

Minutes of the 3rd INCORD-Workshop

6th – 8th of April 2005, Krakow, Poland

List of Participants

Blass, Jörg Thomas (6.-8.)	Hindov, Eike (6.-8.)	Parr, Melanie (6.-8.)
Brocks, Silke (6.-8.)	Huttenloher, Christian (6.-8.)	Petrusek, Roman (6./7.)
Bulikowska, Magdalena (6./7.)	Jakubowska-Lazecka, Joanna (6./7.)	Piorkowski, Janusz (6./7.)
Cybula, Stanislaw (6./7.)	Knieling, Jörg (7./8.)	Piszczek, Marzena (6./7.)
Czerwinski, Krzysztof (6./7.)	Kotwica, Barbara (6./7.)	Slivka, Karel (6./7.)
Czuday, Holger (6.-8.)	Kowalik, Bogumila (6./7.)	Svadlenkova, Miroslava (6.-8.)
Dallmann, Wilfried (6.-8.)	Mazal, Rostislav (7./8.)	Sweet, David (7.)
Dvorak, Jan (6./7.)	Moistus, Tanel (6.-8.)	Trejbal, Zdenek (6./7.)
Hellmer, Franziska (6.-8.)	Palicka, Vaclav (6./7.)	Tylka, Agnieszka (6./7.)
		Vavreckova, Marketa (6.-8.)

Wednesday, 6th of April 2005

Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Marzena Piszczek, President of the board of the MARR S.A., welcomes all participants and wishes all partners a successful and enriching meeting. *Joanna Jakubowska-Łazęcka*, Director of the Department of Consulting and Assistance Programmes of the MARR S.A., presents the agenda for the following days. *Roman Petrusek*, President of the German Corporation of the State Development and Real Estate Companies, thanks the MARR for their hospitality and friendly welcome.

The Region of Malopolska

Joanna Jakubowska-Łazęcka (MARR) presents the main features of the Malopolska region. The region is located in the south of Poland and has 3.2 million inhabitants, who live in 57 towns, 22 poviats and 182 gminas. Krakow with 740,000 inhabitants is the largest town of the region. The region covers 5% of Poland's area and produces 6.5% of Poland's GDP, has 8.4% of the Polish population, 10% of all students and 12.7 percent of all Polish scientists.

In Malopolska there are 2.300 companies with foreign capital share and a total investment of 4.7 billion USD was made by the end of 2002, whereof 38% came from Germany. A sign for modern economy is that Malopolska produces 68% of all computer systems of Poland.

Moreover, Malopolska is an ideal picturesque place for holidays. It has five UNESCO heritage sites, different national parks, castles, summer festivals and extraordinary (wooden) architecture. Krakow, the former capital of Poland, was "City of Culture 2000" and is a city of eminent artists and famous people.

The Activities of MARR S.A.

Bogumila Kowalik from the Department of Consulting and Assistance Programmes of the MARR S.A. gives an overview about the activities of the MARR. The MARR was established in 1993 upon the initiative of the Krakow Voivode and the Agency for Industrial Development in Warsaw. More than 86.8% of the shares are held by the Malopolska Voivodeship. Other shareholders are local government institutions, regional enterprises and business associations.

The main activities of the MARR are the provision of services to SME, running of the regional investment service centre, cooperation with local governments (strategic planning, consulting, etc.) and the implementation of international cooperation for example in the frame of international projects, INCORD or COTOUR, by organising study visits, business meetings and international conferences.

One capital project of MARR is the Krakow-south investment zone. Here the former industrial site of a soda factory has been redeveloped comprehensively. As a result of the process, in 1998 a Carrefour Shopping Centre and a Cinema City complex opened.

Presentation of the RDC-Guide

Each partner receives a folder containing the so called RDC-Guide. *Silke Brocks* (DV) presents the structure and main intention of this guide. The RDC-Guide will be one main output of the INCORD-project. It provides all partners with common guidelines, good practice examples and recommendations how to develop an integrated RDC. The INCORD guide is thereby connected to the pilot projects in a reciprocal way. On the one hand the guide is designed to support all pilot regions to develop their pilot RDCs. On the other hand the results of the pilot projects shall be used as practical input for the guide. The guide is until now mainly based on an intensive literature research, since we have not yet all information about the practical experiences within the pilot projects.

Resulting from this procedure, the general structure of the guide is in line with the topics that have been discussed during the last workshops. After a general overview of the conditions that lead to the increasing importance of RDCs and of the functions of RDCs, concrete recommendations are given on how to organise the process of developing a RDC. Especially the questions "Which actors have to be involved?", "Which organisational structure is appropriate?" and "How can the process be organised effectively and successfully?" are answered in this part. The fourth chapter shows how to develop a RDC step by step. It provides information on each element that is ideally discussed in a RDC. These are at first the regional demarcation, and then the SWOT-analysis, the development of a regional vision and objectives as well as strategies, priorities and finally the detailed development of projects and measures.

