

Notes from the CORE Kick – Off Meeting in Brussels 11th February, 2011

By: Oliver Richmond, Janel B. Galvanek and Jonas Gräns

Welcome and introductions

Presentation from the project Scientific Officer Angela Liberatore (European Commission)

- Provided a short overview of the 7th framework program and the background to the Research Call within Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). **CORE is part of a broader policy and research domain at the EC devoted to peace and security. It is part of the “Europe in the World” program, which operates under the idea ‘if the EU wants to play a role in the world, it will have to understand the world better.’**
- Explained that the **European Commission tries to have each project built on past projects and supports networking between partners. There are a number of people working on the CORE project who have been involved in other such EC projects.**
- Highlighted that **the idea of this program is not only to research what is happening at the other side of the world. Practising research collaboration is also one of the aims. CORE is hence a pilot project of this kind of collaboration within social sciences and humanities.**
- Informed that the work of the scientific officer will be basically to remind the consortium of what it promised to do and deliver, with both quality and time in my mind. The scientific officer will also try to link the project’s research with other research efforts and to the policy community (Policy on the European side). On the Indian side the project has to rely on the Indian partners and the EU-India delegation in Delhi. The scientific officer will hence monitor and support the work of the project.
- Pointed out that participants in CORE remain independent researchers and the intellectual copyrights are with the consortium. The research might be critical but it’s important that it is conducted professionally and with exceptional quality.

Presentation from Mr. Gabriel Munuera Vinals from the European External Actions Service (Asia Desk, EEAS) on EU policy perspectives on EU-India cooperation

- Provided a brief overview of the newly established European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (since January 2011) and explained that EU is a main partner for India - the EU is the largest donor, investor and trade partner.
- Emphasized that India is no longer an emerging force – it has already emerged and is seeking to expand its foreign policy, for instance with China, the USA, the EU and ASEAN.
- An overview was provided on:
 - The background of EU – India relations, ranging back to 1963.
 - Background and information about the EU-India action plan (people to people and cultural exchanges)
 - The EU-India summit in 2008/2009
 - The EU- India Free trade negotiations (a broadly-based trade and investment agreement).
 - The human rights dialogue between the EU and India
 - The institutional architecture, highlighting different facets and areas of cooperation between India and the EU (summits, political/security dialogue, joint commissions (sub-commissions, working groups) and parliamentary exchanges).
- The cooperation between India and Europe is broad and there is much space for parties to have a wide and inclusive dialogue, not the least in the field of security. Specifically mentioned was the maritime counter-piracy cooperation between the EU and India.
- Highlighted that the EU and India together share many challenges, albeit often different in character, nevertheless both parties can learn from each other. The question becomes where to find the interaction in talking about these issues: Intergovernmental, NGOs, think tanks, forums, etc.
- Explained briefly about the EU-India dialogue taking place in EUISS think-thank forum.
- 1994: Cooperation agreement on partnership and development was signed. This agreement is still the guide for the relationship between the two countries.
- The Action Plan has a very comprehensive agenda including issues of governance, human rights, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding.
- Research and technology play a large role in the Action Plan, as well as people-to-people and cultural exchanges.

- Recent milestones: a work program on climate change, clean development and energy; a re-launch of free-trade negotiations.
- 11th EU-India Summit: joint declaration in international terrorism, part of a widened partnership which includes the security field.
- The way forward for the EU and India: fewer priorities, greater EU coherence (between member states and EU bodies), and more results.
- Priorities: security (CT, CS, counter-piracy/Somalia); energy/climate change (including solar power programs); FTA/economic diplomacy.
- There are massive needs in the area of skills development and capacity-building. One idea that is currently in preliminary discussion is implementing a program on “managing diversity”.
- The government of India has not been interested in discussing issues in Kashmir or in the northeast of India, but this is not surprising. The EU doesn’t discuss conflict in Europe with Indian partners. So there are no high-level discussions on the various conflicts in India.

Opens up for comments and questions

Angela Liberatore (European Commission): Expressed that the main point is that research also covers these issues and supports policy in these areas. Moreover, what would be interesting is to see how the results of this and previous projects could fit in at those seminars and dialogues that will take place between the EU and India.

