PAT-TEIN: CASE STUDY DEVELOPMENT GRID

We would like to recommend the following **WORKING STEPS** in order to elaborate meaningful case studies:

Please **build on the existing cross-border cooperation experiences** of **stakeholders**, **yourself** and other **experts** that you can engage in the development process. The case studies should be based on real experiences that you or your colleagues have made throughout cross-border cooperation (CBC). This could be all kind of challenges or missed opportunities in CBC that are related to the different (cultural) background of actors. However the actual cases can also be 'invented' situations that are inspired by experiences that have been made. The actual CB challenges might be linkable to scientific cultural dimensions (Hofstede, Demorgon etc.), or linked to problems related to cooperation aspects and the challenges to work together, or to different perceptions or lack of know-how on project management – **in any case, CBC Project management is about how to build a common understanding of the project and common ground to work together**. Therefore we would like to **focus on the practical learning effect** for future training participants, in order to find solutions that enable fruitful CBC; overcoming cooperation barriers in various settings.

Definition: WHAT is a cross-border case study in the sense of PAT-TEIN?

A cross-border case study is a description of a cross-border situation which should (once incorporated into training sessions) ensure a practical learning effect for (future) actors of CBC, through the illustration of thematic and cultural challenges in cooperation.

The actual way how the case study will be incorporated in an actual training is determined by the pedagogical needs of different target groups, sector and cultural conventions.

1. For the start we would like to equip you with a **"list of potential problem dimensions of CBC",** related to the different phases of cooperation. Having this (open) list you should **BUILD JOINT CB-REFLECTION GROUPS** with actors/colleagues that have already been involved in cross-border cooperation in your region.

   Please go through the list with your team and reflect if such kinds of problems are also imaginable in your CB context or if someone has even experienced an actual situation that is linked to the described issue. The provided problem dimensions should thereby be understood as first stimulation of an extensive discussion process – open to adaptation to your CB-context.

The reflection group itself should consist of **actors from both sides of the border**; however it could be inspiring to have a first reflection session separately. A separated pre-session could enrich the following collective discussion processes, as partners will maybe come up with very different views than the ones they would articulate in a mixed session.

2. Based on the discussions the joint reflection groups should **DESIGN AND DESCRIBE OWN CASE STUDIES** (i.e. actual cross border situations) in a second step. In doing so you may find out that the situations touch upon different problem dimensions/questions of the provided list. This would be perfectly fine – please feel free to combine different aspects.

   The description of a certain situation itself could be written out of the perspective from 'one side' in order to make it more reader friendly.

   Please consider also the 'scope' of the case study. Be aware – **the 'bigger' the case study** i.e. the more problem dimensions you want to touch upon, **the more complex it gets to create a (realistic) situation**. Therefore it might be wise to develop one or two case studies more but focus each of them, tailored to *a* particular challenge during a cross border project.

   Furthermore it could be imaginable that you have **a particular cross-border project in mind that is big enough to inform several case studies**. Partners are invited to draw on key projects which they deeply know. These CB-projects could then be used to as umbrella including case studies for the sequence 2, 3, 4 and 5. A benefit of this approach will be the reduction of contextualization – i.e. once the project and its purpose is described in the beginning it is easy to follow next steps. However a disadvantage would be the limited flexibility as there is not much possibility to tailor the studies to different target groups if it is all about one project. It would be important to have a rich spectrum of different case studies that future participants can identify with.

3. Within a third step each party should **REVIEW THE ELABORATED CASE STUDIES INDIVIDUALLY**. Please consider therefore in particular the **wording of the drafted case studies**. Due to unconscious stereotypes or prejudices it could be the case that the situations 'tend to be' formulated in an unbalanced manner; i.e. preferring the attitude of one perspective. In order to overcome this, the studies need to be **re-worked in a neutral way**. Though the situation is still described out of the perspective of one side, judgement elements should be neutralized and/or feelings of the counterpart should be integrated to allow a more balanced view.

4. Once the teams have elaborated **common draft versions** the partners are invited to **PRESENT** their first findings during the 3rd Collective Meeting in Perpignan JUN/2013. The findings will be jointly discussed; ideally giving advice for further **fine-tuning** of the case studies until the 4th Meeting DEC/2013.

