



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate I - Preserving the Ecosystem : environmental research
The Director

Brussels, 18 December 2001
RTD/I.3 - (D) 539525

Prof. Dr. Hubert Heinelt
Darmstadt University Of Technology
Centre For Interdisciplinary Studies Of Technology (Zit)
Hochschulstrasse 1
DE - 64289 Darmstadt

Subject: Programme "Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development"
- **Call identifier: EESD-ESD-3 (JO 2000/C324/09)**
- **Proposal No: EVK1-2001-00308 - DIALOG**

Dear Prof. Dr. Heinelt,

I would like to inform you that the Commission services with the help of independent experts have recently evaluated the proposals submitted in the context of the above mentioned call. This includes the proposal entitled: "Developing Institutional Abilities for Sustainable Water Management in Southern Europe" submitted by yourself.

You will find attached a copy of the evaluation summary report on your proposal.

A ranking will be made of all proposals submitted and evaluated.

A batch of the most highly ranked proposals will be invited to contract negotiations with the Commission services. The size of this batch will depend on the Community funding available for supporting proposals under this call.

For those proposals which did not pass an evaluation threshold (as mentioned in the Evaluation Manual), you are reminded that they will not be retained for possible selection.

This information letter should not be regarded under any circumstances as prejudging the final Commission decision on your proposal.

I would be grateful if you could inform the other participants in this proposal of the content of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Christian Patermann
Director

Encl.: Evaluation summary report

Area: Sustainable Management and Quality of Water (KA1)

Proposal No : EVK1-2001-00308 DIALOG
 Title : Developing Institutional Abilities for Sustainable Water Management in Southern Europe
 Duration (months) : 36
 Attributed Key-Action : EVK1
 Attributed Area : 1.1.4.-1.1.2. Socio-economic aspects of sustainable use of water
 Type : RS

	Block 1	Block 5	Block 2-3-4	Total
Points	4.0	2.5	0.0	6.5
Weighted	36.0	10.0	0.0	46.0
Result	Go	NoGo	NoGo	NoGo

Block 1 :Scientific/technological quality and innovation 4.0

General remarks concerning scientific or technological quality and innovation:
 Governance is relevant to the WFD with respect to implementation at the catchment level;
 The degree of transferability is sufficient and the inclusion of water rights, law and governance is appreciated.

Strong points of the proposal :
 The case studies are clearly integrated into the WP that involve catchment inventories;
 The clear matrix organization between thematic and geographic Wps and the inclusion of existing simulation models for hard data are strong points.

Remarks relating to the weak points of the proposal:
 There are doubts on the relevance/practicability of benchmark models on governance structure.
 The unequal contribution of Germany compared to other countries which are the focus of the study lead to consider a reduction of the manpower allocated to Germany. The analytical tools remain unclear.

Other remarks:
 The panel has concerns on the competence of the consortium.

Block 5 : Resources, partnership and management 2.5

General remarks concerning resources, partnership and management:
 Ambitious targets, conceptual framework but inadequate expertise for both coordinators and case study participants.

Remarks relating to management, tasks, schedule, milestones: strong points; weak points:
 The project requires input of external knowledge through one academic conference with a panel of external expert reviewers. The advisory group is sufficient.

Remarks relating to partnership, competence, roles, users: strong points; weak points:
 The partnership for technical/engineering governance is good while the economic partners have little experience in water resource economics as well as the legal partner, which raise some doubts on the performance in the specific tasks.
 The decision making role between regional and national level of the water authorities is unclear. It requires other regional level actors such as "Länder" level in Germany. Doubtful whether water boards can set governance if end users are not well structured.

Remarks relating to resources:
 The way in which man months are divided up seems arbitrary. Top heavy for Germany (39 months) when it is only an example case with little experience in water governance.
 It is unclear why the coordinator gets 40% of budget.

Other remarks:
 While the technical expertise is good, the socio-economic and sociological expertise are weak and therefore a successful implementation is questionable.

Block 2: Community added value and contribution to EU policies	0.0
3: Contribution to Community social objectives	0.0
4 : Economic development and S&T prospects	0.0