The folder that each partner received is divided according to the chapters of the RDC guide. So, for instance, there is a register called "SWOT-analysis". In this register not only the RDC-guide chapter "SWOT" can be found, but also the presentations and minutes of the respective 2nd INCORD-workshop etc. So, the folder is intended to be the main INCORD-documentation handbook. The partners are asked to use this practical workshop documentation for the future to arrange all the information they receive during the coming workshops. The handbook will thereby grow step by step with the INCORD-project.

Visit of Sites

Afterwards the sites of the Carrefour Shopping Centre and the Soda factory are visited.

Thursday, 7th of April 2005 – Conference on EU-Structural Policy

Welcome and Introduction

[The Marshal of Malopolska Voivodeship, Janusz Sepiol, is not able to attend the conference due to the Pope's funeral.]

Dr. Marzena Piszczek, President of MARR S.A., opens the INCORD-conference on EU-Structural Policy. She explains that MARR is the leader for regional development. Their task is to prepare businesses as effective as possible for the EU-programmes and thus they are trying to meet the demand for information about the programming period and on assistance programmes.

Roman Petrussek, President of the BVLEG, welcomes all participants on behalf of the whole INCORD partnership. He especially thanks Joanna Jakubowska-Lazecka and Bogumila Kowalik for the sound preparation of the meeting. Afterwards, he refers to the first initial moments of the INCORD project and its (thematic) background. He expresses that this conference on EU-Structural Policy is of main importance for the INCORD-project since regional development concepts are strongly connected to EU-funding policy. Therefore, he is especially glad that Mr. David Sweet from the DG Regio could join the conference and talk about the future plans of the European Commission regarding the Cohesion Policy after 2006.

Besides, Roman Petrussek reports about the State Development and Real Estate Companies in Germany which are partner of the INCORD-project. He describes their main fields of action and interest as well as their capacity and function regarding regional development.

At the end of his presentation, Roman Petrussek states that cross border cooperation – such as the INCORD-partnership – gets more and more important since Europe is especially performing at the border regions. INCORD should – after having build up very good, constructive and trustful relations – lead us to concrete and long-term cooperation and also lead to new business relationships and to common projects and results.

Presentation of the INCORD-Project

Franziska Hellmer (BVLEG, INCORD Lead Partner) shortly presents the INCORD project in terms of partnership, main objectives, different themes of interest as well as project activities and events.

Presentation of the Malopolska Pilot Project

Bogumila Kowalik (MARR) presents the RDC pilot project of the Malopolska region. In the frame of the project an integrated strategy shall be developed not only on an abstract and theoretical level. The aim is to revitalise post-industrial and post-military brownfields. Each of these sites has a different character. Which sites should be developed first is already decided. Other goals within the RDC process are firstly the development of competence and building a team for developing those areas and secondly to develop a programme for a given area (integrated development strategy).

Until now, the following results have been achieved:

- For the post-military areas the necessary database is available for elaborating development concepts;
- A regional analysis with a focus on post-industrial and military issue has been elaborated;
- Inventory and identification of those areas, database, only larger and medium sized areas have been considered;
- Analysis of Municipalities where areas are located;
- A SWOT-Analysis has been made to identify strengths and weaknesses and to use the potentials of the region;
- Presentation of barriers: lack of legislation, lack of financial instruments, unorthodox solution for redevelopment;
- Development of competence & set up of competence team: the MARR is experienced in managing the transformation of industrial areas. The MARR established a consultation council which will meet first on the 22nd of April.

The first project for which a feasibility study will be made is the area of the white seas (continuation of the Solvay area). The first idea is to set up a contemplation part for meditation and religion (also in memory of John Paul II) in one part of the area. At the moment further parts are prepared and further projects selected; e.g. there is a plan to open a museum.

Future Reflections on EU-Structural Policy 2007–2013

David Sweet (Programme Manager of the Unit Poland, DG Regional Policy, European Commission) hold a presentation on “Growth, jobs and cohesion – structural funds in the Lisbon economy”. He gives an outlook on the EU-Structural Policy between 2007 and 2013. In the future, the EU-Structural policy shall be focused stronger on the Lisbon agenda, thus it has to be found out how regional policy can enforce these strategies.

