



**TWG1 – Targeting territorial specificities and needs in Rural
Development Programmes**

Minutes of the 3rd meeting

06/05/2010, Brussels



Connecting Rural Europe

Agenda of the meeting:

1. Introduction
2. Presentation of main elements of the draft Step 3 Report
3. The building blocks for a revised typology of rural areas
4. Discussion on the draft step 3 report
5. Discussion on the TWGs joint Meeting and possible further cross-cutting issues / joint work
6. Agreed action points, completion of Phase 1

ANNEXES:

List of Participants

Agenda Item	Introduction
Meeting objectives	<p>The purpose of the meeting was to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The main elements of draft Step 3 Report of the Group's work• The key points from the TWGs 1-2-3 Joint Meeting of 23rd March 2010• Further cross-cutting issues and future joint activities between Thematic Working Groups• Dissemination of TWG 1 – Phase 1 main findings. <p>The ppt presentations delivered at the meeting will be made available on the EN RD Website.</p>
Introduction by the Chairman	<p>The Chairman introduced the meeting and its focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalising the Step 3 Report and Phase 1 of TWG 1, and offering first thoughts on the possible scope of Phase 2• Preparation for the joint workshop between the four TWGs and the Coordination Committee, scheduled for 7 June. The purpose of this meeting is to present the findings of TWGs 1, 2 and 3 and the state of play of TWG 4, and to discuss further cross-cutting issues and joint activities between TWGs, and their next steps, mainly concerning deliverables and dissemination.

Agenda Item	Presentation of main elements of the draft Step 3 Report
Presentation	<p>Michael Dower and Tomas Ratinger presented the draft step 3 report. It was recognised that more work needs to be done in order to finalise the Report's conclusion on building blocks for a revised typology of rural areas (Section 7).</p> <p>The presentation covered the following main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reminder of the overall structure of Phase 1.• Key findings of Step 1, related to the definition of rural areas for the overall purpose of the RDPs.• Key findings of Step 2: related to the analysis of approach to demarcation and complementarity within the RDPs studied in Step 1; plus a set of 17 case studies of the approach within each relevant RDP to targeting of specific territories, with focus on the definition of these territories, the assessment of their needs and the application of measures and resources (within and outside the RDPs) to address those needs.• Building blocks for a revised definition of rural areas: drawn mainly from section 7 of the draft Step 3 Report.

Agenda Item	The building blocks for a revised typology of rural areas
Presentation	<p>The process of developing building blocks, and initial directions for a possible revised typology was described. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The main assumptions made and the fact that that the typologies identified so far by other projects tend to be characterised by a descriptive/analytical purpose

while the TWG1 work aims to propose a set of policy-focused typologies and baseline indicators.

- The use of definition criteria in the current RDPs, and indicators ranked by frequency of use.
- The four main factors used by MS for their definitions of rural areas: population density; land use; urban areas and; accessibility.
- Summary characteristics of some typologies developed in the course of other initiatives. It was noted that the EDORA project goes a step beyond others by analysing the change in the development of rural areas and capturing the drivers which cause it, although still maintaining an analytical approach rather than a policy oriented one.
- The importance of a multiple-issue typology, which relates factors to include and which data to use, noting that lack of data can bias the choice of the typology and its related factors.
- Possible changes or additions to the present set of baseline indicators, including territorial implications of the 'new challenges', for example territories which may be well suited to carbon capture and sequestration or to the location of solar panels and wind turbines.

Agenda Item

Discussion on the draft step 3 report

Discussion Points

The following points were raised in discussion on the report.

- Latitude could be used as an indicator of relative disadvantage, in the way that altitude is used by Italy in its gradation of rural territories. Latitude can take into account both cold in the north and aridity in the south. Latitude and altitude may be combined, are easy to measure and do not change over time. It was noted that the definition of mountain LFAs already includes an element of latitude, namely lands north of the 62nd parallel, which echoes the earlier Objective 6 areas in Scandinavia; and that Finland already uses latitude as a factor in fixing levels of financial support to farmers.
- In the gradation of rural territories, land use is not necessarily a good proxy for socio-economic factors. Farms, forests and rural landscapes can be seen as resources for diversified rural economies, for example through added value enterprises or tourism. For this reason, analysing the interaction between land use and socio-economic issues could be useful.
- Abandonment of farmland is becoming a serious issue in, for example, Spain and Southern Italy (Puglia) where the installation of solar panels and wind turbines may offer higher income than farming. A further factor is urban sprawl. This clearly implies the need for effective spatial planning, alongside economic policies.
- The usefulness of the distinction between 'rural' and 'urban' areas was challenged. This is relevant for some RD measures but not all. An alternative would be to analyse the real problems affecting the territory, concentrate on the related objectives and solutions, and focus the measures accordingly. MS should be given flexibility to apply a varied toolkit of indicators and of measures.
- It is important to recognise EU value added in dealing with common challenges at an EU level, which require corresponding common solutions, taking into account the varied realities in different countries. These challenges include food security, conservation of soil and water, mitigating or adapting to climate change, realising

