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• Rural-urban partnership is an organism that covers a territory: where rural and urban areas co-exist and are connected through one or more functional linkages (e.g. commuting, value chains, demography, natural resources, etc.).

• The partnership is the mechanism of co-operation which manages these linkages in order to reach common objectives.

• There are a few distinct features:
Definition of a rural-urban partnership

1. an awareness of the interdependency of rural and urban areas in a given space (functional region)

2. a membership mix that includes the relevant rural and urban representatives

3. a framework for action or objectives that represent mutual interests (urban and rural)

4. initiatives aimed at yielding collective benefits to urban and rural partners

5. an organisational form that is fit for purpose to facilitate the realisation of the partnership objectives.
### The governance approaches to rural-urban partnership

#### Explicit rurban partnerships
- Rennes (France)
- Geelong (Australia)
- Nuremberg (Germany)
- Central Zone of West Pomeranian Voivodeship (Poland)
- BrabantStad (Netherlands)

#### Implicit rurban partnerships
- Forlì-Cesena (Italy)
- Extremadura (Spain)
- Castelo Branco (Portugal)
- Central Finland (Jyväskylä and Saarijärvi-Viitasaari) (Finland)
- Lexington (United States)
- Prague/Central Bohemia (Czech Republic)

### Models Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated functions</td>
<td>No delegated functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes (France)</td>
<td>Geelong (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg (Germany)</td>
<td>Nuremberg (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Zone of West Pomerania Voivodeship (Poland)</td>
<td>Central Zone of West Pomerania Voivodeship (Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrabantStad (Netherlands)</td>
<td>BrabantStad (Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated functions</td>
<td>No delegated functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura (Spain)</td>
<td>Lexington (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forlì-Cesena (Italy)</td>
<td>Prague (Czech Republic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Finland (Jyväskylä and Saarijärvi-Viitasaari) (Finland)</td>
<td>Central Finland (Jyväskylä and Saarijärvi-Viitasaari) (Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelo Branco (Portugal)</td>
<td>Castelo Branco (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The governance approaches to rural-urban partnership

### Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit rural-urban partnership with delegated functions</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can directly manage rural and urban issues</td>
<td>Threat to local autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a unified voice, and can speak on behalf of the region</td>
<td>Less citizen engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination of service delivery</td>
<td>Less private-sector engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More local influence with national/regional policy makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified rural-urban action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater access to resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More implementation mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More organisational support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Capacity to engage – silo’d sectors e.g. agriculture
- Capacity through planning instruments to think about urban and rural
- Limited flexibility
## The governance approaches to rural-urban partnership

### Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit rural-urban partnership without delegated functions</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can directly manage rural and urban issues</td>
<td>Fewer resources</td>
<td>Flexible governance structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can manage a wide range of functions</td>
<td>Less implementation instruments</td>
<td>High capacity to engage a diversity of sectors vertically and horizontally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sync with national policy initiatives</td>
<td>More dependent on volunteers</td>
<td>Strong understanding of rural and urban interdependence – a balanced approach to rural and urban issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a unified voice – can speak on behalf of the region</td>
<td>Dominant versus subordinate relationship</td>
<td>Mix of top down and bottom-up initiatives to stimulate rural-urban partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More local influence with national/regional policy makers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Different approach to determining the “right” scale to foster a rural-urban partnership and matching the scale of governance with issues of functionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can improve accessibility to national and regional funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted efforts to build trust and strengthen connections between urban and rural stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness: urban and rural local authorities are involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>The level of visibility of “rural” members in a rural-urban partnership is an important consideration and raises notions about “direct” or “indirect” rural representation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More scope for citizen, university and private-sector participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can create forums for action and debate on policy initiatives, e.g. forums, working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The governance approaches to rural-urban partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Implicit rural-urban partnership with delegated functions</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates bottom-up process of rural-urban collaboration</td>
<td>Fewer resources</td>
<td>“Soft” or “hard” encouragement by a governance level may be needed to steer rural-urban partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can promote a territorial approach on rural-urban issues in all initiatives</td>
<td>More complex management framework</td>
<td>Overseeing a complex mix of largely bottom-up rural-urban partnerships cultivated outside the partnership structure can be challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves local autonomy</td>
<td>Needs legitimacy: recognition from the bottom</td>
<td>Sometimes policies meant to foster development and collaboration can inadvertently widen rather than reduce the gap between urban and rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can support multiple single-purpose rural-urban initiatives</td>
<td>Needs good evidence of rural-urban issues</td>
<td>Certain circumstances (e.g. clear tensions between rural and urban towns, the size of the towns and the distance) help determine when there should be an explicit rather than implicit approach to rural-urban partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be the forum to bring key rural and urban stakeholders together</td>
<td>More opportunities for sectoral vs. integrated strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The governance approaches to rural-urban partnership