The Lisbon agenda was agreed upon in 2000. There the Council met to work out, why the EU is not so competitive as other world regions (e.g. USA). The strategies they developed include a stronger focus on a knowledge-based economy, on more competitiveness and dynamism and the creation of more and better jobs. But the social model and sustainable development should still prevail. The main aims of the Lisbon Agenda are to liberalise the utility markets, to open up transport, to increase the employment rate, to harmonise services and to promote Europe’s R&D, etc. Until now, the targets could not be reached. For example, the economic growth in 2004 was only 2% whereas the target was 3%, the R&D expenditure was only 1.9% of GDP (Lisbon target 3%). In February 2005 there was a relaunch, which meant a change in the Lisbon strategy but not a change in the aims.

Regional policy is strongly connected to the Lisbon Agenda. She is necessary to compensate losers in a global and free economy and enable weaker regions to take part in the economic process. If there are regions that are not working integrated into the economy their potential can not be used totally and therefore every region benefits if regional policy is effective.

EU-enlargement since 1973

In Poland poverty is a serious problem. Generally there are big differences in the GVA (Gross Value Added) between the European countries, but especially to Poland. For example in the agricultural sector Polish farmers produce 20 times less than French farmers. The Polish remedy was to set up a National Development Plan whose aim is to promote economic growth and an environment for job creation. Macro and micro analyses and actions have been conducted and financial resources shall be targeted on key growth axes.

In order to link regional policy to the aims of Lisbon, key issues which the EU-commission sees are: Assistance must be more targeted, stronger focus on creation of job opportunities, not just research but Development and Innovation, appropriate infrastructures and furthermore an environment has to be created for enterprises, which does not regard entrepreneurial failure as a disaster but also as a chance for many new opportunities.

There is a total of 1.025 billion Euros available for regional policy whereof 133 billion Euros are for competitiveness and 345 billion Euros for Cohesion. But Mr. Sweet's opinion is that it doesn't really matter how much money is available, but it is important how the money is used. One or two million Euros more or less do not matter.

In the financial perspectives 2007–2013 it is planned to spend the largest share of all means (34%) on Cohesion, 29% will be spend on agriculture and 13% for competitiveness. Split by objectives 177.80 billion Euros of a total of 345 billion Euros are allotted for objective 1, 62.99 billion Euros for the Cohesion fund and 48.31 billion Euros for regions outside convergence with the aim to improve their regional competitiveness and employment.

The principles that will guide the EU-funding in the following years are:

- **More Concentration:** It is not wise to allocate means to all different issues; therefore a more strategic approach reinforcing the Union's priorities is needed. The geographical focus lies on the less developed regions, on which 4/5 of all means will be spend in the new funding period (before 2/3). Thematically the funding shall be stronger focused on the aims of the Lisbon and the Gothenburg Agenda. In this context a strategic document for cohesion policy has been adopted by the Council and a link between cohesion policy and Lisbon and Gothenburg has to be created.
- **Simplification:** This is very difficult to achieve when you have to assure that tax-payers' money is used in an efficient and effective way, because this makes high control efforts, monitoring of the effectiveness, etc. necessary to justify the way the money is spent. Things will not actually get simpler without a reduction of objectives and funds, an operation of programmes on a mono-fund-basis, the establishment of a more flexible financial management and a determination of the eligibility of expenses on the national level.

Mr. Sweet's conclusion is that Europe needs growth, jobs and cohesion. Only national policies can fulfil the Lisbon Strategy but European Structural Policy can make a real contribution to it.

Structural Policy in the Regions – Malopolska Development Strategy 2007–2013

Bozena Pietras-Goc from the Malopolska Marshal's office presents the project "Malopolska 2015". In Malopolska region they are actually discussing the future regional development and the future of EU Structural Policy.

In the first part of her presentation, Mrs. Pietras-Goc presents the context in which they are operating in Malopolska region. Malopolska has approached the task to elaborate a strategy of shaping future development. As the strategy is not only implemented by the Marshall office various partners are needed and a debate on the future development has begun.

In January 2005 the National Development Plan for 2007–2013 has been presented. Additionally, there will be regional operational programmes that are prepared independently by the regions. Malopolska will receive about 1,409.10 Million Euros, which is a lot more money as so far.

The project "Malopolska 2015" aims to develop a new development programme for 2015. The objectives are:

1. To initiate a public debate for regional needs and to create a regional consensus;
2. To develop a vision of necessary changes;
3. To develop a strategy document and operational programme, measures and tools.

For the development strategy the areas of environment, economy, links and relationship are of main interest. The main resources for this strategic document are the results of the public debate, information on needs by surveys and expert opinion and the own vision of the Voivodeship. It is important to involve partners into the planning process, therefore county workshops, consultation conferences with NGOs, etc have been held.

In the second part of her presentation, Mrs. Pietras-Goc explains how they think about Malopolska. There are three challenges the region has to meet: Globalisation, transport in the EU and competitiveness. Concerning the challenges of globalisation it has to be stated, that social and economic partners are changing and Malopolska region does not want to stay behind.