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Assured that the CORE project will fit well into EU’s priorities and what the EU is doing with India, maybe particularly with regard to the human rights dialogue. However the government in Delhi is not very keen on engaging in cooperation when it comes to discussing internal affairs (Kashmir etc.). This sort of dialogue is not taking place on the governmental level, however ideas might well be discussed at the forum taking place at EUISS in September establishing important synergies with the CORE project - Mr.Munuera Vinals promised to get back with details on the forum and who the partners engaged were.

Nathalie Tocci (IAI): The areas of cooperation in the realm of security (terrorism, piracy, etc.) are all related to a very narrow definition of security. Are there any plans or negotiations to deal with a broader definition of security?

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Explained that at this point, the cooperation between the EU and India on security is relatively new. They have chosen a few issues and priorities to work on. They have generally decided to get to know each other and their security issues better. Other issues that deal with broader issues of security, for instance human security, are not spoken of per se, but are included in other issues under discussion, for instance within human rights discussions. So yes, broader issues of security are being addressed, but they are not being called such.

An important question here is also: at what level should/could such discussions about security take place? At the diplomatic level, think-tank level, civil-society level?

Hans-Joachim Giessman (BCR): Questioned the use of ‘we’, taking into account the fact that the EU contains many different actors and interests. Also asked whether there is anything else beyond counter-piracy outside Somalia where the EU and India together are working on regional security.

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Explained that when using the word ‘we’, focus is on the European Union as a whole, but it is nonetheless important to acknowledge that the EU is to a great extent its member states, and security is an aspect where bilateral relations between many of our members and India are prominent. Yet, the EU is striving towards a more coherent approach also in the field of security, and the EEAS function is to a large degree to complement these bilateral relations between individual member states and India that are strong and have a long history. . In addition the EU also brings capacity and security tools to the table that it can engage with India.

Paula Banerjee (MCRG): Commented that there is a general disconnect between EU (multi-state) negotiations with India (state). The contact must in itself be limited because the state of India will only put the EU in contact with people who have something to do with the state.

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Explains that the EU is aware of this possible tension and is making an effort to visit other places – not just Delhi – and to talk with other actors.

Paula Banerjee (MCRG): Asked what the actual issues on migration between the EU and India are?

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Answered that it is to facilitate and manage migration flows and to encourage legal migration, but at the same time fight illegal migration and to combat organized crime related to migration. The EU needs migration, therefore, legal migration is important.

Paula Banerjee (MCRG): “What happens in the peripheries of India affects what happens in Delhi, but what happens in Delhi doesn’t necessarily affect what happens in the peripheries.”

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Describes that both the EU and India are committed to the UN framework for conflict resolution and the peacekeeping philosophy of the UN. Civil society is included on many different levels, through civil society forums, think-tank meetings, academic exchanges, seminars for journalists (planned). In addition the local dimension is very much a part of the EU-India relationship; it just happens to appear in different areas.

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): The two entities - EU and India - are not that different. Some things needs to be intergovernmental; with migration, some aspects are dealt with indirectly, for example in terms of skilled workers the whole aim is to facilitate, not constrain. Our position is that we want to favour legal migration, and there is a need for some type of migration, but we are also eager to fight illegal immigration.

Michael Merlingen (CEU): Asked the question on what kind of institutional mechanism exists for collaboration between EC fund for research and EU policy in the EEAS. In other words, how is a project like CORE utilized in the EU policy sphere? – Does the desk officer receive information on research and is there a particular function for monitoring the critical research taking place?

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Explained that there is a mechanism that to a certain extent is institutionalized. In particular there are two avenues: The EEAS country team meets frequently and particular persons in the team are assigned to monitor certain issues (such as migration etc.) within their respective field. Then there are attempts to include the relevant information into the meetings of the European Council (in briefings etc.), and include relevant information in the background to the briefings with the High Representative of EEAS.

Angela Liberatore (European Commission): Emphasised that it is important to make sure that the CORE project gets into the radar screen of these briefings at the EEAS. It is difficult to foresee the impact the project can have in this respect, but it will be possible to make ourselves aware of these briefings and to increase our knowledge on a lot of details.

Oliver Richmond: Asked whether there has been a difference in discussion and agreement on concepts between the EU and India? - Is there an agreement on what these concepts should entail (human security, conflict resolution, civil society, governance etc.).

