



HAL
open science

RURALIZATION. The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms

Aisling Murtagh, Maura Farrell, Marie Mahon, John Mcdonagh, Natasha Keenaghan, Therese Conway, Shane Conway, Florian Ahlmeyer, Clara Blasco, Aline Brochot, et al.

► To cite this version:

Aisling Murtagh, Maura Farrell, Marie Mahon, John Mcdonagh, Natasha Keenaghan, et al.. RURALIZATION. The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms. [Research Report] H2020 Ruralization. 2020, pp.150. hal-02891012

HAL Id: hal-02891012

<https://hal.science/hal-02891012v1>

Submitted on 6 Jul 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



RURALIZATION

RURALIZATION

The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms

D3.3 Review Report and Fact Sheets based on previous European projects

Part A: Review Report



"The project RURALIZATION has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N° 817642."

Version history

Ver.	Date	Comments/Changes	Author/Reviewer
0.1	17.04.20	First full draft revised from working draft 1	NUI Galway/Consortium
1.0	30.04.20	Revisions made based on Consortium and S.A.B. feedback	NUI Galway/Consortium & SAB

Project Acronym	RURALIZATION
Project Title	The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms
Project Number	817642
Instrument	Research and Innovation Action (RIA)
Topic	RUR-01-2018-2019 Building modern rural policies on long-term visions and societal engagement
Project Start Date	01/05/2019
Project Duration	48 months
Work Package	WP3 Framework for Research and Innovation
Task	T3.1 Review of literature and previous projects at European level
Deliverable	D3.3 Review Report and Fact Sheets based on previous European projects
Due Date	30/04/2020
Submission Date	30/04/2020
Dissemination Level ¹	PU
Deliverable Responsible	NUI Galway
Version	Part A, version 1.0
Status	Final
Author(s)	Aisling Murtagh, Maura Farrell, Marie Mahon, John McDonagh, Natasha Keenaghan, Therese Conway, Shane Conway
Contributor(s)	Florian Ahlmeyer, Clara Blasco, Aline Brochot, Alessandra Corrado, Miquel Correa, Adrienne Csizmady, Kim Graham, Krzysztof Janc, Dóra Karsa, Anne Kinsella, Willem Korthals Altes, Imre Kovách, Alice Martin-Prevel, Nicole Mathieu, Szocs-Boruss Miklos Attila, Irene Quesada, Andrzej Raczky, Veronique Rioufol, Jofre Rodrigo, Pertti Ruuska, Silvia Sivini, Petra Tas, Levente Viszló, Annamaria Vitale, Hans-Albrecht Wiehler
Reviewer(s)	RURALIZATION S.A.B. and Consortium members

¹ PU= Public, CO=Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services), CL=Classified, as referred to in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC

Table of Contents

Version history	2
List of Figures	4
List of Tables.....	4
Acronyms & Abbreviations	4
Executive Summary	5
1 Introduction.....	7
1.1 The RURALIZATION project.....	7
1.2 Report structure.....	7
2 Generational renewal, gender and rural regeneration.....	8
2.1 Definitions of key terms.....	8
2.2 Key issues: Literature and EU project review	10
2.2.1 Facilitating youth and their contribution to rural regeneration.....	10
2.2.2 Gender issues and rural regeneration	12
3 Foresight analysis	18
3.1 Definitions of key terms.....	18
3.2 Key issues: Literature and European projects review.....	21
3.2.1 Context and relevance: Rural foresight analysis.....	21
3.2.2 Research on megatrends, trends and potential weak signals.....	23
4 Rural newcomers and new entrants to farming	26
4.1 Definitions of key terms.....	26
4.1.1 Rural newcomers	26
4.1.2 New entrants to farming and succession	31
4.2 Key issues: Literature and European project review	35
4.2.1 Facilitating newcomers and rural regeneration	35
4.2.2 Facilitating successors/new entrants and rural regeneration.....	40
5 Access to land	47
5.1 Definitions of key terms.....	47
5.2 Key issues: Literature and European project review	49
5.2.1 Facilitating access to land	49
6 Policy instruments and governance approaches	60
6.1 Rural governance	60
6.2 Classifying rural governance approaches and instruments.....	62
7 Conclusion	67
8 References.....	69
Part B: Fact Sheets.....	92

List of Figures

Figure 1: Typology of counterurbanisation migration strategies	28
Figure 2: Different yet interlinked modes of farming	32
Figure 3: New entrant to farming typology	34
Figure 4: New entrant pathways	34
Figure 5: The RURALIZATION perspective	67

List of Tables

Table 1: Definitions of foresight analysis terms	21
Table 2: Examples of megatrend research relevant to rural regions.....	23
Table 3: Trend/scenario building research relevant to rural regions	24
Table 4: Research highlighting potential weak signals relevant to rural regions	25
Table 5: Types of rural newcomers	29
Table 6: Different types of governance approaches.....	63
Table 7: Different types of governance instruments	64
Table 8: Classification of existing/emerging governance approaches and instruments	65

Acronyms & Abbreviations

CEE	Central and Eastern European
EC	European Commission
ECA	European Court of Auditors
EIP-AGRI	European Innovation Partnership for Agriculture
EP	European Parliament
ESPON	European Spatial Planning Observatory Network
EU	European Union
SAB	Stakeholder Advisory Board
UN	United Nations
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

RURALIZATION deliverable D3.3 'Review Report and Fact Sheets' Part A provides a review of key issues relevant to RURALIZATION from European research. RURALIZATION is concerned with understanding how to facilitate rural regeneration and generational renewal. In this context, its key focus areas are: rural foresight and trend analysis; the future dreams of rural youth; facilitating rural newcomers; farm succession; new entrants into farming; and access to land. This generates a number of areas of focus for this review. Within each of the five main sections, definitions of key terms are considered, alongside barriers to and supports that can facilitate regeneration.

Generational renewal, gender and rural regeneration

Consideration of the over-arching, cross-cutting RURALIZATION issues of gender and youth reveal the multi-faceted nature of issues impacting generational renewal and rural regeneration. Drivers identified as impacting insufficient levels of young people in rural areas include lack of youth return migration, the ineffective transition from education to work, a weak youth labour market and wider factors such as poor services. Supporting greater levels of youth in rural areas highlights opportunities such as building on the desire among youth to be rurally located, but also complexities for policy as rural youth are not a homogenous group, and neither are rural areas, meaning targeted supports appear called for.

RURALIZATION also places focus on opportunities for new generations of women. Women play an important role in rural areas, such as being drivers and pioneers of rural development and innovation. Overcoming gender-related barriers to rural regeneration can further unlock this potential. These barriers come in many forms such as traditional gender roles and a lack of social and economic opportunities. Barriers also relate to the nature of rural places themselves. They can be perceived as lacking opportunity or suited to particular stages of life, such as a place for family life. Again overcoming these challenges needs responses that recognise local context and the complex, interconnected issues that are gender-related challenges to rural regeneration and generational renewal. An opportunity identified is building a new type of rural economy that presents a more feminised labour market.

Rural foresight analysis

Identifying opportunities through foresight analysis is central to the RURALIZATION perspective. Wider European research supports this perspective where the diversity of rural areas, and complex range of issues impacting these areas, raises the importance of using scenarios as a policy tool. This approach helps to find commonality among diverse drivers of rural change. Foresight reports analysing trends, building scenarios and outlooks for the future relevant to rural areas cut across a number of domains. This review also identifies and illustrates some research of potential interest to a rural trend analysis.

Newcomers, successors and new entrants to farming

RURALIZATION aims to promote rural innovation by focusing on newcomers to rural areas and new entrants/successors into farming. In relation to rural newcomers, some barriers to realising their potential include the nature of rural as a social space where there can be a lack of openness to newcomers leading to divided rural communities. Also if newcomer

entrepreneurs create jobs the local labour market may not effectively meet these demands. If newcomers are an unstable presence in rural areas this can limit the regeneration impact, as they are a temporary part of the economy and community. Supporting integration into rural communities is important. Generating opportunities must also address the multiple challenges of stimulating newcomers to come to rural areas and create jobs through entrepreneurship, but also that the local labour market is capable of meeting these new jobs created.

Many issues are also identified in relation to facilitating succession and new entrants to farming. They can link to the farm itself such as the viability of farm livelihoods, ease of transferability of farms and the need for succession planning. The attractiveness issue also emerged here in relation to farming as a profession, as well as rural areas more broadly. For new entrants particularly they face similar issues to newcomers in terms of openness and integration into rural communities. The importance of access to training (formal, informal, and practice-based) is also important to support farm development and innovation both for successors and new entrants. Specific gender issues also emerge such as traditional gender and work identities alongside gender inequalities in land inheritance. Emerging ways forward for policy include seeing farm succession and retirement as a twin issue, the potential increasing role of joint ventures and more careful targeting of supports to specific needs (e.g. of particular regions, types of farms and farm entry pathway).

Access to land

Addressing the issue of access to land is a vital starting point fundamental to dealing with wider agricultural decline issues in rural regeneration. Barriers to land access include land availability, land market and financial capital access but also socio-cultural factors around farming as for example an 'inherited profession'. Maintaining access to land can be impacted by tenure insecurity on rented land, as well as farm viability and how it interlinks with maintaining land access. Evidence suggests a broad need for land reform in the access to farmland context. Strengthening the role of public land in farming as well as land leasing to support access without necessarily ownership are some emerging potential ways forward.

Rural governance approaches and instruments

Rural governance is not static but dynamic and changing in nature. The characteristics of contemporary rural governance indicate, bottom-up, participatory approaches are now also a rural governance trend. But also there are multiple types of approaches and scales at which governance can take place. The correct mix of approaches is a key issue. The review has also highlighted existing and emerging governance instruments from both policy authorities and civil society contexts of potential interest for RURALIZATION.

This review highlights the significant policy challenge embedded within the realisation of the 'RURALIZATION' perspective. This review also highlights some areas of interest where opportunity may lie. The knowledge base generated by RURALIZATION will be crucial to generate more effective policy tools to enable the creation of a new rural frontier where new generations find stimulating opportunities for economic and social sustainability.

1 Introduction

1.1 The RURALIZATION project

The RURALIZATION project aims to look at ways to overcome rural decline issues that support rural regeneration and generational renewal. The empirical focus of the project is to develop, assess and disseminate novel instruments, strategies and policies that cater for rural regeneration, in relation to the **future dreams of rural youth**, facilitating **rural newcomers, succession and new entrants into farming** and by addressing the issue of **access to land**. RURALIZATION will also carry out a **trend analysis** to uncover relevant trends for rural regions. This knowledge base will culminate in generating effective policy tools, and through this RURALIZATION aims to contribute to the development of a **new rural frontier** that provides **exciting opportunities to new rural generations** for social and economic sustainability and to realise their dreams in a rural context. Overall, RURALIZATION develops a novel perspective for rural areas to trigger a **process of ruralisation as a counterforce to urbanisation**.

1.2 Report structure

The 'Framework for Research and Innovation' that forms RURALIZATION work package (WP) 3 seeks to ensure the research and innovation approaches in all WPs are well connected. It also seeks to integrate the results of previous projects into RURALIZATION, which this RURALIZATION deliverable D3.3 'Review Report and Fact Sheets' is centrally concerned with. It provides a review of literature and previous projects at the European level. Projects were reviewed that paid particular attention to areas such as renewing rural regeneration including foresight analysis, rural newcomers, new entrants to farming, farm succession, access to land and policies to address it. The deliverable is broken into two parts. Part A focuses on the review of evidence in relation to the RURALIZATION core areas of focus. Part B provides Fact Sheets based on our review of previous projects at the European level.

This report (D3.3 Part A) provides a review of key definitions and issues relevant to RURALIZATION. It aims to grasp core issues and explore considerations around defining key terms acting as a starting point that can feed into other core WPs. The report provides a series of topic papers on the core areas of focus for the RURALIZATION project:

- Generational renewal, gender and rural regeneration
- Rural foresight analysis
- Newcomers, successors and new entrants to farming
- Access to land
- Rural governance approaches and instruments

This review provides a starting point for more in-depth work within WPs by highlighting opportunities, barriers and potential policy implications of key issues.

2 Generational renewal, gender and rural regeneration

2.1 Definitions of key terms

Key terms

Rural regeneration

From a policy and practice perspective, *rural regeneration* has been defined as: “programmes and policies intended to lead to the social, economic and/or community development or rejuvenation of a local area – and particularly where this area has suffered significant decline or depopulation in the recent past” (Osbourne et al., 2002, p.1085; Osbourne et al., 2004, p.158). Conceptual discussion on rural regeneration is presented in deliverable D3.2 Detailed Conceptual Guidelines. Key aspects of this are:

- Problems of decline create a need for regeneration, to re-make and transform in response to decline. Regeneration focuses on interventions that address problems of decline (Woods, 2005; Pemberton, 2019).
- Regeneration must recognise local context and diversity of place. Generalisations are important for policy and should be as representative as they can be of contemporary rural diversity (Copus and de Lima, 2015).
- Regeneration must harness distinct local resources, but with an eye on the wider world. There is a danger of not capturing development opportunities if too narrowly focused on local resources. Rural regeneration is neither focused on ‘bottom-up’ or ‘top down’ development.
- Locally-led regeneration should facilitate multi-actor, collaborative, flexible approaches. It is important different stakeholders are involved as they possess diverse, complementary knowledge and resources. It is also important programmes are not too heavily prescriptive allowing flexibility so that local place specific challenges can be tackled (Powe et al., 2015, Woods, 2005).
- Regeneration should ideally be multi-dimensional and integrated, seeking to develop mutually supportive measures that assist with alleviation of a number of aspects of decline (Furbey, 1999; Roberts, 2000). Addressing one problem in the short term (e.g. social decline issues) could help address others (e.g. economic opportunities) in the longer term. Regeneration can require longer-term interventions where results are slow to emerge (Powe et al., 2015).
- Regeneration must recognise that rural areas are composed of a wide range of interconnected relations and forces. Rural is not as a place with boundaries around it but a dynamic, changing space of interconnected relations (Woods, 2011; Heley and Jones, 2012).
- Regeneration can involve looking to the future and envisioning what this would ideally look like. This may need novel policy-making methods such as designing interventions in response to the visions communities have for rural futures (Kuhmonen et al., 2016; Shucksmith, 2018).

Generational renewal

The renewal of generations in rural areas is an issue for both farming and the wider rural economy. In European policy discourse, the concept has been linked to achieving economic and social sustainability in European rural areas (Bori, 2019; ENRD, 2019). For the purposes of assessing the impact of the CAP on generational renewal, Dwyer et al. (2019) outline what the achievement of generational renewal looks like in both agricultural and non-agricultural contexts:

- *Generational renewal (agricultural)*: “...where there are sufficient young people, willing and able to take on farms and farming as a business choice, to enable agriculture to make a positive and enriching contribution to the local economy and community in which their farms are situated” (Dwyer et al., 2019, p.4).
- *Generational renewal (non-agricultural)*: “...where rural communities are stable or growing in population, and there is a sufficient range of rural businesses and employment opportunities for young people, to sustain them. The judgement of what is ‘sufficient’ is context-dependent: there is no universal threshold for all EU rural territories” (Dwyer et al., 2019, p.4).

Clearly, embedded within generational renewal are multidimensional aims. Dwyer et al.’s (2019) definitions for example describe agricultural generational renewal in terms of young people wanting to farm, but also that their farms positively support their local economy and community. In the context of the CAP, Bori (2019) describes it as focused on improving rural and agricultural innovation and competitiveness, alongside seeking to maintain viable food production and broader viability of rural areas. Generational renewal is ambitious and highlights the interconnections between demographic, social, economic and environmental renewal in rural areas. Drivers impacting these processes may be inside or outside rural areas, and operate on different scales. Projects analysing rural-urban relations (e.g. RURBAN, Fact Sheet 26; BUILDING RURBAN RELA, Fact Sheet 41; SELMA, Fact Sheet 48, Part B) and rural-global relations (e.g. DERREG, Fact Sheet 32 and GLOBAL-RURAL, Fact Sheet 36, Part B) demonstrate this. Also, based on findings of the SURE-Farm project (Fact Sheet 13, Part B), Coopmans et al. (2019) categorise four types of factors operating at different levels impacting farm intergenerational renewal: personal/individual factors; farm (family) level factors; farming system level factors; and regional/societal factors. Personal/individual and farm (family) level factors are found to vary widely within and between SURE-Farm case studies while farming system level and regional/societal factors are more consistent within case studies.

