

**WORK DOCUMENT T1.1**

**Work document for selecting the good practices**

T.1.1 Analysis of the state of the art in the regions and detailed study of good practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document/Deliverable name** | Integrated Regional Action Plan for Innovative, Sustainable and Low Carbon Mobility |
| **Author(s)** | Paul Alzer |
| **Co-author(s)** |  |
| **Status (Final, Draft)** | Draft |
| **Comments** |  |
| **Date**  | 2017/06/23 |

**Foreword**

**REFORM Overview**



**INSTRUCTION**

**See for example a (existing) good practice of Parkstad (Regional SUMP). This is an good example also because it derived from a EU project Poly-SUMP. Other GP’s of Parkstad still to put in:**

* **Creation of a ecarsharing pool of companies and authorities**
* **A pilot with a cross border e-bus between Heerlen (NL) and Aachen (G)**
* **The employer's approach for mobility management**
* **Regional strategy for public and private e-load infrastructure based on households, businesses and centres.**

**Leave your ideas at the piece NEW Good Practices at page 14**

**(please try to give us as much information you like, but mention in your reply if we can contact you for further questions or information)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Region** | ***Parkstad Limburg*** |
| **Author(s)** | *Paul Alzer* |
| **Affiliation** | *PL/Alzer* |
| **Date** | *8th June 2017* |
| **Completed Section** | *2.,3., 4., 5., 6.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION .1 – Identification of the GP** |
| 1. ***GP Title (should be self-explanatory)***
 | *[100 characters]**Regional SUMP Parkstad Limburg* |
| 1. ***Does this GP come from an Interreg Project? If yes, mention the project acronym***
 | ***YES******Project acronym: Poly-SUMP*** |
| 1. ***Objectives of the GP***
 | *[1000 characters] Please specify the objectives of the GP specifying as most as possible and referring to the scopes of REFORM Project ( Policies and Methodologies).**Parkstad Limburg has a mobility plan for the region agreed on in July 2011 (RVVP 2011-2020). The RVVP is an integrated plan on mobility for all modes of transport and made in cooperation of all main stakeholders as province, communities and border region (see RVVP projects list in appendix 1). With using the Poly-SUMP project, funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme, carried out for Parkstad by Panteia and with the cooperation of representatives of almost all stakeholders, the focus has been made to get a more sustainable focus. The result is this proposal on sustainable mobility, that together with the RVVP will be used for this polycentric region as a (Poly-)SUMP.**Low carbon policies and regulations were the main motivation, but also the regional policy on energy transition and participation in poly-sump* |

NOTE: If the selected GP comes from an Interreg Europe Project it has also to be described in a standard format provided by the JTS which contains a subset of the above reported information and must be submitted to the Programme. This template has to be filled on-line on the INTERREG Policy Learning Platform and is reported in this annex after the REFORM questionnaire. It has to be filled by the same PP in charge of analyzing the selected GP and validated by the Lead Partner.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Classification of the GP**

*Each selected GP can be classified both from the point of view of the type of “regional support policy” and from the point of view of the “methodology for SUMP development” it refers to. Considering both of these classifications a matrix (that we will shortly call Support Policies / SUMP Methodologies) can be created.**Each single GP can be classified including it in a cell of this matrix, characterized by the policy and the methodology it refers to.**As an example, if a Region has decided to fund local training courses for cities, the GP can be classified in the cell “Economic support / development of local know-how”. If a regulation has been adopted requiring the development of SUMP for cities of a certain size, the GP can be classified as “Normative obligation / development of SUMP” and so on.* *Each single selected GP should be classified in at least 1 of the cells; in certain cases the same GP could cover different aspects and can be classified in more than one cell.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Classification grid for GPs: description of each line is provided in Ch. 5. If “Other” is used, replace “Other” with the appropriate title | REGIONAL SUPPORT POLICIES |
| Technical support | Economic support/Funding | Standardization | Other types of incentives | Normative obligations | Regional scale implementation | Other (specify) |
| METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS FOR SUMP DEVELOPMENT | Methodologies for the development of SUMP  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development of local know-how |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tools for large scale integration  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICT applications  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMP as evolution of existing planning instruments and plans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementation of "replicable modules" at local level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public involvement and participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Put one or more cross according classification and level of compliance to the criteria ( X, XX, XXX)*

