



# FROM GAPS TO CAPS

## Risk Management Capability Based on Gaps Identification in the BSR

### TECHNICAL REPORT

January 2017

(Covers 01/01/2015-31/12/2016 period)

Vilnius, Lithuania

### Table of contents

1. General reminder of project objectives, partnership and expected deliverables.....	2
2. General summary of project implementation process.....	2
2.1. General overview of the process.....	2
2.2. Comparative analysis of the process.....	3
3. Evaluation of project management/implementation process.....	6
3.1. Positive aspects / opportunities.....	6
3.2. Internal and external difficulties encountered.....	6
3.4. Cooperation with the Commission.....	6
3.3. Partnership/core group cooperation (as appropriate).....	7
3.5. Comments on European value added.....	7
3.6. Lessons learnt and possible improvements.....	7
4. Activities.....	7
5. Presentation of the technical results and deliverables.....	23
5.1. The BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments, a first approach.....	23
5.2. Possible future opportunities for risk and capability assessments in the BSR.....	23
5.3. Recommendations and Best Practices in case of emergencies and exercises.....	23
6. Evaluation of the technical results and deliverables.....	24
6.1. General lessons learnt.....	24
6.2. Strengths.....	25
6.3 Possible challenges and/or improvements to be tackled through further action.....	26
6.4. Recommendations to stakeholders, partners, authorities in charge, National and EU institutions.....	26
7. Follow-up.....	26

## **1. General reminder of project objectives, partnership and expected deliverables**

From Gaps to Caps started as a follow-up project of 14.3 in January 2015. The purpose of the project was to build knowledge on disaster risk management capability assessments and to develop a more common understanding of such assessments at national level in the BSR. The main objective of the project was to facilitate future national assessments of risk management capability in accordance with the EU Decision on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism among the participating countries. It consisted of two concrete objectives:

1. To disseminate findings on actual disaster risk management capability and ways forward in assessing and improving such capability from a macro-regional and European perspective among key decision-makers of civil protection in the Baltic Sea countries.
2. To produce a publication on ideas for future national assessments of risk management capability in the BSR.

By the Project these expected results were achieved:

1. Enhanced capabilities of participating states for preparing and reviewing national capability assessments as well as national risk assessments for prevention.
2. Increased comparability between future national capability assessments around the BSR through the development of common frameworks and terminology for prevention.
3. Enhanced awareness of cross-border hazards among agencies responsible for national risk assessments and capability assessments in the BSR.
4. Enhanced awareness and understanding among the BSR states for the cross-border needs in case of complex emergencies.
5. Enhanced preparedness among participating states for responding to complex emergencies.

The project was split into four tasks. Task A, covering project management and reporting, was entrusted to the Fire and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania. Task B was dedicated to the publicity of the project and was conducted by the Communications Unit of the Council of the Baltic Sea States. Task C, led by the University of Iceland, dealt with Risk Management Capability Assessment Methodology and Task D consisting of the Comparison of Evaluations of Emergencies and Exercises lied with the responsibility of the Hamburg Fire & Rescue Service. Other project partners were Frederiksborg Fire & Rescue Service (Denmark), Estonian Rescue Board, Ministry of the Interior of Finland, State Fire and Rescue Service of Latvia, Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB), Main School of Fire Service in Warsaw and Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB).

## **2. General summary of project implementation process**

### **2.1. General overview of the process**

Project activities implemented have not significantly deviated from the initial schedule. Seminar No. 3, Final Seminar and the Final Conference were transferred within two weeks period in order to avoid absence of participants due to holiday period. Concerning the new dates of the events, submission of the reports was also subsequent. Furthermore, with the agreement of the Commission Seminar No. 3 included the workshop of Task C not only Task D as was initially planned. Additional Seminar of the Task C contributed to achieving expected project results within the project period. Concerning the project

publicity activities, the launch of the website, scheduled during months 1 – 3 has been postponed to a later stage of the project.

## 2.2. Comparative analysis of the process

Initial and actual time schedule			
No.	Action	Initial date	Actual date
1.	<b>Action A.1:</b> Participation in the compulsory kick-off meeting in Brussels for approved projects	1 <sup>st</sup> month (expected)	19-20 January, 2015 (1 <sup>st</sup> month)
2.	<b>Action A.2:</b> Concluding formalities between the Coordinator and the Beneficiaries	1 <sup>st</sup> month	27 February 2015 - 9 April 2015 (4 <sup>th</sup> month)
3.	<b>Action A.3:</b> Kick-off conference of the Project	3 <sup>rd</sup> month	24-25 March, 2015 (3 <sup>rd</sup> month)
4.	<b>Action A.4:</b> First progress report	6 <sup>th</sup> month	30 November, 2015 (11 <sup>th</sup> month)
5.	<b>Action A.5:</b> Mid-term review report	12 <sup>th</sup> month	/
6.	<b>Action A.6:</b> Second progress report	18 <sup>th</sup> month	29 July, 2016 (19 <sup>th</sup> month)
7.	<b>Action A.7:</b> Participation in the second compulsory project meeting in Brussels	Commission decides	/
8.	<b>Action A.8:</b> Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	22 <sup>nd</sup> month	15-16 November, 2016 (23 <sup>rd</sup> month)
9.	<b>Action A.9:</b> (Post-project) reporting on the Project to the Commission	Within three months of the project end	
10.	<b>Action B.1</b> Preparing a tailored communications strategy for the project.	1 <sup>st</sup> month	Presenting the communications strategy at the kick-off meeting 24-25.3.2015 (3 <sup>rd</sup> month)
11.	<b>Action B.2</b> Preparing a website and other new media channels for the project, based on project visual identity	1 <sup>st</sup> - 2 <sup>nd</sup> month	Launch Facebook page (@GapstoCaps): 1.1.2015 (2 <sup>nd</sup> month)
12.	<b>Action B.3</b> Launch of website for the kick off conference of the EUSBSR Flagship Project From Gaps to Caps as well as ensuring publicity of the event.	1 <sup>st</sup> - 3 <sup>rd</sup> month	16 November 2015 (11 <sup>th</sup> month)
13.	<b>Action B.4</b> Preparing material for and ensuring visibility at the high-level political events in 2015.	1 <sup>st</sup> - 13 <sup>th</sup> month	2 <sup>nd</sup> - 13 <sup>th</sup> month
14.	<b>Action B.5</b> Preparing material and actions for the project's participation at EUSBSR events and other EU Civil Protection Mechanism gatherings.	1 <sup>st</sup> - 20 <sup>th</sup> month	2 <sup>nd</sup> - 20 <sup>th</sup> month
15.	<b>Action B.6</b> Ongoing documentation of project activities and ensuring communication throughout the whole project.	1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month	2 <sup>nd</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month
16.	<b>Action B.7</b> Coordination and information exchange with associate partners about the developments of the project.	1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month	1 <sup>st</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month
17.	<b>Action B.8</b> Preparing material for and ensuring visibility at the high-level political events in 2016.	13 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month	13 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month
18.	<b>Action B.9</b> Preparing for the final conference of the EUSBSR Flagship Project From Gaps to Caps.	20 <sup>th</sup> - 22 <sup>nd</sup> month	20 <sup>th</sup> - 22 <sup>nd</sup> month
19.	<b>Action B.10</b> Editing, layout, publishing and disseminating the publication on ideas for future national assessments of risk	20 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month	20 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month

