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Urban-rural partnership: where does it come from?

- ESDP, 1999: polycentric spatial development and a new urban–rural relationship
- Territorial Agenda, 2007: « We need new forms of partnership and territorial governance between rural and urban areas»
- Green paper on territorial cohesion, 2008:
  - Concentration, connection and co-operation
  - Questions for debate: definition; scale and scope of action; better co-operation; better coordination; new partnerships; improving understanding of TC
Urban-rural partnership: where are we now at EU level?

- 3 seminars on Urban Rural linkages
- 3 seminars on territorial cohesion
  

- Action Plan of Territorial Agenda: action 1.1a (coord CZ)

  ➢ ES: « Urban and rural narratives and spatial development trends in Europe » MCRIT for ES presidency
  
  http://www.mcrit.com/urban_rural/
MCRIT’s conclusions (1)

- Fuzziness of geographies: beyond urban and rural narratives
- Geography of flows: beyond core and periphery paradigm
- Network relationships: connexity
- Placed based development strategies: attractiveness
- Economic diversification of rural areas
MCRIT’s conclusions (2)

- Territorial identity still matters
- More efficient and sustainable resource management
- Access to public services, from sensitive neighbourhoods to sparsely populated areas
- Empowering local communities and project based partnerships
- Cooperation in territories with variable geometries
Territorial Cohesion in the Lisbon Treaty, as shared competence of EU and MS!

But what is it about?

- ensuring **harmonious, sustainable and polycentric development**
- enabling citizens and enterprises
  - to make the most of their territorial capital
  - **to benefit from and contribute to** European integration + the Single Market
  - wherever they happen to live or operate

**TC, territorial dimension of sustainable development**

**4 Key areas for fostering TC**
1. Territorial programming

...at every stage of the programme cycle

Necessity to increase support

- for **integrated local development initiatives** in diverse contexts (urban, rural, urban-rural …), based on URBAN and LEADER experience; common approach for ERDF, EAFRD, EFF

- at the appropriate geographical level, preferably **functional areas** (e.g.: TTWA,…)

- But the regional scale remains the reference for programming

Possible options

- Mandatory **territorial dimension in NSRFs and OPs**
- Providing greater flexibility in designing programmes (multi regional)
- Improving the partnership approach: more involvement of **local authorities**; global grants…
2. Cooperation between territories:

Integrated strategies in cross-border regions and macro-regions: territories are concerned! ...Including urban rural

Possible options

- Cooperation in strategic policy documents (CSG, NSRF, ...)
- Reinforced link between transnational co-operation and macro-regional strategies (but 2 different things)
- Better coordination across borders of legislation, strategies and funding
- Within multi-level governance; EGTC, eg for cross border territories
- Focus on external dimension: enhancing ENPI

Interregional cooperation:

- Linking network activities to mainstream OPs ("RfEC " approach)
- Enhancing networking on territorial and urban issues
3. Coordination of policies with territorial impact

Need for horizontal coordination at each level; vertical coordination between levels

Possible options:

• Greater territorial dimension in the EU2020 Strategy
• Improved alignment and coordination of funds; “Common EU Strategic Framework” (for ERDF, EAFRD, EFF, ESF) and NSRF, describing coordination procedures
• Territorial and urban monitoring within the strategic follow-up
• Integrated methodological framework to analyse territorial impacts (ESPON, Territorial Agenda)
• Inter service Group on Territorial Cohesion
4. Evidence-based policy making

- Ability to measure diverse **assets as well as constraints** of territories
- Need to go below NUTS 2
- Need for prospective studies (territorial scenarios, visions); eg: EDORA and the « urban-rural meta-narrative »

Possible options:
- Encouraging use of existing data and analysis: Urban Audit, Urban Atlas, ESPON
- **Refined data sets and new territorial indicators**, in close cooperation with **national Statistical Offices**.
And in the Baltic Sea Region?

- Transnational co-operation: Article 6.2.b: « Sustainable urban development: strengthening polycentric development at transnational, national and regional level. Actions may include: the creation and improvement of urban networks and urban-rural links; strategies to tackle common urban-rural issues(...) »

- VASAB and the Baltic Sea Strategy: what role for spatial planning?
This map does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

- **Area of economic integration**
- **Major urban network**
- **Link between areas of economic integration**
- **Linking city**
- **Major maritime freight route**
- **Biomass production area**
- **Area with dynamic residential economy**
This map does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON Monitoring Committee.
Next steps

- November 2010: 5th Cohesion report
- 31/01-1/2 2011: Cohesion forum
- Spring 2011: financial perspectives 2014/2020; draft regulations
- 1st semester 2011: HU Presidency: TA revision (in coordination with the UDG, as decided in Toledo)
- 2nd semester 2011: PL Presidency: TA Action plan; link with future Cohesion policy
Thank you for your attention!
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