Malopolska has the lowest level of unemployment in Poland, which is 15%, the national average lies at 19%. Also the GDP is very good compared to the rest of Poland, but there are differences within the region (Krakow has a high GDP but the south a very low GDP). The level of education is also good compared to other regions, e.g. 10% of the population have a university degree or higher education (Poland 12%). Concerning investment Malopolska is the second region after the capital region of Warsaw.

Compared to the EU-25 Malopolska has a GDP of only 39.9%. If Krakow would not lie in the region, the situation would be comparable to the regions of Eastern Poland. The unemployment rate is very different in the regions of the Voivodeship: very low in Krakow but very high at the western border to Silesia and in the south-east. This is the starting point of the new structural funding period.

In the debate on convergence there are two different perspectives: Firstly there is the internal view, which looks at the differences between the Poviats of the Voivodeship (internal convergence). Here as much convergence as possible should be achieved; the weak parts of the regions shall not be left alone. But on the other hand there is only a limited number of projects that can be funded. Secondly Malopolska has to be compared to the other regions. The

Local Authorities have to answer question which conversion should be tackled, this has not been answered until now.

At the end, Mrs. Pietras-Goc states that a look to institutional changes should be emphasised also within the INCORD project, e.g. new proposal of trans-border institution of the European Commission.

The Implementation of the EU-Structural Policy in Poland – The National Development Plan 2007–2013

Michael Olszewski, Polish Ministry of Economy and Labour, Department of Structural Policy Coordination, presents the Polish National Development Plan (NDP) 2007–2013. The nature of the NDP is the same as a strategy; it formulates guidelines and directions for the country. But the NDP contains no guidelines for project implementation; these are formulated in the Operational Programmes (OPs) which are deduced from the NDP for each of the 16 Polish regions. The OPs are tactical documents. Draft versions of the OPs will be published this summer.

For the regional OPs, the European Commission wants to establish the mono-fund principle, which means one fund per programme.

Each Polish region gets European funding, the regional programmes are divided into regional sections. Each programme is developed on the basis of a regional analysis, through rounds of experts and thematic conferences. In the new NDP an OP on Civil Society will be integrated. This has been initiated by NGOs.

The act on NDP regulates that the NDP has to comply with the budget of the Cohesion Policy of the EU. One change is that the actual NDP has a three years period; the new one will have an extended timeline harmonizing with the EU timeframe.

The NDP is a planning instrument not only for the EU-Commission, but also for instruments from the state budget. For example in the current programme period road funds are not integrated into the NDP. There is another programme for transport, there are inconsistent aspects and it is difficult to make them coherent. Therefore there are two policies of road development (national infrastructure plans and NDP).

The timeframe of the Commission and the Polish preparation does not match. End of May there will be informal contacts between member states and EU where common guidelines will be discussed. In Poland the consultation on the NDP shall be finished end of June. Some think that this schedule is very narrow.

The priorities of the NDP are:

- Maintenance of Competitiveness, Technological Advancement
- Employment
- Coherence
- Social Integration
- Development of Human Resources, Training, Qualification
- Protection of Cultural Assets
- Cohesion of Regions
- Energy (renewable sources, efficiency, environment protection)

- Infrastructure
- Science and Information society (RND)
- Social issues and labour market: 1) Education and competences, 2) Social integration, support for infrastructure, 3) bringing citizens closer to decision of local areas (funded by global funds)
- Technical assistance

There are many people applying for funding, but the quality of projects is often low. There are many applications, but only few signed contracts. And the process of refunding is very slow. Because there are problems with the financial control it is possible that some means will not be refinanced. 11 Mrd. Zloty have to be paid back, but at the moment only 40 Mio Zloty have been paid back. They work hard in order to improve the procedure in the new programming period.

Experiences with EU-Structural Policy of Malopolska Region

Jacek Wozniak, Head of the Regional Development Unit of the Marshal's Office, states that the timeframe 2000–2006 does not match the national frame. Poland was not covered by the EU-Cohesion Policy since 2000. Therefore they stand on two platforms. The changes in the system will have impacts on the system after 2006.

The Polish system is legally too much regulated, there is the very bureaucratic mechanic of the structural funds. The solutions are hardly flexible and mobile, thus the question arises how positive results can be achieved in the next period.

In 2000 there were many Pre-accession projects. A very good project was the programme for the flood catastrophe: It was very flexible, uncomplicated and effective with little means.