It is also important that generational renewal does not see youth in isolation from wider society and that it takes an integrated focus across the generations. Eurofound (2019) argues that policy ambitions for rural generational renewal and economic regeneration must not be too single minded in pursuit of opportunities such as for rural youth and entrepreneurial newcomers. Focusing on improving quality of life of the elderly and existing rural residents, such as through improving service access and developing social amenities, is also important. Research also shows how older rural residents have an important role to play in rural regeneration. For example, volunteering senior citizens can assist to maintain rural services (Mettenberger and Küpper, 2019). Older farmers possess important knowledge and skills that can assist younger generations of farmers (Conway et al., 2019).

Ways to achieve generational renewal and rural regeneration need to be better understood. RURALIZATION is concerned with better understanding circumstances and drivers that can realise this. The complex range of issues that come into play are the focus of this review.

2.2 Key issues: Literature and EU project review

2.2.1 Facilitating youth and their contribution to rural regeneration

This section focuses on the drivers impacting insufficient levels of young people in rural areas and factors that evidence suggests can facilitate generational renewal and rural regeneration. Farming issues are focused on in section four and five, as well as gender issues in section 2.2.2 below. This section takes a broader view on the rural economy and society.

Barriers to youth and rural regeneration

Lack of youth return migration

Youth out-migration contributes to an ageing rural population and lack of sufficient generational renewal. Nevertheless, leaving rural areas can have benefits for rural youth. Education and training opportunities are more limited in rural areas, which then also reduces career prospects (Shucksmith, 2000). More broadly, leaving can provide a space for gaining new experiences and knowledge (Gambino and Demesure, 2012). Stockdale (2006) finds outmigration has generally positive impacts on youth education levels, occupation status and personal development meaning youth migrants need to leave to develop these skills. Ní Laoire and Stockdale (2016) view out-migration of rural youth as a life course event. Although related to age, out-migration is connected to a life transition from youth to adulthood. Rural areas lack higher education opportunities, which provide rural youth with their initial opportunity to leave their rural setting. Once educated and having gained a familiarity with the 'broader world', alongside a lack of suitable employment aligned to qualifications, the tendency is to establish roots elsewhere. In the Scottish context, Stockdale (2006) also finds personal ties elsewhere can influence youth returning to a rural area they had previously left because of migration.

Ineffective transition from education to work

In the preliminary findings of the YUTRENDS project (Fact Sheet 50, Part B) the transition from education to employment is identified as an important period meriting attention when dealing with the question of youth unemployment. It is also however a complex issue to address. YUTRENDS does not focus solely on rural areas and assesses territorial trends in youth unemployment across European regions and cities. Nevertheless, the findings still have relevance for rural generational renewal. If the transition from education to work does not happen effectively, it can have wider impacts, leading to youth unemployment affecting longer-term employment prospects. Evidence reviewed by YUTRENDS finds this can impact gaining future work because of unemployment periods when starting into employment, also it limits chances to develop work-based skills and may lead to a move into further education that still does not match labour market needs. The category of NEETs (young person not in education, employment or training) is identified of particular concern as hard to reach with labour market policy supports. Youth unemployment also has wider regional impact,

potentially creating a social exclusion effect and associated social problems. Relating to the regional economy the ineffective transition from education to work is also presented as a wasted opportunity not harnessing young people's potential (Pop et al., 2019).

Weak youth labour market

A simple lack of job opportunities can impact on youth leaving, but also the possibility that they can return to the rural area that have previously migrated out (Stockdale, 2006; Engel et al., 2019). However, beyond this, in the UK context, a binary path for rural youth into the labour market is highlighted by Shucksmith (2000). Rural youth enter the national market, characterised by working outside the rural area with high pay and career opportunity, alongside the local labour market that displays the opposite traits of low pay and limited career progression prospects. Preliminary findings from YUTRENDS suggest for a strong youth labour market, central characteristics include the presence of an entrepreneurial culture, quality of jobs (also flexibility), labour mobility and a skills balance in the youth workforce (Pop, 2019). Weaknesses in these areas potentially impacts how the rural economy can effectively serve a youth jobs market.

Multi-faceted set of conditions can act as barriers

The above paragraphs discuss social, but mostly economic barriers to rural generational renewal and regeneration. Wider factors can come into play, such as poor services. For example, transport and being able to avail of rural work opportunities are linked. In some rural areas, travel to work can need access to a car (Shucksmith, 2000). In the French context, Gambino and Demesure (2012) argue a wide set of conditions (e.g. services, quality of life, education, social and economic conditions) impact how favourable rural areas are for youth. However, alongside this there are a multitude of trajectories for rural youth, meaning what is generally favourable may not match all youth.

Supporting rural regeneration through youth: Governance reform issues

Rural youth are not a homogenous group, neither is outmigration straightforward

Leading on from the point above relating to the wide set of factors impacting rural attractiveness for youth, better understanding of the nature of rural youth out-migration is important to enable the design of policy measures that are effective and appropriately targeted. In the German context for example Engel et al. (2019) argue rural youth should be viewed as a heterogeneous group and out-migration can be selective of certain groups of youth. It is viewed as important to understand drivers of out-migration and what changes can enable youth to stay.

Building on the desire among youth to be rurally located

Existing research identifies a desire among some rural youth to stay rural. For example, research based in a predominantly rural region of Hungary finds among 17 to 19 year olds, migration outwards was not considered a definitive choice for the future. While results for women differed slightly (discussed further below), overall there was general contentment with rural life and emotional ties to the rural area. Future opportunities they desired provided the decisive push towards moving out from the region (Timar and Velkey, 2016). In the UK context, a Food, Farming and Countryside Commission (2019) report found a clear preference

amongst young research participants (16-24 year olds from both rural and urban areas) to work in rural areas if employment was available. RURALIZATION will develop an inventory of the rural dream futures of youth. The dream futures will be discussed at regional levels to explore how they can be made come true.

Collaboration and integrated employment support services

Addressing youth unemployment is important to support rural generational renewal. Preliminary findings from the YUTRENDS project identify core themes important to effective policy measures addressing youth unemployment. Because of the complex problem of effective transition from education to employment it is important different actors collaborate to deliver tailored interventions. The Polish YUTRENDS case study for example identifies a range of regional and local collaboration partners working together to deliver the Youth Guarantee: "...the labour offices at the different levels work with the long-established Voluntary Labour Corps (or OHP), financial intermediaries, labour market partners (social partners, employment agencies, NGOs, social economy actors, educational institutions, social dialogue institutions, municipalities and employers)" (Pop et al., 2019, p.33). In addition, employers are a key collaboration partner, often at the centre of implementation of measures. In addition, there is a need for room within policy measures to tailor implementation to regional needs (Pop, 2019; Pop et al., 2019).

Youth entrepreneurship

As already discussed above, rural youth out-migration is not the only core issue for generational renewal and rural regeneration. Also pertinent is youth do not return, or when they do, they generally do not create jobs (Stockdale, 2006). Youth entrepreneurship then becomes important for how youth return migration can better support rural regeneration.

2.2.2 Gender issues and rural regeneration

Extra emphasis on opportunities for new generations of women is part of the RURALIZATION project aims. A specific objective is to harvest potential growth that can be unlocked by overcoming traditional gender roles in the generational renewal of rural areas. The issues covered below are more general to rural regeneration, but are important considerations in the context of their impact on facilitating rural newcomers, new entrants into farming, succession and access to land. Because of the specific focus within RURALIZATION on opportunities for new generations of women, this section presents analysis framed within binary understandings of gender. This is also where rural research is concentrated. However, we also touch on wider gender and sexuality issues, which is also an area of future research need.

Importance of addressing gender issues for rural regeneration

Enhance integrated rural regeneration

Increasing women's economic participation has significance for both rural economic regeneration and community development. For example, Midgley (2006) suggests opportunities arise from rural restructuring to increase rural women's participation in the formal economy. It is also suggested in more traditional gender identity contexts,

opportunities exist to transfer a more feminised set of skills (e.g. developed in domestic settings) into society via community-led regeneration activities.

Improved economic opportunities unlocks other opportunities

In more traditional contexts where patriarchal household structures remain greater job opportunities for women in rural areas can disrupt this, bringing not just economic, but also social and cultural benefits. For example in the Turkish context, Him and Hoşgör (2019) find that the emergence of export companies employing women contributed to a feminisation of the rural economy. Despite the more negative aspects of low-pay and long hours of work, the employment particularly enabled young women to gain a wage and contribute significantly to the financial capacity of their households. Working in these factories also provided a space for women to enhance their social network and gain access to an external market economy (e.g. access popular culture and social media via purchased smartphones) in a regional context of geographic, social and economic isolation.

Women as rural innovators

Women play an important role in rural areas as drivers and pioneers of rural development and innovation. They are key contributors to local and community development (EIGE, 2017). More 'feminised' farm practices are important representations of farm-level innovation that support economic viability and farm diversification. Women can be the drivers of these practices. Evidence suggests a more multi-functional approach makes farming more attractive to women such as: less dominant methods (e.g. organics, smaller-scale, mixed, extensive farming), diversified farms (e.g. farm tourism, food processing/adding value to farm produce, on-farm education, green care/social farming) or shortened supply chains (e.g. local/direct to market initiatives) (Heggem, 2014a; Ball, 2019; Coopmans et al. 2019). Franić and Kovačićek (2019) argue that despite the presence of gender inequality issues, there are also exceptions. Rural women can still be drivers of rural innovation and diversification (e.g. development of new products, services and wider activities). The SIMRA project (Fact Sheet 21, Part B) also demonstrates this highlighting how women play a role as beneficiaries of social innovation, but also as innovators and participants of rural social innovation (Valero and López-Marco, 2018). Overcoming gender-related barriers to rural regeneration can further unlock this potential. For example, Ní Fhlatharta and Farrell (2017) highlight how rural women in Ireland can be drivers of rural innovation, but also face challenges due to more traditional patriarchal attitudes and norms.

Gender-related barriers to rural regeneration

Female out-migration impacts population renewal prospects

Lifecourse stages can mean outmigration of women is concentrated among younger age groups. Younger women leave rural areas to gain education, work and skills (Liebert and West, 2016). This trend however can have a deep impact on a region's renewal prospects. For example, in the Swedish rural context, Johansson (2016) argues it is the age and intensity at which the out-migration of rural women occurs that is a key factor in rural decline. Between ages 18 to 34 out-migration for rural women was found highest in the study region due to high unemployment. This in turn influences the natural population increase of the region. While

the region also experiences female in-migration and a sustained trend of return migration, out-migration of young women was still greater than in-migration levels.

Traditional outlook on gender can limit both social and economic opportunities

Rural places tend to be more traditional than urban. Midgley (2006) observes rural women's identity has traditionally been constructed as separate from the economy, framed within ideas of motherhood and domesticity, with rural economic practices and structures more masculinised. For example, in relation to gender roles this is found present both in agriculture (Heggem, 2014b; Dwyer, 2015), but also the wider rural economy such as entrepreneurship (Ní Fhlatharta and Farrell, 2017) or particular sectors providing more 'feminised' employment opportunities (Him and Hoşgör, 2019). Leisure activities can also be associated with stereotypical feminine and masculine gender differences. According to Shortall (2016), urban leisure activities (such as visiting cafes, shopping and cultural activities) can be considered more feminine, and rural leisure activities (such as fishing, hiking and hunting) more masculine. Urban lifestyles are also identified as more female friendly in comparison to rural areas (Rauhut and Littke, 2016). This can limit social and economic opportunities available to women in rural areas and balanced renewal of the rural population.

Rural attractiveness

Issues around rural attractiveness also have a gendered dimension. For example, in the Swedish rural context, Rauhut and Littke (2016) find that rural areas can be a place perceived as lacking opportunity and potential for community integration. This is because of traditional, more conservative value systems and social norms, as well as masculinised lifestyle and labour market issues. This is described as negatively impacting female newcomers and return migrants.

Out-migration due to a lack of employment opportunities

Evidence highlights many younger women in particular leave rural areas to look for opportunities (e.g. work, education) in urban areas (Heggem, 2014a; Johansson 2016; Leibert 2016; Liebert and West, 2016). Patriarchal farm succession patterns can also lead to female out-migration (Luhrs, 2016). For example, in Ireland gender is a key feature in out-migration, with a distinct lack of employment for females in rural areas. Agriculture and other primary industries in some rural areas are traditionally male dominated, which encourage mobility among females (Ní Laoire, 2002). Regions such as Västernorrland in Sweden also display a masculinised labour market with sectors such as fishing dominating (Johansson, 2016).

Rural as a predominantly domestic, family place

The persistence of more traditional gender identities limits female participation in the rural economy. However, alongside this, women themselves can prioritise care-giving responsibilities over economic opportunities. For example, in rural Germany, Tuitjer (2018) finds rural as a place for family life can be a driver of rural in-migration, while challenges relating to employment and income within rural areas were accepted as part of rural motherhood. Urban and rural migration patterns of women were not solely linked to labour market opportunities. Lifestyle choices to return and commit to living in a rural area superseded the lack of employment opportunities and/or an income perspective. Based on biographical interviews of women (with and without children), the urban was described as a

space of youth and freedom, further education and employment opportunities while the rural became a marker of family life with greater opportunities for family-rearing and home-building (Tuitjer, 2018). In Ireland, McNerney and Gillmor (2005) find that the majority of women who had dependants (e.g. children, elders) actively prioritised their caring responsibilities over participation in the labour market. Their central role was in the family and employment was accessed if it could be paired with care-giving responsibilities. In some local contexts this was more possible than others e.g. tourism offering seasonal employment. A majority of women who were not in paid employment cited a responsibility to home life as opposed to a lack of opportunities as the reason for this (McNerney and Gillmor, 2005).

More generally, limited job opportunities in rural areas, alongside a desire for a rural family life may impact work-life balance for men. For example in the Swedish context Anderson et al. (2018) find that males (and older workers) are most likely to become long-distance commuters (albeit while being married and having children decreases the probability) from rural areas. Women are almost twice less likely than men to long distance commute from rural areas. It was also found that single women would accept longer commutes.

Attitudes to rural areas as a place of (in)opportunity

While a place in some respects young women may want to stay (e.g. emotional/social/cultural reasons), rural areas can also be places where young women in particular do not envision offer a realistic future for them. For example, a study of dream futures of the youth finds that: "women prefer rural locations equally to men but have limited chances to realise their dreams" (Kuhmonen et al., 2016, p.98). Leibert's (2016) study of sex-selective migration in rural East Germany notes how following the fall of the socialist regime a pessimism developed and persists. This now entrenched pessimistic outlook on the labour market is described as an important factor contributing to quite significant levels of youth migration, particularly young women. Other research has shown that a number of factors can combine to impact how rural areas become a place perceived as lacking opportunity. In the Swedish context, Rauhut and Littke (2016) find lifestyle and image factors come into play here, with a negative view of the region, alongside traditional values and cultures of rural life, shaping out-migration decisions for young females. In the Hungarian context, Timar and Velkey (2016) find young women had a pessimistic view on their future prospects in the area, despite having positive emotional ties. Rural regions were considered less favourable places to develop a future career or family life, and poor services including education and healthcare fed into migration plans. Also, to a much greater extent, parents were found advise their daughters to leave than their sons.

Gender and age imbalanced human capital decline

Outward migration of young women (and younger age groups more generally) can lead to depriving a rural area of human capital and impacts its capacity to attract external investment and new technological infrastructure (Johansson, 2016).

