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OECD – GOV / TDPC
establishing a territorial perspective

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
- Territorial Development Policy Committee (WPTI, WPU RB and WPRUR)
- Internationally agreed Regional Typology: PU – IN – PRC and PRR
- Mountains, regions with geographic specificities (EU: 29% of area and 13% of population; global: 24% area/ 20% population; in 53 countries more than 50% of territory)
Population in mountain areas
and worldwide (inset)

Source: UNEP, Mountain Watch, 2002: 18
Innovation in rural regions

- A more effective approach to sustainable regional development
- Policy messages and governance

→ Shaping a New Rural Paradigm (NRP; 2006); assessing regional performance (territorial reviews), revisiting NRP (OECD Rural Development Conferences) and promoting urban-rural linkages (RURBAN project)
GDP per capita and productivity growth by OECD regional types, 1995-2007
How do rural regions perform?

- More than half of OECD population in non-urban regions (fairly stable proportion over last 15 years)
- Rural regions lower economic base, but: highest rate of growth in GDP per capita and productivity (part. PRC)
- Demographic development: PRC – attract population; PRR – population decline; increasing immigration in rural regions
- PRR part. hit by effects of crisis since 2008
- Need for a differentiated rural policy

Source: OECD 2012a
OECD rural policy dialogue

- „Innovation“ and „modernisation“: key aspects to trigger regional performance
- Learn from successful country experiences
- Adjust rural development policies to changing rural context

Implications:
- Strengthen internal and external markets; focus on human capital; understand entrepreneurship and innovation
- Change narrative on rural areas, to make use of opportunities
- Place-based approach addressing location specific assets and policy coherence (transition to practice of NRP)

Source: OECD 2012b
Scope of mountain policy approaches

wide variation of approaches towards mountain policies

- Sectoral policies (addressing mountain specificities)
- Multi-sectoral development recognised (coordination activities)
- More integrated policy approaches (mountain laws, „mountain policy“); Territorial Cohesion and mountain areas
Mountain policy framework

Recent stronger **territorial** orientation (sector policies, CAP, SF, including trans-border cooperation and Territorial Cohesion)

- **Main sector policies**
  (agriculture, forestry, tourism, infrastructure, public services; environment, risk management, nature conservation; spatial planning)

- **Trans-national cooperation** (including international agreements: Alpine and Carpathian Conventions; Interreg programmes)

- **Integrated** approaches (pilot action, including Leader in mountains, national priorities and action)

- **Mountain development discourse**
  (research and development: Mountain Forum, Rio/Johannesburg process, IYM 2002, Mountain Partnership, SARD-M „remunerating positive externalities“)
Territorial dimension of CAP

Main findings (ESPON project 2.1.3):

- **Pillar 1** in favour of core areas,
  - regions with larger farms: higher levels of support
  - fruit or vine production: less support
  - positively correlated with accessibility

- **Pillar 2** with limited compensation effect:
  - regions of northern Europe: prioritise agri-environment and LFAs
  - RDP funds, based on historical spend
  - co-financing requirements restrict shifts towards pillar 2 spending

Shucksmith et al. 2005
LFA scheme in mountain areas

Source: EC 2009
Local action in mountain development

Need for **innovative approaches** beyond LFA scheme

- Bottom-up approaches (since 1970s), pilot action towards mainstreaming (Leader etc., community capacity building, cooperation – governance)

- Two aspects of local capacity building:
  - „diversification“ of farm households
  - general spatial relevance of rural action (types of rural regions)

- Best-practice and success dimensions
Lessons from project examples in mountain regions

(1) Professionalization in region-specific production and services (processing und marketing, tourism and linkages, new services, wood/energy, cultural landscapes, water resources …)

(2) Address high quality production („mountain products“ label)

(3) Focus on skills development, capacity building and enhancement of community development

(4) Role of participation in local initiatives

(5) valuation of positive externalities provided by mountain areas to external regions

▸ harness mountain amenities, and apply multi-sectoral approaches
Success factors

- Professionalising local action
- Develop/review local strategies

Local **network structures** (local actors/interest groups; participation and cooperation; institutional development)

Development path (from disadvantage to amenities; diversity a potential; role of „change“; evaluation processes)

Trans-regional linkages (regional development agencies: to promote internal/external relationships; institutions to reflect experiences; exchange with external areas)

Rural innovation:
- enabling innovation (all spheres)
- focus on **amenities** of mountain areas
- address **complex system** of innovation (product, socio-cultural, institutional) and
- of **regional governance** (multi-level gov.)
Key policy messages – for effective regional governance

- Rely on **responsible** institutions (coordinator) → mechanisms for **dialogue** and coordination (vertical/horizontal)
- Install **strategic** public support (long-term commitment, targeted and place-based approach)
- Work at appropriate **scale(s)** for supplying local public goods and services
- Address spatial **relationships** (trans-regional; urban-rural; mountain-lowland)
- Strengthen **local capacity** and nurture rural **amenities**
- Ensure policy **learning** (evaluation experience)
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