Voivodeship Contracts are a remedy for the whole regional policy system. Until 1990 there were only sectoral policies and no principles for the transfer of funds. It was a complex situation and no coordination or monitoring and no integrated view. Today there is a very simple system: All money allocated to the regions has to be fixed in the Voivodeship contracts. There are two parties in the negotiation process: The National Government and the Marshals, who integrate arguments from the regional strategy. They discuss the projects and decide which of them gets money. But after some months problems of coordination arose, because they are only Polish funds and Poland is a poor country. An external stimulus is missing.

The Implementation of the EU-Structural Policy in the Czech Republic

Rostislav Mazal from the Czech Ministry for Regional Development (Section for European Integration) gives a lecture on structural operations in the Czech Republic. In his presentation he gives an overview on the following three aspects:

- The present state of the Community Support Framework (CSF)
- JROP – experiences and findings from programme and project level
- Approach for the next period 2007–2013

The present state of the Community Support Framework (CSF)

From 2004 to 2006 a total sum of 2,630.5 Million Euros is available in the Czech Republic for all structural operations. Thereof 1,454.3 are spent on objective 1. The whole country is eligible for objective 1 apart from Prague, which gets objective 2 and 3 funding. The funding available for objective 1 is distributed through four operational sectoral programmes (OP Industry and Enterprise, OP Infrastructure, OP Human Resource Development and OP Rural Development and multifunctional infrastructure) and one Joint Regional Operational Programme (JROP). The priority lies on the JROP and 31% of the CSF (which means 454 Million Euros) are allocated through it.

The first calls for proposals were launched in May 2004. The first experiences with the EU-Structural Policies show a very mixed picture. In some fields there is an excess of demand, the projects are easy to prepare and there is an unlimited absorption of projects. On the other hand in other topics there is only low interest. But these are often projects necessary for structural change such as air protection, development of rural areas. For these soft projects in human resource development there seems to be a lack of ideas.

After one year there are very high demands on submitted projects, but until now no means have been paid out.

JROP – experiences and findings from programme and project level

The JROP has a very decentralized implementation structure, it is a cross-sectoral programme and has very different final beneficiaries (public, NGOs, private sector). It has five priorities of which the most important is infrastructure, and the second biggest is development of tourism. There are three types of projects: Individual projects with regional impacts, actions within kraj's grant schemes and supra-regional projects with a countrywide impact.

The project cycle begins with a launch by the Managing Authority or regional body. The request is elaborated, transmitted and selected. After the contraction, the project realisation and various checks, finally there are payments. Until now there have been three calls for proposals. In the first call 139 projects have been selected and contracted, the other calls are at the moment at the phase of ex-ante checking of the selected projects and the third call just ended on the 31st of March. A big advantage is the possibility of electronic application.

After one year experience with structural funds and three years experience with pre-accession funding they have developed some "golden rules" for programme development, e.g. to simplify the implementation structure, to support the absorption capacity, to continue dialogue and partnership, to present good practice and to consult as much as possible with the European Commission and other EU members. On project level, they recommend among others to define realistic projects, to ensure a sound time management and to consult project leaders.

Approach for the next period 2007–2013

The Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG) will be prepared in partnership between the European Commission and the Member States between January and April 2005. The presentation of the first draft is planned for early May. The CSG is a framework of EU priorities for the next generation of national and regional programmes taking into account the specificity of each of the three proposed Cohesion Objectives.

The National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) ensures that the Community structural aid is consistent with the CSG. The Member State should submit the NSRF to the EU without delay after adoption of the CSG (possible after adoption EU legislative package), in the case of the Czech Republic it means November 2005. Other programming documents relevant for the implementation of the structural and cohesion funds are: The Strategy for Economic Growth CR, the National Development Plan 2007–2013 (NDP), the strategy for regional development and the strategy for sustainable development. The NDP should be a supporting document for the NSRF during the negotiations with the European Commission and should reflect internal and external changes. A first version of the NDP will be presented in September 2005.

Recently a document has been approved, which assesses the absorbing capacity of the Czech Republic. The Managing and Coordinating Committee (MCC) has a general coordination role during 2007–2013. Particular working groups will operate subordinated to it.

The Czech government has identified five preference issues for the new programming period: Enterprise, Innovation and Knowledge Economy, Human Resources Development and Universities, Accessibility and Infrastructure and Solving of the Regional Disparities.

Friday, 8th of April 2005 – 3rd Workshop on RDC-development

Welcome and Introduction

Christian Huttenloher (DV) welcomes all partners to the 3rd INCORD workshop. The workshop addresses the question how a regional vision and objectives, as an integral part of a RDC, can be developed. Silke Brocks (DV) presents the foreseen agenda and structure of the workshop. First of all, the status of the pilot projects are presented in order to gain a better insight at which step of the process they are. In a second step, Prof. Knieling gives an introduction into the main workshop topic – how to develop a regional vision. Afterwards, the partners present the vision of their region which gives a picture on what their region wants to achieve. Last but not least, a short reflection about the vision for the INCORD-partnership is foreseen.