Gabriel Munuera Vinals (EEAS): Replied that there is a mutual understanding based on the mainstream definitions existing within the UN peacekeeping framework. Explained further that during the recent summit, a joint declaration was adopted identifying a shared understanding of certain concepts, for example on culture.

Presentation from Peter Ronald deSouza on India perspectives on India – EU Cooperation and regional conflict resolution:

- Particularly highlighted the importance of a partnership that this project symbolizes, both from an interdisciplinary character and with regard to cultural differences in defining and relating to different concepts. Emphasized that such a knowledge-based partnership shall be based on clusters:
 - Intellectual heritage – If we want to understand the present, we must understand the past (-historical engagements etc.). India and Europe have a much longer relationship that affects the present relations.
 - Colonial encounter – Many multicultural issues have long historical roots, hence one must be careful with regard to the contemporary attitude of instrumentality.
- When speaking about India there is a small vocabulary problem. The term “emerging democratic powers” is not really correct. “Emerging powers that are democratic may be much more exact, taking into account that some of the powers labelled as the part of the BRIC countries have been democratic for a long time. In India, ‘development’, ‘justice’ and

‘human rights’ are all part of democracy. This is what democracy means to the people. In the West, such terms can be taken apart. Furthermore, India could arguably be described using the following three scripts:

- The script of success: with 60 years of democracy and taking into account the fact that in India many view democracy as part of their inheritance. Nevertheless, a challenge to transform itself from an unequal society to an egalitarian state.
 - Script of a series of problems: There are noticeable problems and puzzles with democracy in India, for instance the problem of corruption and various state of emergency issues.
 - Script of failure, which is starting to overshadow the two other scripts: Those running the state of India are part of the global elite – they are disconnected from the people of India, which clearly creates problems for democracy.
- If India and the EU seek to engage in questions of human rights, conflict transformation and security, it is emphasised that they should both be willing to open themselves up to equal scrutiny. The phrase “democracy promotion” in dealing with India is rather insulting and does not take into account the fact that India has a long history of democracy – hence “democracy support” would be a more appropriate term.
 - Some concluding advice for the project:
 - Be careful with the concepts - democracy promotion should be removed and perhaps be replaced by democracy support.
 - A project like this must see the questions at hand from the point of view of collegiality. It is hence necessary to develop a common framework for understanding. Important to acknowledge that India has a lot to learn, but also a lot to teach; the same goes for Europe.
 - It was emphasized that the project should have a broad framework, rather than a narrow approach.

Planning Coordination and Workpackage Tasks

WP1 - Scientific and Administrative Coordination (USTAN and PRIO):

- A full list of all project deliverables was introduced and partners agreed to implement the suggestion of submitting a draft version of the deliverables one month in advance of the official deadline – in order to have sufficient time for review and make any changes.
 - This rule shall be flexible for the deliverables to be submitted shortly after the kick-off meeting (D.2.1 and D.3.1). It was brought up that especially in terms of WP2, it will be difficult to define a methodology in such a short period of time without any consultation

with the other partners and expect that the other workpackages will follow this methodology exactly.

- It was explained that the deadlines for all deliverables are fixed according to the project's description of work (DoW) (which is essentially a contract). All partners are responsible for delivering their contributions to deliverables as requested by Workpackage leaders.
- Delays of deliverables need to be avoided as they have irrevocable knock-on effects for all deliverables and the credibility of the project in the eyes of the funder. Given the very close working relationships between all partners on most deliverables, cooperation on this matter is expected.
- Effective and structured communication within and between workpackages, partners and the coordination team is important.
- The project's various meetings are also regarded as deliverables and need to be attended (as much as humanly possible).
- It was made clear that while the coordination office is responsible for the overall coordination of the project, the workpackage leaders are responsible for coordinating the work within the respective work packages – hence establish contact with all the relevant partners to explain to them what they need to deliver, and at times delegate the work.
- A meeting list was circulated with suggestions for particular dates. Partners indicated concern over some of the dates and it was decided that the meeting list shall be revised and circulated to all participants for confirmation. Some important comments that came up:
 - The meetings should be more than one day in order to have sufficient time.
 - The Advisory Board will be included in the Steering Committee Meeting II in Delhi, scheduled for December 2011 (Hosted by PRIA).
 - Steering Committee meetings shall to the extent possible be held in conjunction with other meetings in order to reduce travel.
 - Interesting to place one of the workshops in one of the case countries. Cyprus was brought forward as an alternative, and PRIO volunteered to host a meeting taking into account its presence in Nicosia (PRIO Cyprus Centre).
- Emphasis was put on the mutual responsibility of all project participants and the consultative process that shall characterize the project – with the Steering Committee meeting as the ultimate forum for discussion and sharing important reflections. The fact that all partners are involved in Workpackage 2 (work plan and methodology) shows how consultative this process should be.
- The scientific coordinator, Oliver Richmond, pointed out that he foresees his role mainly as a coordinator rather than as an assimilator.