5. Alongside this fine-tuning period (following the 3rd meeting) the partners should also **WORK ON THE DESCRIPTIVE** part of the case studies which should includes the following aspects:

    I. What is the problem in the situation described - What lessons to be learned from the actual situation
    II. Which information would have been necessary to the actors in order to overcome the problem?
    III. In the light of the project management cycle, what is missing, what should have been done – scientific reasoning referring to project management phases, perception of cooperation or to cultural dimensions

As a final result it would be great if we could **map all partner case studies in one matrix**, illustrating which study is addressing which kind of cooperation problem. This could then also be interesting for supplementary cross-cutting-analysis.

CENTRAL QUESTION: What kind of challenges or missed opportunities in CBC could you imagine in your border region, related to the different (cultural) background of actors in the below presented dimensions?

Problem Dimensions in CBC	Guiding Questions (non exhaustive list)
Sequence 1: The need for cross-border project management	*- Theoretical part -*
Sequence 2: Defining the project	
• Need assessment and problem analysis	→ Which analysis of the situation has been done by each partner? → Which methods and analysis tools have been used? → Which criteria have been chosen and according to which systems of reference? → How has the problem been identified? → How did each partner understand the problem? → How did the partners define a common problem? → Are there different perceptions of problems? → Are there entire concepts linked to certain problems (e.g. a certain problem solving approach that is recommended)?
• The partnership – Stakeholder engagement	→ Which actors from which country have been involved in the project? → Where were the actors coming from (public or private sector, association, citizen initiative, etc.)? → How have they been identified? → How directly has each of them been involved in the project? → How is the institutional and professional environment of each partner organized? → Which are the differences and similarities between the different environments (functioning, practice, hierarchy, sharing up of competences, internal organization, etc.)? → Are there general (Cultural) differences in identifying/engaging stakeholders?

• The development of the project idea	➔ What is the share for each partner in the project? ➔ Do partners know enough about the context of the other to plan the project properly? E.g. knowledge about the national, regional and local administrative organization; skills, responsibilities and interactions of the different administrative levels; ➔ Do partners know each other? Do partners understand the requirements/restrictions that 'the other side' has? E.g. political backing that needs to be ensured before further actions, legal obligations, financial abilities, institutional capacities, rules and procedures of the partner organization, ability to engage relevant target group etc. ➔ Did the partners create some decisional, operational, assessing structures, specifically for the cross-border project? If yes, what kind of structures and how do they work? ➔ How has the cooperation been made official? ➔ Is there the need to have a definite financial commitment (or at least a tender where partners can apply for) in an early development stage of the project (?) or is it also possible that partners consolidate their idea in a first phase and look then for funding opportunities? ➔ Is creativity appreciated during CB-team meetings in order to develop a common project idea or do partners tend to be just creative in their "own setting", coming to CB-meetings with fixed, double-checked project plans?
Sequence 3: Developing the project	
• The objectives	➔ Which long term aims and middle term objectives have been set? ➔ Could there be the possibility that terminologies are understood differently? ➔ Which operational objectives have been set? ➔ Which processes lead to the definition of the objectives, aims and actions? ➔ Are there different procedures to set objectives? E.g. need to engage higher hierar-

	chies or not?
• Assessing and choosing different options	➔ Which actions have been planned? How? ➔ Which realizations have been planned? ➔ Have the partners defined a strategic action plan? Which partners exactly? How? ➔ Did the partners define common working methods? If yes, why? How? Which partners exactly made the decision?
• The working methods	➔ Do project partners prefer different kinds of working methods? E.g. certain preference/reluctances to use creativity techniques, desk research, telephone conferences, consultations etc.? ➔ Is there consensus about certain working terminologies i.e. are things understood in the same way e.g. what does it mean to "prepare a concept"? ➔ Do partners have a common opinion when to meet where and how often? ➔ Do partners want to work "really jointly" or do they want to split each task, delegated to one party? Can they even work jointly or is there a stronger need to have 100% divided responsibilities for each task? ➔ Are CB-Team meetings understood as collective reflection and thinking rounds, leaving space for debates etc. or are they seen as pure decision making events where the consolidated opinion from 'each side' is presented?
• Defining: ○ Work packages ○ Roles and responsibilities ○ Timeframe and milestones	➔ Have the partners decided to put an operational team in place for the implementation of the project? If yes, how have the members been chosen (profile, qualifications and specific skills, bi-national teams, etc.)? How have they been prepared and formed for cross-border work? How have they been supervised? Regarding which position (full-time or half-time job) and according to which labour legislation? How