	management capability in the Baltic Sea Region.		
20.	<b>Action B.11</b> Preparing a publicity strategy for the post-project phase, including the potential restructuring of the project website into a database.	21 <sup>st</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month and beyond	20 <sup>th</sup> - 24 <sup>th</sup> month
21.	<b>Action B.12</b> Compile final beneficiary report.	Within three months of project end	/
22.	<b>Action C.1:</b> Task C kick off	3 <sup>rd</sup> month	24-25 March, 2015 (3 <sup>rd</sup> month)
23.	<b>Action C.2:</b> Preparation and dissemination of questionnaire on capability assessments in BSR	4 <sup>th</sup> month	April, 2015
24.	<b>Action C.3:</b> Seminar No. 1 on National Risk Management Capability Assessments and Guidelines/ Indicators	5 <sup>th</sup> month	18-20 May, 2015 (5 <sup>th</sup> month)
25.	<b>Action C.4:</b> Preparation a draft report on national capability (and risk) assessments and related challenges in the BSR	3 <sup>rd</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup> month	First draft September, 2015 Final report November, 2016
26.	<b>Action C.5:</b> Seminar No. 2 on National Capability (and Risk) Assessments – Challenges and Opportunities - in the BSR	11 <sup>th</sup> month	9-11 November, 2015 (11 <sup>th</sup> month)
27.	<b>Action C.6:</b> Final Seminar of Task C and Task D	20 <sup>th</sup> month	14-15 September, 2016 (21 <sup>st</sup> month)
28.	<b>Action C.7:</b> Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	22 <sup>nd</sup> month	15-16 November, 2016 (23 <sup>rd</sup> month)
29.	<b>Action D.1:</b> Task D kick off meeting	3 <sup>rd</sup> month	24-25 March, 2015 (3 <sup>rd</sup> month)
30.	<b>Action D.2:</b> Seminar No. 1 on defining criteria for evaluation reports	5 <sup>th</sup> month	18-20 May, 2015 (5 <sup>th</sup> month)
31.	<b>Action D.3:</b> Comparing evaluations of emergencies and exercises	5 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> month	1 May - 31 October, 2015 (6 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> month)
32.	<b>Action D.4:</b> Seminar No. 2 on gathering the evaluations of the partners	11 <sup>th</sup> month	9-11 November, 2015 (11 <sup>th</sup> month)
33.	<b>Action D.5:</b> Seminar No. 3 on compilation of the final document of Task D	18 <sup>th</sup> month	27-29 June, 2016 (19 <sup>th</sup> month)
34.	<b>Action D.6:</b> Final Seminar of Task C and Task D	20 <sup>th</sup> month	14-15 September, 2016 (21 <sup>st</sup> month)
35.	<b>Action D.7:</b> Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	22 <sup>nd</sup> month	15-16 November, 2016 (23 <sup>rd</sup> month)

Planned and used resources			
No.	Cost category	Planned resources	Used resources
1.	Personnel	258 793	271 088,18
2.	Travel and subsistence	169 176	98 907,97
3.	Equipment	1 200	1 420,53
4.	Sub-contracting / External assistance	120 865	23 589,26
5.	Other direct costs	40 300	31 011,84
6.	Indirect costs / overheads	41 323	28 991,14

Due to the fact that Project development was more difficult than it was expected (experts spent more hours on the project as it was foreseen), some of the beneficiaries (University of Iceland, Hamburg Fire & Rescue Service, Frederiksborg Fire & Rescue Service, Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency) have redistributed costs from budget line "travel and other subsistence" to "personnel" budget line. As it was mentioned before, Coordinator has redistributed

3500,00 Eur from its “sub-contracting” budget line to Hamburg Fire & Rescue Service “other direct costs” budget line for the organization of the additional Task C Seminar. Moreover, State Fire and Rescue Service of Latvia transferred 827,38 Eur from budget line “travel and subsistence” to “other direct costs” budget line due to organizational expenses of the First Project Seminar.

It should be noted that exchange rate used in the Final financial statement was made according to the first day of the project 01/01/2015 as it is stated in the official EC website ([http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts\\_grants/info\\_contracts/infoeuro/index\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts_grants/info_contracts/infoeuro/index_en.cfm))

The Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning has exceeded project budget costs because more people were involved in the project when it was planned during the project application process. However, the institution did not ask for its’ budget amendment during the project implementation period despite the fact that all beneficiaries were periodically contacted by the CO to examine the need of the budget redistribution. So, CO has included all the personnel costs of The Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning in the Form \_05 (Personnel costs) of the Final Financial Statement but the overfulfilment of these costs were not included in the Participant Cost Statement Summary. The Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning has agreed not to receive all the actual costs occurred during the project and to receive the amount indicated in the GA.

Expected and actual results		
No.	Expected results	Actual results
1.	<b>Enhanced capabilities of participating states for preparing and reviewing national capability assessments as well as national risk assessments for prevention</b>	During the Project participating organizations has presented existing approach to preparing national capability assessments. Methodologies for assessing capability applied in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have been analysed. Attention has been paid for examining national capability assessment developed by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency.
2.	<b>Increased comparability between future national capability assessments around the BSR through the development of common frameworks and terminology for prevention</b>	The significant amount of time was designated to identify what are the main needs that project participating organizations relate to the risk management capability assessment. During this process project members reached the agreement about the common terminology (capability vs capacity and etc).  Differences and similarities between methodologies used in BSR as well as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands were identified. New risk management capability assessment methodology was developed by the project partners. The new methodology developed is user-friendly, universal and connecting practice of real event (emergencies and exercises) experience. The methodology was translated into the national languages of the project participants.
3.	<b>Enhanced awareness of cross-border hazards among agencies responsible for national risk assessments and capability assessments in the BSR</b>	The survey identifying which emergency on the opinion of the project participating experts is the most relevant for the Project participating organizations was circulated. The results of the Questionnaire revealed that storm weather and floods are topical among BSR countries.
4.	<b>Enhanced awareness and understanding among the BSR states for the cross-border needs in case of complex emergencies</b>	Development of templates based on common criterion to evaluate experience of emergencies and exercises among BSR countries. Comparison of the templates assisted to stress the similarities, differences, best practise and gaps between the countries while evaluating the following dimensions of the emergencies’ and exercises’ experience: knowledge and competence; resources; communication; cooperation; management / leadership.

		The methodology developed within the project is based on evaluating actual countries' experience of emergency management.
5.	<b>Enhanced preparedness among participating states for responding to complex emergencies.</b>	All of the above mentioned actual results achieved contribute to the enhanced preparedness among participating states for responding to complex emergencies.

### **3. Evaluation of project management/implementation process**

#### **3.1. Positive aspects/opportunities**

It can be stated that the fluent project management process was assured. CO has constantly communicated with the Task Leaders and the Core Group. Task Leaders and CO updated project participants with the project related information. In order to maintain participants' involvement into the project, participants were informed about the future tasks, responsibilities and events during the gap periods. CO tried to maintain high response rates when being inquired about all project related questions. In its turn, CO periodically asked participating organizations to evaluate their present and possible budgetary needs, their satisfaction with the project implementation process. Second, active involvement and contribution of the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency should be highlighted. Representatives of the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency take up the responsibility to monitor one of the project workshops.

It can be claimed that CO and the Task Leaders managed to receive the necessary information from the participants without the considerable delay and implement tasks according to the work plan approved. CO paid significant attention to assure the transparency of the project management: important project related decisions were made with the consultation of the participants; all the project reports were circulated; changes between the budget lines were made with the knowledge of the participants.

#### **3.2. Internal and external difficulties encountered**

During the project implementation process a few difficulties were faced and solved without causing any consequences to quality and schedule of the project. First of all, additional seminar for Task C was needed to fulfil the aim of the task more comprehensively. With the agreement of Commission additional seminar was organized on 27-29 June 2016 together with the third Task D seminar. Furthermore, about a half of the initial project personnel had changed including the personnel of the CO. The rapid change of project participants had caused some difficulties in information sharing and maintenance of the project consistency, it induced slower involvement into the project than it was expected. It could be added that high number of project participating organizations slightly complicated project management process. Third, implementation of the Task C required more engagement when it was planned. The challenge was solved by dividing some of the responsibilities among participating countries. This decision stimulated more active participants' engagement into the project. However, it required more time for the experts to assign to the project and resulted in higher personnel costs.