- The contact with the Scientific Officer at the European Commission (Angela Liberatore) shall be structured and generally be channelled through the coordination office.

Planning Coordination and Workpackage Tasks (Second Session)

Work package 2 - Theory and Methodology (CEU):

- It was stressed that the aim with Workpackage 2 is to develop and elaborate a common framework for the project, which will enable the other workpackages to relate their research to this common framework. This framework shall also work as a guiding tool in setting the research path forward:
 - The project deals with five issue areas: policing, democracy, institution building, governance initiatives, rule of law, human rights. It was however emphasized that the project should not have a clear cut list; hence there should be room for flexibility and for identifying new governance initiatives in the field.
 - There are a number of concepts that have yet to be exactly defined (European, international, Indian, governance, resistance, etc.). It also needs to be debated how the project is going to define the layer below the state? “Local”?
- Comments and reflections that were brought up:
 - It is important to acknowledge that the theoretical framework does not determine the final results. There should hence be a room for methodological innovation.
 - Concepts are differently interpreted in different local contexts, especially thinking about European and Indian differences. We must take care not to be either Eurocentric or Indian-centric as we establish its critical intellectual parameters. The intention with the method work plans is not to have a contract but rather a document with concepts and a set of ideas on how we can work.
 - The overall project needs to push itself further conceptually and methodologically => back to conceptual questions on governance and conflict at the international/ local/ conceptual level, as well as understanding local resistances/ agency, hybridity, and localised concepts of peace and governance in a civil society context. Consensus is not necessary but everyone needs to be aware of the debate that emerges over these issues during the project.
 - Important to define specific characteristics or differences of governance in both contexts (governance is seen economically based in Eurozone by Indian rep, whereas EU follows a broader Liberal Peace approach), as well as concepts like: conflict resolution and peace-building; human rights/ security; the ‘local’; civil society; and culture.
 - Patricia Justino (Adv.Board) mentioned a couple of issues that needs to be addressed: How does conflict interact with governance, and what are the dynamics on the

institutional level? Secondly, the question of governance from whom, including other types of participatory governance and local policing, which exist in India. Also important to clarify what the project means when it talks about local actors. Finally, important to clarify what the project is actually looking at.

- Important to develop an understanding of the post-colonial encounter, avoid Eurocentric/ nationalistic instrumentality. Improve the understanding of both internal and external perceptions and dynamics of both governance and conflict resolution in India and Europe: criticisms for their concepts of governance, culture, rights, conflict resolution, and civil society/ local, should be equally applied to each.
- It was brought forward several times that India has a very rich thematic literature on conflict resolution because of the history of conflict. Based on this literature, there could be many different research questions than those which have already been formulated. It is therefore important that the work in Workpackage 2 includes reflections from the Indian partners.
- Others wanted the framework in Workpackage 2 to provide navigation and clarity on concepts and crucial terms, and offer a kind of framework that gives us a point for navigation rather than a framework.
- The framework that will developed in Work Package 2 needs to be flexible, open and representative.

