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Overview

1. Papers presented
2. Presentation 1: Lukesch: a more effective policy delivery
3. Presentation 2: Kuhn: adapting urban management approaches to rural areas
4. Presentation 3: Tarangioli: agri-food and rural districts
5. Discussion: Lively, concentrated on networking and Leader mainstreaming, local development
6. Conclusions: key messages
Lukesch’s governance system

Strategic visions / guidelines
Framework programmes with funding instruments
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Value added chains
Network learning
Regional governance

Land management

Research

Thematic concepts

GD
Rural-urban linkages
common lifestyles - common governance?
Kuhn’s governance system

Sustainable (Gothenburg)
Competitive (Lisbon)

Transport, consumption, housing
Information, employment, education
Recreation, ...

Urban area

Urban Thematic Strategy (DG ENV)
Leipzig Charter, Territorial Agenda (DG REG)
Aalborg Commitments
European Sustainable Cities & Towns Campaign

Cyclical (integrated) management
Participatory (integrative) governance

Rural area

Rural Development Policy (DG AGRI)
Strategic Guidelines
Community Framework
National/regional + bottom-up
Rural Development Network

Initiative, ownership
Mutual learning

Sustainability - Competitiveness
Management - Planning
The district as a governance instrument

Tarangioli’s system

- Network
- Policy coordination
- Relationships
- Innovation
- Multi-functionality
- Sectorial / territorial planning
- Attract new resources
- (local) Empowerment
- Competitiveness
1. Governance: the issues raised

1. RDP policy, design, implementation, evaluation

2. Linkages between RDP and other policies with impact on RD, different sectors and institutional levels (horizontal, vertical)

3. Networking, with a big N and a small n

4. Leader mainstreaming: difficulties
1a: RDP design, implementation, evaluation

- Higher decentralisation of design & implementation
- Is urban governance a good model for rural gov.?
- Strategy; strengthen strategic capacity not just at national level, high pedagogic value for integration
- Carry-over effect of old measures over new measures in designing strategies (Titanic effect could kill dealing with climate change)
- Opposed messages about whether rural areas should specialise (Tarangioli) or aim at diversification of sectors (Guyomard)
1.b: RDP design, implementation, evaluation

- Better monitoring of strategies to keep sense of purpose, coherence; meet more frequently?
- Authority should establish “boundary conditions of relevance” (different for different measures, some more bottom up, others more top down)
- Allow rebundling of measures (across axes) and funding, freedom of approach
- Subsidiarity: not either/or; bottom up can only work with appropriate top down, needs to be understood better, should be executive and supportive, linkages crucial (link kingdoms), shared responsibilities
1.b: RDP design, implementation, evaluation

- Phase out purely compensation measures while increasing the rewarding for the provision of services
- Consider cyclical integrated management approach
- Address potential conflicts between axis 1 and 2 measures
- Need for independent, high level review, rural proofing
- Allow flexible forms of evaluation for different levels in the complexity of programs
2. Linkages with other policies

- Interface management is a key task, for the whole range of sectors involved, distinct and interlinked (for funding, for sectors, for implementation)
  - Example of urban cyclical management (agenda 21, Kuhn), rural-urban linkages
  - Example of groupings (interreg model, RED)
  - Example of agro-food districts (Italian model, Tarangioli)
- Put in place structures of coordination
- Aggregation of different funding sources, then budget issues less determinant, and better able to implement a strategic approach
3. Governance and networking

- Let the network work: give directions and then check;
- Do not manage as a “measure”, with hierarchical, detailed instructions
- Strategic capacity building diffused through networking
- Training for networking is needed
4. Governance and Leader mainstreaming

- Commission should actively support mainstreaming
- Leader should stay informal, spontaneous: it has been formalized, confused with a delivery method
- Commission vigilant, danger of backstreaming: keep freedom in design of local strategy, of choice of measures; administrations should take some risks (it pays: helps to introduce innovations (Titanic effect))
- Obstacles to LAG decision making may come from a specific level of the administration, or of a sector refusing to implement innovative approaches, or being dominant over others (no checks & balances)
Conclusions: Key messages (linking WS5 with plenary)

- Coordination mechanisms more important than which administration does what, rural proofing to check coherence of R-Policies
- Coordination needs to take place at EU, national and regional level
- Given budget threats, pooling of funds from different sources needs to be put in place, some good examples (need collect best practice?)
- Aim at a balance between formal and informal networking