#### **3.3. Cooperation with the Commission**

During the first months of the project intense cooperation with the Commission concerning changes in the project personnel, possible financial amendments, eligible costs, publicity related questions had been proceeded. Also, three requests for amendment of the grant agreement due to the alteration of the bank account of the Fire and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania, the change of coordinator of the Project for the communication with the Commission and the change of the name of the one project beneficiary were asked. Also, Commission had approved the CO request to organize additional seminar of the Task C.

### **3.4. Partnership/core group cooperation (as appropriate)**

Cooperation between beneficiaries and coordinator was based on the constant communication via e-mails in order to maintain full project viability. Core group was contacted to request their evaluation of project activities and work of coordinator in order to improve project management process. However, most of the important questions were discussed during the meetings with all project participants.

### **3.5. Comments on European value added**

Cooperation between countries in the area of civil protection is particularly relevant now due to the escalating disasters caused by the climate change. It can be stated that this project demonstrates the successful example of collaboration whose aim is to enhance preparedness among states for responding to various emergencies. Project results contribute the priorities of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and integrate well into the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030. Also, the project managed to sufficiently continue work carried out in the previous European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region flagship project 14.3 Macro-regional risk scenarios.

### **3.6. Lessons learnt and possible improvements**

A few lessons were learnt during the implementation of the project. First of all, a project is more successful when it involves representatives from different (level) institutions because it enables to tackle the issue from different perspectives, however the optimal amount of the participant organizations should be maintained. Moreover, in case of various level experts' participating the common terminology and goal should be clearly introduced in the project. Secondly, established networks between the experts stimulate further cooperation towards a common goal and sharing of experience also in other than project related area. However, appropriate communication channels should be chosen as well as great attention and time spend for communication should be assured. Thirdly, in the Baltic Sea region project format common challenges and ways for improvement were identified and resulted in a joint "Baltic Region Spirit" meaning that all the participating countries felt responsible to achieve and further develop quality results.

Future project coordinators could be advised while planning the project budget to evaluate a real need of the funds and not to include all conceivable expenditures that might at a very low possibility occur during the project. Furthermore, participating organizations should feel responsible to hand out project related tasks and information properly in case of the change in the personnel.

## **4. Activities**

No.	Activity	Comparison between initially planned and actually implemented activities, including monitoring, evaluation and dissemination
A.1	Participation in the compulsory Kick-off meeting for approved projects in Brussels (19-20 January 2015)	<p><b>Description:</b> the compulsory Kick-off/information meeting was organised by the Commission in Brussels for the Coordinating Beneficiaries of approved projects.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> presenting the project to the Commission and other approved projects with a goal of creating synergy and coordination. Clear understanding of the administrative and financial rules related to the Project, to be forwarded to all associated beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the participation in the meeting provided important knowledge on project management rules and practice. Afterwards, relevant information was forwarded to all Beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> after the meeting relevant information was forwarded to all Beneficiaries. Main aspects of administrative and financial rules were presented to stakeholders during the Kick-off meeting.</p>
A.2	Concluding formalities between the Coordinating Beneficiary and the Associated Beneficiaries	<p><b>Description:</b> a partnership agreement following the guidelines from the Commission and fully compatible with the Grant Agreement between Coordinating Beneficiary and the Commission was concluded with each partner. Beneficiaries were informed about the administrative-financial rules of the Project and the payments to them were transferred.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> formal legal basis and good administrative-financial order.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> draft Cooperation Agreements were amended according to the comments of the project partners and signed. Payments were transferred to Associated Beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> Cooperation Agreements were disseminated to all participating institutions. Signed Agreements were provided to the Commission.</p>
A.3	Kick-off conference of the Project	<p><b>Description:</b> a 2-day Kick-off conference was organized in Iceland. The first day of the conference focused on general information on the project and its partners. Beside representatives of all partner organisations and some important stakeholders (especially relevant CBSS Expert Networks and Strategic Partners), it was also attended by the Icelandic member of the CBSS Committee of Senior Officials, Mr Guðmundur Árni Stefánsson. During the meeting, participants were provided with the necessary information on project management and all open questions were clarified.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> a clear demonstration of the political salience of the Project. First wider gathering of the practical implementators of the Project after the Project start.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> project was successfully initiated by providing participants with the necessary information on project management; all dubious aspects were clarified by answering the questions.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> information presented during Kick-off meeting was disseminated to all the participants and also was shared on the website to be available for other stakeholders.</p>
A.4	First progress report	<p><b>Description:</b> the compulsory first progress report was drafted and amended according to the comments of task leaders and the core group. After that the report was submitted to the Commission.</p>



		<p><b>Purpose:</b> identification of possible problems in implementing the project plan and schedule, implementation of corrections where needed.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> preparation of the report allowed evaluating the pros and cons of the project implementation and also gathering partners' opinion about possible improvements.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> prepared progress report was disseminated to project partners.</p>
A.5	Mid-term review report	<p><b>Description:</b> detailed evaluation report should have been prepared and consist a part of the Project's final report. The report should have been submitted to the Commission.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> clear understanding of the status of the Project in terms of its wider societal impact in the macroregional context.</p> <p><b>Evaluation:</b> the draft of the evaluation report was prepared but it was not submitted to EC. The period after the second seminar until the submission of the second progress report was very intense in reaching great progress in task implementation which was difficult to divide into separate stages and report about them. On the basis of the part of draft mid-term review report the second progress report was prepared in order to avoid the repetition of information. Also, the content part of the project is constantly updated in the draft Task C report.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> prepared draft and final second progress report was disseminated to project partners.</p>
A.6	Second progress report	<p><b>Description:</b> The compulsory second progress was prepared and submitted to the Commission.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Possible problems in implementing the project plan and schedule were identified. Also, activities that must be implemented during the last six months were identified.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> preparation of the report allowed evaluating the pros and cons of the project implementation and also gathering partners' opinion about possible improvements.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> prepared progress report was disseminated to project partners.</p>
A.7	Participation in the second compulsory project meeting in Brussels	/
A.8	Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	<p><b>Description:</b> the Final Conference of the project was arranged in Stockholm focusing on discussions of the final reports of each Task and the way forward within the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region framework. Also, during the Final Conference the coordination of the compilation of the final report as well as the production and dissemination of the project outcomes were discussed.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Final report produced and the result discussed. Framing of the next steps in this field.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> all the expected topics were covered during the</p>

		<p>event.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> to the Final Conference high level guests were invited - Icelandic Chairman of the CBSS Committee of Senior Officials H. E. Ambassador Guðmundur Árni Stefánsson, Director General of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Secretariat H. E. Ambassador Maira Mora and Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), PA Secure Coordinator EUSBSR, Strategic Adviser on EU and International Issues Julia Fredriksson. Also, all the Final Conference related information was placed on the project's official website.</p>
A.9	(Post-project) reporting on the Project to the Commission	<p><b>Description:</b> Following the contract guidelines, post-project reporting to the Commission follows the relevant guidelines. It includes transferring the final payments to the Beneficiaries after receiving the last payments.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Formal conclusion of the project with the Commission and the Beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> in progress</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> /</p>
B.1	Preparing a tailored communications strategy for the project	<p><b>Description:</b> A tailored communication strategy for the project, taking into account the projects internal communication, as well as external communication with non-project stakeholders was prepared. This included high-level political visibility, synergies with the EUSBSR framework; related expert networks and visibility outside the Baltic Sea macro-region. Also, an information exchange process with associated partners in order to maximise visibility of the project was defined.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Preparation of a communication timeline and the creation of a visual identity.</p> <p><b>Evaluation:</b> With some timeline adjustments according to the changing dynamics and re-formulations in the project processes, the prepared communication strategy has provided a structured timeline for the various communication outputs and processes. The creation of the visual identity has occurred in line with the project's schedule and was set up before the Kick-Off Meeting in Reykjavik, March 2015, giving the other project partners the opportunity to familiarise themselves with the visuals and to use them in their presentations and material. The Branding the project remains in its context of PA Secure and previously achieved work on risk management capability, in line with DG ECHO financing. Therefore, the project logos are visually connected with the Gaps to Caps predecessor project 14.3. Each task has differently coloured logos in order to distinguish between the methodological and the comparative/case-study aspects of the project. The main project logo is black, Task C has an orange disc and Task D is coloured with green.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> The memorability of the ring-design used in the From Gaps to Caps visual identity and other PA Secure projects involving risk management capability assessment, allows ongoing activities in this field to be accomplished by strong branding. The cooperation in the field of Civil Security within the EU and third countries therefore has the potential for high recognition.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> The visual identity is in constant use by all project partners. It has been applied through the projects online presence and other</p>