Status of the pilot RDCs

In order to gain a better insight at which point of the process the pilot projects are, the pilot projects are presented.

Melanie Parr (EGS) presents the status of the pilot projects Drawsko and Keila. The **Drawa river region** in Poland is developing an integrated tourism development concept for the Drawa river basin. Main objectives are to create an adequate tool for the set up of a joint image of the region emphasizing on cultural and historic regional values, to integrate local activities in the region concerning the development of common tourism offers and to create a platform enabling the integration and coordination of activities of the private sector and the local/regional government.

The **Keila river region** in Estonia is also striving to foster an integrated tourism development in the Keila river basin. By the RDC-development they will survey and evaluate the existing tourist infrastructure, analyse the strengths and weaknesses of their tourist offers and deter-

mine general tourism development objectives. At the end of the project, they strive to have a concrete tourism marketing strategy and to set up tourism projects.

In order to achieve these objectives, a wide range of actors has already been involved in the RDC-development process such as the administration on regional and national level, politicians, representatives of the military, NGOs, entrepreneurs (e.g. hoteliers, mill owner) as well as other external experts. The involvement of regional actors is mainly ensured by workshops and thematic as well as organisational meetings. Besides, the direct pilot project partners and the external experts are cooperating intensively via mail or additional meetings.

The regional analyses of both regions are not yet finalized. The vision process has been fostered by a kick-off-conference that took place end of last year/beginning of this year. By this, many steps forward regarding the development of a vision and concrete objectives have already been done. First ideas regarding strategies and main fields of actions are existent. And some projects and measures are already in preparation.

The practical experience showed that the involved actors want to see very concrete results of the RDC process and also have very concrete questions. For instance, in Keila, the problem is that the Harju county government is not interested in their RDC-process because they do not see the potential of the INCORD-project and are also too busy with other day-to-day businesses. Only the southern county is interested and participates. Eike Hindov (City of Keila) imagines that they are interested because the southern municipalities are – comparing to Tallinn – weak and therefore interested in cooperating with Keila.

Marketa Vavreckova (Olomouc region) asks whether there is a good tourist infrastructure in the two pilot regions. Eike Hindov replies that there is not yet a real offer. Therefore, they want to define now what kind of infrastructure is needed. In terms of population there can be a potential for tourism offers since the region of Tallinn disposes of about one third of the Estonian population.

Rostislav Mazal (Czech Ministry for Regional Development) stresses that in Ostrava, the city he is coming from, there were very poor cultural sights. It is an old coal-producing region. He never thought that his region could be once attracted by tourists. But now, after the decline of the coal-industry, they have built up a “coal-mine-museum” – a kind of Disneyland promoting the coal industry. This museum is now a magnetic point in the region. And people are coming when they see that the region is developing and something is going on and changing.

The partners conclude that there are two main objectives for concentrating on tourism development and for fostering the region’s attractiveness: on the one hand, they strive to attract as many tourists as possible (economic potential) and on the other hand, they want to create a nice living atmosphere to attract SMEs to settle in their region.

Holger Czuday (LEG Thuringia) presents the status of the pilot projects in **Olomouc, Ostrava and Malopolska**. The thematic focus of all three pilot RDCs is laid on industrial and commercial development of the region. Here especially site development of former military and industrial areas is addressed. The main objective is to define regional key projects for the industrial and commercial development of the region, combined with strategies for business support, regional marketing etc. Currently, all three regions are finalizing their regional analyses as base for the further development of concrete projects.

Marketa Vavreckova presents the current situation of the pilot project of the **Olomouc** region. After a long discussion process, they will finally focus on the transformation of the current

military airport of Prerov to an only civil used airport. The decision of the RDC focus could be finally taken as the military decided recently to definitively leave the area. The main output of the project shall be the RDC completely describing this transformation process with all related impacts. Up to now, they have already a good basis for the RDC: a regional analysis for the Prerov region and an analysis of the social-economic potential of the region for the utilisation of the airport. Besides, they are concentrating on the technical and organisational part of the project (in terms of airport infrastructure and equipment which is necessary for the operation of a civic airport) as well as an analysis of the airport's impact for the surroundings (necessary road connections to the airport, inhabitants, surrounding industries/SMEs etc.). For the concrete RDC elaboration an external consultant (probably RDA) shall be hired. The final RDC structure and outline will be adjusted in the frame of the INCORD-workshop in Erfurt on the 19th of April. In terms of regional actors, they have involved politicians, NGOs, Chamber of Commerce etc. in an advisory board (which met once so far). Last but not least, Marketa Vavreckova stresses that the most challenging problem is that a new owner for the airport area has to be found.