Gender, sexuality and LGBTQ belonging

Diversity is important to both economic performance and social cohesion. Part of diversity relates to cultural groups (DIVERCITIES, 2019). Lived experiences in both urban and rural areas can be socially oppressive for LGBTQ communities. In relation to rural areas, they can be an environment where LGBTQ (youth and adults) may experience isolation and struggle to find a

rural sense of belonging if supportive friendship networks are not effectively formed. Challenges can also be experienced in relation to expressing, exploring and forming identity (Annes and Redlin, 2012; Cohn and Leake, 2012; Wienke and Hill 2013; Hulko and Hovanes, 2018; Forstie, 2018). Negative experiences can influence moving out of rural areas. For example, Hulko and Hovanes (2018) find that a lack of acceptance and/or the need to suppress sexuality can lead to negative associations towards rural surroundings and raise a desire among LBT youths to move to an urban area where they felt they could experience greater acceptance and access to wider social networks. This group of rural youth therefore appear more susceptible to out-migration. But the availability of public space where these youths feel safe impacts positively on their wellbeing and their identity (Hulko and Hovanes, 2018). Also supportive family and wider social networks, alongside specific support resources can positively impact the lives of LGBTQ rural youth (Cohn and Leake, 2012).

Overcoming gender issues in rural regeneration: Governance reform issues

Recognition that issues are complex and local context matters

Gender issues discussed here reflect more generalised issues, but local context can mean they present differently. For example in relation to female migration, Liebert and West (2016) argue a country's 'gender culture' can inform female migration behaviour. If a more traditional, patriarchal family model persists with a gender division of labour, this can place constraints on independent mobility and employment of women. Where a more traditional gender culture is less persistent female employment and spatial mobility can be promoted. It is also observed that many Nordic rural areas are experiencing trends of migration (outward and inward) influenced by local contexts relating to the lifecourse, while rural regions in Eastern Europe can experience more selective migration out of these regions. Also recognising that female rural migration is complex is important. It can be driven by work and education opportunities, but also lifestyle aspects such as poor infrastructure, as well as masculine local culture, for example (Rauhut and Littke, 2016).

Greater hurdles for some groups of rural women

Treating rural women as a homogenous group in rural regeneration appears not an effective approach. For example, Him and Hoşgör (2019) find opportunities afforded by the feminisation of the rural economy were not uniform across all groups of women. New employment opportunities taken up by rural women in mountain villages of Turkey had greater positive impacts (social, cultural, economic) on younger than middle-aged women. The traditional position within the patriarchal household was more difficult to disrupt for middle-aged women despite this work, or the significance of their wage to the household income. Their waged work was incorporated alongside their other responsibilities (e.g. household work, family rearing, farm work). Beyond this, the different experiences were also found to damage solidarity among rural women with many older women reporting they felt increasingly isolated in the face of changing economic, political and cultural systems.

'Feminising' of the rural labour market

Supporting rural regeneration and greater opportunities for rural women could be facilitated by strategies to support expansion of a more feminised rural labour market to help address the gender gap in opportunities in rural areas. For example in the Swedish context, Johansson

(2016) observes how the Västernorrland region has experienced deindustrialization alongside growth in a more female-friendly labour market in urban regions. These act as a push factors driving out-migration of young women to urban regions. The Västernorrland labour market is comparatively 'unfriendly' for women, a masculine imaginary frames local culture. Fishing and hunting are central to local culture and dominate the local labour market. Johansson (2016) cites as public service jobs as an area supporting a more feminised labour market. Other sectors of potential interest could include the creative industries, for example. Findings of the EDORA project in the Scottish context show the gendered nature of the rural labour market with "more men involved in the 'traditional' sectors based on natural resources (agriculture, fishing, forestry, etc.), finance and manufacturing. Women dominate jobs in the tourism, public administration, education and health sectors" (Shucksmith, 2010, p. 640). However Shucksmith (2010, p.640) also points to imbalances at higher levels despite the gender divisions, where women dominate jobs, "men hold most of the leadership and management jobs with those sectors".

Facilitation of greater levels of female return migration

At certain stages of the lifecourse women are more likely to leave rural areas, but also during others they are more likely to return (Johansson 2016; Liebert and West, 2016; Tuitjer, 2018). For example, Tuitjer (2018) finds that for rural women returning home to their rural origin is an important part of their lifecourse. The return is part of a self-actualising element of their identity. However, other barriers may hinder return and policy measures could provide stimulus. For example, in the Swedish rural context, Rauhut and Littke (2016) argue that a lack of modernisation of the rural economy and the gendered nature of the labour market mean women are less likely to return, particularly those with high levels of education career prospects can be limited.

Rural as a distinct LGBTQ space

An association with urban space as more open to LGBTQ culture while the rural associated with LGBTQ lifestyles as 'closeted' is observed (Schweighofer, 2016). Nonetheless, it is important to move beyond stereotypes of rural places that do not reflect current reality and negatively impact how rural is perceived as a place to live and work. Not disregarding that rural can be an oppressive environment for LGBTQ communities, Schweighofer (2016) argues that the rural context informs and requires a much different conceptualisation of LGBTQ identities. In rural settings sexuality may not be centralised or prioritised in how a LGBTQ person forms their identity. Rural LGBTQ individuals can also find that other elements of their rural identities are not reflected in urban normative stereotypes. Schweighofer (2016) argues that rural life actually permits different variations of LGBTQ identities. Also depending on the stage of life, rural areas may be more attractive to LGBTQ individuals. Gorman-Murray (2007) find that the desire to explore identities in a freer and more accepting space is a key push-factor for LGBTQ rural-to-urban migration. However, identity formation for LGBTQ individuals can involve an array of movements that extend far beyond the rural-to-urban patterns. Annes and Redlin (2012) suggest that a return to rural life can be a key element to identity formation for gay men with rural origins. Nevertheless, vital to facilitate rural as a place facilitative to distinct LGBTQ identities is that barriers impacting belonging and expression of identity are overcome.

3 Foresight analysis

Under WP4, the RURALIZATION foresight analysis consists of regional trend analysis, an inventory of the rural dream futures of youth and assessment of the findings. Trend analysis will involve identification, analysis and assessment of trends relevant for rural regeneration. It also has a qualitative dimension profiling various rural areas as destinations of the future dreams of youth. Finally, synthetic analysis of the trends and dreams to reveal potentials and avenues for positive future developments in various types of rural areas will be carried out.

3.1 Definitions of key terms

Foresight analysis uses a range of terms (e.g. for an overview see Forward Thinking Platform, 2014). Table 1 outlines definitions of a range of terms of specific relevance to the RURALIZATION trend analysis. Broader discussion of wider features is presented below.

Trends

For RURALIZATION, a trend is defined as “Developments that are effective in specific regions and activities” such as local food, teleworking and renewable energy (Kuhmonen, 2019, p.8). RURALIZATION will identify context (i.e. in specific regions) and phenomenon specific (e.g. local food; renewable energy) trends. RURALIZATION will also identify different types of trends relevant for rural regions, such as megatrends. For RURALIZATION, a megatrend is defined as “Overarching mainstream that affects most regions and activities” such as globalization, urbanisation and climate change (Kuhmonen, 2019, p.8). A number of wider features of trends can also be distinguished:

- They have a pervasive nature (Saritas and Smith, 2011).
- Individual actors (e.g. stakeholders, organisations, individual nations) generally cannot influence them (Saritas and Smith, 2011).
- They can be distinguished by their duration but tend not to be short-term and are longer-term (e.g. lasting a number of years to a vast period of time) (Saritas and Smith, 2011).
- Trends have different degrees of predictability. This can depend on “the inertia of the system, the degree of dependence of a future state from the past” (Bisoffi, 2019, p.7).
- Other attributes of trends include their: strength (e.g. strong or weak); scale (e.g. megatrend); evolutionary pathway (e.g. potential trends become trends, existing trends cease, trends become stronger or weaker); structure (e.g. trends that are related to each other, complexity of trends and factors influencing them, stable/evolving trends); and temporal influence (e.g. gradual or fast) (Saritas and Smith, 2011; Forward Thinking Platform, 2014).
- Trends can be influenced by wild cards, which are defined by OECD (2016b, p.22) as: “...high impact events that are unpredictable or unlikely to happen”. If realised wild cards have high impact and create fundamental, destabilising change in existing systems (Saritas and Smith, 2011; Forward Thinking Platform, 2014).
- Discontinuities can also occur which are: “Abrupt, major changes in the nature or direction of a trend” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.8). Similar to wild cards discontinuities are disruptive but differ in being unanticipated (Saritas and Smith, 2011).

Drivers

Assessing drivers influencing trends is an important part of trend analysis. More broadly, understanding drivers of rural decline and regeneration, as well as what drives some areas not to decline, is important to RURALIZATION. A number of wider features of drivers can also be distinguished:

- Drivers are distinguished from trends by the fact that they are causes of change, while a trend is the direction of change (Bisoffi, 2019).
- Drivers tend to be wide ranging, such as political, economic, societal, technological, legislative or environmental factors (UK Government Office for Science, 2017).
- Drivers of change are potentially amenable to influence by different actions such as policy change or investment (Saritas and Smith, 2011).
- Drivers are changeable and their influence can lessen or increase over shorter timeframes than trends. Uncertainty is therefore also associated with drivers where they can result in driving patterns of change in different directions: “if a driver goes one way or the opposite way the real divergence occurs and change patterns evolve differently” (Saritas and Smith, 2011, p.295).
- Drivers are sometimes understood as direct (clear, strong influence on system change) and indirect (some impacts on drivers or has less direct impact) (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014).

Weak signals

For RURALIZATION, a weak signal is defined as: “Symptoms of change in specific regions and activities” such as food activism, sharing economy and urban farming (Kuhmonen, 2019, p.8). A number of wider features of note include:

- Weak signals are diverse in nature (e.g. social, demographic, technological, environmental, economic or psychological) (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014).
- Weak signals can become emerging patterns, but more often they do not become new mainstream trends. However, they can become trends hence are important to effectively understanding potential futures (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014).

Scenarios

RURALIZATION will analyse the relationships between trends and drivers to identify key triggers of rural trend scenarios.

- Scenarios are descriptive outlooks on the future, looking ahead to a reasonable point in time (e.g. 10 or 20 years ahead) (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014; UK Government Office for Science, 2017). Rotmans et al. (2000, p.811) describe scenarios as starting from: “an initial state (usually the present), depicting a final state at a fixed time horizon”.
- They consist of different elements that are causally related e.g. “states, driving forces, events, consequences and actions” (Rotmans et al., 2000, p.811).
- They can take different forms such as exploratory (possible futures) and normative (desirable future) scenarios. Different types of scenarios may be developed in foresight analysis (Bisoffi, 2019).

- Scenarios are hypothetical, possible futures pathways. They are not predictions nor probable futures. Their development enables more open, creative thinking about possible futures and development of actions that make certain futures more probable (Rotmans et al., 2000; UK Government Office for Science, 2017; Bisoffi, 2019).
- They provide a vehicle to explore possible futures and “different outcomes that might result if basic assumptions are changed, for instance regarding policy interventions” (Rotmans et al., 2000, p.811).
- Explanations of causes behind scenarios or grouping them together is described as ‘narratives’ or ‘storylines’. This approach can have importance when factors more difficult to measure (e.g. values, behaviours) drive change, or drivers are vast and highly numerous. This can be defined as: “A coherent description of a scenario (or a family of scenarios), highlighting its main characteristics and dynamics, the relationships between key driving forces and their related outcomes” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.16).

<i>Foresight</i>	“A systematic, participatory and multi-disciplinary approach to explore mid- to long-term futures and drivers of change” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.25).
<i>Trend</i>	<p>“General tendency or direction of a movement/change over time” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.25).</p> <p>“The direction in which something is developing or changing” (Bisoffi, 2019, p. 7).</p> <p>“A visible – or emerging – pattern of events that suggest change. In futures thinking, a ‘trend’ becomes a ‘driver’ when it acts on the policy or strategy area of interest” (UK Government Office for Science, 2017, p.93).</p>
<i>Megatrend</i>	<p>“A megatrend is a major trend, at global or large scale” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.25).</p> <p>“...long-term driving forces that are observable now and will most likely have significant influence on the future” (European Commission (EC), no date).</p> <p>“Large scale social, economic, political, environmental or technological changes that are slow to form but which, once they have taken root, exercise a profound and lasting influence on many if not most human activities, processes and perceptions” (OECD, 2016a, p.4).</p>
<i>Weak signals</i>	<p>“An early indication of a potentially important new event or emerging phenomenon that could become an emerging pattern, a major driver or the source of a new trend” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.27).</p> <p>“...the first signs of paradigm shifts, or future trends, drivers or discontinuities” (Saritas and Smith, 2011, p.297).</p>
<i>Drivers</i>	“Factors causing change, affecting or shaping the future” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.10).

	<p>“...those factors, forces or events – developments which may be amenable to changes according to one’s strategic choices, investments, R&D activities or foresight knowledge and strategies. They are both presently accessible and future relevant” (Saritas and Smith, 2011, p.295).</p> <p>“A current or emerging trend that is likely to shape (have an impact on) development of the policy or strategy area” (UK Government Office for Science, 2017, p.92).</p>
Scenarios	<p>“A description of how the future may unfold according to an explicit, coherent and internally consistent set of assumptions about key relationships and driving forces” (Forward Thinking Platform, 2014, p.22).</p> <p>“stories that describe alternative ways the external environment might develop in the future and how different market conditions might support or constrain the delivery of policy and strategy objectives” (UK Government Office for Science, 2017, p.93).</p> <p>“...hypothetical sequences of events, constructed for the purpose of focusing attention on causal processes and decision-points” (Rotmans et al. 2000).</p>

Table 1: Definitions of foresight analysis terms

3.2 Key issues: Literature and European projects review

This section presents findings from literature and European projects relevant to RURALIZATION foresight analysis on rural regeneration. It also identifies literature and reports of potential relevance to WP4 trend analysis, which will uncover and analyse relevant trends for rural regions and impacting rural regeneration.

3.2.1 Context and relevance: Rural foresight analysis

This section draws together some key findings from European projects relevant to rural foresight analysis and wider rural policy implications.

Diversity of rural areas leading to the importance of scenarios as a rural policy tool

Projects such as EDORA (Fact Sheet 33, Part B) and FARO-EU (Fact Sheet 35, Part B) emphasise the diversity of rural areas and the need for differentiated approaches to rural supports. Both projects classify different types of rural area through development of typologies (e.g. see Copus et al. 2011b; van Eupen et al., 2012). Both projects also emphasise that diversity goes beyond what typologies can encompass. The policy process is highlighted, particularly around governance structures, institutional heritage and policy-making traditions, as diverse across rural Europe. In this context, FARO-EU recognised scenarios as an important policy tool. FARO-EU recognised available models cannot adequately identify many issues, and the relationships between them, significant for rural futures. It also recognises scenario modelling using indicators is challenging, given for example different governance structures across the EU.

Combing both data of qualitative and quantitative nature is therefore important, which is the RURALIZATION approach. Projects such as FarmPath (Fact Sheet 5, Part B), TRANSMANGO (Fact Sheet 28, Part B) and VOLANTE (Fact Sheet 30, Part B) make use of use foresight, scenario and vision development.

Creative and participatory foresight methods

Different approaches can be taken to scenario development in rural foresight studies. Approaches that combine different types of data and involve local knowledge appear particularly important. Building on preceding phases of the EDORA project it takes a simplified qualitative approach combined with expert assessment of potential scenario implications. The IMAJINE (Fact Sheet 45, Part B) project uses participatory scenario building to not just test the project results but establish the extent to which the evidence resonates with policy-makers and other stakeholders, in an effort to highlight possible alternative approaches to dealing with the challenges of spatial injustice. In the context of global drivers, to build exploratory scenarios for future food system change TRANSMANGO used a three stage process involving multiple types of EU stakeholders “building scenario skeletons...developing scenario narratives...analysis of results and preparation to use scenarios in local and EU case studies” (Vervoort et al., 2016, p.3). More broadly, the project also used creative methods by carrying out a game jam tour with young gamers. This enabled the use of applied games to explore the future of food experiment with different potential futures (TRANSMANGO, 2018). Following the more creative and innovative trends in rural foresight studies, RURALIZATION will develop foresight analysis that combines both empirical data of qualitative and quantitative nature. For the qualitative aspect, RURALIZATION will deploy the ‘dream futures’ method developed by Kuhmonen et al. (2016).