### Model 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit rural-urban partnership without delegated functions</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintains local autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer resources</td>
<td>An environment hostile to rural-urban partnership will limit the scope of action, even where the need to collaborate is acknowledged by rural and urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can address challenges on a service-by-service basis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No one voice: no one speaks for the territory</td>
<td>If “partnership and institution fatigue” has set in, an ad hoc approach to rural-urban partnership seems to make the most sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can bring in relevant stakeholders as needed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No region-wide co-ordination</td>
<td>In some circumstances, fostering a rural-urban partnership when the intermediary level of governance is weak can present challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More opportunities for sectoral vs. integrated strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An as-needed approach to partnership seems to fit, especially where the interest in a rural-urban collaboration (either from rural or urban actors) is low, despite the functional links.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why make these distinctions? It is about:

...determining how to provide support and what type of support...

...recognising the factors that work for and against rural-urban partnerships...

...making the time investment.
Explicit
Improving rural-urban evidence
Breaking policy silos
Identifying alternative funding sources

Implicit
Encourage political buy-in
Legal and regulatory policies that promote rural-urban partnership
Provide incentives for co-operation
Unlearning practices that have become inefficient
Managing relationships and initiatives cultivated within vs outside the partnership

Functional rural-urban area (A)

Relationships are developed within the partnership structure; and initiatives and sub-partnerships to deliver a project are managed by the organism, e.g. NMR, G21:
- More opportunity to drive the process
- More input in the initial stages of development
- More opportunity to ensure the initiatives consider the impact on rural and urban areas
- More opportunity to involve key stakeholders

Functional rural-urban area (B)

Relationships are developed independent of the partnership but facilitated by an outside body, e.g. the province:
- Less opportunity to drive the process
- Less input in the initial stages of development
- Less opportunity to ensure the initiatives consider the impact on rural and urban areas
- Less opportunity to involve key stakeholders
Why make these distinctions? It is about:

...determining how to provide support and what type of support...

...recognising the factors that work for and against rural-urban partnerships...

...making the time investment.
## Factors that promote rural-urban partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the interdependence of rural and urban areas</th>
<th>Mutual understanding of the need to act in concert</th>
<th>Clearly defined objectives</th>
<th>Representational membership and democratic participation</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rennes, France</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong, Australia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg, Germany</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Zone Poland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabant, Netherlands</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague, CZ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forli-Cesena, Italy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura, Spain</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelo Banco, Portugal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Finland (Jyväskylä and Saarijärvi-Viitasaari)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky, USA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Factors that hinder rural-urban partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regulatory and political barriers:</th>
<th>Lack of trust/social capital</th>
<th>Lack of partnership buy in/incentives to partner</th>
<th>Policies that widened vs shrinking the gap between rural and urban areas</th>
<th>Low Private sector involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rennes, France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong, Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg, Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Zone Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabant, Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague, CZ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forli-Cesena, Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura, Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelo Branco, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Finland (Jyväskylä and Saarijärvi-Viitasaari)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why make these distinctions? It is about:

...determining how to provide support and what type of support...

...recognising the factors that work for and against rural-urban partnerships...

