mayor of Gdansk, Mr Marcin Szpak. Mr. Mikko Jokinen, Co-Chairman of the Commission on Environment, UBC shared the project background and introduced the objectives for the event.

Ms. Catherine Parmentier, Chief Executive Officer, EUROCITIES spoke about the role of the cities in Europe and highlighted the key challenges to come.

Challenges of EMAS in participating cities and added value of project outcomes were presented by the project Co-ordinator Tea Nõmmann. Research results were introduced by David Ludlow.

First plenary was followed by group discussions and workshops in three parallel workshops, which were facilitated by the sub-consultants of the project from Estonia, Latvia and Poland.

All project partner cities presented and shared their lessons, challenges and further plans. Common needs, challenges and achievements were evaluated and based on the summaries from the workshops the draft list of recommendations was drawn.

Selected partner cities introduced their achievements also during the Second plenary, to set a background and framework for plenary discussions to agree on joint recommendations from the project cities across Europe to the European Commission, to their National Governments, to their

own municipalities as well as to International local authorities network organisations, like UBC and EUROCITIES. Please see agreed recommendations in part 4.10 as well as in Annex 11.

All slide presentations from the Final Event are attached to Annex 14.

#### **4.9 CERTIFICATE TO PARTNER CITIES**

All partner cities representatives received the Certificate proofing their active participation in the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project and that cities had contributed to developing and testing the Peer Review method that encourages and supports the implementation of the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme in European Municipalities. Our partner cities are committed to share their experiences of the implementation of the environmental management systems with its European Municipality partners.

Please see the Certificate in Annex 15.

#### **4.10 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROJECT**

EMAS Peer Review for Cities project has been one of the largest projects promoting EMAS and covering altogether 16 cities across Europe, with an important focus on cities in new member states. The size of the cities participating has varied from 20 000 in Viljandi to 1,5 million in Barcelona. The organisation having or implementing EMS has varied from size of 7 people in the department in Viljandi to 35 000 people in Leeds as EMAS is covering all services of the city. In addition there has been EMAS beginners and EMAS experienced cities in the project. This broad variety of different cities has given an interesting and valuable experience on implementing environmental management systems. It has also provided insights about possibilities and about bottlenecks.

During the Final Event all partners and participants of the event shared and discussed their challenges and lessons from the project itself, from EMAS Implementation as well as from Peer Review method. Based on the experience, presentations and very active workshop discussions list of recommendations to the European Commission, national governments, local authorities governments and international local government network organisations was drawn.

##### **4.10.1 To the European Commission:**

1. Must recognise and promote EMAS as the principal tool within the EU25 to deliver environmental regulatory compliance
2. Must require consistency in performance of EMAS competent bodies across member states
3. Must require consistency and municipalities-dedicated approach when dealing with municipalities.
4. Must recognise capacity and resource deficit and provide financial support for municipalities in new member states to implement EMAS
5. Must reflect the centrality of EMAS in all regulations, strategies, directives to deliver continual environmental improvements in Europe's environment.
6. Must support establishment of network of municipality peers or mentors to help overcome barriers and support implementation
7. Should support development and better "signposting" of "best practice", "EMAS software", and case studies in tools and techniques.
8. Should support research into the costs and benefits of the tools and techniques available to manage the significant environmental aspects.
9. Should recognise that ISO14000 remains for many municipalities the preferred tool to manage their environmental aspects.

10. Should recognise that although municipalities may implement EMAS the benefits of registration may not outweigh the costs for some.
11. Should start an agreement of EU wide indicators for communities as quality criteria for environmental performance thereby improving the comparability.
12. Should establish EMAS for the assessment of indirect aspects concerning the environmental performances of the Municipalities. Indirect can only be calculated over longer periods (3-5 years).

#### **4.10.2 To the National Governments in EU member states:**

1. Commit to implement EMAS
2. Must promote, encourage, support and provide resources for EMAS to be integrated into the work of municipalities
3. Must provide resources for a training, experience exchange (study visits, peer reviews, etc) and support framework for politicians and officers
4. Must help to provide better understanding by politicians and senior management of the benefits of EMAS
5. Must facilitate learning between municipalities, for example peer reviews.
6. Must promote the use of EMAS in “non-environmental” departments ( schools /hospitals /social care/libraries etc)
7. Must provide greater financial support for “EMAS competent bodies” to support municipalities
8. Must verify the competencies of “competent bodies” and provide the resources for them to support municipalities
9. Support national local authorities associations involvement in promoting and education the use of management systems in municipalities to improve local public services and policies