the socio-economic potential of rural areas etc. Important for TWG1 is to check if it is possible to develop robust 'building blocks for a revised typology' at EU level.

Work on a revised definition of rural areas. The Chairman highlighted the need to revise the broad definition of rural areas, starting from the current OECD definition which is not sufficient. On-going work is being carried out by DG AGRI, DG REGIO and Eurostat to develop a new basis for defining urban and rural areas in order to have a common language and statistical basis at EU level. The basic OECD definition, focused on average densities at the LAU2 level. It does not capture the fact that LAU2 areas vary greatly in size and an average density may conceal a mixture (within one LAU2 area) of dense and sparse population.

The proposed new approach focuses on concentration of population. Specifically, defining urban areas by the use of 1km² population grids to identify areas with density higher than 300/km² and contiguous areas of more than 5,000 population. This exercise has been completed for all MS. Some already have the necessary population grids and for others they have been estimated using land cover data to identify built up areas.

These population concentrations can then be used to define NUTS 3 areas as urban, intermediate or rural (based on the % of population living in the identified high density population areas. As the size of NUTS 3 regions varies very significantly between MS, it may be necessary to combine one or more small NUTS 3 areas (those of less than 500 Km²) with their neighbour areas in order to categorise regions as urban, intermediate or rural. The results of this work may be presented during the workshop on 7 June and published probably in September 2010 by Eurostat.

It would be useful if the 'building blocks' of a possible new typology being considered by the TWG could be used to categorise areas which fall within the broad rural definition described above.

- Categorisation could be based on the four aspects or (or lines of gradation) between rural areas. Namely: (i) degrees of difficulty or physical handicap related to land use (arising from altitude, latitude, slope, aridity, salinity, lack of water or other factors); (ii) degrees of sensitivity in terms of ecosystems, landscapes or cultural heritage (for example NATURA 2000); (iii) degrees of socio-economic disadvantage, which are the starting-point for efforts to achieve territorial cohesion; (iv) potential to contribute to meeting the new challenges of carbon storage or sequestration, generation of renewable energy etc.
- These aspects of gradation may or may not overlap. A matrix could be developed to show their links, for example the interaction between physical handicap and socio-economic disadvantage, Sardegna offers a good example of overlap of these two categories, and might help in identifying 'white spots'. It was clarified that the degree of overlap between these categories should not necessarily imply the degree of priority in policy choice terms.
- It was agreed that 'sensitivity' in terms of ecosystems, landscapes or cultural heritage could be a categorisation, particularly relevant at EU level, that could play an increasingly important role in the future because of biodiversity and carbon sequestration issues, related to land use/management. A focus on socio-economic aspects cross-related to land use would also be relevant since these aspects are vital for the development of the territory at EU level.
- It was suggested that focussing interventions in some areas more than others can lead to unbalanced development and related migration problems, because human and economic resources move to richer regions from poorer ones, thus increasing

the gap between territories: as seen, for example, in Estonia. This could be caused by inappropriate application of policies rather than by badly designed policies. Nevertheless, it might be useful to set a minimum threshold of GDP, population loss etc. acceptable at EU level. The available information about 'gradation' could be used to better design eligibility criteria in order to avoid poor targeting of policies. This could be carried out at MS level, with a comparative EU level set as standard.

- Rural typologies (except for factors like altitude and latitude) need to be thought of as dynamic, requiring an update over time on the basis of evaluation.