Work package 3 – Analysis of Policy (USTAN):

- A presentation of the overall work to be conducted by the work package was made:
 - St. Andrews will create a document archive of all relevant literature. The research archive shall be stored at the CORE website. Members of the project will be contacted in order to send in relevant texts and literature to be included.
 - Information was given about the scholarly articles, which will look at various aspects of governance. The bulk of putting these together will be conducted by the forthcoming post-doctoral researcher at St. Andrews.
 - The process of completing the final analysis report is foreseen to be rather straightforward. In functional terms, it will become possible to connect the analysis with the methodological discussions as the project progresses.
- Comments and reflections that were brought up:
 - Important when dealing with foreign policy analysis to have a broad perspective. For example when dealing with Georgia, it is necessary to include analysis on Russia, and

even the US. The same goes for dealing with Kashmir, which apart from India needs to at least include Pakistan.

- It was pointed out that out of the three European case studies, only one of these is actually within the EU (Cyprus). There is therefore a need to clarify whether we want to talk about how the EU is tackling these, or if the project shall aim more broadly and go for Europe.
- It was expressed that there needs to be limitations on how broad and wide the project can go, yet it is important to make sure that key actors such as OSCE, the UN and other regional initiatives are not ignored.
- India's shift to global player, the relationship with US / EU, the commitment to multilateralism and the UNSC also need to be accounted for.

Work package 4 – Thematic Analysis (BCR):

- Explained that the main task with Work Package 4 is to formulate and clarify the different themes and methodology for the socio-cultural, economic and political dimensions which determine the viability and impact of government agendas.
- Expressed that overlapping tasks and work in WP2 and WP4 might become a problem, and argued that although the work packages are designed for different purposes, there could be differences among the research findings in the two workpackages.
- The work in Work Package 4 will entail a lot of mapping. The discussion of different perspectives is essential, and this will be an important focus of the workshop in Berlin in June 2011. BCR will ask for input from all participants at this workshop on Theme A.
- Comments and reflections that were brought up:
 - It was emphasized by Peter Burgess and Oliver Richmond that this overlap shall rather be viewed as an opportunity for cooperation, not as inefficiency, and the best thing to solve this is to have proper and efficient communication.
 - Important that work package leaders take responsibility to ensure sufficient coordination in this respect.

Work package 5 – Systematic Case Survey (USTAN):

- Introduced the main part of the work to be carried out in Work Package 5 and expressed that the main part of the efforts will evolve around conducting the case studies.
- Important that the project go beyond the institutional framework, and look at other innovative ways of looking at governance, which in turn leads to asking the question 'what is governance'?

- It would be interesting to explore the expectations of governance, in other words where do people expect governance and what do people expect from governance?
- Theme B: move beyond the way we view impact, not viewing governance agendas and initiatives in a narrow sense. Very often we will look at conflict management in action. Sometimes it is not connected to state initiatives.
- Realizes that effective coordination is the key to sort out and avoid any potential difficulties.
- Case study selection is fairly rigid as per the proposal, but there is flexibility in terms of how and where fieldwork is conducted, of course within the logic of the project. Fieldwork needs to be project and research oriented, not solely action or participatory oriented (as the project has to publish results in international peer-reviewed journals).
- Comments and reflections that were brought up:
 - It was raised that it will be important to agree on how broad the project shall approach these case studies in terms of the regional and international context. It was recommended that this should be driven by the context of the different case studies, hence allowing for a case by case approach.
 - Case studies should also focus on best practice in places where peacebuilding and development worked out well.
 - Another comment was that the project shouldn't get caught up in the various case studies as being our object of investigation – we are not looking at these conflicts. We are looking at governance initiatives to resolve these conflicts. It is a completely different research question.
 - Several partners questioned why these particular case studies were chosen.
 - The cases chosen do not to a large degree address the conflict concerning resources. Peter Ronald DeSouza (Adv.Board) emphasized that if the project does not address the issues of resource conflict under its three year duration, one may regret it.
 - It was clarified from Oliver Richmond that additional interesting case studies could perhaps be included; however, they cannot be the central point of the study.
 - It was again pointed out that intergovernmental organisations other than the EU were not sufficiently included into the proposal (such as the OSCE and the Council of Europe). This could, however, be bridged by having a broad approach focusing on the European.