...making the time investment.
## The time investment

### Six stages of the BrabantStad partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>before 2001</th>
<th>Ad hoc arrangements, pre-official network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Formal network created establishing the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Joint lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>2004-2008</td>
<td>Joint policy and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>Joint investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>2012 onwards</td>
<td>Collective investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!
The Nuremberg European Metropolitan Region as an Urban-Rural Partnership

Dr. Christa Standecker
Managing Director
Agenda

1. *Who we are*
2. *How we cooperate*
3. *What we do in concrete terms*
Resolution of the Ministerial Conference on Spatial Planning (MCSP)

European Metropolitan Regions in Germany 1997

European Metropolitan Regions in Germany 2005
Data & Facts

- 21,300 km²
- 3.4 million inhabitants (2012)
- 1.8 million working population (2009)
- GDP € 106 billion (2009)
- Export ratio 47.3% (2010)
- Accessibility
A Response to Globalisation and an Alternative to Mega Cities

Urban-rural partnerships as a central prerequisite for global visibility of towns, cities and regions.
Agenda

1. Who we are
2. How we cooperate
3. What we do in concrete terms
Rules for Cooperation

- Subsidiarity
- Openness and dynamic approach
- Consensus
- Democratic core: Metropolitan Region Council
- Cooperation on equal terms
- Urban-rural partnership
- “Regional governance“: Networking with industry, science, culture, sports and administration
Community as Guiding Principle

COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN REGION
- Political Board / 3 Members

STEERING COMMITTEE
- MANAGING BOARD
  - Political chairman
  - Business chairman
  - 2 deputy chairmen of the council
  - 2 deputy business chairman

BUSINESS ASSOCIATION FOR NUREMBERG METROPOLITAN REGION
- Business Board / 3 Members

OFFICE OF THE NUREMBERG METROPOLITAN REGION

Source: Office of the Nuremberg Metropolitan Region
ASSOCIATION INDUSTRY FOR THE NUREMBERG EUROPEAN METROPOLITAN REGION

99 Founding members
“We want to be the preferred home region for talented and dedicated people from all over the world. Together we will create a home for the creative.”

**Strength through Polycentrism**

“We want to make polycentrism and cooperation our unique characteristic.”

**Exemplary Culture of Welcome**

“We will develop an exemplary culture of welcome.”

**Most Family-Friendly Metropolitan Region**

“We strive to become one of Europe’s most family-friendly Metropolitan Regions.”

**Top in Future-Oriented Fields of Competence**

“We will strengthen the competence fields of the WaBe model.”

**Efficient Infrastructures for People, Goods, Information**

“We aim at sustainable development of transport infrastructures for people and goods and an infrastructure for information exchange.”
Bad Windsheim Declaration

Priority on equal living conditions and integration of urban and rural areas.

Fields of Action

- Regional economic cycles
- Domestic tourism (local “wanderlust”)
- Transport networks in the region
- Clusters in rural areas
- Cross-border cooperation
Agenda

1. *Who we are*
2. *How we cooperate*
3. *What we do in concrete terms*
Promotion of Intraregional Tourism

“EntdeckerPass”
- Strengthening leisure and local recreation tourism
- 140 leisure facilities and culture attractions in the entire region
Networking of ten Nature Reserves in the Metropolitan Region
Regional Campaign “Original Regional”

The Kalchreuth cherry farmers, partners in the regional campaign, at their market stall on Nuremberg Main Market.
Nuremberg Metropolitan Region Strengthens Competence Areas

Example: Medical Valley Metropolregion Nürnberg e. V.
Creating and keeping a Skilled Labour Force

Network Future Coaches

A network of 18 future coaches strengthens the labour market, offering tailor-made qualification measures.

Target groups: young people, women, and senior citizens.
Climate Protection

lenkungskreis

klimaschutz und
nachhaltige entwicklung

in der
metropolregion
nürnberg

Gemeinsame Kreis- und energiepolitisches
Klimaschutz- und Metropolregionen-Kolloquium

Energie Zukunft heute:

Städte und Landkreise
als Akteure
im Klimaschutz


www.klimaschutzkonferenznurnberg.de

1. KLIMASCHUTZKONFERENZ
DER METROPOLREGION
NÜRNBERG

metroregion nürnberg
Achievements:

- European attention and recognition
- Common voice at European, Federal and State level (lobbying)
- Successful projects in urban-rural partnership
- Successful projects for the economic promotion of the region

Conclusion:

- High quality of cooperation as a good foundation
- Urban-rural partnerships are stable and are a good alternative to mega cities
- Projects generate win-win situations
Contact
Nuremberg European Metropolitan Region Office
Theresienstrasse 9
90403 Nuernberg
Tel. +49(0)911 / 231 -10511
Fax +49(0)911 / 231 -7972
geschaeftsstelle@metropolregion.nuernberg.de
www.metropolregion.nuernberg.de
BrabantStad

10 years of experience with cooperation in an urban network

Linda Peltzer
EU Office BrabantStad
Brabant(Stad) in the Netherlands
What is BrabantStad

BrabantStad in short

- Established in 2001
  - Focus on recognition of national government & Europe
  - Voluntary network

- Agreed investment program of € 1,4 billion Euros for 2008 - 2013

- Bid European Capital of Cultural

- Strategic Agenda BrabantStad 2012 - 2020
Our philosophy

• 5 cities, one metropolitan area
• Together strong
• Make use of one another’s resources and influence
• Mutual faith and unity
• Transparant & open networks
The BrabantStad Network

- Deputy of the Province and Eldermen
- Steering group
- Commissionair of the King and Mayors
- Policy makers
- BrabantStad office
- Provincial and City Council Management

- Breda
- Eindhoven
- Helmond
- 'S- Hertogenbosch
- Tilburg
- Province North Brabant
How the network works

- Share our stories
- Connect our agenda’s
- Build and maintain our networks
- Achieve our goals by good processes management
Regional governance arrangements around the 5 cities

*BrabantStad provides the connection*
BrabantStad meeting place
To conclude

BrabantStad is:

• An urban governance network

• Polycentric

• Equal partners.

• Each of the cities is a partner in a regional partnership, working on regional issues and agenda’s.
Tips for cooperation

• Start the cooperation with something small and concrete. Communicate the success!

• Organise informal meetings; get to know each other and build trust

• Make a quick scan of national and European funds that are eligible for cooperations.
Extra slides
Strategic Goal 1. Strengthening our economic resilience through knowledge, innovation and valorisation
Strategic Goals 2 Increasing our international allure
Strategic Goals 3  Increasing our (international) accessibility
Strategic Goal 4. Strengthening the spatial structure of the urban network
“the art of cooperation”
OECD 9th Rural Development Policy Conference
“Rural-Urban partnerships: an integrated approach to economic development”

Case Study: Beira Interior Sul

Ana Firmino

Bologna, Italy, 24th October 2013
Beira Interior Sul

3,748 Km²

71,644 Inh.

19.1 Inh/Km² (P 114.3 Inh/Km²)

4 “Concelhos”

Adapted from ADRACES Database, 2012
The urban representation occurs in some parishes but even in the cities some parishes are rural.

Adapted from ADRACES Database, 2012
Viver, April, 2012
Adraces (LAG)

Ana Firmino - Universidade Nova de Lisboa
FCSH/DGPR
Elderly Rate (%)

Beira Interior Sul (TL3)  44.8  
Central Region (TL2)       31.9  
Portugal               26.7  
OECD                 21.8  

Population +64        28.83%  
Population 15-64      59.66  
Population 0-14       11.51  

Net Migration (2001–2011)  -2,702  

Ageing is a constraint but also a potential for job creation (800 jobs for social and health care in Castelo Branco). There are no homeless.
Carapalha Farm, Castelo Branco (silk factory in a social institution that works with handicapped people)
Functional Definition

- Beira Interior Sul is a remote rural area
- Cross-border rural region
- Largest city (Castelo Branco 32 000 Inhab.)
- Main rural/urban partnerships at the municipality level (social care, for example)
- Difficult to establish rural/urban partnerships although they have been increasing, namely with Rural Tourism (Leader) and Quality Products (Provere Program).
- New partnerships possible due to Corporate Social Responsibility (Communities based on Permaculture, for ex.).
Present Situation

• The economic crisis favored the return to the countryside (Family roots and cheaper cost of living)

• Schools (also due to birth rate decline) and health care centers were closed down to reduce costs in the most remote areas. These services have been concentrated in the urban areas.
New Actors in the Territory

- Neorurals seek new opportunities in the countryside. Mainly young people with higher education, innovative entrepreneurs (Ecogerminar); some adopt Permaculture (mode of agricultural production and life’s philosophy). Use of Local “Social Currency”.

- Different mentality among younger people favors trust and cooperation among urban and rural stakeholders.