Finding commonality among diverse drivers of rural change: The role of ‘narratives’ and ‘storylines’

The EDORA project finds a plethora of thinking on drivers of rural change. However when looking beyond the local level, EDORA argues there are exogenous, external drivers of change that can be considered virtually similar across Europe. They are described as: “the consequence of deeply-rooted global socioeconomic trends which may be considered effectively immutable (in terms of policy intervention)” (Copus et al., 2011a, p.34). These exogenous drivers are presented as three ‘meta-narratives’ which group together ‘storylines’ (economic, social, environmental, and policy processes commonly occurring together) of rural change. These are the agri-centric meta-narrative, the rural-urban meta-narrative and the meta-narrative of global competition and capitalist penetration. EDORA is also careful to point out the distinction it makes in calling these ‘meta-narratives’ as opposed to ‘narratives’. This is because of the hugely complex nature of rural change and hence the difficulties in understanding it fully, as well as the danger in thinking in linear, cause and effect, terms. Meta-narratives also are not to be interpreted as development paths of particular rural areas and may occur in different combinations. The meta-narratives are also presented within the overarching theme of ‘connexity’. This sees growing interconnectedness of the rural economy and society over long distances. This impacts the capacity to exploit rural resources where “the strength of linkages to sources of information, innovation, and business opportunities, and the capacity to exploit them can become more important than proximity to resources per se” (Copus et al., 2011a, p.122). EDORA contends that accepting these exogenous drivers, one

important scale for policy responses (in addition to macro-level interventions aligned to different rural area types) is “micro-scale (localised) differences in capacity to respond” that builds territorial (both tangible and intangible) capital (Copus et al., 2011b).

3.2.2 Research on megatrends, trends and potential weak signals

Foresight reports analysing trends, building scenarios and outlooks for the future relevant to rural areas cut across a number of domains. Some have specific focus on foresight in rural areas, but a number of other domains are also important to identifying trends of relevance to rural regeneration. The tables below identify initial lists of research of potential interest to RURALIZATION. Table 2 identifies megatrend research relevant to rural regions. Table 3 identifies research constructing scenarios and identifying trends either at the European or broader international (e.g. OCED countries) and global levels. Table 4 is illustrative of potential weak signals emerging in rural research.

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Themes</i>
Rural (cross-cutting)	Leveraging megatrends for cities and rural areas (OECD, 2019)
Agriculture and Food	Global megatrends in agri-food (Ferreira et al., 2019)
Environment and Land	Megatrends threatening SDGs (UNDP, 2017) Global megatrends and the European environment (EEA, 2015)
Political	Geopolitical megatrends impacting Europe (EPRS, 2017)
Technology	Megatrends impacting science, technology and innovation (OECD, 2016b)

Table 2: Examples of megatrend research relevant to rural regions

Domain	Themes
Rural (cross-cutting)	Rural trends 2015-2030 (Perpiña Castillo et al., 2018) Rural storylines, meta-narratives and future scenarios (EDORA project - Copus et al. 2011a; 2011b)
Agriculture and Food	Drivers and scenarios beyond 2020 (M'barek et al., 2017) Farm employment trends (Schuh et al., 2019) Agroecological farming scenarios for transition by 2050 (Poux and Aubert, 2018) Land use and food security scenarios (Le Mouël et al., 2018) Global food security trends and European impact (Maggio et al., 2015) EU agricultural outlook for markets and income, 2019-2030 (EC, 2019) Global drivers of future food systems change and explorative scenarios (TRANSMANGO project - Vervoort et al., 2016) Transition pathways for European sustainable and equitable food and nutrition futures for Europe (TRANSMANGO project – Vervoort and Helfgott, 2017)

Environment and Land	Global land resource assessment and scenarios of change (UNCCD, 2017) European land use scenarios (PRELUDE project – EEA, 2007) European level trend analysis across 25 environmental themes, grouped in three clusters (environment; socio-economic; and systemic perspectives) (EEA, 2015) Dietary change scenarios for sustainable food systems (Willett et al., 2019). Scenarios for high nature value (HNV) farmlands (Lomba et al., 2019)
Technology	Future technology trends (OECD, 2016a; 2016b)
Society and Economy	Rural employment, growth and innovation (Ecorys, 2010) Territorial trends in youth unemployment trends (Pop et al., 2019) Female migration scenarios for rural regions impacted by female out-migration (Wiest et al., 2013)

Table 3: Trend/scenario building research relevant to rural regions

Theme	Potential weak signals
Agriculture	<p><i>Re-feminisation of farming and rural areas:</i> Increase in ‘feminised’ farm practices (e.g. farm tourism, ‘caring’ practices related to education, environment and community associated with more multi-functional farming) and female participation in farming and rural economy (Heggem, 2014a).</p> <p><i>‘Back to the land’ movement:</i> Value-driven migration from urban to rural areas to develop a land-based lifestyle and reconnect with nature (Halfacree, 2001; Dolci, and Perrin, 2018; Wilbur, 2014)</p> <p><i>Participatory certification systems:</i> Move away from third party certification (e.g. organics) and towards assurances that involve participation between producers and consumers (Källander, 2008; Sacchi, 2019).</p> <p><i>Agroecology movement:</i> Both an explicit movement towards agroecological farming practices and more ‘silent’ turn where practices not explicitly identified as agroecological (or proto-agroecological) are identified on ‘peasant’ farms (e.g. van der Ploeg et al. 2019).</p> <p><i>Re-peasantisation of agriculture:</i> In response to agricultural modernisation an de-peasantisation a process of ‘re-peasantisation’ is observed since the 1980s where focus is on more ecological and multifunctional farming practices (e.g. van der Ploeg, 2018a).</p>
Environment and Land	<p><i>Land abandonment:</i> Land previously used for agriculture abandoned and not used for other purposes. Understood as more dominant in upland areas or those with biological limitations (Lasanta et al. 2017; Van der Zanden et al., 2017; Perpiña Castillo et al., 2018).</p>
Society and Economy	<p><i>Rural cosmopolitanism:</i> International migration to rural areas without a recent precedent of in-migration due to greater global mobility, but also characterised by ‘precarity’ such as insecure work and citizenship (Woods, 2018).</p> <p><i>Counterurbanisation:</i> Migration from urban into rural areas, such as accessible rural areas close to cities or remote rural areas (Šimon, 2014).</p>

	<i>Commercial counterurbanisation</i> : In-migration that stimulates rural economy growth, such as through entrepreneurship, local employment and local professional networking/cooperation (Bosworth, 2010).
Political	<i>Radical ruralism</i> : Migration to rural areas seeking farming lifestyles accompanied with efforts such as achieving self-sufficiency or experiments in alternative social organisation (Halfacree, 2006; Wilbur, 2013; Hunt, 2019).
Technology	<i>Smart farming</i> : Increasing range of applications of information and communications technology in agriculture (e.g. Wolfert et al., 2017; Bacco et al., 2019)

Table 4: Research highlighting potential weak signals relevant to rural regions

4 Rural newcomers and new entrants to farming

Under WP5 RURALIZATION aims to promote rural innovation by focusing on newcomers to rural areas and new entrants/successors into farming. It will improve understanding of the current situation, drivers of better performance and innovative practices that can support this. This section explores defining key terms and outlines core issues emerging from a literature and European project review. It looks at the importance of these groups to rural regeneration, barriers to realising their potential as part of rural regeneration as well as issues for rural policy and governance. Within this, gender issues are also discussed. Findings from a review of European projects are also drawn on. European projects such as NEWBIE, SURE-FARM, FarmPath, Farm Succession in Europe, Farm Success, Farm Succession and A2L (Fact Sheets provided in Part B) feed into the review on succession and new entrants into farming. In relation to newcomers, projects such as EDORA, DIVERCITIES and MIGRARE feed into our review (Fact Sheets provided in Part B).

4.1 Definitions of key terms

RURALIZATION will study different groups: (1) rural newcomers, i.e., people who migrate from another area towards a rural area, but who may work outside agriculture or forestry, (2) new entrants to farming (who also can be rural newcomers), (3) successors, such as, new generations that take-over the family farm.

4.1.1 Rural newcomers

Key terms

Rural newcomers are new in-migrants to rural areas. Put simply, they are new residents who migrate from another area to a rural area. A number of terms are used in migration research that are important to consider. They help inform how 'rural newcomers' might be defined in the RURALIZATION context and important fields of research of interest to RURALIZATION. For example, Piša and Hruška (2019) observe that in the Czech context, direct focus on entrepreneurial in-migration is lacking and analysis can be found from studies on amenity migration and counterurbanisation.

Counterurbanisation is generally understood as migration from urban into rural areas. Mitchell (2004) however distinguishes it more specifically as migration from concentrated (urban) to de-concentrated (counterurban) areas. Counterurbanisation has been described as a problematic, complex and even chaotic term, used inconsistently and sometimes with vague definition (Halliday and Coombes, 1995; Mitchell, 2004; Halfacree and Rivera, 2012). Because of problems surrounding understanding and defining counterurbanisation some have moved away from use of the term. For this reason, Halfacree and Rivera (2012, p.92) use the term *pro-rural migration* defined simply as "people moving towards more rural destinations". Nevertheless, the term is still widely used in research and it is a relevant area to RURALIZATION. Halfacree (2008) argues that rather than focusing attention on deep definition of counterurbanisation, shifting to look at the people who are part of the counterurbanisation process is more fruitful.

Amenity migrants to rural areas are attracted primarily by the natural and/or cultural environment, rather than economic drivers (Gosnell and Abrams, 2011).

Newcomers: Who, why and where

To define *rural newcomers*, it is important to consider who migrates and why, as well as their sending countries.

Types of rural newcomers (who) and motivations (why)

Understanding rural newcomers as a relatively homogenous group of middle-class migrants attracted for example by more idealised views of rural life is not adequate (Halfacree, 2001, 2008; Mitchell, 2004; Haartsen and Stockdale, 2018). Rural newcomers may not always be migrants by choice but also those who migrate out of necessity, for economic or humanitarian reasons (Membretti et al., 2017). Research by Pistre (2012) in the French 1970s/80s context demonstrates how rural newcomers are a diverse group, also with diverse motivations, including people at different life-stages (e.g. families, retirees/close to retirement) and from different occupation groups. Patterns did show preference for certain geographic locations, but also attraction to the countryside increasing with age (Pistre, 2012). Gieling et al. (2017) highlight research that describes rural newcomers as migrants driven by pursuit a variety of factors such as rural quality of life, a quiet life, rural community life, affordable housing or they migrate for personal or family reasons. Quality of life can link to different factors, such as occupation or rural environment. For example, Piša and Hruška (2019) observe motivations for newcomers can include the desire for more fulfilling, meaningful occupation with more autonomy, freedom and independence. Entrepreneurship is a necessity to achieve this rather than a prime motivation. On the other hand, qualities of the rural environment such as social (slower pace of life) and environmental (rural landscape and amenities) factors can motivate newcomers (Piša and Hruška, 2019; Argent et al. 2013). Further to this, personal issues can also be a driver, such as a major life-change or event (e.g. divorce, death of a family member) (Stockdale, 2014; Piša and Hruška, 2019). However, from counterurbanisation research in the Czech context, Šimon (2014) finds urban to rural migration is motivated by a wide range of factors, however looking more broadly it primarily has non-economic drivers (e.g. lifestyle, quality of life). Counterurbanisation research also highlights how this process brings different types of in-migrants to rural areas:

- *'Marginal' or 'back to the land' counterurbanisation* is distinguished where in-migrants are motivated by establishing an alternative lifestyle, such as farming utilising marginal land or developing sustainable communities.
- *'Mainstream' counterurbanisation* is a more generalised form that can have varying motivations, but most significant is the value attached to living in a rural environment.
- *'Default' counterurbanisation* is a category of migrants where the rural itself is not a central driver, but an incidental part of their migration such as international labour migrants (Halfacree, 2001; 2008).

In the context of understanding counterurbanisation's economic impact, Bosworth (2010) develops the concept of *commercial counterurbanisation*, understood as in-migration that stimulates rural economy growth. It is not just about entrepreneurship, but "...may take the form of business creation by rural in-migrants, their employment in other rural firms, or their

promotion of other businesses through local trade, knowledge exchange, and cooperative working” (Bosworth, 2010, p.977). It subsumes residential counterurbanisation where commercial counterurbanisers live in rural areas. It is also seen as a potentially two-stage process where residential counterurbanisation can occur before commercial counterurbanisation. The commercial aspect, such as rural business creation, can emerge at a later stage and migrants do not come to a rural area with the intention of starting a business. Based on research in remote rural areas in the Czech context, Šimon (2014) distinguishes four types of counterurbanisation (see Figure 1).

Types of migration strategies	Household motivation	Household preferences	Household employment
Ex-urbanisation strategy	Lifestyle oriented (consumption)	DWELLING in destination – Household seeks environmental and social amenities associated with rural dwelling.	Maintain strong employment link to urban areas. At least one adult member employed in urban area of origin.
Anti-urbanisation strategy	Lifestyle oriented (consumption)	DWELLING in destination and NOT WORKING in urban area – Household seeks environmental and social amenities associated with rural dwelling and working.	Close up employment link to urban areas. One/both partners outside labour force, employed at destination or unemployed.
Family livelihood strategy	Economy oriented (production)	ECONOMIC NEED – Household seeks primarily to satisfy their economic needs (housing, cost of living, employment, etc.); environmental and social amenities associated with rural areas are secondary.	One/both partners employed at urban area of origin or at destination or unemployed/outside labour force.
Rural entrepreneurship strategy	Economy oriented (production)	ECONOMIC PROFIT in destination – Household considered environmental and social amenities associated with rural areas as appropriate for setting their business activities.	Create strong employment link at destination. At least one adult member employed at destination.

Figure 1: Typology of counterurbanisation migration strategies

(Šimon, 2014)

While not strictly ‘newcomers’ rural return migration is also potentially important to consider in how rural newcomers are defined. For example, in the Irish context Ni’ Laoire’s (2007, p.343) research highlights how return migrants can adopt “both insider and outsider roles” and occupy a space in-between local and migrant highlighting how treating these a separate, binary categories is problematic. Return migrants have potential value to support generational renewal.

Rural newcomers can be broken down to a number of types, reflecting different overarching motivating drivers (see Table 5). Newcomer entrepreneurs and lifestyle migrants display overlaps. For example, Píša and Hruška (2019) find that for entrepreneur newcomers, entrepreneurship is more of a necessity to achieve a more meaningful, fulfilling occupation in a rural location that they value as a place which offers the potential to realise this ‘dream’. In the Swedish context, studies have classified newcomers at the same time as entrepreneur and lifestyle newcomers/in-migrants (e.g. Carson et al., 2018; Carson and Carson, 2018; Eimmermann and Kordel, 2018).

Type	Examples of studies
Farmers and foresters	'Back to the land' migrants such as in the UK (Halfacree, 2001), Portugal (Dolci and Perrin, 2018) and Italy (Wilbur, 2014).
Entrepreneurs (working outside farming and forestry)	Urban entrepreneur newcomers to peripheral rural areas of Czechia (Píša and Hruška, 2019). Creative entrepreneurs in Danish rural areas (Herslund, 2012). Winter tourism entrepreneurs in northern Sweden (Carson et al. 2018; Carson and Carson, 2018). Dutch rural tourism entrepreneurs in Sweden (Eimermann, 2016). Lifestyle migrant entrepreneurs in Slovenia and Sweden (Eimermann and Kordel, 2018). Thai female rural to rural entrepreneurial immigrants to Sweden (Webster, 2017).
Labour migrants	Newcomers as international labour migrants working in low skill jobs in the fishing sector in Northern Norway (Aure et al., 2018). European international labour migration to rural mid-Norway (Rye, 2018). Ukrainian labour migrants to the agricultural sector in Poland (Górny and Kaczmarczy, 2018).
Marriage migrants	Newcomer who migrates to a rural area due to marriage to a local (Munkejord, 2017).
Refugees and asylum seekers	Integration of skilled political migrants into declining rural communities of Latvia (Bakre and Dorasamy, 2019). Immigration of asylum seekers and refugees to Alpine mountain communities (Membretti et al., 2017; Perlik et al., 2019).
Amenity/Lifestyle migrants	Amenity migration to mountain regions (European Alps and Andes) (Bender and Kanitscheider, 2013). Amenity migration to rural peripheral areas in Italy (Steinicke et al., 2009).