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION .2– General Framework** |
| 1. ***Territorial and social environment interested (Region/Municipality/ population, other)***
 | *[300 characters Please indicate the Region and the municipality(ies) involved; add the population and any other information regarding territorial and urban environment where the GP has been implemented]**Parkstad Limburg, consisting of 8 communities/cities:**Heerlen, Kerkrade, Brunssum, Landgraaf, Nuth, Voerendaal, Onderbanken and Simpelveld (255.000 inhabitants)* |
| 1. ***Body which implemented the GP and other Bodies involved with the relevant role (stakeholders, partners, etc.)***
 | *[300 characters Please indicate the body which implemented the action; add a list with all the relevant stakeholders and their roles in the GP implementation]**Board of region, as a mobility policy which implies the communities are obliged to the policy agreed on**In a first step the current situation, policy documents and indicators have been analysed to generate a regional profile (based on mobility indicators and general used GINI-factors). This profile was used to define problems, stakeholders and responsibilities. In a second step a two day workshop (using the Local Future Search Workshop method) with the stakeholders was used to define actions for a more sustainable mobility. These steps were carried out and documented by Panteia, Zoetermeer.**The region Parkstad Limburg has discussed the results of the first steps with the communities and defined this proposal. This proposal is a policy framework for the region Parkstad Limburg and its communities. Together and with other stakeholders they will start and work out the implementation, in policy and realization.* |
| 1. ***Motivations for the selection of the GP and highlighting of the points that are considered as elements of success***
 | *[1000 characters] Please list the motivations of selecting the GP; Highlight the success elements using bullet point.**Regional**Cooperation between communities on common vision, goals and directions* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 3 Detailed description of the GP and its implementation** |
| 1. ***Description of GP pointing out its key implementation issues, especially those relating to the aspects for which the GP was identified as such***
 | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:*- *What is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice?*- *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?**The region Parkstad Limburg has discussed the results of the first steps with the communities and defined this proposal. This proposal defines the focus on and the further implementation of the following actions:**1. Cycle related measures (infrastructure network, cycle routing, cycle parking, and support of e-cycling with charging possibilities)**2. E-mobility (e-car sharing at companies, support cities and companies to use electric vehicles in their own fleet, out roll of charging facilities)**3. Development of a green logistics/distribution center**4. Public transport improvement (also cross border)**5. Raise awareness and promotion activities to support sustainable mobility**This proposal is a policy framework for the region Parkstad Limburg and its communities. Together and with other stakeholders they will start and work out the implementation, in policy and realization. There is still no agreed action plan and it is difficult to monitor* |
| 1. ***Any regulatory / administrative tools to which the GP refers***
 | *[300 characters] Please specify the regulatory framework (National law / regional Law/ other).**/* |
| 1. ***Short description of the implementation process with the roles played by all the involved Bodies and players***
 | *[1000 characters] Please provide information on the implementation process; describe the role of the main players.**This proposal is a policy framework for the region Parkstad Limburg and its communities. Together and with other stakeholders they will start and work out the implementation, in policy and realization.* |
| 1. ***Elements of innovation with respect to the regional state of the art or adopted policies***
 | *[500 characters] Why is this practice considered innovative? Please provide factual evidence that demonstrates its innovation with respect to the regional state of the art.**Direction is agreed but communities are responsible for implementation. By REFORM we want to come to smart action plans and shared responsibilities in the ambition**The future search workshop, a kind of pressure cooker of two days is innovative* |
| 1. ***Time scale for the implementation of the GP***
 | *2014-2020* |
| 1. ***Financial resources used for implementing the GP and amount of the allocated funds***
 |  *[500 characters] Supply information on the financial resources used for the development and implementation of the GP. If possible supply a breakdown of the cost by phases (design development implementation etcetera) and, if possible by main operating body**Only staff money at region and communities and EU project money by PANTEA to support process by analysis and workshop**In a first step the current situation, policy documents and indicators have been analysed to generate a regional profile (based on mobility indicators and general used GINI-factors). This profile was used to define problems, stakeholders and responsibilities. In a second step a two day workshop (using the Local Future Search Workshop method) with the stakeholders was used to define actions for a more sustainable mobility. These steps were carried out and documented by Panteia, Zoetermeer.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 4 Results achieved and problems encountered** |
| 1. ***Results achieved by the implementation of the GP (particularly in relation to the stated objectives)***
 | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:*- *Describe the stated objectives of the AP*- *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?*- *Relevant results**Not yet available. By REFORM we want to come to smart action plans and shared responsibilities in the ambition* |
| 1. ***Other possible effects recorded (especially the unexpected ones)***
 | *[300 characters] Please specify any other recorded effects (if any).**Effects till now that actions have been taken up (Public transport, Biking, E-mobility etc) but on a more voluntary basis. With the agreed ambition on energy transition PALET (energy neutral region in 2040) new energy allows us to act in REFORM and strengthen our policy* |
| 1. ***Identification of evaluation indicators***
 | *[1000 characters]* ***(****they can also be very different from case to case, quantitative or qualitative, direct or indirect, and relate to specific aspects of GP but must in any case related to the elements considered successful)**Not yet available. By REFORM we want to come to smart action plans and shared responsibilities in the ambition* |
| 1. ***Specific mechanism for monitoring the GP results eventually implemented/designed. If existent, describe it and the most important indicators and methods adopted***
 | *[1000 characters] Please indicate if a monitoring process has been foreseen/implemented and indicate the methodology adopted and parameters to be monitored**Not yet available. By REFORM we want to come to smart action plans and shared responsibilities in the ambition* |
| 1. ***Main problems encountered in implementing and description of the measures taken to overcome them***