		material.
<b>B.2</b>	Preparing a website and other new media channels for the project, based on project visual identity	<p><b>Description:</b> A website and other new media channels for the project, based on project visual identity, were prepared and ongoing documentation of project activities as well as ongoing communication throughout the whole project has been carrying out.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To make the project visible to the public and to portray its rather abstract and technical content in an accessible way.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> Next to the official project website (<a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu">www.gapstocaps.eu</a> Annex 8), the project is also featured in a separate section under the menu item “Flagship” on the EUSBSR PA Secure website, where general updates from the meetings in Riga and Reykjavik have been published. More images have been shared on the PA Secure Flickr account. The PA Secure Twitter has also been used to regularly post updates on the project meetings. The CBSS website features Gaps to Caps in two sections, one under its long-term priority Safe and Secure Region and another under EUSBSR Strategies. Thirdly, the Kick-off was reported on with a front-page slide in April 2015 to highlight the beginning of the project.</p> <p>The project’s website has been professionally designed with a subcontracted web-designer. It is available online under the domain <a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu">www.gapstocaps.eu</a> as of 9 November 2015. The website was launched with an overview presentation at the 2<sup>nd</sup> project seminar in Tallinn, in November 2015.</p> <p>Furthermore, the use of different social media channels allows the ongoing documentation of the project to be ensured and displayed in a public space. The project has its own Facebook page (<a href="http://www.facebook.com/GapstoCaps">www.facebook.com/GapstoCaps</a>), which features the visual identity and is updated regularly, and will become even more crucial in the dissemination of the project results. The project is also communicated through the EUSBSR PA Secure Facebook (@bsrSecure), the CBSS Facebook (@cbsspage) and the partner organisation social media channels.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> Public access to the project processes, its partners and their activities, highlights the transparency of the EU-Civil Protection Financial Instrument and its commitment to funding projects with public interest. In the long run the data will help to form a common approach in risk-reduction in the region, increase the response pace and overall make the region safer.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> The use of various platforms instead of only a project website increases the project outreach and targets a wide-spread audience. The different channels that Gaps to Caps has been communicated through, have ensured ongoing documentation and public display of the project.</p>
<b>B.3</b>	Launch of website for the kick off conference of the EUSBSR Flagship Project From Gaps to Caps as well as ensuring publicity of the event	With the launch of the specific project website being postponed to a later stage of the research part of the Task C and D, the Publicity Task team ensured the online visibility through its already established and largely followed platforms during the kick-off conference in Reykjavik. A project leaflet was designed with the new Gaps to Caps visual identity, together with social media updates from the meeting, as well as post-event communication through the CBSS website and the EUSBSR PA Secure Flickr account.
<b>B.4</b>	Preparing material for	<b>Description:</b> Several initiatives were undertaken to ensure the visibility of

	<p>and ensuring visibility at the high-level political events in 2015</p>	<p>the Gaps to Caps project at high-level events in 2015.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b></p> <p>A project-leaflet was designed in March and disseminated amongst the project partners at the kick-off meeting in Reykjavik in March, 2015. The purpose of the leaflet is to give an overview of the project, the different tasks and methods on how to approach them. It has served as one of the main tool to explain the project and its findings to other stakeholders and the public.</p> <p>Project representation at the European Communication Summit in Brussels, June 2015.</p> <p>Project visibility at the Annual Meeting of Directors General for Civil Protection of the Baltic Sea States 2-3 June 2015, Tallinn.</p> <p>Representation at the 3rd CBSS Committee of Senior Officials Meeting under the Estonian Presidency in Tallinn on 3-4 February 2015.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> the leaflet gives a short, precise and relevant finding of the project in a concise manner that makes it accessible to readers who are not from the field of civil protection. It is a tool during networking activities to ensure wider-spread knowledge and visibility of the project.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the leaflet has been disseminated between the project partners and other relevant stakeholders, as well as at the above-mentioned events and is available on the CBSS own in-house information stand.</p>
<p><b>B.5</b></p>	<p>Preparing material and actions for the project's participation at EUSBSR events and other EU Civil Protection Mechanism gatherings</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Preparation of materials and actions for the project's participation at EUSBSR events and other EU Civil Protection Mechanism gatherings have been prepared. (See visual appendix for the specific items)</p> <p>The project has been visible at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3rd meeting of the Committee of Senior Officials of the CBSS Estonian Presidency in Tallinn;</li> <li>- Input was provided to the CO for the inter-service consultations in May 2015, on the revised Action Plan, where Gaps to Caps now represents a flagship of the renewed Policy Area Secure.</li> <li>- The EUSBSR Annual Forum in Jurmala 15-16 June 2015;</li> <li>- Baltic Leadership Programme for on Civil Security Future Decision Makers, 23-26 November 2015;</li> <li>- EUSBSR PA Secure Steering Committee Meetings (2 June 2015 Tallinn &amp; 13 May 2016 Krakow) &amp; other meetings initiated by Policy Area Secure;</li> <li>- Meetings of the Director Generals of Civil Protection (2-3 June 2015 &amp; 8-9 June 2016 in Gdansk);</li> <li>- The EUSBSR Annual Forum in Stockholm, 8-9 November 2016: joint seminar with HA Climate "Financing Climate Action".</li> </ul> <p><b>Purpose:</b> ensuring the visibility of the project</p>

**Qualitative evaluation:** The project and its visual identity, has been presented on several regional platforms and meetings throughout the project duration.

On 3-4 February 2015, the 3rd meeting of the Committee of Senior Officials of the CBSS Estonian Presidency in Tallinn was held back to back with a roundtable on the Council's long term-priority Safe and Secure Region. The PA Secure Coordinators presented ongoing work and advertised the upcoming kick-off of Gaps to Caps during this meeting. The Annual Report of the Estonian Presidency (launched in August 2015) includes an 8-page section on the Policy Area Secure in which the Gaps to Caps project is described in detail and connected to its contribution to the EUSBSR action plan. The CBSS Polish Presidency Annual Report, (launched in August 2016) also included an overview of the Gaps to Caps project activities.

In June, during the 6th annual Forum of the EUSBSR in Jurmala, the CBSS Communication Unit has made sure that the From Gaps to Caps leaflet provided visitors with first impression of the project and its participating countries and partners. Throughout the event, members of the CBSS Communication Unit, as well as the CBSS Secretariat's Senior Adviser on Safe and Secure Region, were present to respond to questions and general interest about the project.

The Baltic Leadership Programme (BLP) in PA Secure (2015) was financed by the Swedish Institute (SI), and organised and developed in partnership with MSB, CRISMART and the CBSS, the latter in their capacity as Policy Area Coordinators for PA Secure. The BLP constitutes a unique platform of knowledge and competencies enhancement among future decision-makers from the Baltic Sea Region countries which in turn are also important influencers and stakeholders also on the European level, working for the civil protection and public order.