- Some look for introspection (Spirituality).
By Peter Brul: «Young people from the cities are looking for a future in organic farming. Portugal a new spirit in organic farming». Ecology & Farming 1-2012, p.10
1. **Permaculture** (life’s philosophy – David Holmgren, Bill Mollison)

Urban young people, higher education, settle down in rural areas and start a community.

- Less subsidy oriented than other farmers;
- Alternative Financing: Crowdfunding and Funds granted in the frame of Corporate Social Responsibility (EDP, Gulbenkian Foundation)

Quinta do Lúzio, Janas, Portugal
Corporate Social Responsibility as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis. Being socially responsible means ... also going beyond compliance and investing ‘more’ into human capital, the environment and the relations with stakeholders”.

Ana Firmino - Universidade Nova de Lisboa
FCSH/D
(European Commission with the Green Paper –In July 2001)
“We are those for whom we are waiting for”.

They can be an example and motivation for the locals to adopt a more entrepreneurial, resilient and cooperative attitude.
ECOGERMINAR

We promote Attitudes
Social Responsibility

Ana Firmino - Universidade Nova de Lisboa
FCSH/DGPR
ECOGERMINAR
Solidarity and Sustainable Trade (CSS)

“Traditional Regional Products, characteristic of the region, produced with the local raw materials in an organic mode of production, distinct from mass production, potential promoters of a conscious consumption through Solidarity and Sustainable Trademark (CSS).

www.css.org.pt

Olive-Oil, Cheese, Wines and Liqueurs, Cakes, Honey, Herbal Tees, Medicinal Herbs, Handicraft...
2. Quality Products and Short Cycle

Baker’s daughter sells the same kind of cookies that her father always produced but in a different size and modern design. Innovation, entrepreneurial attitude, experience abroad, sales on-line.

Salgueirinhos, Castelo Branco

Street market for organic products in Loures, organized by Agrobio.

The municipality of Loures started with box schemes - Program PROVE, september 2013
(www.proveportugal.pt since 2010 www.taste-portugal.com)
3. Rural Tourism

- Historical, Cultural, Architectonic and Archaeological Heritage (Monuments, Legends, Schist villages, Museums, ...)
- Geopark (SPA for Birds, Natura 2000)
- Routes (Wine, Olive-Oil...)
- Senderism
- Geocaching
- Canoeing
- Horse and Donkey riding
- Gastronomy and Quality Products
- Hunting
- Handicraft
- Spa

José Diogo Castiço and his wife invested 232 237,70 Euros in Rural Tourism (60% supported by subsidies). *Viver*, April, 2012, Adraces (LAG)
Belgais (Castelo Branco) Rural Tourism at Maria João Pires place
Future Challenges (1)

- Less subsidy oriented attitude;
- Alternative financing sources (crowdfunding; corporate social responsibility, ...);
- More intensive links between rural and urban areas due to recent and slow change in the values (alternative consumption models, organic street markets in the cities; boxes scheme; projects “nice people buy ugly fruits” to reduce food waste...);
- Important role of LAG (ADRACES) and ITI (Tejo Internacional);
Future Challenges (2)

- Solidarity between the rural and the urban areas in order to overcome the adversities (formal and informal partnerships);
- Voluntary work (namely through the Polytechnic Institute);
- Trust and cooperation to avoid duplication of institutions (several associations exist simply because there has been enough money to support them);
- Rationalization of the means and coordination at different governmental levels (national, regional and local);
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Well-intended metropolitan organisation

- Democratic basis
- Participation
- Knowledge and information
- Legitimacy in elected bodies

Policy:
Municipalities & City/cities regional / national / private sector

Administrative coordination

Theme 1
Theme 2
Theme 3

Metropolitan collaborations...started as “ad hoc”, with a shared sense of urgency
The problem of asymmetry

- Capacity
- Power
- Issues
- Knowledge
Key challenges to government

- Taxation
- Regional policy and local / sectoral responsibility
- Democracy and representation
- Joint leadership
“My main role is to convince the municipality that the regional perspective is paramount and influences the municipality.”

“In prioritising projects, my job is to explain the regional perspective as being important to sell locally.”

Mayors of Zug and Zürich, in Zürich Metropolitan Conference