 | *[1000 characters]**Lack of money**No forces to ask for commitment* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 5 Analysis of transferability** |
| 1. ***Prerequisites for the adoption / implementation of the GP;***
 | *[1000 characters] Please explain i there are specific elements or conditions that must be present to allow the implementation of the GP**The will to cooperate and come to a shared policy.**In our case it is easier because Parkstad has the mandate for regional policies, but also without that regional cooperation, policy and agreed SUMP and action plans are possible* |
| 1. ***Any significant element of impediment to the adoption / implementation of the GP;***
 | *[500 characters]**The financial responsibility for implementation of measures lies at the communities or the region has to collect money and pay it (collect at communities and EU/Province)* |
| 1. ***Portability or transferability of the GP items among the REFORM Partners or to other European Regions.***
 | *[1000 characters] Describe if the GP can be considered portable or transferrable to the partner Regions, identifying the main elements that should be revised/adapted.**Manchester does the same. For Central Macedonia and Emilia-Romagna it is more difficult but is possible and can be stimulated by regional or higher authorities, at demand or subsidies* |
| 1. ***Resources necessary for the development and / or implementation (financial, technical and professional and so on);***

 | *[1000 characters] Give a qualitative or quantitative descriptions of the resources not only from the financial point of view, but also regarding elements such as norms, professional skills, instrumentation, software packages, laboratories, etc.**Most important is will often political will.**It is necessary to have enough skills to analyse the region and form a vision and measures, but external experts can help, experiences enough. National or regional policies or norms can help, as software, ICT or apps (perhaps from somewhere else or external experts). A basic shared vision on the region you want to live in in years is a good start, than working back the steps to change and reach that (Future search can help)* |