The presentations of the project, held during the second Steering Committee Meeting of PA Secure as well as at the 13th Meeting of Directors General of Civil Protection, were supported by branded Power Point slides created by the Task B team.

The joint workshop with HA Climate at the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Forum created synergies between the Policy Area and the Horizontal Action Climate. The workshop underlined the strong links between climate and security and aimed at addressing the complexity of challenges in the BSR – and beyond – and invited 50 national, regional and local level policy makers to discuss and find macro-regional and EU-wide solutions to common problems.

**Value-added:** The representation of Gaps to Caps at high-level events has not only allowed the partners to present their work but also to create a discussion about potential collaboration and the ways to use and share the results that have evolved from the project. Through the previous project 14.3, actors and policymaker in the field of Civil Protection in the Baltic Sea Region are familiar with the concept behind Gaps to Caps. The fact that the work on assessment of risk management capability has continued reflects positively on all partners, including the EU Civil Protection Financial Instrument that the work is continuing.

**Dissemination:** The Director Generals of Civil Protection Meetings in Tallinn and Krakow gathered over 30 high-level decision makers from most countries of the BSR region and it was highly beneficial to familiarise this

		<p>audience with the project and its visual identity. The second Baltic Leadership Programme for Future Decision makers in 2015 gathered around 30 Civil Protection professionals from the 11 CBSS member states. The EUSBSR Forum in Jurmala was attended by over 600 participants from more than 12 countries and the EUSBSR Annual Forum in Stockholm in November 2016 was attended by more than 1000 people.</p>
B.6	<p>Ongoing documentation of project activities and ensuring communication throughout the whole project</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> The purpose of this task has been to document the activities of the project as such, from an overall project (rather than only one expert field) position. This has included photographic documentation, updates and posts directly from the project meetings, as well as post-event online follow-ups describing the state of play in the project.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The documentation has focused on external communication and aimed to give an outside viewer a visual glimpse into the various project activities and meet-ups, as well as to provide a short contextual overview of the status of the project along the various stages. This has been aimed at increasing interest in the project and its future outcomes for the Baltic Sea Region.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> All the seminars and conferences have been documented photographically and written about in posts on the EUSBSR Policy Area Secure website <a href="http://www.bsr-secure.eu">www.bsr-secure.eu</a>, the <a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu">www.gapstocaps.eu</a> website and the CBSS homepage (<a href="http://www.cbss.org">www.cbss.org</a>). The project was moreover several times presented and introduced at various meetings (listed under 2.b.i).</p> <p>A project poster has been designed and displayed at the premises of the CBSS Secretariat. Communication from all the meetings was also ensured via social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, Flickr).</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> All the pictures of the meetings, seminars and conferences are publicly available on the PA Secure Flickr account (<a href="https://www.flickr.com/photos/bsrsecure">flickr.com/photos/bsrsecure</a>) as well as on the webpage: <a href="http://gapstocaps.eu">gapstocaps.eu</a> and therefore accessible to a wide range of people. The CBSS homepage, directing visitors to the Gaps to Caps platform, has a monthly page visitor count of 8000 people. The poster shown at the CBSS Secretariat premises is visible to every visitor and available for download at <a href="http://gapstocaps.eu">gapstocaps.eu</a>. In the last two years the CBSS has hosted several hundred conference and meeting participants, including high-level government representatives and relevant civil protection stakeholders.</p>
B.7	<p>Coordination and information exchange with associate partners about the developments of the project</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Coordinating information dissemination with and to associate partners, in order to ensure project visibility and promotion on the BSR level and on the level beyond regional civil protection cooperation; coordinating communication and publicity activities/suggesting joint communication activities with EUSBSR stakeholders in order to increase visibility of impact of macro-regional civil protection cooperation in the EU.</p> <p>An internal site (password-locked) was also created on <a href="http://gapstocaps.eu">gapstocaps.eu</a> in order to provide all the partners with the access to information and updates e.g. powerpoint presentations held during the seminars and conferences; as well as access to the publicity material (Visual Identity guidelines, material to download).</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Constant and smooth communication allows for feedback from (external) European experts and delegates and input from associated partners. In addition, good coordination can increase synergies with other</p>

		<p>similar projects and help avoid any duplications of workload.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> Given that the project partners all represent national civil protection actors or international organisations engaged in macro-regional civil protection frameworks, the Gaps to Caps project setup provided a natural habitat for building synergies within the BSR Civil Protection cooperation. The inclusion of Gaps to Caps at the various EUSBSR PA Secure Steering Committee meetings, the meetings of the Civil Protection Director Generals of the Baltic Sea States, as well as the EUSBSR Annual Forums, ensured that the associate partners would be kept updated regularly on the state of play within the Gaps to Caps project.</p>
B.8	Preparing material for and ensuring visibility at the high-level political events in 2016	<p><b>Description:</b> Preparing material for the high-level political events in 2016, most notably the Meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers of the CBSS on 8 June 2016 and the EUSBSR Annual Forum in Stockholm 8-9 November, and ensuring that the project results were properly recognised in the respective resolutions.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To engage a larger audience in the project and increase the different potential uses of the final methodological outcomes of the project.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> Presentations, following the visual identity of Gaps to Caps, on the project's progress and follow-up steps were given at the 5th Steering Committee Meeting of PA Secure and at the 14th Meeting of Directors General for Civil Protection in the Baltic Sea Region. Further, the Gaps to Caps project goal – capacity building for efficient crisis and risk management – was stressed at the Meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers of the CBSS and highlighted in the Warsaw Declaration on 8 June, 2016.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the Gaps to Caps leaflet was updated in early 2016, announcing the upcoming publication and giving some more detailed information on the project and the more elaborated methodology.</p> <p>Taking into account, the results of Gaps to Caps Task D, an information card was designed and distributed among the project partners, giving recommendations and listing best practices for risk management and exercises. It is also available on the project's website for download.</p>
B.9	Preparing for the final conference of the EUSBSR Flagship Project From Gaps to Caps	<p><b>Description:</b> Organising the final conference in coordination with the lead partner, with the purpose of hosting an open discussion on the draft methodology, desired final results from the various partners and the content of the final publication (methodology).</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To propose possible post-project avenues of how to put the methodology into practical use.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> The two day conference included presentations from all the Task Leaders on their findings and a discussion on the final publication ("A BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments"). The project partners received the first draft of the layout for the BSR Methodology and the updated leaflets, as well as the Annual Report of the Polish CBSS Presidency, in which From Gaps to Caps is highlighted as flagship under PA Secure. The final conference was also attended by high-level guests, e.g. Icelandic Chairman of the CBSS Committee of Senior Officials H. E. Ambassador Guðmundur Árni Stefánsson, the Director General of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Secretariat H. E.</p>

		<p>Ambassador Maira Mora, as well as the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), the PA Secure Coordinator EUSBSR, the Strategic Adviser on EU and International Issues, Julia Fredriksson. Taking into account that the current (2016-2017) CBSS Presidency is held by Iceland and Task B was led by the University of Iceland, the project received special attention from the Icelandic Chairman of the CBSS CSO.</p>
<p><b>B.10</b></p>	<p>Editing, layout, publishing and disseminating the publication on ideas for future national assessments of risk management capability in the Baltic Sea Region</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Editing, layout, publishing and disseminating the publication “A BSR Methodology for Risk and Capability Assessment”.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To publish the key findings and outcomes of the project and disseminate the final publication among stakeholders and associated partners of the project.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> While the period of the project saw some changes in staffing across the partner organisations, the coordination amongst the partners remained smooth and effective. The final communication outputs from the project have hence been generated through a consensus amongst the partners. The publication's layout is commissioned from the same graphic designer as the 14.3 project (Gaps to Caps predecessor project) and printed by the same printing house, ensuring a visual and conceptual link between the 14.3 project and the follow-up processes of Gaps to Caps.</p> <p>The publication will be available and ready for download on gapstocaps.eu. Because of its length and complexity, the more academic part of the publication will only be available online as a PDF and not printed. However, Appendix A and Appendix B of the final report of Task C will be printed as two single publications and distributed amongst stakeholders and partners. Reducing and splitting the Task C Report in these three parts will facilitate the communication and distribution of the results; making the results and methodology more accessible and attractive for stakeholders and any interested parties.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> this publication symbolises the acceptance and promotion of a new proposed methodology for risk and capability assessments in the BSR, which is fully in line with the objective of “Strengthening capacity to respond and to recover from major emergencies and accidents: better risk assessment and crisis management” in the EUSBSR Policy Area Secure. All project partners agree that this methodology should be introduced within the partner countries and should serve as a basis for further development work in the field. Having a macro-regional perspective and approach, it can be easily transferred to a broader EU-level and adapted in other European countries beyond the BSR.</p> <p>The publication in all its three parts will be freely accessible on the project's website as a PDF file. There will be 300 copies of the two printed brochures available for dissemination amongst the project partners and other stakeholders.</p>