#### **4.10.3 To the Municipalities:**

1. Should be open to institutional learning and change their organisational structure if needed
2. Must have top level commitment and integrate EMAS into their “corporate” or “central” administrative management system
3. Must realise that citizens, businesses and stakeholders will continue to demand improvements in their local services and environmental quality and that an EMS can deliver these cost effectively.
4. Must give higher priority to EMAS implementation in schools in recognition of the long term benefit to the environment and the community
5. Must share their expertise with neighbouring municipalities (training & awareness materials & successful approaches to implementation)
6. Must share technical expertise (in integrating EMS into management systems, developing performance indicators for indirect aspects, sharing internal auditing resources, procurement)
7. Must develop partnerships with local companies and their associations (that provide services and goods/have an EMS).
8. Must recognise the need to use media in raising awareness, in communicating and persuading people and companies to change their behaviour.
9. Must be honest and transparent about their weaknesses

#### **4.10.4 To the international local government network organisations UBC & EURO CITIES:**

1. Must facilitate continuation of the use of EMAS
2. Must facilitate establishing the network for experienced EMAS peer reviewers.
3. Should support contribution of NGO’s to assist cities in implementing EMAS

4. Must facilitate a move from “best practice by the few” to “common practice by all,” particularly in:
  - how to use environmental subsidies and taxes to deliver continual environmental improvement of public services and policies.
  - deciding what indicators are appropriate and what data is needed for their measurement.
  - Implementing green procurement as a central management tool across city administration

#### **4.11 EMAS IMPLEMENTATION AND EMAS PEER REVIEW TRAINING PACKAGES**

Special training packages have been prepared for both training sessions: EMAS Implementation and EMAS Peer Review. Training packages are attached to Annex 16 and Annex 17.

#### **4.12 REPORTS FROM PEER REVIEWS**

The peer review conclusions were drawn with the help of Peer Review Guidebook, which helped a systematic review of host cities EMAS Implementation process.

Peer Review reports (recommendations) based on the peer reviews have been directly presented at the end of the peer reviews to the host cities. It was agreed with the cities that the peer review results will not be disseminated without the acceptance of the host city. Peer reviews have been summarised for project purpose to monitor the progress of cities in implementing EMAS.

Peer Review reports by peer reviewers have been in different format. The selection of the type of the report was left on the peer reviewer taking into account the situation and wishes in the host city. The recommendations and findings have been recorded in the form of slide presentation and press release (Rostock and Düsseldorf), report on review (Viljandi, Gothenburg), minutes of peer review (Leeds, Porto, Barcelona), summary of recommendations and further action points (Jelgava, Liepaja, Panevezys, Siauliai, Gdansk and Sopot). Some cities have not been able to submit their finalised recommendations, which they did present at the end of the peer reviews (Düsseldorf about Tallinn, Barcelona about Bristol, Gdansk about Newcastle). Main reason for this has been the everyday workload of peer reviewers. The summaries of peer reviews can be read from Annex 4.

## 5 PROBLEMS AND DIFFICULTIES FOUND

There have not been any grave problems or difficulties during the project. Some smaller challenges and changes of schedules we have faced and reported in earlier progress reports, but this has not caused any shortcomings for the project outputs and results. As these challenges and solutions to them have already been reported in the progress and interim reports, they will not be repeated here.

The European-wide two-year project with 4 team partners and 17 partner cities has of course been a big challenge for the team. The overall work-plan was highly ambitious. The project created a considerable number of outputs (2 guidebooks in 10 languages, CD-ROM, 5 newsletters, Survey and Research Report, web-page, 2 different packages for two full day training seminars), implemented demanding activities in many countries (assisting 17 cities in EMAS implementation and peer review, carrying out peer reviews, developing and testing guidebooks, translations), organised several events (two training sessions, 16 peer reviews, final event) and dealt with different languages, experiences and cultural contexts. Managing this complexity has been a remarkable challenge – and the project coordinator and team have successfully met it.

In the project, the actual goals for the participating cities were also quite large compared to the resources made available to them within the project. However, the cities highly valued the project and its aims and also made strong in-kind contributions. In cities, there can often also be intervening factors that may affect on a commitment of activities for two years. In our project we were quite lucky: only one city out of 16 actually failed to complete its work programme, and even this could be compensated by inclusion of a new highly motivated city partner. The lessons learnt, however, have been taken into account in the design of the new EMS project for European Cities (Managing Urban Europe - 25). Much larger resources will be made available for the participating cities in that project (although, also more will be expected from them).

## 6 FUTURE POSSIBILITIES (CHALLENGES) AND DEVELOPMENT

With regard to the future usefulness of EMAS and other environmental management systems in European cities, the project team is quite optimistic. We expect the Thematic Urban Strategy of the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP to mark a remarkable step on European level towards enhanced planning of environmental management in cities. Management systems will definitely play an important role in the implementation of such plans. They already now provide an excellent tool for numerous cities in Europe to improve their local environments and reduce the overall negative environmental impacts of municipal and other activities within the urban areas. The project partners, in co-operation with several other European city networks, aim at giving good contributions to this process.