**INTERREG Good Practice template**

* All Good Practices identified by an Interreg Europe project and reported in the progress reports have to be submitted to the Programme.
* In order to submit a practice, you will have to register in the Interreg Europe website. Online submission will be available the first semester of 2017.
* NB: in green: 2 optional fields. All other fields are compulsory.

|  |
| --- |
| **1. General information** |
| **Title of the practice** | *Regional SUMP Parkstad Limburg* |
| **Does this practice come from an Interreg Europe Project** | ***Yes*** *[Technical: Good Practices outside the IR-E projects relevant to the topics and validated by the Policy Learning Platforms experts will also be included in the database]* |

In case ‘yes’ is selected, the following sections appear: **Further filling in line with above table in system EU**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Please select the project acronym*** | *Drop down menu with all acronyms* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specific objective** | *Drop-down list of the 6 specific objectives**[Technical:* *In case a project is selected, the specific objective is automatically completed]* |
| **Main institution involved** | *[Technical: The name of the institution and location of the practice are per default those of the practice author. They remain editable.]* |
| **Location of the practice** | Country | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 1 | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 2 | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 3 | *Drop-down list* |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Detailed description** |
| **Detailed information on the practice** | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:*- *What is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice?*- *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?*- *Who are the main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the practice?* |
| **Resources needed** | *[300 characters] Please specify the amount of funding/financial resources used and/or the human resources required to set up and to run the practice.* |
| **Timescale (start/end date)** | *e.g. June 2012 – May 2014/ongoing* |
| **Evidence of success (results achieved)** | *[500 characters] Why is this practice considered as good? Please provide factual evidence that demonstrates its success or failure (e.g. measurable outputs/results).* |
| **Difficulties encountered/ lessons learned** | *[300 characters] Please specify any difficulties encountered/lessons learned during the implementation of the practice.* |
| **Potential for learning or transfer** | *[1000 characters] Please explain why you consider this practice (or some aspects of this practice) as being potentially interesting for other regions to learn from. This can be done e.g. through information on key success factors for a transfer or on, factors that can hamper a transfer. Information on transfer(s) that already took place can also be provided (if possible, specify the country, the region – NUTS 2 – and organisation to which the practice was transferred)**[Technical: A good practice be edited throughout a project life time (e.g. to add information on the transfers that have occurred)]* |
| **Further information** | *Link to where further information on the good practice can be found* |
| **Contact details** *[Technical: the contact details will be visible only to “Policy Learning Platforms registered members”* |
| **Name** |  |
| **Organisation** |  |
| **Email** |  |
|  |
| **Expert opinion** | *[500 characters] [****Technical: to be filled in by the Policy Learning Platforms experts****]* |

**NEW Good Practices**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Region**  |  |
| **Author(s)** |  |
| **Affiliation** |  |
| **Date** |  |
| **Completed Section**  | *2.,3., 4., 5., 6.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION .1 – Identification of the GP** |
| 1. ***GP Title (should be self-explanatory****)*
 | *[100 characters]* |
| 1. ***Does this GP come from an Interreg Project? If yes, mention the project acronym***
 | ***YES NOT.******Project acronym:*** |
| 1. ***Objectives of the GP***
 | *[1000 characters] Please specify the objectives of the GP specifying as most as possible and referring to the scopes of REFORM Project ( Policies and Methodologies).* |

NOTE: If the selected GP comes from an Interreg Europe Project it has also to be described in a standard format provided by the JTS which contains a subset of the above reported information and must be submitted to the Programme. This template has to be filled on-line on the INTERREG Policy Learning Platform and is reported in this annex after the REFORM questionnaire. It has to be filled by the same PP in charge of analyzing the selected GP and validated by the Lead Partner.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Classification of the GP**