<p><b>B.11</b></p>	<p>Preparing a publicity strategy for the post-project phase, including the potential restructuring of the project website into a database</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Ensuring on-going visibility after the end of the project</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> To effectively disseminate the results of the project</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> A post-communication strategy was already included in the main communication strategy (B.1) and lists as “Phase 7” the dissemination of the results, the restructuring of the website and the compilation of the beneficiary report.</p> <p>The two parts of the final Task C report are about to be printed and then disseminated amongst all project partners. There will be 300 copies of each brochure, which can then easily be distributed amongst other stakeholders. The more academic part of the report, as well as the other 2 parts, will be published online as a PDF file. For the distribution of the results of Gaps to Caps, the project partners stakeholder lists, as well as the 14.3 stakeholder database lists, will be used.</p> <p>The website was restructured in the sense of updating old information, informing about the end of the project and its outcomes (along with the upload of the final report). Following the contract, all information about the project will be kept online on the project’s website and other CBSS-managed web platforms for the next 5 years.</p> <p>Further, From Gaps to Caps has been included in the info booklet of HA Climate “Baltic Sea Climate Partnerships” under the section “Focus on Climate Change Adaptation – Cross-Sector Projects”. The booklet is available online and will be further distributed at upcoming events under the framework of PA Secure, HA Climate and of the CBSS Baltic 2030 Unit for Sustainable Development.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> Post-communication ensures the project’s sustainability and durability and should highlight the outcome and the practical results of the project. The used social media platforms, but especially the website of the project can be considered as a solid, long-standing information source for stakeholders and be used to maybe develop the methodology and the project’s topic further in the future on an even broader level than the macro-regional approach applied now.</p> <p>The results (publication, 2 printed parts, 1 exclusively online PDF) will be disseminated to the project partners and uploaded on the website where all 3 parts of the publication will be available for the Gaps to Caps peer groups. We will inform about the publication on the CBSS website, on the Gaps to Caps Facebook page, Twitter channels and gapstocaps.eu to maximise the reachability.</p> <p>The Task D postcards will be also available online and sent to the stakeholders involved in the Task D topic.</p>
<p><b>B.12</b></p>	<p>Compile final beneficiary report</p>	<p>Following the contract guidelines, post-project reporting to the Commission has been done following the relevant guidelines.</p>
<p><b>C.1</b></p>	<p>Task C kick-off</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> workshop with the aim of starting the Task and its activities was held in Iceland. An objective of the workshop was to consolidate the partners and produce a more detailed activity plan.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> formulated outcomes and decision from kick-off workshop (detailed task implementation plan) and concept paper on capability (as well as risk) assessments as a preparation for Seminar No. 1.</p>

		<p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> at the kick-off conference the partners agreed upon task implementation plan and prepared the first version of a questionnaire to be answered by the partners, with a view of providing background on present situation regarding capability and (risk) assessments. All partners introduced themselves and respectively their organizations.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> at this early point of the process the results of Action C.1 were disseminated within the participating organizations.</p>
C.2	Preparation and dissemination of questionnaire on capability assessments in BSR	<p><b>Description:</b> the questionnaire on capability assessment in BSR was prepared and disseminated.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> an overview that will serve as background material for Seminar No. 1 as well as input to the forthcoming project publication.</p> <p>The questionnaire was distributed to regional authorities and national institutions in order to achieve comprehensive results</p> <p>Comparison of the different results and finding common ground, which could be linked in the future.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> during Action C1 a draft questionnaire containing five pre-developed questions was sent to the partners for comments. As a result of this first step, the Task Leader, the Core Group and Task Leader of Task D formulated a more comprehensive questionnaire with 10 questions and sent this to partners to answer. The answers were collected in a document, distributed to the partners, and the main results disseminated. The results provided a good overview on the status of capability assessment and how such assessments are carried out in the different partner countries, although in many of the countries such assessments are not carried out in a systematic manner.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> comparison of the different results and finding common ground, which could be linked in the future.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the questionnaire was distributed to regional authorities and national institutions in order to achieve comprehensive results.</p>
C.3	Seminar No. 1 on National Risk Management Capability Assessments and Guidelines/ Indicators	<p><b>Description:</b> Seminar No.1 on National Risk Management Capability Assessments and Guidelines / Indicators was held in Riga.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> conclusions from 1st learning exchange seminar (to be fed into the report, under C.3).</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the results of the questionnaire were presented and discussed. It is clear that most of the participating states do not have developed an explicit methodology on risk management capability assessment. However, the UK, the Netherlands and Sweden have been carrying out such assessment for some years and these three methodologies were presented and discussed at the seminar. The use of the EU Guidelines on risk management capability assessment was discussed and examined as a practical tool (logic of provided questions, meaning of questions etc.). It became clear, as a result of this work, that many of the partners had expected the EU Guidelines to provide a clear methodology for performing capability assessments. However, the EU Guidelines only provide some questions that indicate, once answered, if there is capability to perform capability assessments. It became clear that in the following work Task C will have to focus much more on developing or describing a methodology for capacity assessments, since the EU</p>

		<p>Guidelines do not provide this and no such widely accepted methodology exists.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> the realisation that a partially non-existence of fully developed methodology on risk management capability assessment can be seen as added value, as this case is a gap in risk management capability even in European context.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> action C.3 was disseminated within participating organizations</p>
C.4	Preparation a draft report on national capability (and risk) assessments and related challenges in the BSR	<p><b>Description:</b> a draft report on national capability (and risk) assessments and related challenges in the BSR was initiated.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> report on national capabilities and risks assessment differences, similarities and cross-border dimensions.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> based on the conclusions of Seminar 1 the Task Leader wrote a first draft of a report describing the work performed in the project so far, summarizing the work on national capability and risk assessments and showing the results of the questionnaire. The report was circulated for comments and new corrected draft was sent out to project partners. The aim of the report is to give an overview of relevant aspects of the civil protection systems involved, differences and similarities. It is now clear that the main challenge of Task C is to produce, describe and agree on the methodology for capability assessment, since there is no such accepted methodology in existence, and apply the methodology to some practical scenarios.</p> <p><b>Value-added:</b> as result of the report so called best practices can be identified in order for the participating states to benefit from.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the report is compiled by the different disaster management authorities of the participating states. Action C.4 was distributed to regional authorities and national institutions in order to achieve comprehensive results.</p>
C.5	Seminar No. 2 on National Capability (and Risk) Assessments – Challenges and Opportunities - in the BSR	<p><b>Description:</b> A seminar on National Capability and Risk Assessments was held in Tallinn (not Vilnius as originally planned) in November 2015.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The main purpose was to discuss and evaluate the EU document “Risk Management Capability Assessment Guidelines” and its potential use. The document contains 51 questions that are meant to serve as a way of collecting information that can be useful as input when assessing management capability to meet disasters. Group discussions were performed where project partners gave some thoughts on the relevance and clarity of each of the 51 questions. To test the methodology, a questionnaire was circulated amongst the partners, asking them to answer the 51 questions and give comments on questions of choice. The results are described in the Report on task C.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> One of the conclusions of this work is that it is important to distinguish between the two types of methodologies discussed in the context of capability assessments. On the one hand, there is the methodology described as the EU questionnaire, where the purpose is to estimate to what extent a given country is prepared to assess capability. On the other hand, there are more comprehensive methodologies, where the purpose is to analyze a given scenario and conduct a risk- and capability assessment with the aim of preventing and responding to crises. Such a methodology was discussed and developed in</p>