Table 5: Types of rural newcomers

Who: Active newcomers?

The role(s) newcomers play in rural areas when they locate here is important to rural regeneration. In the context of newcomer entrepreneurial in-migrants, Píša and Hruška (2019) define newcomers as in-migrants that have become permanent residents in rural areas; they do not commute to urban areas for work and general daily household activities (e.g. shopping). Nonetheless, new work patterns introduce problems with this view. Those engaged in rural remote working neither commute to urban areas for work nor have a place of work in rural areas. Distinguishing economically and/or socially active newcomers is important to rural regeneration. Vuin et al. (2016, p.135) for example define active in-migrants as those who are "active in the labour force and/or volunteer organizations". Nevertheless, non-active rural newcomers may become active newcomers. In addition, non-active rural newcomers can also contribute to demographic regeneration of rural areas more widely.

From where and to where?

Rural migration is complex. Findings from the EDORA project identify three distinct rural migration 'story-lines'. One is urban to rural migration (counterurbanisation). Another is

movement of human capital from remote rural to accessible rural areas (or urban areas) and finally movement of economic migrants from poorer regions of newer EU member states to EU15 regions both urban and rural (Copus et al., 2011b). The sending locations of newcomers are thus diverse, for example:

- Rural newcomers are not confined to migrants from within national boundaries. Newcomers can be international migrants (e.g. Aure et al., 2018; Rye, 2018; Górný and Kaczmarczy, 2018). They may include for example citizens from other European member states, non-EU migrants, refugees and asylum seekers.
- Rural newcomers can migrate from urban areas (e.g. Píša and Hruška, 2019). But as opposed to counterurbanisation, rural newcomers are not just from urban areas. Haartsen and Stockdale (2018) include both those who have come from urban areas or other rural areas in their study of rural newcomer family stayers. Webster (2017) assesses rural to rural entrepreneurial immigration from Thailand to Sweden.
- How far should a newcomer have travelled? Haartsen and Stockdale (2018) include those who have moved short or long distances in their study of rural newcomer family stayers.
- The specific type of rural destination is also important to consider, such as to accessible, peripheral and intermediate rural areas. For example, Píša and Hruška (2019) are concerned with urban migrants to peripheral rural areas.

In summary, in the RURALIZATION context, some preliminary observations on defining, and more broadly characterising the dynamic notion of 'rural newcomers' can be drawn:

- It is important to define rural newcomers as a diverse group, with different types of newcomers (who), coming from different places (where) and with different primary motivations (why).
- Rural newcomers who are active in rural areas are particularly important to rural regeneration. RURALIZATION is therefore particularly concerned with facilitating 'active' (both economically and/or socially) rural newcomers. Counterurbanisation where rural is predominantly a place of consumption does not align with the RURALIZATION approach.
- In addition to this, RURALIZATION also acknowledges that rural newcomers can be attracted to a rural lifestyle first and search for a way to support this lifestyle second. Hence active rural newcomers are of interest, as well as how to embed inactive, consumption-oriented newcomers as more active rural newcomers. Amenity/lifestyle migration for example is potentially an important driver of entrepreneur newcomers.
- RURALIZATION also identifies the importance of understanding 'active' in a non-binary way, not seeing strict divides between rural and urban. For example, remote workers while working in rural areas, their employer is located elsewhere.
- Rural newcomers can originate from both rural and urban locations. However, in a rural regeneration context, newcomer trends that counter the urbanisation trend are of more interest to RURALIZATION. This does not mean rural to rural newcomers are not of interest, but regenerative rural-to-rural newcomer migration has certain dynamics, which RURALIZATION must seek to further understand. For example, rural to rural newcomers can build translocal knowledge networks and economic

interconnections, of benefit to both rural areas (sending and receiving) (e.g. Webster, 2017).

- All types of rural areas are of interest (e.g. accessible, peripheral and intermediate rural areas). While some rural areas are more greatly impacted by depopulation (i.e. peripheral, remote regions), newcomers still have a role to play in regeneration of different types of rural areas and RURALIZATION must seek to further understand this.
- Rural newcomers can be at different stages of their life course. In a generational renewal context, young newcomers would appear more relevant, however also more broadly 'active' (both economically and/or socially) rural newcomers bring various forms of capital (e.g. human, social, cultural) to rural areas, generating opportunities that ultimately contribute to rural regeneration and generational renewal.

4.1.2 New entrants to farming and succession

Key terms

Farms and Farmers

The notion of a 'farm' and 'farmer' are multi-faceted terms.

- European Innovation Partnership for Agriculture (EIP-AGRI) (2016, p.7) raise the question "how much agricultural production is required to be recognised as a 'farmer'" and discuss a number of different scenarios such as very small-scale production, farmers who also work off-farm or combine farming with a wider business and those involved in non-traditional production.
- The size, scale and mode of farming can also lead to classification of a number of types. In the context of world agriculture van der Ploeg (2018b) identifies three inter-related modes peasant (multifunctional farms built on the sustained use of ecological capital) entrepreneurial (expanding, specialised 'modernised' farms built on financial and industrial capital) and corporate (large-scale corporate farms focused and hired labour).
- Gioia (2017) looks more specifically at the notion of 'small farms' identifying terms such as family, agroecological and peasant as being associated with small farms. Physical size, economic size and labour input as defining parameters, but also point to limitations when focused on physical/economic size and suggest greater focus should fall on labour input to recognise the job creation role of small farms.




Figure 2: Different yet interlinked modes of farming

(van der Ploeg, 2018b, p.3)

Farm succession

The transfer of farms, i.e. managerial control of the farm business and/or farm ownership, between generations is termed farm succession. It is a key stage in family farm development and its renewal (Lobley, 2010; Chiswell and Lobley, 2018).

- Farm succession is a multi-faceted, heterogeneous process that can occur over a long timescale. It involves the farm transferor and *farm successor* where a farm enterprise is taken over by a successor (e.g. individual or group) (Handl et al., 2016).
- Farm succession can also be broken down into “succession to the farm and succession to the occupation of farming” (Lobley, 2010, p.839).
- Farm succession is often distinguished as occurring within (familial succession) or outside the family (extra-familial succession) (Handl et al., 2016; Helms et al. 2018).
- Its complexity has been categorised by researchers as a multi-stage process (e.g. moving from farming in partnership to full control) that can play out in different ways (e.g. see Handl et al., 2016; Chiswell, 2018).
- *Farm transfer* involves the transfer of a farm from the existing farmer (s) to the successor (s) (Handl et al. 2016). Farm transfer is just one stage in the succession process.

New entrants

The term new entrants into farming has been associated with young farmers as successors, however more detailed consideration suggests this is inadequate. For example some aspects are:

- A new entrant may or may not be a ‘**rural newcomer**’ (see section 4.1.1 above).
- New entrants are not always individuals or families, but **take different forms** such as collectives or businesses (EIP-AGRI, 2016).
- **Successors** have been distinguished either as succeeding to the farm through a **family or non-family connection** (see above on ‘Farm succession’). New entrants can also be distinguished by their **previous connection to farming**. For example, **continuers** are

described as those who have a connection to farming and take over a farm they have a family connection to, while **newcomers** have no direct connection to farming and enter through non-dominant routes (Monllor, 2011; Monllor i Rico and Fuller, 2016).

- Taking this a step further, the EIP-AGRI (2016, p.7) Focus Group on New Entrants into farming identified “a substantial grey area between the extremes of **ex novo new entrants** and **direct successors** to farming businesses”. It classifies common types, identifying six types of new entrant (diversified new entrant, innovative new entrant, full-time new entrant, part-time new entrant, hobby farmer, hybrid new entrant) and five types of successor (diversifying successor, innovative successor, direct successor, delayed successor, indirect successor), as well as different pathways to these categories (see Figure 2 and 3 below). RURALIZATION acknowledges this issue and will use the typology defined by this focus group to categorise practices.
- Zagata et al. (2017, p.19) however observes that: “Most young people who start farming because they take over a farm as part of a farm succession process are not ‘new entrants’”.
- New entrants/newcomers and continuers/successors are not dualistic categories as newcomers may have some connection to farming and successors may transform farms rather than just continue with an existing business model (Access to Land Network, 2018).
- A new entrant may or may not be a ‘**young farmer**’. The 2013 Rural Development Regulation defines a young farmer as “a person who is no more than 40 years of age... possesses adequate occupational skills and competence and is setting up for the first time in an agricultural holding as head of that holding” (EP and EC, 2013).
- EIP-AGRI (2016) argue new entrants are **not only young farmers, but can be of any age**. The NEWBIE project’s definition of new entrants also takes this approach where new entrants are defined as: “anyone who starts a new farm business or becomes involved in an existing farm business. They comprise a wide range of ages, agricultural experience and resource access. Newcomers and successors can enter farming at any stage in their working lives” (NEWBIE, no date).
- New entrants may also be defined by the **year of entry into farming**, also sometimes combined with age criteria. EIP-AGRI (2016) identifies differing approaches, such as the EU (to qualify for new entrant support farmers must be under 40) and US (10 years or less).
- Overall, an important point is made by EIP-AGRI (2016), that new entrant is a complex term and **should be defined in specific contexts** (e.g. for policy purposes) so that it is fit for purpose. For example if policy goals aim to increase young farmers, setting an age limit may be relevant, while **if the goal is enabling innovation definitions should not focus on age but the intended farm activity**.




Figure 3: New entrant to farming typology

(EIP-AGRI, 2016)




Figure 4: New entrant pathways

(developed by Monllor i Rico and Fuller, 2016, based on EIP-AGRI, 2016)

Wider characteristics of new entrants can also be distinguished:

- New entrants can also be distinguished based on how they financed their entry into farming. The NEWBIE project (Fact Sheet 18, Part B) identified three categories: “self-funding (purchase, partnerships), external funding (crowd-funding, customer financed, investors), and sharing (share farming or partnership with land owners)” (Helms et al., 2018, p.3).
- Different types of new entrants are thought to be more frequently found in different types of rural areas (e.g. peri-urban associated with lifestyle farms/diversified farms and remote rural with ‘back to the land’ farmers) (EIP-AGRI, 2016).
- Other broader characteristics can also be identified such as a greater likelihood to be female, have university level education, be involved in livestock/horticulture production and alternative farming practices (e.g. value-added, local food chains, organics) (EIP-AGRI, 2016).

4.2 Key issues: Literature and European project review

4.2.1 Facilitating newcomers and rural regeneration

In-migration (return or newcomers) has an important role to play in rural regeneration from within (Stockdale, 2006). Newcomers in rural areas potentially help address a number of rural decline issues. Rural newcomers are important to the generation of opportunities in rural areas. They bring economic activities and help create jobs in rural areas. Newcomers increase the population, helping support reversal of the urbanisation trend and support retaining or expansion of rural services (e.g. schools, transport). They bring novel perspectives, consumer habits and networks of relationships to rural areas. In the Italian rural and inner area context, Membretti et al. (2017) illustrate the varied regeneration benefits of newcomers such as reactivating public services, using or restoring vacant properties, entrepreneurship and job creation, as well as community revival benefits. The regenerative impacts of newcomers however is not guaranteed, which calls for addressing barriers that are outlined in the next section.

Importance of rural newcomers to rural regeneration

Newcomers and jobs

In-migrants that are self-employed or create small businesses can bring new jobs to rural areas rather than just compete for jobs as part of the existing labour market (Findlay et al., 2000, Stockdale, 2006). That said, other rural in-migrants can also lead to job creation, albeit in jobs that are not a major basis of strong rural regeneration. Findlay et al. (2000) find in rural Scotland part-time, low-pay job creation linked to employee migrant households. Píša and Hruška (2019) also identify the job creation benefit of entrepreneur newcomers, but also a complex picture around the nature of these jobs. They can be skilled jobs, but also seasonal, part-time or low-skill and pay. In addition, in some contexts newcomers can fill labour demands in some areas. For example, Membretti et al. (2017) demonstrate this in relation to agriculture, forestry and sheep-farming in Italian Alpine and Apennine areas and Aure et al.

(2018) discuss newcomer international labour migrants working in low skill jobs in the fishing sector in Northern Norway.

New networks

Beyond new job creation, the wider networks newcomers sometimes bring with them to rural areas can also have wider economic, social, cultural impacts. Newcomers can build networks across rural areas benefiting both areas with regeneration benefits (Webster, 2017). Newcomer entrepreneurs also link rural places to external people and places, such as external markets and attracting external visitors to rural areas through services or changed rural image (Píša and Hruška, 2019).

New knowledge and ideas

Entrepreneur newcomers can get involved in local community activities and try to engage the local community in their activities, as well as network and collaborate with other local enterprises (Píša and Hruška, 2019).

Rural diversity

The RURALJOBS project (Fact Sheet 40, Part B) identifies diversification of the rural economy as important to rural job creation. Entrepreneur newcomers can contribute to rural regeneration by contributing to economic diversification. For example, entrepreneur newcomers operate businesses in areas such as tourism, leisure services, creative industries, food and drink (e.g. Herslund, 2012; Eimermann, 2016; Webster, 2017; Carson et al. 2018; Píša and Hruška, 2019). While in an urban context, the DIVERCITIES project (Fact Sheet 44, Part B) finds that diverse places hold opportunities for also diverse forms of entrepreneurship, supporting economic regeneration (Eraydin, 2016). DIVERCITIES highlights the importance of diversity not just to economic performance but also social cohesion. It also distinguishes diversity (presence or coexistence of a number of specific socio-economic, socio-demographic, ethnic and cultural groups within a certain spatial entity, such as a city or a neighbourhood) from hyper-diversity (an intense diversification of the population, not only in socio-economic, social and ethnic terms, but also with respect to lifestyles, attitudes and activities) (DIVERCITIES, 2019).

Barriers to rural newcomers and rural regeneration

Rural lacks attractiveness

Depending on the type of newcomer and their subsequent ambition for their life in a rural area, what makes rural areas attractive differs. Positive lifestyle and environment factors may not come into play. Perceptions and representations of rural places impacts rural attractiveness and rural population renewal through newcomers. In relation to rural in-migration, the nature of rural communities themselves was a barrier to return migration where some felt they had, in Stockdale's (2006) words, 'outgrown' the locality or that perceptions existed that returning was a sign of failure. Additionally, perceptions of peripheral decline and lifestyle implications can negatively impact attracting newcomers with human capital capable of starting businesses and generating jobs (Stockdale, 2006). Depending on the age group, rural attractiveness may also differ. In the rural Netherlands context, Elshof et al. (2017) find rural villages gaining families were areas that had scenic surroundings, could

provide the means for home ownership, were relatively close to transport links and had reasonable access to jobs. Rural villages did not provide the preferred settlement types for younger age-categories or older groups. Only the 30-60 age groupings recorded high settlement rates in the area. Rural villages retaining young adults tended to be larger villages further from scenic amenities. These villages also had greater availability of rental settlements and a greater availability of employment within the surroundings.

Housing issues, commuting and changing rural-urban relationships

House prices in rural areas can also be a facilitator for newcomers, but housing is also an important issue to address if barriers exist for rural newcomers. Quality and availability (rental or purchase) are potential barriers facing rural newcomers. For example, in the Netherlands context, Elshof et al. (2017) find rural villages are most attractive to those who can afford to build or buy a suitable home. Anecdotal evidence in Finland suggests despite affordability of housing not being a major issue, finding suitable housing can be challenging for example as uninhabited or abandoned houses are not on the market for sale.