Prof. Jörg Knieling reflects the pilot project of the Olomouc region. He points out that normally it is said that it is better to start a RDC process with smaller pilot projects in order to be able to show project successes at an early stage. First early successes are essential in order to motivate the participating actors. In this regard, the airport project is a very big and difficult project which can eventually lead to frustrations within the regional cooperation. Marketa Vavreckova replies that, at the beginning, they did not expect that the project becomes so huge.

Presentation of Prof. Jörg Knieling: Future Visions as an instrument of regional development – Characteristics, Functions and Methods

Jörg Knieling, Professor at the Institute of Urban, Regional and Environmental Planning of the Technical University of Hamburg-Harburg gives a lecture on "vision development" as an integral part of a regional development process. According to the formal RDC process, a vision has to be ideally developed after having analysed the strengths and weaknesses of a region. The vision has to be deduced from this regional analysis. And the vision itself should lead to common objectives and strategies for the region which at the end result in concrete projects. The main characteristic of a "vision" is that it describes neither the actual state of the regional development nor the targeted state or trend. And it is neither a utopia. It is an informal instrument which describes a desired future state of a region. A future vision for a region should be unique, achievable, communicable and motivating. Unique means that one has to make clear that the vision is not the same than e.g. for the neighbour region. Achievable means that a vision should not be a utopia; it does not make sense to develop a vision if she cannot be achieved. Communicable means that a vision should not be too abstract and too academic. Last but not least, motivating means that each participant and regional inhabitant should be able to identify himself with the vision.

A vision is normally made up of three main elements: a future vision process, a future vision and finally the implementation of the future vision into objectives and measures. Thus, a vision does not mean to have just a slogan for a region, it means to foster a discussion process about the future of a region. And many actors have to be integrated in that process which should be cooperative, consensus orientated and concentrated on main issues.

In terms of content, a future vision can contain economical, ecological, social, cultural,... topics. She is orientated on the specifics of the region in order to guarantee uniqueness and she is developed by a problem-oriented approach. She may contain both verbal and visual elements. Both are important in order to make the vision communicable. The main elements are: a logo, slogan, philosophy and principles, values, beliefs. But all components are not strictly needed. A slogan for instance is never a must.

But why is it important to have a future vision process? Such a process can have several functions: coordination (to coordinate interests of inhabitants), orientation/reflection (where do we want to go?), innovation (what is unique for/in our region?) and last but not least marketing (internal and external) because an easy communicable vision can be used to lobby for a region.

Furthermore, Prof. Knieling reports on the methods for the development of a vision. Instruments can be regional conferences, working groups, creative workshops, public participation and a panel of experts etc. Central questions which should be reflected in a vision development process are:

- 1) Where do we come from?
- 2) Who are we? Where do we stand? (SWOT-analysis in a way)
- 3) Where do we want to go?

There are also some risks that have to be kept in mind during the vision process. The formulation of the future vision can be for instance too abstract (like "better future for our region"). A vision can be also too detailed (like "airport in Ostrava"), because if then the airport project fails, the vision for the whole region makes no sense anymore. And a vision can be too fixed and inflexible. A vision should rather be able to change when circumstances change. Also in terms of the elaboration process, there are some inherent risks: The process can be too long (one cannot discuss one year about a vision without concrete results). It can be that important actors are not integrated in the process and then the implementation of the vision will be difficult. And it can be that there is no sufficient public participation which hampers the identification of all inhabitants with the regional future vision.

Last but not least, Prof. Knieling emphasises that the main aim has to be to implement the vision by measures and projects and to integrate it into a broader regional and dynamic development process. If today's future vision is tomorrow a back number, then the RDC process has been successful.

Pilot Projects' Visions

Melanie Parr (EGS) presents the vision development process for Keila and Drawsko. For developing a future vision, they organised a Kick-off-conference (including creative workshops) in each region. For facilitating the discussion process, the moderators of these conferences presented first the principles of the tourism vision for the region of Schwerin.

The draft vision for the Drawa river region is called "Four seasons on the Drawa river". Main objectives under this overall vision are the prolongation of the tourism season, the development of a joint image for the region and the promotion of local products in order to create a unique tourism highlight. Out of this, the partners already deduced the main fields of action: water tourism, cultural/event tourism, active/specialised tourism, agro tourism, eco tourism. In the following, concrete guiding projects will be developed for each of these fields. The

main target groups the RDC will be focussing on are seen in relation to these main fields of action.