	have they been recruited? ➔ Do the members have a decision-making autonomy or are they just participating to explore or even to develop something that will be submitted to external decision-makers anyway? ➔ Have the tasks been shared up between the different partners? If yes, according to which methods? How has this sharing up of tasks been set and at which stage of the cooperation? ➔ Is there a clear division of roles and responsibilities – especially the question; who has the authority to give directives? ➔ How do the different actors match, considering the different cultural backgrounds? ➔ How has the timeframe been set by the partners? Have the partners had a different approach of time management? If yes, how has this been included in the setting of the timeframe? ➔ Which indicators have been chosen? How? According to which system(s)?
• Finances and budget	➔ How did the partners proceed to define funding opportunities? ➔ When is it necessary to talk about finances? ➔ Who is empowered to talk about finances? Who can decide? ➔ Did some partners bring some ideas with them, considering their potential former experience in cross-border project management? ➔ Did the partners adjust the project to the eligibility criteria of a specific funding program so as to have better chances to be co-financed? ➔ How has the financial planning for the project been done? According to which systems? How have the budgetary estimates been done? ➔ How has the budget been divided up between the partners? And how did the negotiations go? At which stage of the project?
• The project application	

Sequence 4: Implementing the project	
• Managing: ○ Partnership ○ Work packages and timeframe ○ Budget ○ Reporting	➔ How has the communication between the cross-border structure and the original structures been organized? Has there been regular information exchange? If yes, how? ➔ Has the linguistic factor played an important role? ➔ How did the partners integrate the project in their daily non cross-border missions? ➔ How has the cooperation been accepted? ➔ Did you notice differences between the working methods of the partners? If yes, which differences? How did you manage to link the different methods? ➔ Which difficulties did you face considering the gap between the different (cultural) systems (gap between the institutional systems, difficulties to understand the environment and administrative practices of the partner, etc.)? What did you learn thanks to this gap (discovering another system, others practices, mutual improvement)? ➔ Which strategies did you use to overcome issues? ➔ Which has been the differential between the planned realizations and successfully completed realizations? ➔ Have there been adjustments? If yes, what kind of adjustments? At which stage have they been done? According to which method? How have these adjustments been negotiated between the partners? ➔ How has the cooperation / project been financed? With which sources? ➔ Have there been financial adjustments? If yes, which adjustments? Why? At which stage have they been done? How has the decision been made? ➔ Which management methods have been used? According to which system(s)? Why? How have the different managements systems been matched?
Sequence 5: Assessing the project	➔ Has there been an evaluation prior to, during or after the project?

	➔ By whom has the evaluation been done? ➔ Which were the results of the evaluation (new action fields, job creation, better answer to the population's needs, etc.)? ➔ According to which methods the evaluation has been done? Has these methods been discussed between the partners? ➔ Which have been the political, operational, cultural consequences of this erasure of the border? ➔ Has the work in bi-national teams been evaluated (how did the cooperation, the pooling of practices, the match of different working approaches, the development of new practices work out)? If yes, how? By who? At which stage has it been launched? When has it been done? ➔ Has there been a capitalization of the developed practices? In which form? ➔ When did the partners start to think about this issue (at which stage of the project)? ➔ How did they proceed to find new funding? Did they use their respective networks? ➔ How does the future of the project look like? ➔ If there has been a continuation of the project after the funding period, how did the transition between the project period and the continuation period work out? ➔ How does the project match with other projects?
Sequence 6: The transversal skills of a CB project manager	➔ <u>Communication about the project</u>: - How has the public been informed about the project? How has the reaction of the target audience been taken into account? How has the project been received by the people? At which time? - Have the external communication actions been common actions? How have they been decided among the partners?

PLEASE REMEMBER:

- The core objective of the case studies is a **PRACTICAL LEARNING EFFECT** for actors of CBC; consisting of three elements. The Case Studies will have an
  (**1**) AWARENESS RAISING EFFECT leading to a
  (**2**) CRITICAL (SELF-) REFLECTION of the training participants and
  (**3**) a lasting SENSITISATION which should have a sustainable impact on their future work –
  i.e. enabling them to refer to what they have learned and **ensure the functioning of their cooperation**.

- The final incorporation of the case studies can take place in **VARIOUS TRAINING SCENARIOS/SETTINGS** once they are developed. E.g. a mixed group of participants could get a certain description of a CB working situation. Based on that they will have a joint reflection of the situation followed by an explanation of the trainer. Furthermore role play exercises are imaginable.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.