The Peer Review methodology, as further developed and thoroughly tested in the project, will provide one very useful method for advancing environmental management plans and systems in European cities. The project partners are – as part of their basic network action – continuously advancing such collegial exchange and city twinning that the peer review approach supports and requires. Establishing of a peer reviewers network and/or contact database is within possibilities and under consideration by the UBC and EUROCITIES.

European follow-up activities to the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project (including new projects) are under development and implementation. The goal is to deepen and spread the experience and knowledge in European cities on how to improve and develop the environmental management of urban areas (incl. synergies with the private sector and communities). The project team has also planned to further liaise with the project partner cities, their national bodies and local specialists to help the cities to create locally and nationally follow-up activities and projects to promote and use the results and outputs from this project.

The project also developed – in extensive dialogue with the project team and cities – altogether over 30 recommendations for the European Commission, National Administrations, and European cities and their networks on how they could enhance the future work on EMAS implementation at cities. According to the recommendations, the European Commission should for example put an even stronger emphasis to better enable the EMAS system and its support structures (competent bodies etc.) to meet the needs of cities. It would also be very important to make more support measures available for cities in the new Member States. The recommendations also propose to start an agreement of EU wide indicators for communities as quality criteria for environmental performance thereby improving the comparability. On basis of the recommendations, there are also many things that the National Administrations could do to better support the implementation on the local level. Also City networks are seen as very important facilitators: networking can create large added value to active cities that get engaged in it. The recommendations are presented in chapter 4.10. in this report, and also listed in Annex 11.

In addition to such European wide challenges and future development possibilities, each of the participating cities is also having its own important goals. The future aims of the partner cities are summarised in chapter 4.1. The focus, experiences and achievements of the EMAS work of the participating cities are presented in Annex 3.

## 7 OTHER USEFUL INFORMATION

The project co-ordinator, Union of the Baltic Cities, in co-operation with other (old and new) partners has prepared a new project to follow up many activities started in the EMAS Peer Review for Cities project and parallel projects by other organisations to expand EMS usage in urban areas as well as investigate ways to use EMS in managing sustainability issues in local authorities.

The overall objective of the new Managing Urban Europe – 25 project is to improve the state of the environment and promote sustainable development in European cities through analysing, developing and testing feasible EMS applications and methods. This will be based on improved application of existing systems. The intention is to provide better practical feasibility, improved linkage with stakeholders and coverage of the whole urban area. Improved implementation of European environmental legislation will be one of the key outcomes. More specifically, the project aims at:

1. Analysing existing environmental management systems and making recommendations on how to adapt these to the changing needs of European municipalities;
2. Developing and implementing capacity-building, communication and monitoring tools (piloting in 14 European cities) in order to improve the linkages between EMS, policy making and assessment;
3. Applying new innovative elements such as SEA into EMS; and
4. Developing new innovative regulatory and fiscal instruments into EMS to improve management of significant environmental aspects on local level.

The co-ordinator of this new project is Union of Baltic Cities, Commission on Environment Secretariat. The partners are: ICLEI, University of West England, UNEP-Grid Arendal, Lake Constance Foundation, Lake Balaton Development Coordination Agency, ACRR, Energie-Cites, ASSURRE, TURKU, Lahti, Karlskrona, Växjö, LEEDS, Lewis District Council, Ancona, Siena Province, Riga, Kaunas, Siauliai, Siófok, Balatonfüred , Oslo.

The project has received a positive funding decision (contracted) from DG Environment, and is just now at its start phase. The implementation period of the project is 36 months. The partners, networks, cities and experts, are expecting a lot from this new undertaking.

## **LIST OF ANNEXES TO THE FINAL REPORT**

Annex 1 – Project Plan

Annex 2 – Project Summary Sheet

Annex 3 – Overview of cities goals, EMS focus, experience from the project and further plans

Annex 4 – Summary overview of Peer Reviews

Annex 5 – EMAS Implementation Guidebooks

Annex 6 – EMAS Peer Review Guidebook

Annex 7 – CD-ROM with Guidebooks in 10 languages and project information

Annex 8 – Full Research Report

Annex 9 – Summary Research Report

Annex 10 – Survey questionnaire

Annex 11 – Project Partners Recommendations

Annex 12 – Newsletters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Annex 13 – Program and Participants of Final Event

Annex 14 – Presentations of Final Event

Annex 15 – Certificate to the Cities

Annex 16 – Training Package from EMAS Implementation

Annex 17 – Training Package from EMAS Peer Review Seminar

Annex 18 – Results of Peer Review and Guidebook 3 Evaluation

Annex 19 – Background paper on urban EMAS and local environmental economic Instruments

Annex 20 – Overview of the Project Web-Site: [www.emascities.org](http://www.emascities.org)