		<p>the following project activities.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> The results show that the EU questionnaire can be a very valuable tool when estimating to what extent a given country is prepared to assess capability. The methodology can also be used as a first step in a more comprehensive capability assessment.</p>
C.6	Final Seminar of Task C and Task D	<p><b>Description:</b> Final seminar was held in Lithuania in August 2016, but as a preparation, an extra seminar was held in Hamburg in June 2016.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The purpose was to develop, describe and test a methodology for capability assessments for future use in the Baltic Sea Region.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> The Swedish Civil Contingency Agency (MSB) for a number of years has worked on developing a methodology for capability assessment. Using this work as a basis, a document was developed in advance of the extra project meeting in Hamburg in June 2016 where such a method was presented. At the Hamburg meeting the project group tested the methodology and applied it to the Extreme weather/storm scenario in a workshop. As a result, the document "The BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments, a first approach" was written and the project group agreed to promote and use the methodology for risk and capability assessments presented, for further development. This was later confirmed in the Final seminar of Tasks C and D held in Lithuania August 2016.</p> <p>In this chapter we will therefore present in Section 5.1 a very brief description of "The BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments, a first approach". A more detailed description of the method is presented in Appendix A. The method in Appendix A was used by the participants in Task C of this project to analyze the "Extreme weather/storm scenario" at the Hamburg meeting and a very brief description of that scenario and the workshop is therefore given in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> The report "The BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments, a first approach" describes a methodology for risk and capability assessments. The methodology was tested on the Extreme weather/storm scenario. All project partners agreed that this methodology should be further developed and used for capability assessments in the Baltic Sea Region. This must be seen as being an important achievement.</p>
C.7	Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	<p><b>Description:</b> A final "Report on Task C" was sent out to project partners in September 2016 and a final seminar was held in November in Stockholm.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The purpose of the report and the final seminar was to summarize the project findings and conclusions</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> A methodology for scenario analysis, risk and capability assessment was documented and described (see Chapter 5 and Appendix A in Report on Task C). The method was tested, using the Extreme weather/storm scenario from the 14.3 project in a series of Workshops held at a project meeting in Hamburg in June 2016. All project partners agree that this method should be introduced and developed further within the BSR.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> The main results of the project will provide a solid base for future work aimed at harmonizing risk- and capability assessment work within the Baltic Sea Region. A major achievement is the acceptance and</p>

		<p>promotion of a new proposed methodology for risk and capability assessments in the BSR, which is fully in line with the objective of “Strengthening capacity to respond and to recover from major emergencies and accidents: better risk assessment and crisis management” in Policy Area Secure in the EUSBSR. All project partners agree that this methodology should be introduced within the partner countries and should serve as a basis for further development work in the field.</p>
D.1	Task D kick off meeting	<p><b>Description:</b> this was the first meeting for the core team in Iceland with the purpose of initiating the work of the task.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> conceptualization of the Task</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> considering the outcomes and decisions from the kick-off workshop (in Brussels) the partners agreed upon a detailed task implementation plan. All partners introduced themselves respectively their sending organisation, their professional backgrounds and their possible contribution to the project.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.1 within their own organisation and partly within other organisations within their countries.</p>
D.2	Seminar No. 1 on defining criteria for evaluation reports	<p><b>Description:</b> seminar No. 1 on defining criteria for evaluation reports. The seminar took place in Riga, Latvia.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> this seminar served to agree upon criteria for evaluation reports.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the structures of evaluations within the member states differed in some extent widely; as a result the participants decided on the forms and the content for evaluation of exercises and emergencies (two different forms) only after intense and vivid discussions. To achieve comparable results the task group developed two templates to ensure the comparability of the different evaluation documents.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.2 within their own organisations and partly within other organisations within their countries.</p>
D.3	Comparing evaluations of emergencies and exercises	<p><b>Description:</b> comparing evaluations of emergencies and exercises. This was the main goal of this Task and the most important activity for achieving tangible results.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> the evaluations of emergencies and exercises served as a basis for the comparing of the Member States’ evaluations later on. The MS’ documents were submitted to the task leader.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the compiling of one document for emergencies and one document for exercises was a challenge as the evaluation documents differed widely even in just one country.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> to achieve comprehensive results the participants contacted different disaster management authorities and organisations within their countries to receive different evaluations of emergencies and exercises. These authorities and organisations (besides the participating ministries) were informed about the project’s process.</p>

D.4	Seminar No. 2 on gathering the evaluations of the partners	<p><b>Description:</b> this seminar focussed on the evaluations submitted by all partners and discussing on their content as well as pointing out the key observations in them. The seminar was held in Tallinn.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> the seminar served to compare the MS evaluation documents and to prepare a summing up document taking in consideration the results of Actions D.2 and D.3. Besides conclusions were discussed as an input to Task C document.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> during the seminar the participants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. worked on the evaluations of emergencies,</li> <li>2. worked on the evaluations of exercises,</li> <li>3. compared the documents,</li> <li>4. highlighted differences and similarities and</li> <li>5. made some adjustments to ensure the comparability of the documents (without changing the content).</li> </ol> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.4 within their own organisations.</p>
D.5	Seminar No. 3 on compilation of the final document of Task D	<p><b>Description:</b> this Seminar focussed on the form and content of the final document including the conclusions made during the discussions in the Seminar No. 2. The seminar was held in Hamburg (in combination with Task C seminar).</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> producing the final document.</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the comparing of the different evaluations was a challenge, as the evaluation documents differed widely. The participants agreed upon the form and content of Task D final document.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.5 within their own organisations.</p>
D.6	Final Seminar of Task C and Task D	<p><b>Description:</b> the Final Seminar focussed on the inclusion of Task D results into the final document with all partners from both Task C and Task D participating. The final seminar was held in Vilnius.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> input of Task D results into Task C. Agreement on final products of the project (Task C: Methodology for Risk Management Capability Assessment; Task D: Comparing of evaluations of emergencies and exercises and drawing conclusions on differences and similarities of best practices and main gaps).</p> <p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> during the seminar the participants agreed upon the input of Task D results into Task C and the final documents of Task D and the Task C.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.6 within their own organisations.</p>
D.7	Final report compilation and final conference of the Project	<p><b>Description:</b> Final conference discussing the compiled final report (consisting of the final reports of each Task) and the way forward. This action included also the coordination of the compilation of the final report. The final conference was held in Stockholm.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Final report produced and the project results discussed. Framing of the next steps in this field.</p>

	<p><b>Qualitative evaluation:</b> the participants presented the content and layout of the final report and discussed the results of the project and the next steps to be taken. All expected topics were covered during the event.</p> <p><b>Dissemination:</b> the participants disseminated the results of Action D.7 within their own organisations. It was agreed upon informing the other contact-ed and / or affected authorities and organisations as soon as the final documents will be available.</p>
--	--

## 5. Presentation of the technical results and deliverables

### 5.1. The BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments, a first approach

<b>Description</b>	These guidelines for scenario analysis are based on work with national risk and capability assessment at the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency. This document presents a short version of the Swedish guidelines and is prepared to form a basis for further development of the methodology within the Baltic Sea Region (BSR).
<b>Purpose of the deliverable</b>	The aim of these guidelines is to contribute to developing a solid (and holistic) uniform scenario analysis, a harmonized methodology for risk and capability assessments could be formulated and developed within the Baltic Sea Region countries.
<b>Evaluation of the deliverable</b>	The goal is to develop guidelines that are user-friendly, practical, and create conditions for scenario analysis of good quality. Moreover, the guidelines are based on a method that can be used for assessment of impact and capability more generally (for example, in the evaluation of actual events and exercises).
<b>Value-added – in particular European value-added and transferability - of the deliverable</b>	A major achievement is the acceptance and promotion of a new proposed methodology for risk and capability assessments in the BSR, which is fully in line with the objective of “Strengthening capacity to respond and to recover from major emergencies and accidents: better risk assessment and crisis management” in Policy Area Secure in the EUSBSR. All project partners agree that this methodology should be introduced within the partner countries and should serve as a basis for further development work in the field.
<b>Dissemination</b>	<a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/">http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/</a> Please see section 4. B 11 & B 12 for planned dissemination.