Lower house prices in rural areas can also lead to an interdependency between rural (places to live) and urban (places to work) areas. As highlighted by projects such as NEWRUR (Fact Sheet 37, Part B), this is particularly an issue for peri-urban areas. Research has also been concerned with changing the urban-rural relationship (e.g. RURBAN project, Fact Sheet 26, BUILDING RURBAN RELA, Fact Sheet 41, Part B) to a more complementary one where different assets and needs in both areas are harnessed to generate more sustainable development patterns (OECD, 2013).

Gentrification

If newcomers to rural areas lead to a process of gentrification (which can have social, economic, cultural and physical dimensions, detailed by Smith (2011)), this counters rural regeneration goals. Smith (2011, p.597) for example notes that gentrification can lead to "...the exclusion and marginalisation of low income households, and, ultimately, the socio-spatial segregation of affluent and poor rural populations".

Local labour market deficits

Piša and Hruška (2019) identify skilled job creation by newcomers that local labour supply cannot serve which leads to urban to rural commuting. Other research identifies similar issues. New job creation may not match the existing local skills base, also creating a need for supports for upskilling (Findlay et al., 2000). In relation to the experiences of Dutch tourism entrepreneurs in rural Sweden, Eimermann (2016) finds local employment creation limited because entrepreneurs felt the local skills base and work ethic did not match their needs so staff were recruited from the home location.

Newcomer (in) stability

Beyond the act of migration to a rural area, newcomers then live in and experience rural places. A temporal dimension is also worth consideration in understanding how rural newcomers can contribute to rural regeneration. Some newcomers can be temporary residents. Due to how demographic statistics are compiled, in the Finnish context Pellervo Economic Research (2019) note how the rural population can be underestimated and does

not allow for temporary migration such as to second homes or for long-distance working in rural areas. They also note the lack of accounting for this fact in population statistics can also impact the level of public services in rural areas as the transitory nature of population movement is not accounted for. In the context of Dutch tourism entrepreneurs in rural Sweden, they are described as ‘flexible’ movers. Rural Sweden was not their permanent residence and newcomers moved to work and live elsewhere at different times of the year (Eimermann, 2016). Precarity is associated with different types of newcomers, such as international labour migrants (Woods, 2018) and lifestyle/entrepreneur migration (e.g. Eimermann, 2016). Assessing rural newcomers in a rural regeneration context must also consider not just attracting newcomers, but also how to facilitate their long-term residence in rural areas (e.g. Aure et al., 2018). Place attachment is also complex and newcomers can have a certain level of attachment. Gieling et al. (2017) look beyond the local-newcomer divide to classify seven different ways village attachment can play out among residents and newcomers. In the Italian context Membretti et al. (2017) also raise the issue of the permanence of relocation in relation to the resettlement of asylum seekers and refugees in Alpine mountain regions.

Lack of openness to newcomers

In an urban context, DIVERCITIES highlights openness to diversity as important to attracting a diverse population and potential entrepreneurs (Eraydin, 2016). Promoting rural diversity and hyperdiversity through facilitating rural newcomers may have potentially similar positive impacts on economic and social rural regeneration. Better understanding openness to newcomers and the circumstances that can support it is important in the RURALIZATION context.

Divided rural communities

A lack of social and economic integration of newcomers limits their regenerative contribution to rural areas. Pířa and Hruřka (2019) find that in some cases the extra-local markets newcomer entrepreneurs tap into can mean they remain disconnected from the local economy and community. They use the example of a micro-brewery where local consumers are not their target market, nor is the local community who they are targeting to visit the brewery. They also cite minor conflicts between the local and newcomer community as locals might not welcome the change that newcomer enterprises create. In relation to the experiences of Dutch tourism entrepreneurs in rural Sweden, Eimermann (2016) finds limited networking and hence knowledge transfer occurred between these newcomer entrepreneurs and local stakeholders, limiting knowledge spillover.

Supporting rural newcomers and regeneration: Governance reform issues

Supporting re-location

Initiatives to encourage newcomers to relocate to rural areas are tools used to support increasing newcomers. This can include publicity and information campaigns about lifestyle and work opportunities, such as Look West (WDC, no date) in Ireland and Pueblos Vivos (Living Villages) in Spain (Sanchón Ortas, 2019). The New Paths programme developed by the Cepaim Foundation is a more hand-on, proactive initiative. It supports the relocation and integration of immigrant families from urban to rural areas through a mediated, gradual, planned process.

It works directly with local low-density population municipalities (>10,000 population) to identify potential employment options for newcomers (Coto Sauras, 2019).

Supporting staying and integration

Integration programmes can help to deal with social, cultural and economic aspects of rural newcomer migration, helping support longer-term residence in rural areas. Examples show targeting at particular types of newcomers (e.g. labour migration, refugees) and dealing with particular types of integration issues (e.g. social, economic). One example targeted at labour migrants is the integration and inclusion programme in Herøy, Northern Norway to assist integration into the local community, including a service office to provide information on local services and the migration process, as well as Norwegian language classes (Aure et al., 2018). In the context of refugees and social integration, the 'Being Involved' programme in municipalities of Austria mobilises volunteer citizens to develop various social events (e.g. cooking, markets, language exchange) (Moosburgger, 2019). Integration programmes for refugees to bring these migrants into the local labour market are also very important. The example of 'We are Active' in Alberschwende, Austria combined coordination of voluntary work and linking refugees with local employers (Moosburgger, 2019). The 'Talents for Austria' programme operates a boarding school with job training and placements for unaccompanied minor asylum seekers (PlurAlps, 2019). Membretti et al. (2017) observe new social enterprise type businesses emerge in Alpine and Apennine areas managing refugee reception projects and the positive benefits created, but also questions remain around their sustainability. The MIGRARE project (Fact Sheet 46, Part B) examined how different EU territories have responded to the integration needs of refugees and asylum seekers finding different response capacities, but also good practice that can support future policy.

Supporting local and non-local interconnections for job creation

New trends underpinned by technological change, such as remote working and novel manufacturing techniques such as distributed manufacturing can bring jobs, and people, to rural areas. OECD (2018) discuss how distributed manufacturing allows manufacturing to occur as part of a network of geographically dispersed sites, with potential to change economic geographies towards more de-concentration.

Supporting newcomer entrepreneurship and local embeddedness

While entrepreneur in-migration can lead to job creation, evidence suggests the need for a more integrated policy response than simply encouraging or expecting in-migrants to create new economic opportunities. For example, Stockdale (2006, p.355) argues wider supports for in-migrants are needed, such as training and supports to return migrants or newcomers to use their skills to support job and new business creation. Based on the trend of newcomer entrepreneurs not employing locals due to skill gaps (e.g. Píša and Hruška, 2019; Eimermann, 2016), the need to stimulate newcomer entrepreneurs to employ locally also appears important, such as through supports for up-skilling of local residents to fill newly created positions.

4.2.2 Facilitating successors/new entrants and rural regeneration

Importance of farm new entrants and successors to rural regeneration

New entrants and innovation

New entrants are important to support greater levels of innovation and entrepreneurship in farming, thereby supporting wider local development. EIP-AGRI (2019) list a range of reasons for this, such as the new knowledge, business and organisational models new entrants bring to farming. More specifically, Gretter et al. (2019) presents new entrants in remote areas of the Italian Alps impacted by land abandonment as an example of social innovation helping to combat challenges facing this area. More broadly, the rural regeneration contribution of newcomers is strongly argued by Monllor i Rico and Fuller (2016). They argue newcomers to farming represent a dynamic new group within rural society representing a 'new rurality'. They embed social values which can: "...create strong social capital, further the connections between rural and urban spheres, aim for optimal food quality and better health, re-inhabit abandoned areas, create new social relations, propose alternative ways of organizing and collaborating, bear in mind future generations, and strive to maintain a rich, diverse and economically dynamic agricultural area" (Monllor i Rico and Fuller, 2016, p.546). Similarly, Milone and Ventura (2019) identify the emergence of a generation of Italian farmers termed the 'new peasantry' who are innovative, collaborative and responsive to new demands.

Preservation of the family farm model

If there is no farm successor, land can be sold leading to growth in the size of existing farms and reduction in numbers of farmers (Rioufol and Volz, 2012; Access to Land Network and Urgenci, 2017).

Barriers to succession and new entrants to farming

This section provides an overview of barriers and challenges facing succession and new entrants into farming. It presents an overarching view on key barriers but the situation differs across Europe. For example, the age profile of farmers is an EU level issue but the young farmer problem presents differently in different EU states. Zagata et al. (2017) identify four groupings of EU countries, one of which has a high proportion of young farmers relative to a low proportion of older farmers (Poland, Austria, France, Luxembourg, Finland). The Access to Land Network (2018) has assessed national level issues in Belgium, France, Italy, Romania, Spain and the UK.

Access to land

Access to land is a major barrier to new entrants to farming across Europe. Research findings consistently suggest it is the greatest barrier (e.g. Zagata et al. 2017; Helms et al. 2018). Rural regeneration and farm generational renewal issues have land issues at their core. Access to land issues are discussed in detail in section 5.

Rural attractiveness

In some of the SURE-Farm project case study regions, the nature of rural areas themselves were found to act as a deterrent to young people from entering the farming profession. Whether grounded in reality or not, perceptions of rural places can also impact rural attractiveness. Coopmans et al. (2019, p.135) explain: “Rural abandonment, lack of social services, remoteness from urban life (and thus the lack of a nearby market), are characteristics associated with a life in the countryside that are withholding the new generation to entry into farming”.

Economic viability of farm livelihoods

Low farm incomes, farms where economic viability is uncertain, as well as farms that do not provide full-time employment requiring a second job to support a livelihood, are central barriers to new entrants (Regidor, 2012). Economic viability of farm livelihoods is a rural issue globally (Van Vliet et al., 2015). This also links to the question of focusing on the farm itself in relation to facilitating farm succession and new entrants.

Transferability of farms

Another important barrier to highlight is the transferability of the farms themselves. In some cases, farms have become increasingly large and equipped with expensive machinery. While the amount of capital necessary to take over a farm has increased in the past thirty years, agricultural revenue has diminished. In the French context for example, InPACT (2019) discuss this issue and highlight that when farms transfer this can also lead to different types of restructuring, such as farm enlargement, abandonment or reorientation. It is also noted however that to enable effective succession and farm transfer focusing on how transferable farms are is important, as well as the issues impacting transferability. This is noted as particularly important in relation to large farms. Helping to address the financial constraints of retiring farmers who have invested in the capital and have small pensions is important. In addition, issues for new entrants include the potential need to restructure the farm and change production model, make it more viable and/or establish as a collective.

Local labour market

Limited local employment outside of farming in rural areas can also be a barrier to maintaining a part-time or establishing a farm when external income is needed. On the other side of the coin, further to this farm labour availability such as for seasonal work can be limited in rural areas (EIP-AGRI, 2016).

Insufficient farmer retirement is a complex issue

A high proportion of EU farmers are nearing retirement age - 31% are over 65 and just 5.6% of farms are run by farmers under 35 (EC, 2017b). Research acknowledges that there are two sides to farm generational renewal and the dual nature of the problem - the entering and existing farmer (Regidor, 2012). This is also linked to a range of complex, wider issues. One is a general lack of planning (discussed further below) or even broader discussion of succession (Cassidy et al., 2019). There are also wider social, cultural and economic issues facing the older farmer. Barriers to older farmer retirement include for example financial insecurity (e.g. Leonard et al. 2017). Conway et al. (2019) identify the importance of softer, emotional and

social dimensions related to potential loss of personal identity and status that impact decision-making and planning for retirement.

Succession planning

Many organisations working on supporting farm transfer insist on anticipation of the succession project. Lack of anticipation and planning for succession is an important phenomenon acting as a barrier to succession. For example according to a national study in France, in 2010 only a third of farm managers over 55 had an identified successor (Agreste, 2015). In Ireland results of the FARMTRANSFERS survey found that while 63% had identified a potential successor 67% did not have a succession plan in place (Conway et al., 2018). The outcomes of the Farm Success project (Fact Sheet 3, Part B) point to the importance of succession planning and developing a farm strategy to ensure future farm sustainability. The project also highlights the time factor – how time is needed to ensure succession occurs effectively and without conflict, but also can demotivate successors if they are slow to gain control of the farm. This links to the number of stages involved in succession. The Farm Succession in Europe project (Fact Sheet 4, Part B) conceptualises succession as a long, complex and multi-stage process of eight phases - awareness, wish, education, experience, search/decision, form, handling/takeover and running the farm (Handl et al., 2016). In the French context for example, the range of issues and experiences are explored in publications such as by InPACT (2014). Succession planning should help to anticipate and deal with issues such as mis-matched timelines between retiring farmers looking to sell rapidly and new entrants having their needs in place (e.g. secure loans, complete training). More broadly, it should allow space to transfer knowledge, prepare the legal and administrative formalities, and find solutions for arising issues (e.g. selling some farm equipment not required by the successor, restructuring the farm to allow entry of more than one successors, etc.).

Successor/newcomer compatibility with the exiting farmer

Gradual take-over of farms as existing farmers reduce their role has strong benefits for skill development and local knowledge transfer. But it is also a highly personal relationship. Case study research on the Fresh Start Initiative shows the importance of careful matching of new entrants and older farmers because a mis-match in expectations and motivations can influence the outcome of long term and full-takeover of farm by a new entrant (Ingram and Kirwan, 2011).

The 'born' farmer, identity and generational renewal

The need for a cultural shift is identified, as well as the need for further expanding of traditional norms of who can become a 'farmer'. The idea that farming is an intertied profession where farmers are born into it, and the traditional view of a successor as a male from within the family, can be barriers to succession and new entrants. Examples of research from the Irish (Cassidy et al. 2019), UK (Chiswell, 2018), Norwegian (Villa, 1999) contexts explore this. Issues around identity formation and a desire to farm also impact having enough new entrants and successors. For example, as part of the SURE-Farm project, Coopmans et al. (2019, p.7) argue the formation of a successor's identity as a crucial stage in farm intergenerational renewal. An identity supportive of generational renewal is "self-identity as a farmer on the one hand versus the perceived ability to cope with the often hard life as a farmer and its challenges" (Coopmans et al., 2019, p.7). They argue if a supportive identity is

not formed resulting in succession not occurring, other measures to assist farm transfer are made redundant.

Profile of the farming profession

Farming as a low income, labour intensive occupation with poor recognition/poor social status as a career option is raised (Access to Land Network, 2018; Regidor, 2012). However, some also raise its positive traits that attract new entrants, particularly linked to farming as a way of life where there is independence associated with self-employment and working in a natural environment (e.g. EIP-AGRI, 2016). In particular, 'back to the land' new entrants are perhaps one group that identify these positive traits (e.g. see Halfacree, 2001; Dolci, and Perrin, 2018; Wilbur, 2014).

Openness to new entrants

Similar to rural newcomers overall, important to new entrants to farming is a supportive social environment. The Erasmus+ A2L (Fact Sheet 1, Part B) project highlights the local social environment is important to facilitate newcomer new entrants such as the pre-existing presence of newcomer new entrants, the existence of positive local citizen and farmer relationships and a supportive local authority.

Access to training

The Access to Land Network (2018) explore the importance of different types of training (e.g. formal, informal, practice-based) for new entrants and detail the training supports provided by their organisations and on a wider level in certain European contexts. However, a number of more specific issues also merit attention, which are also highlighted by the Access to Land Network (2018). In the French context, the importance of practice-based learning is noted to consolidate skills learned more formally. The linking of supports to training is also highlighted as a potential barrier for new entrants when it comes to accessing supports (Dolci and Perrin, 2018; Access to Land Network, 2018). For example, while the situation differs in the EU the European Court of Auditors (ECA) (2017) assessment of the CAP Pillar 1 payment for young farmers highlights how in some Member States this is tied to having (or commit to acquiring) additional skills and/or training requirements, while in others (most Member States) training is not an additional requirement to access this support. While the life-long nature of farming knowledge and skills development is a wider issue, in the Romanian context the Access to Land Network (2018) note that this is a challenge facing new entrants in particular. Succession within family contexts also provides a space where knowledge, skills and wider experience of farming can be generated before succession is even considered. On the broader level, in relation to young farmers, Zondag et al. (2015) highlight that they have different knowledge needs (and barriers to gaining knowledge) depending on a number of factors (e.g. newer Member State or EU-15, agricultural sector, their existing education, if farm owners and type of rural region). They suggest the importance of tailored approaches. In addition more generally Zondag et al. (2015, p.70) raise a broader need to highlight the importance of knowledge and skills development, particularly in certain areas: "young farmers need technological skills and skills to develop a farm strategy, as well as entrepreneurial skills – such as marketing, networking, communication and financial skills – to keep their farm viable. They are not always aware that they need all these different kinds of skills. Many farmers are used to managing their farm in a traditional way and do not see the need to change". The Access

to Land Network (2018) observe in some contexts a lack of training in organic, permaculture, or other techniques that can be more attractive to new entrants. Dolci and Perrin (2018) also note in relation to 'neo-farmers' a dissatisfaction with more formal, institutional training resulting in a moving away from this type of knowledge development and towards more informal, alternative sources.