Agenda Item	Discussion on the TWGs joint Meeting and possible further cross-cutting issues / joint work
Presentation	Michael Gregory presented the key discussion points arising from the Joint Meeting of TWGs 1, 2 and 3 held on 23 March 2010. The Chairman tabled the draft agenda for the joint workshop of TWGs 1, 2, 3 and 4 and the Coordination Committee, to be held on 7 June 2010. The first three TWGs will present outcomes, and TWG 4 its state of play. The next steps for all the groups, including deliverables and dissemination, will be discussed.
Discussion	<p>It was discussed and agreed that the presentation of TWG1 findings to the joint workshop should focus on key ideas in a digestible form, and could offer ideas for wider uses of the findings by the Coordination Committee and the other TWGs. A crisp summary should be sent out in advance to invitees.</p> <p>The point was raised that the outputs of TWG 1 might be less suited than those of TWGs 2 and 3 to throw light on changes in the current programming period, since they are by nature future-oriented, especially in the building blocks for a revised typology. All three TWGs are using a case-study approach, the outputs from which should contribute to a knowledge base of relevant experience being developed by the Contact Point. TWG1 case studies are focused on programming aspects rather than projects; TWG 2 has both regional and project-based case studies; TWG 3 case studies encompass both project case studies and programming aspects. The examples to be considered for dissemination need not be limited to projects and can include examples at the measure level or of different programming aspects.</p> <p>It was noted that TWG 2 got stuck in its typology analysis and that TWG 3 is working on spill-over effects from environmental public goods to socio-economic benefits. This offers potential for specific cross-cutting issues to be discussed between the different TWGs. Other issues of common or further interest could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• possible links between TWG1 work on the factors which a new typology of rural areas could capture and the work of TWG3 on public goods (factors related to sensitivity and to the new challenges) and TWG2 on the rural economy (factors related to socio-economic disadvantage);• the findings of TWG 1 work related to LAGs and to complementarity issues as a possible input to the work of TWG 4. <p>Points such as the above could usefully be included in the presentation by TWG 1 for the joint workshop, highlighting relevant issues for the current programming period.</p> <p>It was suggested that the constraints imposed by availability of data, which affect all the TWGs, could also be discussed at the joint workshop. This data problem is particularly related to impact indicators and there is already an on-going process to encourage EUROSTAT, and through it the MS, to work on improving data availability.</p>

Agenda Item	Agreed action points, completion of Phase 1	
Agreed timetable	<p style="text-align: center;">Action / output</p> <p>TWG members to be invited to submit written comments on the draft Step 3 report</p> <p>Revision of draft step 3 report to include in section 7: (i) comparative analysis/summary/potential uses of others recent work on rural typologies and the extent to which the identified building blocks have been used; (ii) 3-4 MS examples from RDPs of which have developed a <i>de facto</i> further typology, assessing their definition, scope and how they have used or planned to be used (Sardegna, Denmark, Finland, French 'Pays' to be considered); (iii) inclusion of diagrams and supporting text on factors (gradations) which could be included in the building blocks and amendment of text in the light of the above.</p> <p>Update summary (originally prepared for the joint TWG 1-2-3 meeting in March) of TWG1 findings.</p> <p>Update ppt (originally prepared for the joint TWG 1-2-3 meeting in March) of TWG1 findings.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Timing / comment</p> <p>Request to be circulated by the CP as soon as practicable</p> <p>Finalised step 3 report, if possible by 7th June. If this proves not possible, new elements being introduced into the report to be incorporated into the TWG1 summary and presentation for joint TWGs / CC workshop.</p> <p>May 28th, in time to be circulated as a preparatory document for the joint TWG / CC workshop.</p> <p>Submit to DG AGRI for review and comment by June 2nd.</p>
Points / Actions to be considered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article(s) on specific themes or elements of TWG1's work for EN RD publications. • 'Accessible' summary of Step 3 report. • Compilation of 'relevant examples' case studies (including for integration into the EN RD's relevant experience knowledge base), primarily based on the step 2 work. • 3-4 Example typologies (or partial typologies) drawn from step 3 report. • Report comprising the specific elements of TWG1 that are of potential use as an input to TWG4. 	

ANNEX 1: List of participants

<i>DG AGRI</i>	Rob PETERS (Chairman) Peggy DIERYCKXVISSCHERS
<i>TWG 1 Members</i>	David HOWELL Magdalena NOWICKA Garri RAAGMAA Hikka VIHINEN Maura WALSH
<i>Contact Point</i>	Michael DOWER Tomas RATINGER Michael GREGORY Serena LIUNI

TWG 1 Members apologies for absence: Marien DELGADO, Caroline LARMAGNAC, Marija MARKES Alessandra PESCE, Peter WEINGARTEN