*Each selected GP can be classified both from the point of view of the type of “regional support policy” and from the point of view of the “methodology for SUMP development” it refers to. Considering both of these classifications a matrix (that we will shortly call Support Policies / SUMP Methodologies) can be created.* *Each single GP can be classified including it in a cell of this matrix, characterized by the policy and the methodology it refers to.* *As an example, if a Region has decided to fund local training courses for cities, the GP can be classified in the cell “Economic support / development of local know-how”. If a regulation has been adopted requiring the development of SUMP for cities of a certain size, the GP can be classified as “Normative obligation / development of SUMP” and so on.* *Each single selected GP should be classified in at least 1 of the cells; in certain cases the same GP could cover different aspects and can be classified in more than one cell.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Classification grid for GPs: description of each line is provided in Ch. 5. If “Other” is used, replace “Other” with the appropriate title | REGIONAL SUPPORT POLICIES |
| Technical support | Economic support/Funding | Standardization | Other types of incentives | Normative obligations | Regional scale implementation | Other (specify) |
| METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS FOR SUMP DEVELOPMENT | Methodologies for the development of SUMP  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development of local know-how |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tools for large scale integration  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICT applications  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMP as evolution of existing planning instruments and plans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementation of "replicable modules" at local level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public involvement and participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Put one or more cross according classification and level of compliance to the criteria ( X, XX, XXX)*

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION .2– General Framework** |
| 1. ***Territorial and social environment interested (Region/Municipality/ population, other)***
 | *[300 characters Please indicate the Region and the municipality(ies) involved; add the population and any other information regarding territorial and urban environment where the GP has been implemented]* |
| 1. ***Body which implemented the GP and other Bodies involved with the relevant role (stakeholders, partners, etc.)***
 | *[300 characters Please indicate the body which implemented the action; add a list with all the relevant stakeholders and their roles in the GP implementation]* |
| 1. ***Motivations for the selection of the GP and highlighting of the points that are considered as elements of success***
 | *[1000 characters] Please list the motivations of selecting the GP; Highlight the success elements using bullet point.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 3 Detailed description of the GP and its implementation** |
| 1. ***Description of GP pointing out its key implementation issues, especially those relating to the aspects for which the GP was identified as such***
 | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:** *What is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice?*
* *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?*
 |
| 1. ***Any regulatory / administrative tools to which the GP refers***
 | *[300 characters] Please specify the regulatory framework (National law / regional Law/ other).* |
| 1. ***Short description of the implementation process with the roles played by all the involved Bodies and players***
 | *[1000 characters] Please provide information on the implementation process; describe the role of the main players.*  |
| 1. ***Elements of innovation with respect to the regional state of the art or adopted policies***
 | *[500 characters] Why is this practice considered innovative? Please provide factual evidence that demonstrates its innovation with respect to the regional state of the art.*  |
| 1. ***Time scale for the implementation of the GP***
 | *e.g. June 2012 – May 2014/ongoing*  |
| 1. ***Financial resources used for implementing the GP and amount of the allocated funds***
 |  *[500 characters] Supply information on the financial resources used for the development and implementation of the GP. If possible supply a breakdown of the cost by phases (design development implementation etcetera) and, if possible by main operating body* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 4 Results achieved and problems encountered**  |
| 1. ***Results achieved by the implementation of the GP (particularly in relation to the stated objectives)***
 | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:** *Describe the stated objectives of the AP*
* *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?*
* *Relevant results*
 |
| 1. ***Other possible effects recorded (especially the unexpected ones)***
 | *[300 characters] Please specify any other recorded effects (if any).* |
| 1. ***Identification of evaluation indicators***
 | *[1000 characters]* ***(****they can also be very different from case to case, quantitative or qualitative, direct or indirect, and relate to specific aspects of GP but must in any case related to the elements considered successful)* |
| 1. ***Specific mechanism for monitoring the GP results eventually implemented/designed. If existent, describe it and the most important indicators and methods adopted***
 | *[1000 characters] Please indicate if a monitoring process has been foreseen/implemented and indicate the methodology adopted and parameters to be monitored* |
| 1. ***Main problems encountered in implementing and description of the measures taken to overcome them***
 | *[1000 characters]* |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 5 Analysis of transferability** |
| 1. ***Prerequisites for the adoption / implementation of the GP;***
 | *[1000 characters] Please explain i there are specific elements or conditions that must be present to allow the implementation of the GP* |
| 1. ***Any significant element of impediment to the adoption / implementation of the GP;***
 | *[500 characters]*  |
| 1. ***Portability or transferability of the GP items among the REFORM Partners or to other European Regions.***
 | *[1000 characters] Describe if the GP can be considered portable or transferrable to the partner Regions, identifying the main elements that should be revised/adapted.*  |
| 1. ***Resources necessary for the development and / or implementation (financial, technical and professional and so on);***
 | *[1000 characters] Give a qualitative or quantitative descriptions of the resources not only from the financial point of view, but also regarding elements such as norms, professional skills, instrumentation, software packages, laboratories, etc.*  |