For the Keila river region, Melanie Parr summarized the main outcomes of the Kick-off-Conference. Out of this, she drafted a vision and slogan, but which is not yet agreed by all partners. She proposes the slogan “Keila river region as a pearl of nature only a stone’s throw away from Tallinn”. During the kick-off-conference the following objectives for the region became clear: the establishment, development and improvement of accommodations and offers for tourists, the information and marketing improvement as well as the coordination of activities via an information centre. Main fields of action are: water tourism, event tourism, action tourism, adventure/extreme tourism, eco tourism. In the following, there will be concrete guiding projects developed referring to these objectives.

Tanel Moistus (City of Keila) adds that he is missing one aspect – the aspect of adventure tourism which does not appear in the slogan. Eike Hindov (City of Keila) expresses her satisfaction with the drafted vision. But she does not see a big interest for a touristy vision in the city government of Keila. Tourism is not yet considered as the main objective for Keila. Their main problem is economic development. Melanie Parr emphasizes that a tourism vision has been nevertheless chosen for the whole region since the surrounding rural areas want to concentrate on tourism. Thus the tourism objective has been the only common ground. Prof. Knieling replies that in this case, the touristy vision should be directed and combined with life of quality-aspects. In this respect, they can combine tourism with economy development, because entrepreneurs can be attracted by a lively and attractive surrounding. This combined approach would then please both sides.

Prof. Knieling additionally comments that the third main objective of Keila - establishing an “information centre” - is not formulated as a real objective, but rather than a concrete measure. Melanie Parr replies that the partners stated this point so often that she wanted to integrate it. But she will reflect if this point can be also reformulated, e.g. “internal and external information support”.

Marketa Vavreckova (Olomouc) reflects that they do not have a vision for the region Olomouc yet. They have not thought about a concrete vision for the airport yet. But they have an overall developing strategy for the whole region which can be used as basis for their airport development concept.

Christian Huttenloher (DV) asks if a vision should not be an umbrella for all sectors instead of having a vision only for the tourism sector. Prof. Knieling replies that it is okay to have a vision concentrated on the tourism sector if tourism is the main guiding development objective for the region. And under the umbrella “tourism” also other projects can be subordinated. But it is risky to have a vision which is concentrating on a single project like the airport in Olomouc. Here, a wider, economic, vision should be taken into consideration, e.g. keeping in mind that the airport can have a positive impulse for the economy.

Vision for the INCORD-Partnership

At the end of the workshop, the partners discuss about their vision for the INCORD partnership in order to exercise at a very concrete example how a vision can be developed. Along the three main questions that lead to a vision (where do we come from? where are we? where do we want to go?) the partners are asked to reflect the INCORD partnership and cooperation so far and what they expect from the future.

Silke Brocks presents answers to the first two questions. Where do we come from?: At the beginning, there have been just several bilateral and sometimes only indirect contacts between some of the partners. On the other hand, some partners did not know each other before. Thus, two years ago, INCORD has only been a very unstructured and incoherent partnership without common objectives.

Where are we now? Now, we have regular friendly meetings and conference. We know a lot more about each partner region. And the mutual understanding for the different institutional structures in each partner country has been increased and a common understanding for RDCs built up. Thus, the INCORD partnership is now a formal cooperation, financed by the European Union, a strong partnership with concrete and common objectives, outputs and benefits.

On this base, the partners reflect about the question “where do we want to go”, how could the INCORD-partnership be in 2010? Melanie Parr states that her first objective is to become / stay friends afterwards. Many friendship relations have been built up so far. Holger Czuday agrees with her comment. His INCORD vision is to have a continuous and sound informal partnership afterwards. He adds that for the LEG Thuringia it is also important that out of INCORD, an economical cooperation in terms of investments and settlements will be developed. They wish to have more contacts in Eastern Europe for further business relations.

For Marketa Vavreckova, the main objective is to attract investors for their airport during the INCORD-project. She can imagine further projects on basis of the INCORD-project with the subject “instruments of clusters”.

From Holger Czuday’s point of view, a continued formalised INCORD-partnership is not necessary after 2006. He would prefer to continue the cooperation on an informal basis. Christian Huttenloher replies that INCORD is for him just a pilot. And he sees advantages of a formal partnership because the contacts you make on an informal way are often not very stable and long lasting. Eike Hindov refers to Holger Czuday and affirms that from her point of view informal partnerships are more flexible. Therefore, she also prefers an informal partnership afterwards.

Christian Huttenloher adds that after 2006, the INCORD partnership will also have the chance to widen the partnership and to search for other additional partners.

Last but not least, Melanie Parr reflects that it is obvious that the implementation process of the INCORD pilot projects cannot be started until 2006. Therefore, it is perhaps possible to focus on an implementation project afterwards.

All presentations are available on the website : www.incord.org (Internal area)

Minutes by Silke Brocks, German Association for Housing, Urban and Spatial Development, 26.05.05