### 5.2. Possible future opportunities for risk and capability assessments in the BSR

<b>Description</b>	This document is the appendix of the first project deliverable.
<b>Purpose of the deliverable</b>	The aim of the document is to give directions of further discussion about resilience and security.
<b>Evaluation of the deliverable</b>	The document supplements BSR methodology for risk and capability assessments by introducing further possibility of its' development.
<b>Value-added – in particular European value-added and transferability - of the deliverable</b>	The document could be considered as a solid base for discussions while considering creating resilience assessment methodology. Further elaborated document could give a first approach to comparing different resilience among Baltic Region States and optimize regional structure of security.

<b>Dissemination</b>	<a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/">http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/</a> Please see section 4. B 11 & B 12 for planned dissemination.
----------------------	---

### 5.3. Recommendations and Best Practices in case of emergencies and exercises

<b>Description</b>	The recommendations and best practices in case of emergencies and exercises based on the templates for evaluation of both emergencies and exercises.
<b>Purpose of the deliverable</b>	The aim of the deliverable is to submit recommendations and to highlight best practices in the mentioned scenarios.
<b>Evaluation of the deliverable</b>	<p>Main conclusions of the deliverable are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish a common and comprehensive monitoring and early warning system.</li> <li>• To have a common and clear communication procedure.</li> <li>• To create a unified information sharing platform.</li> <li>• To integrate the evaluation of all emergencies in the country's legislation (also for small and local emergencies).</li> <li>• To install a cooperation body with determinate competences and with representatives of various institutions involved in charge during an occurring emergency.</li> <li>• To prepare the target group psychologically and to use simulations of real accident and disaster scenarios.</li> <li>• To share experiences and to evaluate the performance of the target group after real life situations.</li> <li>• To focus more on cross-sectorial competences and to learn from each other.</li> <li>• To ensure the access to scientific knowledge and new technical support systems for every country and institution involved.</li> <li>• To share the organisation's own data with other countries and institutions.</li> <li>• To raise awareness on possible capabilities available at local and regional level, including cross-sectorial level.</li> <li>• To be flexible.</li> </ul>
<b>Value-added – in particular European value-added and transferability - of the deliverable</b>	<p>The deliverable is a gainful proposal for improving the evaluation of emergencies and exercises and – even more important – an attempt to enhance the management of emergencies and exercises with the potential to mitigate the partly disastrous effects of emergencies.</p> <p>This approach could be easily transferred from the Baltic Sea Region into other EU regions and to other EU Member States.</p> <p>For this purpose, the templates and the final document can easily be shared within the European Union.</p>
<b>Dissemination</b>	<p><a href="http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/">http://www.gapstocaps.eu/publications/</a></p> <p>The templates and the final document can easily be shared within the project Member States (participating organisations, cooperating authorities, ministries, NGO's, other involved stakeholders) and furthermore EU-wide (e.g. using different networks and /or the national training coordinators of EU civil protection mechanism and others).</p>

## 6. Evaluation of the technical results and deliverables



## **6.1. General lessons learnt**

The project group has found that there is a great variety in how the project partner countries handle disaster management. Some of the countries have no specific methodology in place and rely to some extent on past experiences. Other partner countries have been considering such methodologies or have them under development. The existing capability assessment approaches in the EU/BSR (5 Nordic countries, 3 Baltic countries, Poland, Germany, UK and the Netherlands) have been investigated, discussed and reported on within the current project, resulting in a number of lessons learned by the project partners. Through several Seminars and Workshops the project group found that the Swedish approach to risk and capability assessment was most suitable for adoption and further development as a harmonized methodology for the Baltic Sea Region.

The project group has found that available sources of knowledge on risk management capability may be roughly divided into three intersecting categories: i.e. scenario analyses, evaluations of exercises and studies of real-life experiences. These issues have been the main subjects of the considerable work carried out in Tasks C and D of the project. The project group has found that the new by the project proposed risk and capability assessment methodology is very well suited to combine work on these issues, i.e. scenario analysis, evaluation of exercises and studies of real-life experiences.

## **6.2. Strengths**

The purpose of risk and capability assessments is to identify and analyse risks, vulnerabilities and capabilities to prevent and respond to crises. No single methodology for such assessments had previously been presented or agreed upon within the Baltic Sea Region.

The work within this project has led to considerable advances for the Baltic Sea Region with respect to cooperation and further development of disaster management methodologies. Mainly two methodologies for considering capability assessments have been investigated and worked on - EU questionnaire and the guidelines for scenario analysis based on work with national risk and capability assessment at the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency.

The results presented in this project will provide a solid base for future work aimed at harmonizing risk and capability assessment work within the Baltic Sea Region. A major achievement is the acceptance and promotion of a new proposed methodology for risk and capability assessments in the BSR, which is fully in line with the objective of "Strengthening capacity to respond and to recover from major emergencies and accidents: better risk assessment and crisis management" in Policy Area Secure in the EUSBSR. All project partners agree that this methodology should be introduced within the partner countries and should serve as a basis for further development work in the field.

### **6.3 Possible challenges and/or improvements to be tackled through further action**

Project results indicate that there are possibilities for further development of aspects connected with risk assessment and capability risk management. Having both risk assessment and its possibility to manage allow elaborating deeper knowledge about resilience at any administration level. Moreover, basing on project results, it is worth to consider further steps related to resilience matrix (crisis situation matrix).

### **6.4. Recommendations to stakeholders, partners, authorities in charge, National and EU institutions**

First of all, during the project EU guidelines on risk management capability assessment were tested on experts (not national) level. It was noticed that project members could not answer some of the questions or the response to them were incommensurable among participants because they were rather extensive and abstract. It was discussed that certain topics could be particularised or divided into the more questions to further improve the guidelines.

Second, the risk management capability assessment methodology developed by the project could be tested by Union Civil Protection Mechanism members. For project participating states it could be suggested to consider supplementing the methodology, amending it according to national civil protection system and introducing it.

Third, on the basis of the project results the idea of creating resilience assessment methodology (a first approach) could be reasonably evaluated. On the basis of the above mentioned methodology there emerges possibility to compare resilience in different countries or regions. It will facilitate the process of creating decisions and establish common security criteria for the Baltic Sea Region countries.

Furthermore, the opportunity of creating the platform(s) where countries could place the completed EU guidelines on risk management capability assessment and the unanimous templates evaluating experience of emergencies and exercises (deliverable of Task D) could be discussed.

## **7. Follow-up**

As anticipated, the communication aspects regarding to results have increased during the second part of the project. The Publicity Team is to follow-up on the updating of the website, focusing on uploading missing documents in the internal section of the website and the highlighting of the BSR Methodology publication. These final documents are, as expected, to be disseminated and publicised only now, after the project's ending.