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We address governance in this conference in the twofold sense:

1. Multilevel sector governance translates broad agricultural/rural policy goals into effective support for agriculture, forestry and related sectors;

2. Regional governance enhances territorial development across all sectors.

The two strands coincide with each other in axis 4, but also in axis 3 and, two decreasing degrees, with axis 2 and 1.
The two “heart chambers” of rural policy

- Axis 1: Multilevel sector governance (2nd pillar of CAP)
- Axis 2: Regional governance
- Axis 3
- Axis 4 (Leader)
We also address networking in this conference in the twofold sense:

1. Networking with a small \( n \): a craft, a mechanism…;

2. Networking with a big \( N \): a structure or facility according to the Articles 67 and 68 of the RDR
The diverse aspects of networking

- Coordination mechanism
- Competence or capacity
- Activity
- Institution
- Structure or facility
Seven choices

1. The logic of measures versus the logic of projects
2. The production of public goods versus the generation of private benefits
3. Top-down versus bottom-up
4. Centralized versus decentralized delivery
5. Integrated versus specialized policy delivery
6. Territorial versus sectoral governance
7. Rural versus regional scope
The logic of measures versus the logic of projects

- **Measure-type support** consists of compensations for doing or abstaining from doing something, in an annual rhythm, some with a timely perspective (e.g. early retirement scheme), some just tied to the funding period - with the implicit promise of continuation (e.g. LFA, AEP). They contribute to the annual account of profit and loss. Their recurring character makes it relatively easy to standardize and scale up payment and control mechanisms.

- **Project-like support** relates to investments. They are in principle nonrecurring and represent unique activities requiring customized handling, accompaniment and monitoring (e.g. farm investments, marketing and processing, village renewal, small business start ups…)

谴责 The two types require very different delivery mechanisms.
The production of public goods versus the generation of private benefits

The production of public goods

and the generation of private benefits

should be mirrored by more distinctive delivery and monitoring mechanisms.
Top-down versus bottom-up

1. Participation in sectoral policies mostly appears as **lobbying**.

2. Participation in territorial policies points towards **decentralised decision making**. Example:

   ![](image)

   The first one may be punchier.

   However the second one educates people in the direction of shared responsibilities in the meaning of subsidiarity.
Centralized versus decentralized delivery

Some words about the terminology:

**Deconcentration** means the regionalisation of central hierarchical institutions. **Decentralisation** conveys decision making power, some autonomy with concomitant responsibilities to regional and sub-regional entities. **Devolution** includes non-public stakeholders, the economic sphere and parts of the civil society into governance arrangements in order to accomplish public tasks and to achieve public benefits.

**Local action groups** have in some countries and regions acquired the status of a partnership-based platform or agency, coordinating all kinds of support schemes and funding flows.

They constitute learning fields not only for multilevel territorial governance, but also for global citizenship. This is their most important European added value.
Integrated versus specialized policy delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Decentralized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination of funding programmes

**Good Practice:**
Central coordination of funding programmes, local decision making and responsible implementation

- Lack of coordination between funding programmes, local stakeholders (partnerships, agencies)
  Take charge of local policy integration (customization)

- Isolated execution of funding programmes by central (mostly sectoral) administrations

- Local stakeholders as Implementation partners of well-coordinated and centrally steered funding programmes
Territorial versus sectoral governance

The two rural policy strands – the sectoral/agricultural, and the territorial policy, should be clearly distinguished from each other.

Territorial effects of sectoral policies should be made visible as well as the effects of territorial policies on the development of agriculture, forestry and related sectors.

This can be ensured by diversifying the institutions and broadening the scope of stakeholders involved in the design and delivery of the sectoral and the territorial policy strands respectively.
Rural versus regional scope

How to delimitate rural areas for Axes 3 and 4?

We have the choice between either concentrating on the areas in need for support or including all rural areas equitably, watching out for their interconnectivity and specific rural-urban linkages.

As we all know, rural-urban linkages are a political no-man’s-land.
Governance imperatives in EU Rural Policy

Principles of assistance
Complementarity, consistency and conformity
Partnership
Subsidiarity
Equality between men and women and non-discrimination

Strategic approach
Community Strategic Guidelines, National Strategy Plans
Programmes, Axes and Measures

Governance instruments
Management and Control
Information and Publicity
Monitoring and Evaluation
Let us ask some questions about…

- Partnership
- Management and Control
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Networks
Is Rural Policy adequately represented at the top level of policy making?

How can the Monitoring Committee become a real instrument for strategic controlling?

Does the national/regional management and control system really simplify procedures?

Should the common monitoring and evaluation framework really be the same for all programme areas, regardless of their size and complexity?

What is the longer term for the European Contact Point and the National Networks? Will they develop enough capacity and autonomy as to live up to the demand and the needs of the potential beneficiaries?
Steps towards successful governance and networking
Ensuring the strategic approach to rural development

…means to withstand the TITANIC thrust of past measures on the measures of today…
Monitoring Committees

…should be used as strategic instruments for monitoring (and mentoring) programme delivery, specifically in respect to the adequate balance between the choices mentioned before;

…should ensure a better coordination between policies and complementarities between programmes.

…but they can’t compensate for the absence of an independent, high level structure responsible for policy design and review (such as the Rural Policy Committee in Finland).
Strengthening the strategic capacity of local partnerships

Partnership-based local development is not only good for local policy coordination. It should simply be enhanced because of its educative effects for the civil society. Therefore local action groups should be much better monitored and coached, apart from their project generating capacity.
Managing complexity

Modern administration is executive and supportive. Supportive top-down and local self-organisation should be interlaced.
Rules should be proportioned with the relative size and complexity of a programme.

The Commission has a crucial role in monitoring the mainstreaming of Leader.
Interface management, the cardinal task

Regional policies ↔ Sectoral policies ↔ CAP

Value added chains/cluster development

Local development

Farm development

Distinct and interlinked

Rural Policy
Developing networking as a means for collective learning and sharing good practice

Therefore networking activities, apart from the institutional arrangements prescribed in the Rural Development Regulation, should be endowed with appropriate resources by both programme administrations and local action groups.
Let the Network be a network!

If you go into the forest searching for mushrooms, you won’t find any.

If you become part of the forest, you will have your basket full of mushrooms in no time.