INTERREG Good Practice template

* All Good Practices identified by an Interreg Europe project and reported in the progress reports have to be submitted to the Programme.
* In order to submit a practice, you will have to register in the Interreg Europe website. Online submission will be available the first semester of 2017.
* NB: in green: 2 optional fields. All other fields are compulsory.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **General information**
 |
| **Title of the practice** | *[100 characters]* |
| **Does this practice come from an Interreg Europe Project** | *Yes or no**[Technical: Good Practices outside the IR-E projects relevant to the topics and validated by the Policy Learning Platforms experts will also be included in the database]* |

In case ‘yes’ is selected, the following sections appear:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Please select the project acronym*** | *Drop down menu with all acronyms* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specific objective** | *Drop-down list of the 6 specific objectives* *[Technical:* *In case a project is selected, the specific objective is automatically completed]* |
| **Main institution involved** | *[Technical: The name of the institution and location of the practice are per default those of the practice author. They remain editable.]* |
| **Location of the practice** | Country | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 1 | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 2 | *Drop-down list* |
| NUTS 3 | *Drop-down list* |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Detailed description**
 |
| **Detailed information on the practice** | *[1500 characters] Please provide information on the practice itself. In particular:** *What is the problem addressed and the context which triggered the introduction of the practice?*
* *How does the practice reach its objectives and how it is implemented?*
* *Who are the main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the practice?*
 |
| **Resources needed** | *[300 characters] Please specify the amount of funding/financial resources used and/or the human resources required to set up and to run the practice.* |
| **Timescale (start/end date)** | *e.g. June 2012 – May 2014/ongoing*  |
| **Evidence of success (results achieved)** | *[500 characters] Why is this practice considered as good? Please provide factual evidence that demonstrates its success or failure (e.g. measurable outputs/results).* |
| **Difficulties encountered/ lessons learned** | *[300 characters] Please specify any difficulties encountered/lessons learned during the implementation of the practice.* |
| **Potential for learning or transfer** | *[1000 characters] Please explain why you consider this practice (or some aspects of this practice) as being potentially interesting for other regions to learn from. This can be done e.g. through information on key success factors for a transfer or on, factors that can hamper a transfer. Information on transfer(s) that already took place can also be provided (if possible, specify the country, the region – NUTS 2 – and organisation to which the practice was transferred)**[Technical: A good practice be edited throughout a project life time (e.g. to add information on the transfers that have occurred)]* |
| **Further information** | *Link to where further information on the good practice can be found* |
| **Contact details** *[Technical: the contact details will be visible only to “Policy Learning Platforms registered members”* |
| **Name** |  |
| **Organisation** |  |
| **Email** |  |
|  |
| **Expert opinion**  | *[500 characters] [****Technical: to be filled in by the Policy Learning Platforms experts****]* |

# REFORM Partners









REFORM Contact

**REFORM Coordinator:**

CERTH

Centre for Research & Technology Hellas

Maria Morfoulaki marmor@certh.gr

**Communication:**

 [www.interregeurope.eu/reform](http://www.interregeurope.eu/reform)

 **@InterregREFORM**

 **@InterregREFORM**

 **REFORM group**