

Izkušnje iz prakse:

Predstavitev uspešne slovenske LIFE zgodbe



EcoLexLife

Zlata Tavčar in Matej Klepec



EcoLexLife



LIFE16 GIE/SI/000728

Ozaveščanje
o Direktivi o okoljski odgovornosti v Sloveniji –
predstavitev izkušnje pri prijavi

Portorož, 14. december 2017

Zlata Tavčar in Matej Klepec

O projektu ECOLEX Life

- ECOLEX Life projekt je osnovan na iniciativi LIFE, podlaga za njo pa je EU direktiva o okoljski odgovornosti (ELD, direktiva 2004/35/EC),
- Ključna vsebina direktive je opredelitev **odgovornosti** tako glede preprečevanja kot tudi sanacije **okoljske škode**.

- Izvajalci projekta:
 - TAX-FIN-LEX d.o.o.
 - Pristop Media d.o.o. – komunikacijski partner
- Trajanje projekta:
 - začetek: 15/07/17
 - konec: 31/12/19
- Podatki o proračunu:
 - Skupni znesek: 1.303.848 €
 - Sofinanciranje EK: 59,97%
 - Sofinanciranje MOP: 10%

Ideja – povezana z osnovno dejavnostjo

- **Naša osnovna dejavnost**
 - Imamo portal Tax-Fin-Lex
 - z vso veljavno zakonodajo,
 - sodno prakso
 - strokovni članki
 - elektronskimi mediji
 - namenjem pravnikom, davčnikom, finančnikom
- **Ideja – še druga področja**
 - Okoljevarstveno
 - Širše – povezava EU - SLO

Razlogi za projekt - opredeliti problem, ki ga rešujemo

- kaj je problem, ki ga rešujemo
- podkrepiti s številkami, analizami, ipd.

-
1. **Nepoznavanje zakonodaje** o odgovornosti za okoljsko škodo;
 2. Ker podjetja **ne poznajo zakonodaje** o odgovornosti za okoljsko škodo, tudi **ne izvajajo preventivnih ukrepov za odpravo tveganj** za nastanek okoljske škode;
 3. **Nepoznavanje**, da odgovornost za okoljsko škodo **vključuje škodo** povzročeno **vodi, tlem** in habitatom **rastlinskih in živalskih vrst**;
 4. **Kompleksnost zakonodaje** na področju varstva okolja;
 5. **Slaba komunikacija** med ključnimi **deležniki**

Ugotoviti stanje – anketa pred prijavo projekta

- **Interpretacija** rezultatov ankete – dokaz, da problem obstaja
- **Izziv:** Strošek anketiranja (priprava baz podatkov, adreme, izvedba ankete, interpretacija)

-
- **2/3** malih in srednje velikih podjetij ne pozna zakonodaje
 - **Vsa** velika podjetja poznajo zakonodajo
 - **1/3** tretjina malih gospodarskih družb je menila, da jih zakonodaja ne zavezuje ...
 - **½ družb** nima zavarovane okoljske odgovornosti
 - **Zavarovalnice nimajo produkta** za zavarovanje okoljske odgovornosti (ELD)

Kaj želi projekt doseči?

- jasno opredeliti kaj bomo s projektom dosegli

1. Ozaveščanje vseh ključnih deležnikov, pomembnih za izvajanja zakonodaje o odgovornosti za okoljsko škodo:

- podjetja, Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Agencija RS za okolje in prostor, GZS in gospodarska združenja, nevladne organizacije, zavarovalnice

2. Z ozaveščanjem ključnih deležnikov zmanjšati tveganja za nastanek okoljske škode in posledično obremenjevanje okolja;

3. Vzpostavitev dialoga ključnih deležnikov preko organiziranih delavnic po ključnih vsebinskih sklopih,

4. Povečanje, krepitev zmogljivosti administracije,

5. Prenos dobrih praks iz tujine preko mednarodnih konferenc,

Kako želi projekt doseči zastavljene cilje ?

- opredeliti produkte/storitve, ki bodo narejeni

1. Vzpostavitev **on-line platforme** za okoljsko zakonodajo:

- z obrazložitvijo ključnih predpisov.
- z enostavno in hitro identifikacijo relevantnih predpisov Vzpostavitev orodja za podjetja za oceno tveganj nastanka okoljske škode pri izvajanju njihove dejavnosti poslovanje

2. Izdelava vzorčnih **primerov za zavarovanje tveganja** za nastanek okoljske škode za posamezne sektorje

3. Organizacija **delavnic, mednarodnih konferenc in webinarjev** za ozaveščanje/informiranje in prenos dobrih praks iz tujine

4. Priprava podrobnejših **Smernic za izvajanje zakonodaje** s področja odgovornosti za nastanek okoljske škode;

Plan: aktivnosti, terminski, stroškovni

- zelo zahtevno, ker je za 2 leti težko natančno planirati
- Aktivnosti:
 - Najlažje, vemo približno kaj bo potrebno narediti
- Terminski:
 - To je včasih že težje, obsegi del niso še točno znani
- Stroškovni:
 - Zelo natančno po vrstah stroškov za 2 leti – zelo težko

Kako dolgo nastaja projektna prijava?

V povprečju **3 mesece – 1 leto**, ali več

Faktorji vpliva na trajanje priprave

- Ideja in cilji (definicija, kvantificiranje)
- Sovpadanje s cilji in tematikami LIFE / EU
- Partnerji / konzorcij
- Akcije (ukrepi, kateri?)
- Pristop k projektu („bottom up“ npr.)

Dear Applicant,

I regret to inform you that your application was excluded from further evaluation by the insufficient score that it received for at least one of the award criteria 1, 2, 3, 5 or 6. Please find attached the award evaluation of your proposal.