Work package 6 - Assessment of Governance Initiatives (IAI):

- Information was provided on the work of the project and a tentative workplan was introduced (The project starts in Month 23, November 2012).
- The tasks of the workpackage are largely divided: Comparison and the question of implementation.
- Taking into account that the work in the workpackage is generally a comparison of EU and Indian initiatives, it is important that the research questions are decided upon soon.
- Expect that there are going to be quite large differences in the comparison, for example the EU as an actor in the Cyprus conflict is rather absent.
- Important that when we talk about actors we need to agree on the particular actors that the project wants to look at. Hence this could be a point for discussion.
- Comments and reflections that were brought up:
 - Is there room/funding already calculated into the WP for any field research that may have to be done afterward? It may come up during the comparison that information is missing. Will there be any way of getting this information (through more field research)?
 - It was pointed out that there is very little time between the final conferences and the policy dissemination, allowing little time to include any of the research feedback from the conferences.

Work package 7 – Dissemination and User Feedback :

- External part of the website was presented, and it is online: <http://projectcore.eu>.
 - Intranet under construction
 - All members of the project will be given a username and password in order to change personal details and engage on the intranet.
 - Please send any feedback or constructive feedback to PRIO (jongra@prio.no)
 - Compulsory to include the EU and SSH Logo
 - Include links to other institutions and related projects
 - Important to emphasize gender sensitivity rather than gender neutrality (throughout all project activities).

Legal and Financial Issues (Lars Even Andersen, PRIO)¹

- An overview was provided of the different project documents:
 - Grant agreement (between PRIO and the European Commission)
 - Grant accession Forms (Annex 4)
 - Consortium Agreement – governing the internal operation of the consortium: reporting, ownership, etc.

- An overview of the Reporting procedures was provided:
 - The academic part of the reporting shall be reported to Jonas Gräns at PRIO (jongra@prio.no)
 - The financial part of the reporting shall be reported to Lars Even Andersen at PRIO (larsea@prio.no)
 - Important to acknowledge that all reports (academic, policy or financial) and communication shall go via the coordinator, PRIO.

- Details regarding the financial reporting:
 - Personal costs: salaries and associated social contributions
 - Cost of materials (VAT excluded)
 - Indirect costs – ICM:

- It was urged that great caution should be taken in the use of the budget allocations: the EU regularly sends in teams to check accounts, paperwork etc., and also asks for allocations to be returned if relevant documentation and paperwork is missing or incomplete. All partners have signed a contract with the EU and so have already agreed to abide by its multiple rules, covering deliverables and finances, etc.

- Important comments that were brought up:
 - Partners sending bi-monthly reports to the Coordination’s Office might be a way of monitoring and keeping efficient oversight.
 - Indian partners might get information from the EU Delegation in Delhi in order to settle the details on conformity of the financial reporting. However the contacts with the delegation shall be streamlined through the coordination office.

Additional comments from the CORE Advisory board²

Günther Rautz: emphasized in particular four points that the project should take into consideration:

¹ For more details please see attached PowerPoint presentation

² With Patricia Justino and Chetan Bhatt absent from this session of the meeting

1. Adapt a regional frame, in other words take into consideration other regional actors such as the OSCE and the Council of Europe.
2. Regarding the cases, try to think about the best practices, and have a look at the peacefully-solved ethnic conflicts.
3. Since the project tackles frozen conflict, the project also addresses conflict prevention, not only conflict resolution.
4. With the EEAS in place this will constitute an immense opportunity for the project to introduce peace and conflict prevention in the European dimension.

Peter Ronad deSouza:

- Important to remember that the data gathered by the project may not lend itself to easy interpretation. Hence, important to think also in terms of ambivalence and paradoxes rather than governance deficit.
- Could be both interesting and valuable to bring in other cases in addition to the ones already existing within the project.
- Aim to avoid state-centric together with Eurocentric or Indian-centric. In this regard try to look at cases below the state (towns and local communities), in this context urban governance is becoming very important.
- Consider cultural question of conflict resolution/ peacebuilding=> political community and shared norms
- Important to acknowledge that this project has the potential to offer positions well beyond the existing literature.

David Chandler:

- Expressed a worry over that the project is not really pushing itself. Emphasizing that there is much more potential in this project to do more conceptual and collective assimilated work.
- A set of conceptual questions should be formulated which would open up the material even into the case studies. Argues that it is important to agree on a set of questions and these need to be developed conceptually.
- Currently the project is asking too much dependent on the case studies.
- Important that the case studies do not lead the conceptual framework. In other words it is the conceptual framework that should lead the way forward for the project.