Gender issues

Research examining female succession and new entrants to farming discuss similar issues that are more generally identified, such as access to land, access to knowledge, importance of an identity supportive of farming, farm viability, rural attractiveness, quality of rural services and living standards (Trauger et al. 2008; National Rural Network, 2013; Shortall et al. 2017; Cassidy, 2019; Barbosa et al., 2020). However, specific gendered issues also exist. More traditional gender and work identities persisting on family farms (Ní Laoire, 2002; Shortall, 2014). In particular, gendered inequalities in land inheritance via succession favouring males are identified (e.g. National Rural Network, 2013; Shortall et al., 2017). For example, in the Scottish context Shortall et al. (2017) find a cultural emphasis on male inheritance and strong patriarchal norms around inheritance. Croft tenancies can only have one named tenant and where this is a male family member women can find themselves losing their right to the family croft. Legal frameworks thus can result in reinforcing patriarchal norms and inhibit female entry into agriculture. This observation is also reinforced by the fact that in Norway, 40 years after a law allowing equal access of first daughters and sons to the farm, only 14% of the farmers are women (Heggem, 2014b). Where female successors enter a succession farm partnership with a male sibling, they can play a less central, driving role in the farm decision-making (Luhrs, 2016).

Supporting successors and new entrants: Governance reform issues

Different support needs? New entrants and familial succession

Succession within the family or the hereditary transfer of farms is understood to be the dominant pathway for farm succession to the next generation (Handl et al., 2016; Helms et al. 2018). The Erasmus+ A2L project highlights new entrants outside of the family succession pattern in particular need more targeted support to address entry barriers. For example, access to training and opportunities to develop a farming skillset is highlighted above as appearing particularly important for new entrants without a background in agriculture.

Careful targeting of supports to needs

The need for more effective policy supports for young farmers, successors and newcomers to farming is highlighted by European projects (e.g. A2L) and policy evaluation reports (e.g. ECA, 2017; Zagata et al. 2017; Regidor, 2012). The ECA (2017) notes the need for CAP post 2020 to base its intervention logic in relation to young farmers on strong needs assessment of barriers to young farmers and more specifically how these issues apply in different geographies, farm size and farm sector/system. For example, in relation to CAP pillar 1 payments it was not known if beneficiaries lacked capital supporting farm viability or investment. The Access to Land Network (2018) argue there is an inadequacy between the criteria to obtain Young Farmers Grants and new entrants' agricultural projects. National farm size and age limits, along with important administrative burdens, may lead to the exclusion of a significant share

of new entrants from public support as they may be considered too old, their projects too small or too atypical to qualify for public support. In France, for instance, it is estimated that a third of new farm installations do not benefit from public support (Access to Land Network, 2018). The ECA (2017) also found a lack of coordination between European policy measures and national measures supporting young farmers meaning that a risk of over-supporting some existed if they benefited from a number of measures. Research also identifies a trend among new entrants to develop more innovative, consumer demand driven and environmentally sensitive farms (e.g. Monllor i Rico and Fuller, 2016; Milone and Ventura, 2019). Zagata et al. (2017) note however in relation to starting more diversified farms start-up costs can be high and directly supporting this specifically could be particularly beneficial to these new entrants. More broadly in the German context, Weingarten and Rudloff (2018) argue how direct payments restrict the ecological restructuring of agriculture in the European Union, which may also impact farming's attractiveness to this new generation of farmers.

The dual succession and retirement issue

Farmer retirement can help make room for succession and new entrants, but is a complex policy issue. In relation to facilitating new entrants to farming Matthews (2013) is critical of the CAP Pillar 1 young farmer payment providing income support arguing it is "the wrong instrument addressing the wrong problem" and does not address "the real constraints to generational renewal" which he argues requires dealing with the lack of adequate numbers of older farmers leaving the profession. Early retirement schemes were introduced as an EU level voluntary policy instrument to incentivise farmers between 55 and 66 to retire and transfer the farm to a younger farmer (Regidor, 2012). Early retirement schemes were however found to have limited uptake and poor effectiveness where implemented (Matthews, 2013; Zagata et al. 2017). Bika (2007) assesses these schemes in Greece, Ireland and France to find limited impacts. While lack of exit of ageing farmers is a barrier to new entrants, however they can also be a support. Retirement could benefit from being approached differently in farming contexts. For example, in the Irish context, Conway et al. (2019, p.25) find older farmers have a deep, emotional and social desire to remain active in farming into older life, as well as possessing an important knowledge resources: "locally specific tacit and lay knowledge developed over years of regularized interaction and experience working on the family farm". The barrier of a lack of succession planning is also highlighted above and a greater focus on this emerges as a concern for future policy. For example, the Farm Success project (Fact Sheet 3, Part B) emphasises that guidelines or educational resources are important to support succession. This can help to make clear the phases of the process and what to expect. Clear and reliable information on legal issues are also highlighted as important when it comes to succession and planning for it. Similarly, the Farm Succession in Europe project (Fact Sheet 4, Part B) identifies the need for new tools to support farm succession responding to changes in succession patterns, such as succession outside the family, succession to more than one successor or to different types of farming practices.

Potential increasing role of joint ventures

Joint ventures involve cooperation between two or more parties and has a legal basis, such as contract farming, partnerships and share farming (FAS, 2017; McKee et al. 2018). *Partnerships* are a legal partnership defining the distribution of assets and profits between the existing farmer and new entrant who jointly run the farm. These take different forms, such an equity

partnership or junior-senior partnership (new entrant gradually takes over the farm) (EIP-AGRI, 2016; Helms et al. 2018). *Contract farming* involves a contract between the farmland owner and another party who carries out farm operations in return for a fee and share of farm profit (Helms et al. 2018; Lobley and Potter, 2004). *Share farming* is a legal agreement outlining shared farming arrangements typically between the farmland owner and another party that provides different resources (e.g. labour, machinery). Share farming differs to contract farming by the fact that commercial risk is shared and profit depends on performance of the farm (Price, 2014; Hennessy et al. no date). However, Helms et al. (2018) highlight the need for greater legal clarity on definition of share farming, as well as its potential lack of appeal in low profit farms. The *life annuity contract* operates in Austria, which is a contract negotiated between the existing farmer and successor. On death of the existing farmer, the farm becomes the property of the successor (Handl et al., 2016). The greater uptake of joint ventures to facilitate succession and new entrants also would be assisted by better understanding of how joint ventures work successfully. In the Scottish context, McKee et al. (2018) identify a need for research focused on network-building between landowners and new entrants in order to enhance the success rate of joint venture models. In addition, cultural change, more positive experiences and a mind-set change by existing farmers is also needed before joint venture models could become a sustainable and viable solution to the challenges faced by new entrants (McKee et al., 2018).

Gender issues and succession

Existing research emphasises cultural barriers facing female succession (e.g. Shortall et al., 2017; Cassidy, 2019; Barbosa et al., 2020). This would suggest improving levels of female succession into farming requires a family-wide approach where factors that influence the attitudes, behaviours and decisions of other family members are also focused on. The importance of farm diversification is also highlighted as a potential facilitator to improving female succession. For example, in the Norwegian context, Heggem (2014a) find diversifications of farms to areas such as tourism and Green Care may relate to more feminine farming and daughters as more likely farm successors. This suggests policy targeting diversification of farms could help curb declines of young female populations in farming and rural areas. In this case, farm tourism policy in particular was specifically designed at looking to increase the likelihood of female succession in farms. In the French context, Wright and Annes (2014) demonstrate how agritourism can be an empowering entrepreneurial platform for rural farm females to disrupt prevailing norms, affording the opportunity for farm females to drive an increase in farm income, construct professional identities using their skills and knowledge.

5 Access to land

Under WP6, RURALIZATION will provide an overview of different legal and policy arrangements in all EU Member States to ensure access to land for rural newcomers and new entrants into farming. Alongside this, in-depth analysis of eight specific legal and policy arrangements is carried out. It will conduct a quantitative analysis of land holdings and land market trends (concentration, price, access to land markets, land loss, etc.) to identify contrasted and comparable areas, as well as point to governance arrangements that provide more access to land for rural newcomers and new entrants into farming. RURALIZATION will also review and analyse innovative practices (from civil society organisations, public authorities and the private sector) to provide access to land for rural newcomers and new entrants into farming. This will include analysis of lessons learned and potential for transfer to other areas.

This section explores defining key terms and outlines core issues emerging from a literature and European project review relating to access to land. It looks at the importance of access to land for rural regeneration, barriers to gaining access to land as well as issues for rural policy and governance. Within this, gender issues are also discussed.

5.1 Definitions of key terms

European projects highlight the **diverse range of factors to consider in defining access to land** for farmers. For example, the A2L project considered physical availability, economic accessibility, duration and quality of access. The question of land users also went beyond farmers to include: future farmers, direct consumers, neighbours and local communities, local businesses and other suppliers, local authorities and society at large.

Access and control

In policy contexts, access to land issues can be discussed alongside issues of rights, use and control of land (e.g. FAO, 2012; EP, 2015). To use land there must be access but this does not mean there is control or maintenance of access. Ribot and Lee Peluso (2003) argue ‘**access**’ is a complex and under-theorised notion and work to conceptualise access more deeply. They argue an important distinction to make in defining access is not only in terms of right to access resources but ability to benefit from them. They argue, if there is a right to access this does not necessary mean access is achieved. It is only achieved if there is also an ability to benefit from access. For example: “Someone might have rights to benefit from land but may be unable to do so without access to labor and capital” (Ribot and Lee Peluso, 2003, p. 160). They contend there is a high degree of complexity within resource access and distinguish a number of aspects important to adequately conceptualising ‘access’:

- What constrains or enables resource access goes beyond rights and is impacted by a wide range of mechanisms. These can be interconnected and are described as ‘webs of social relations’ and can come together in different ways as ‘bundles of powers’.
- These social mechanisms are listed as: social identities (e.g. professions, tribes, gender), social relations (e.g. patronage, friendship) and access to other resources (capital, labour, markets, technology, knowledge and authority).

- Because these mechanisms are dynamic and can change access is also dynamic and can change through time.
- Access is also broken down in three ways: *Gaining access* is a “general process by which access is established”; *access control* is: “the ability to mediate others’ access”; and *access maintenance* is: “expending resources or powers to keep a particular sort of resource access open” (Ribot and Lee Peluso, 2003, p. 158-159).

More specific to access to land, Lee Peluso and Lind (2011, p.668) discuss the notion of ‘**land control**’ understood as “practices that fix or consolidate forms of access, claiming and exclusion for some time”. Land control is also presented as an embedded process rooted in for example gender, ethnic or race struggles. A range of factors impact land control, also they can overlap and interact. These range for example from legal instruments and privatisation to new actors (e.g. the state, corporations) and farming practices (e.g. energy crops) (Lee Peluso and Lind, 2011). For example, land ownership concentration and land grabbing impacts land control where decision-making on how and who uses land becomes concentrated with actors who own most land (EP, 2015; Kay 2016).

Reflecting on the meaning of ‘access’ as well as ‘land control’ draws to light the complexity of the access to land issue. The concept of **land systems** sees land as an interlinked human-environment system with complex dynamics. A range of driving factors (demographic, economic, technological, policy/institutions, cultural, environmental) impact system dynamics and changes in land use and cover (Aspinall and Staiano, 2017). Eistrup et al. (2019) draw on the land systems approach to examine barriers facing young farmers providing a lens to guide analysis that acknowledges a set of factors have influence.

A more multi-dimensional understanding of **land fragmentation**, beyond more standard understandings based on physical fragmentation, is also potentially interesting in wider access to land contexts. In an Eastern European context of fragmentation emerging from land reform, Sabates-Wheeler (2002) propose four dimensions – physical, activity, ownership and social fragmentation. Physical fragmentation relates to physical aspects of land such as small parcels of land or a number of land parcels that are part of one farm enterprise. Ownership fragmentation is concerned with disconnection when it comes to legal and physical property rights. Activity (operational) fragmentation relates to disconnection/mismatch between land and other assets needed to farm such as labour, machinery and markets. Social fragmentation relates to a separation between ownership and use. Because of land reform in this context, it is argued: “there has been a separation of those who own the land from those who are most able to work it” (Sabates-Wheeler, 2002, p.1008). For example, land reform resulting in elderly people or urban dwellers gaining land are presented as potential cases. In the context of land consolidation measures (around the year 2000) working to address the fragmentation issue, Sabates-Wheeler (2002) is critical of their potential because land fragmentation is not understood in this multi-dimensional way meaning linked issues are not dealt with. Hartvigsen (2014) however is also cautious about such a wide conceptualisation and how policy measures can actually deal with all considerations, but also still emphasises the need for integration where it is possible.

Land governance

WP6 is concerned with analysis of **legal and policy arrangements** (existing and under discussion) put in place by national or subnational governments impacting access to land for rural newcomers and new entrants to farming. This will involve looking at areas including land-use planning, land market regulations, fiscal arrangements and agricultural policy. Legal and policy arrangements fit within an overall framework of land governance. **Land governance frameworks** differ at Member State levels with some nations holding laws to protect agricultural land in different ways (EC, 2017a). AEIAR (2015) analyses land policies in Germany, Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania and Poland; also for analysis of nine EU countries see Access to Land Network (no date). Nevertheless, at the EU level, EP (2015) argue a number of EU policies impact land governance (CAP, cohesion policy, environmental policy and internal market governance) which it argues is a de facto EU land governance framework. This highlights the complexity of land governance with relevant policies and laws emerging from different scales and areas of governance.

Important to land governance frameworks are systems of land tenure. **Land tenure systems** are composed of formal policies and laws, as well as informal customary practices that regulate access to land, which determine “who can use which resources, for how long, and under what conditions” (FAO, 2012, p.iv). The FAO (2012, p.v) identify **responsible governance of tenure** as a crucial issue for access to land. Weak governance of tenure systems impacts: “the ability to acquire rights, and associated duties, to use and control land, fisheries and forests”.

WP 6 is also concerned with analysis of **innovative land practices** (civic, public and private) that provide access to land. These are defined as: “...processes aimed at the emergence of new modes of management of agricultural land and at their appropriation by stakeholders and society” (Martin-Prével et al. 2019, p.12). In relation to access to land, many observe the need for novel practices supporting new entrants to farming access land (e.g. ECA, 2017; Helms et al. 2018; McKee et al. 2018; Eistrup et al., 2019). **Land reform** involves modifying or changing legal and policy arrangements governing access to land. For example in the Scottish context land reform is defined by the Land Reform Review Group as: “measures that modify or change the arrangements governing the possession and use of land in Scotland in the public interest” (LRRG, 2014, p.16). The focus of land reform is context specific. It can respond to specific issues such as concentration of ownership, as well as wider factors, such as social and cultural issues (Reid, 2015).

5.2 Key issues: Literature and European project review

5.2.1 Facilitating access to land

Importance of access to land for rural regeneration

A cross-cutting rural decline issue

Addressing issues of access to land is a vital starting point fundamental to dealing with wider agricultural decline issues in rural regeneration (e.g. demographic decline, new entrants to

farming and generational renewal; economic decline and unsustainable farm livelihoods). For example EP (2017, p.14) argue: “As with the concentration of financial wealth, too high a concentration of agricultural land splits society, destabilises rural areas, threatens food safety and thus jeopardises the environmental and social objectives of Europe”. In the French context, Gueringer et al. (2016) highlight the connections between land issues and territorial development, as well as the renewal of the importance of the land issue, but also the need for greater research directing attention towards the complex dynamics of the land question alongside civil society innovations responding to the control, acquisition and management of land.