I thank you for your interest in LIFE and look forward to an application from you in a future selection round.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Hervé MARTIN".

Hervé MARTIN

Annex: Award Phase evaluation for your LIFE 2014 application

1. Technical coherence and quality

Minimum pass score: 10

Score received: 6

Positive Comments:

- The project operational and management structures are well organised and controlled by the coordinating beneficiary.
- The partnership is balanced and the selection of project partners represents the necessary technical, administrative and managerial skills to carry out the proposed actions.
- Time planning is realistic, appropriate and there is a proper buffer time between actions.

Negative Comments:

- The pre-operational context is poorly described because the assumed low awareness of the target audiences on Environmental Liability Directive (ELD) in Slovenia and Croatia is only assumed and not sufficiently demonstrated and quantified/justified. Also “some problems with implementation of the ELD in Slovenia” are not explained and therefore only assumed.
- A considerable number of actions (four) are foreseen for desk research to establish baseline knowledge on the problems and threats to be tackled which should have been concluded as part of the project design.
- The proposal fails to put sufficient emphasis on the link between environmental threats, problems and related objectives, actions and expected results. In particular the entire proposal is built on the assumption that lack of awareness is the cause of the problem but the proposal does not present sufficient data to justify that “the identified target audiences are not aware of the need for prevention and remedying of environmental damage and the scope of both”.
- In general the actions are too vaguely described suffering from the generic identification of the target audience that has not been yet clearly defined. In addition, certain actions such as eco-clipping do not sufficiently explain what in practice will be done. Other actions include workshops, international conferences, webinars and awareness surveys. However, their description is rather vague and generic.
- Expected results and indicators of progress do not include measurable means of progress verification against set baseline/targets.

- The project is not cost-efficient and does not represent value for money, as many actions are vague and generic.
- The organigram included does not show roles any responsibilities of the staff and the chain of command is not well demonstrated. The steering committee is not clearly linked with the project as it is mainly composed of stakeholders.
- Lists of deliverables and milestones are lengthy (including 33 and 86 items respectively), poorly identified (often confused with each other) and are not sufficiently streamlined to assist in achieving effective project management and external monitoring.
- The project does not sufficiently demonstrate how actions and results would be maintained after the project is over. In particular, the proposal fails to explain how activities will be funded and exactly who will do what after the project ends.

2. Financial coherence and quality

Minimum pass score: 10

Score received: 6

Positive Comments:

- The personnel costs proposed on form F1 are reasonable.
- The daily rates quoted are in line with the respective national conditions.

Negative Comments:

- Regarding personnel, there is not enough indication within the description of the actions about roles/responsibilities and duties, of the personnel involved in the project, as included in the form F1.
- The number of working days is overestimated for several actions, on form F1. For example the number of working days for Actions B.1 and B.2 is 765 & 724 respectively, which appears excessive, given the proposed activities and expected results.
- The travel and subsistence costs on form F2 (€ 6,647) are not sufficiently detailed and adequately justified (target areas have not been yet clearly identified). It is not clear how these costs have been calculated because most of the destinations are poorly



OPPURTUNITY / PAIN		DESIGN	ACTION PLAN	RESOURCES			
1	BASELINE ASSESSMENT Defining what problem / issue you want to address in the environment. What do you want to change / achieve? Be specific as possible. Every problem is just an opportunity in disguise.	3	INTERNAL What kind of challenges does your company face in terms of the baseline assesment internally? What would you like to change, use to your advantage? Is there a specific problem you would like / need to tackle or address? How would you rate these issues in terms of your future business potential?	6	OBJECTIVES What will the project aspire to achieve? Try quantifying the results for relevant performance analysis and monitoring of project progress.	9	FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK & ESTIMATED BUDGET Resources you have and resources you need to implement your project. Control of sources allocation, what is the strategy going to cost to implement, what are the key cost drivers of defined activites?
		4	EXTERNAL What kind of opportunities / factors can you identify in your nearest and broadest surrounding / business / political environment that influence the baseline? What needs to change and who has the influence to change it?	7			
2	EU REFERENCES Have you already benefited / participated in an a EU funded project? Are you aware of any projects in any of the member states, which could serve as a benchmark and / or potential networking / best practice partner? Which directives and other regulatory / strategic / operational programs relate to the defined baseline issues in the EU?	5	POTENTIAL PARTNERS & SYNERGIES Many projects can be implemented only through partnership between institutions that improve its quality and maximize the objective realisation potential. Can you identify the relevant stakeholders in terms of the baseline assesment? Domestic, foreign?	8	TIMELINE How long will it (appx.) take for you to execute the project? Can you imagine the key milestones and set a timeline of the activities?	10	TEAM What will be the team setup and who will manage project activites, report, coordinate etc? Which capabilities are still missing and will need to be (out)sourced elsewhere?

PROJECT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

Organization, progress monitoring, networking,
after-life communication, external audit



PHASE 1

PHASE 2



COMMUNICATION & AWARENES ACTIONS

Activities and content designed and
adapted for different target audiences



PHASE 3

REPORTING AND MONITORING

Project impact monitoring - KPIs



- leading companies in Slovenia
- Public entities and NGOs
- Public influencers
- Contact with target group
- Networking, resources

- ECO-content
- CO-branding / image campaign
- Know-how & experience
- Regional coverage
- Additional funding



- Adjusted content for target audience
- Detailed planning of budget expenditure
- Stakeholder involvement / promotion
- Media / editorials / PR
- Interactive



AWARENESS raising

Project impact & progress

- Definition of KPIs
- Metrics (baseline?)
- Reporting (internal / EU)

