

**URBACT IV Action Planning Networks_1st Call for Proposals_2023
NETWORK ASSESSMENT SHEET****One health Network for Cities in Europe**

ONCE

**Main EU Cohesion
Policy Objective Focus**

2. A greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe

Partnership

	Partner name	Country	EU Region/IPA
LP	Lyon	FRANCE	EU More developed region
PP	Suceava Municipality	ROMANIA	EU Less developed region
PP	Strasbourg Eurometropole	FRANCE	EU Transition region
PP	Kuopio	FINLAND	EU Transition region
PP	Loulé	PORTUGAL	EU Transition region
PP	City of Lathi	FINLAND	EU Transition region
PP	Benissa	SPAIN	EU Transition region
PP	Municipality of Elefsina	GREECE	EU Transition region
PP	Munich	GERMANY	EU More developed region

Project summary

The ONCE proposal addresses the challenges of human, animal and environmental health in an integrated way by applying One Health approach as a powerful tool to strengthen public health at a local level, improve resilience in populations and enhance the common ability to prevent, prepare for, and respond to future crises.

The proposed project aims at supporting the implementation of the One Health approach by building a network of European cities to work together on defining a common approach and identifying, through small-scale experimentations, the best practices, tools, and methodologies which will allow local authorities and other stakeholders to integrate the One Health approach into the definition and implementation of urban public policies.

EAP Assessment

The EAP would recommend the proposal to be financed.

The EAP makes the following suggestions for improvement during the activation stage:

- The proposal should be more specific in terms of the competencies and resources to be brought by the project partners into their specific tasks;
- Clear references to the APN journey and the URBACT knowledge hubs activities should be provided;
- Aiming to smooth project implementation, the proposal should clearly identify the profiles of the URBACT Local Group coordinators and be more specific with the roles and skills of the local project coordinators;

- Particular focus should be put on the design of outputs, given the fact that they are very generally presented in the proposal including the identification of specific tools intended to be deployed by each project partner;
- Special attention should be paid to the timely formation of the LP team and selection of the Project Coordinator as well as to the quality of the work performed by the interim Coordinator;
- The proposal should make a clear distinction between the roles and tasks assigned to the local project and ULG coordinators that will be reflected in the project partners' budgets (staff costs) accordingly. In addition, it is necessary to verify whether the estimated LP staff costs are justified;
- The Network should explore possibilities to involve a project partner(s) from IPA countries to share the One Health approach within the IPA region.

Comments

Criterion 1: Relevance of the topic/theme/policy issue addressed (10%)	Excellent
---	-----------

The way in which the relevance of the topic has been presented is 'excellent'.

The relevance of the proposal to the Cohesion Policy is strongly demonstrated. Very relevant and substantiated links are made to the European urban policy, explaining how the proposed topic - integrating the One Health approach to the cities' public policy - is responding to this agenda, notably the New Leipzig Charter, the EU's innovating cities initiative and the EU Mobility Strategy. The topic is inspired by the WHO political statement on European Healthy Cities Network which is very promising. Additionally, the proposal features a very good benchmarking of existing URBACT networks.

However, the following shortcoming has been identified:

- References to the URBACT knowledge hubs activities, apart from the existing URBACT networks, are not demonstrated.

Criterion 2: Proposal to address URBACT cross-cutting objectives (10%)	Excellent
---	-----------

The way in which the proposal addresses URBACT cross-cutting objectives is 'excellent'.

The proposal demonstrates an excellent understanding of the relevance of gender equality and green and digital transition to its mission, providing concrete examples of how the URBACT cross-cutting objectives will be implemented through the work packages.

Criterion 3: Quality and Relevance of Partnership (35%)	Excellent
--	-----------

The way in which the quality and relevance of the partnership have been presented is 'excellent'.

The ONCE network includes cities with different levels of experience related to One Health topic which is adequate for the exchange and mutual learning. The diversity of local contexts including health and environmental challenges allows pursuing of different interesting sub-topics by the partners in a complementary way.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified:

- There are no specific references to the APN journey, competencies and resources brought by the project partners into their specific tasks;
- The proposal does not provide information about the required profiles of the local project and URBACT Local Group coordinators.

Criterion 4: Quality of proposed methodology and activities (25%)	Excellent
--	-----------

The way in which the quality of the proposed methodology and activities has been presented is 'excellent'.

The work plan is well-designed and the proposed activities are coherent with the expected outputs. The presented communication approach is excellent, enabling wider outreach through social networks, participation in major events, thematic networks events, press engagements, etc. The proposal provides different ways for exchange and learning, such as transnational meetings, peer learning, site visits, as well as thematic clusters, including a few innovative elements like the constant reference back to the WHO Healthy Cities Network in search for common and wider learning.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified:

- The proposal does not provide any reference to individual partners' needs in terms of specific tools intended to be deployed by each of them;
- The outputs are relevant, however without due details on their content.

Criterion 5: Project Management and Expertise (10%)	Very Good
--	-----------

The way in which project management and expertise have been presented is 'very good'.

The Lead Partner convincingly claims to have long-term EU management experience, including as a partner in URBACT APNs. The proposed structure of the Lead Partner team that will coordinate the work of the ONCE Network is well-designed. A very good understanding of the role of the Lead Expert and Ad-Hoc missions is presented.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified:

- The Lead Expert role is well understood and described but the proposal does not identify the specific skills and know-how required in accordance with the Network's proposed topic;
- The fact that the Lead Partner team and coordinator are not yet selected and that an interim Coordinator will be in charge for the first 2 months represents a potential risk.

Criterion 6: Budget Proposal (10%)	Very Good
---	-----------

The way in which the budget proposal has been presented is 'very good'.

The proposed budget is coherent with the work plan. All envisaged costs are in compliance with the proposed activities and outputs. The budgets of the project partners reflect their involvement in the project.

However, a small number of shortcomings have been identified:

- The staff costs are not fully justified considering that the engagements of local project and ULG coordinators are not defined by each partner and that it is not clear if it is the same or two different posts;
- The envisaged Lead Partner budget approximately 3 times higher than the individual budgets of the project partners, mainly due to the high staff costs is not sufficiently justified and fully convincing.