Enabling succession and new entrants to farming

As touched on in section 4.2.2, access to land is a major, fundamental barrier facing new entrants into farming. Trends of land concentration and land grabbing mean less land is available to the next generation of new entrants creating an ‘entry denial’ situation (van der Ploeg et al., 2015). In relation to the ‘young farmer problem’ according to Eistrup et al. (2019, p.9) “As long as access to land is not solved, many other supporting measures only have very limited impact”.

Preserving the multifunctional family farm model

EP (2017) link the issue of access to land with the preservation of the multifunctional European family farm model and the realisation of the cultural, social, economic environmental functions of the family farm. It argues: “small-scale family farms...play an active role in the economic fabric of rural areas by conserving the cultural heritage and maintaining rural life, sustaining social life and making sustainable use of natural resources, in addition to producing a sufficient amount of healthy and high-quality food” (EP, 2017, p.10). The small, family farm is also highlighted by EP (2017) as an important structure to ensure land ownership is more broadly distributed in rural areas.

Preserving varied rural land use functions

Land is a valuable asset and commodity but its value extends far beyond farming’s economic functions in rural areas. It is both property and a public asset (EP, 2017). Access to land is not just a rural economic decline issue in the farming context, but also has impacts for broader rural decline issues because access to land has social, cultural and environmental functions.

Barriers gaining access to land

Access to land for new entrants is a complex issue with a range of drivers that can interconnect. Gaining access to land is tied up with access ‘mechanisms’ identified by Ribot and Lee-Peluso (2003) - social identities, social relations and access to other resources (capital, labour, markets, technology, knowledge and authority). Aspects of land control also enter this discussion, such as land grabbing and concentration. Also adding to this complexity is that issues present differently across the Europe, in different types of rural regions and farm types (Dwyer et al. 2019; McKee et al. 2018). Based on a preliminary review, some overarching issues at the EU level identified are as follows:

Land availability

Land availability impacts market access to this resource and decreasing availability has a number of driving factors:

- *Land take:* Available land is decreasing due to competing land uses such as urbanisation, land degradation, housing, tourist resorts and green energy production (Rioufol and Volz, 2012; van der Ploeg et al. 2015; Kay, 2016; Access to Land Network and Urgenci, 2017). Farmland conversion to other uses beyond agriculture is particularly attractive to investors. This is because of the expected high return on investment due to conversion of use away from agriculture (EP, 2015; van der Ploeg et al. 2015).
- *Land ownership concentration:* Increasing concentration of land ownership is creating land inequality where there is an inequitable distribution of farmland, particularly inhibiting land access for small farmers and new entrants. Small farms are declining and large farms are increasing, alongside corporate ownership (EP, 2015; Kay, 2016). Land concentration is not a new trend but observed over a number of past decades, however it is argued to have more recently significantly accelerated (van der Ploeg et al. 2015).
- *Land mobility:* Insufficient levels of land mobility, or the transfer of land from one farmer or generation to another, is also an issue. For example in the Irish context Bogue (2013), the ageing farming population points to the lack of land mobility from existing farmers to new entrants. This is however a complex issue and multi-faceted challenges face older farmers around retirement (discussion above in section 4.2.2).
- *Land grabbing:* Also increasing land concentration, van der Ploeg et al. (2015) explain land grabbing as where very large areas of land are bought and controlled by private investors and companies, representing a significant shift away from traditional land use patterns and the European model of family farming. In addition to purchase of land, leasing is also a 'grabbing' instrument where private investors, sometimes with long-term or renewable leases can retain land control for many years. The true extent of land grabbing is not well understood but thought to particularly be an issue in Eastern Europe (EP, 2015; Kay, 2016). Some contend that land grabbing is also a process that can lack transparency and involve political coercion outside of the economic functioning of land markets (EP, 2015; van der Ploeg et al. 2015).
- *Land fragmentation:* Alongside land concentration, the contrasting issue of land fragmentation also exists. Drivers include division of land between a number of successors (Burton and Walford, 2005). Fragmented land ownership also impacts access to land and creates a need for land consolidation (FAO, 2008).
- *Limited land tenancies:* When land prices are high, leasing land is an important avenue for new entrants to gain access to land (van Boxtel, 2016). It is a common, established way for new entrants to access land (Helms et al. 2018). But limited availability of land through tenancies also impacts access, a problem highlighted for example in the Scottish context (McKee et al. 2018).
- *Competition for land:* This can occur between farmers (existing and new entrants) (e.g. Ilbery et al., 2010).
- *Farmland degradation and soil erosion:* Human activity (e.g. tillage, use of chemical inputs, deforestation, removal of hedges, etc.) as well as environmental phenomena

cause farmland degradation. This results in productivity loss for existing farmers, affects new entrants abilities to take over farms (e.g. due to reduced agronomic potential, difficult conversion to organic, etc.) and entails indirect costs for society through declines in biodiversity and contamination issues (e.g. by heavy metals, pesticides, excess of nitrates, etc.) (SoCo Project Team, 2009; JRC EU Science Hub, 2018).

In the UK context McKee et al. (2018) observe that in remote areas land availability can be better, however other challenges associated with remote rural locations impact access, while high land prices are a particular problem in more urbanised regions. EIP-AGRI (2016) observe that access to land can be better in areas of extensive agriculture but these areas bring other challenges to new entrants such as lack of available labour and market access difficulties due to remoteness. Access to smaller areas of land can be less difficult, as Greenfield and Carman (2017) discuss in the UK context in relation to micro-dairies (e.g. 10 acres, 10 cows). Combining this business model with a small parcel of land is shown to be a viable farm enterprise.

Micro individual level factors

Cultural/social identity issues also impact access to land. The tradition of passing a farm from father to son is identified as a persistent cultural norm impacting female access to land (Cassidy, 2019; Shortall et al., 2017). Farming can also be described as an 'inherited profession' (Lobley, 2010) and this is supported by familial succession which is identified as the most common way farms are transferred to the next generation of farmers (Handl et al., 2016; Helms et al. 2018; Schuh et al., 2019). Access to land in particular for newcomers to farming thus emerges as a significant issue.

Land market access and access to financial capital

High farmland prices and rents combined with low farm incomes often cannot sustain the high capital investment required to gain farmland access. In addition, access to external capital, such as loan finance, outside of the farm business can be required to access land and this is also challenging (Rioufol and Volz, 2012; Bahner et al., 2014; EP, 2017; Zagata et al. 2017). This is particularly challenging for new entrants as opposed to successors who have more potential to borrow against the existing family farm (EIP-AGRI, 2016). There are a number of interlinked financial issues at play here. New entrants face access to capital challenges because they "lack of capital assets to utilise as collateral. This barrier is closely linked to competitiveness: lack of finance makes it difficult to acquire sufficient land and equipment to establish competitive farm businesses....Low levels of profitability, particularly in the early years of farm development, make it difficult to repay the loans which are available" (Zagata et al., 2017, p.46).

Lack of land information and land data

As highlighted in the 2017 EP report: "comprehensive, up-to-date, transparent and high-quality data on land tenure, property structures, leasing structures, and price and volume movements on land markets...have so far been lacking and, in some Member States, are collected and published only incompletely" (EP, 2017, p.5). The lack of land market transparency affects the ability to identify landowners and land sale opportunities, which particularly hinders land searches for new entrants lacking territorial connections and

information networks. More broadly, this situation hampers the design of well-informed policy on land distribution.

Gender issues

The dominance of male succession patterns in family farming suggest access to land is a particular challenge for female farmers (as well newcomers to farming more generally) as their entry into farming can depend on access to land to a greater extent than for male successors (National Rural Network, 2013; Shortall et al., 2017). For example, because of the dominance of male succession in family farms, Shortall et al. (2017) suggest that women farmers in Scotland are often new entrants who lease or buy land rather than access through family succession. But this pattern is also linked to driving women towards a more innovative and diversified approach to farming where the higher cost of leasing or buying land demands a high performing farm.

Barriers to maintaining access to land

As new entrants gain access to land, maintaining access is also an important consideration. Two key issues are explored here – farm viability and tenure insecurity.

Maintaining access linked to farm viability

Farm economic viability can be dependent on further access to land for new entrants, which leaves farmers competing for land with each other (EIP-AGRI, 2016). For example, farm diversification can be important to diversifying farm incomes but access to land is identified as a barrier inhibiting this (Schuh et al., 2019). The issue of land abandonment is illustrative in showing how gaining land access is not enough, but viable farming systems are central to maintaining access. Lasanta et al. (2017) discusses factors impacting farm land abandonment and note that the farm system and socio-economic circumstances are key drivers. The lack of viability of farm systems can also lead to a lack of succession and land abandonment by the next generation of farmers. Lasanta et al. (2017) predict land abandonment increasing by 6.7% by 2030 due to decreasing profitability and the lack of aid for extensive farming. But with farm systems focus on biofuel production lower levels of abandonment are predicted.

Tenure insecurity

Lack of land control through tenure insecurity is a barrier to maintaining access. Land access through leasing can be negatively impacted by tenure insecurity where for example short leases or non-renewal of leases is more common because of other issues such as land scarcity and rising prices (Access to Land Network and Urgenci, 2017). Rioufol and Volz (2012) argue this particularly impacts farmers who focus on local markets and sustainable farming methods as they are rooted in place as they build up community connections and work to enhance land quality.

Supporting access to land: Governance reform issues

Broad need for fundamental land reform

The need for fundamental land reform at the EU level is highlighted, to address difficulties for new entrants to farming accessing land, as well as wider issues (e.g. social, cultural, economic,

environmental) raised by land access. European level calls for land reform encompassing more integrated land governance frameworks have been made. Some argue a core shift in land governance is needed, moving away from a market-based approach towards a human rights-based approach, as advocated in the FAO (2012) tenure guidelines (e.g. EP, 2015; Kay, 2016). For example, EP (2015) argue the EU needs to move beyond the current technical, market-based approach based around private property rights and argue for clear political stance on land governance. It should be a “comprehensive, holistic and human rights based approach” detailed through an EC Recommendation on Land and implemented via horizontal frameworks (Internal Market, Agriculture, Environment and Territorial Cohesion) through a series of EU Directives (EP, 2015, p.62). More recently, the United Nations (UN) Declaration on the Rights of Peasant recognised in its article 17 a holistic right for peasants to access land and natural resources: “to achieve an adequate standard of living, to have a place to live in security, peace and dignity and to develop their cultures” (UN, 2018, p.11). The need for more proactive land use planning and mobilisation is highlighted by the Erasmus+ project A2L. A more proactive approach, concerned with who accesses land for what types of farming, it is argued can support rural regeneration such as job creation, supporting local food systems, new business creation, alongside social and environmental benefits.

Deficiencies in current policy instruments

The ECA (2017) found CAP pillar 1 payments to young farmers do not improve access to land as only farmers with land are eligible. However in relation to the pillar 2 measure setting up young farmers the ECA (2017) found the lump sum payment could assist young farmers to access land. While varying among EU member states, decoupled CAP payments have been linked to capitalization of land rents, and also potentially leading to the support of absentee, non-farming, landowners (Ciaian et al., 2017). Zagata et al. (2017) also point to issues relating to CAP direct payments and their linkage to land ownership which act as a land transfer disincentive. They argue: “Older farmers access their subsidies as a form of pension, and are therefore reluctant to release land. Many landowners are reluctant to rent out their land for fear of how it will impact on future subsidy entitlements” (Zagata et al., 2017, p.45)

Inequality of access

Concentration of ownership is a key issued implicated in the access to land debate highlighting unequal access to resources. Large-scale industrial farming can depend on large tracts of land where landowners or users controlling land are remotely located corporate or state actors (Lee Peluso and Lind, 2011). Large, corporate farms are described as a threat to the European multifunctional family farm model (Kay, 2016). Land grabbing also changes how land is used with such large land areas needing more standardised, specialised, industrialised production, again reflecting a move away from the multifunctional European model. It also concentrates control of ecological capital with landowners who may not buy land with farming and food production the primary motive, but as an investment or to avoid tax (van der Ploeg et al. 2015). The new entrants ‘entry denial’ situation calls for land policy reform, as well as wider agricultural policy reform (van der Ploeg et al., 2015). EP (2015, p. 62) found that the current land governance framework results in land concentration and “creates discrimination against non-industrial agricultural enterprises and peasant farming”. As discussed above along with increasing land concentration is the phenomenon of ‘land grabbing’. The growing interest in agricultural land as an investment prospect where investors compete for land alongside much

less well financially resourced farmers creates an inequality around access. For example, van der Ploeg et al. (2015, p.148) observe “Land, business and financial “deal brokers” have emerged in the European land rush, joining the ranks of other elites (food empires, commercial producers, banks) in partly determining the dynamics of land politics”. This sees new types of actors and institutions become investors in farmland (van der Ploeg et al., 2015; TNI, 2012).

Access to capital and financial risk

The above discussion on inequality of access also underlines the importance of addressing the barrier of access to financial capital for new entrants in relation to access to land, as well as wider investment needs. Zagata et al. (2017, p.46) acknowledge that some current supports do focus on access to capital but an important future policy consideration is particularly around decreasing “financial risk (e.g. by subsidising insurance premiums, flexible repayment schemes)”.

Human rights-based approaches to land governance

Greater recognition of human rights in relation to access to land has entered the land reform debate for example in the Scottish (Reid, 2015) and wider European (EP, 2015) context. EP (2017, p.4) states: “access to land and the possibility of ownership are essential rights established by the national law of each Member State”. This entails the right to access land through ownership or rental, or due to government action results in loss of access to land so it also concerned with protecting existing access. More broadly, in the context of a study on farmland grabbing in the EU, EP (2015, p.62) is critical of an EU approach to land governance that takes “a purely technical and market-based approach” and calls for a clearer political orientation and change of direction for land governance. It is argued this should be informed by FAO (2012) tenure guidelines, but that still allows flexible interpretation at Member State level and takes a “comprehensive, holistic and human rights based approach” (EP, 2015, p.62). EP (2017) also point to the fact that land access is connected to the realisation of other human rights, for example the right to food. The FAO (2012) guidelines on responsible tenure governance are also framed as building on and supporting its guidelines relating to the right to food.

Environmental dimension of land access

As outlined in relation to land availability, land and wider environmental degradation can impact availability of quality land and therefore also land access. Preservation of the resource of land itself also becomes a policy concern in relation to access to land. The LIFE ELCN project (Fact Sheet 11, Part B) is testing land conservation tools in high nature value (HNV) farming contexts and protected environments. Such tools for example could help to support the dual goal of conservation and land access in more vulnerable environments. Beyond the HNV farming context, MULTIAGRI (Fact Sheet 12, Part B) also raised the issue of at what scale managing agricultural landscapes to protect biodiversity and enhance ecosystem services should happen. The findings point to the need for actions above the individual farm level and at wider spatial scales, also tailored to local farming conditions.

Increased need for place-based, multi-actor and community governance instruments

A greater emphasis on 'bottom-up' or endogenous, place-based practices in land reform is also highlighted. For example, Sikor and Müller (2010) argue more attention to the role of communities in land reform is needed, moving away from a dominant focus on top-down, state-led, bureaucratic, non place-based reforms. They argue: "Community-led strategies may connect state action better with "bottom-up" political initiatives and property relations on the ground. In this way, emphasis on community does not deny the state a role in land reform, but it calls for a state that is more reactive to political demands originating "from below" (Sikor and Müller, 2010, p. 1307). In the Scottish context, where community-centric land reform has occurred Hoffman (2013) finds that it marks a shift towards local democratic governance providing communities with greater influence over the development of their area. The role of community ownership in rural development has also extended beyond land, to also rural services (e.g. shops, pubs, cafes). Land reform would benefit from involving a greater range of stakeholders in land governance and development of new policy arrangements that facilitate harnessing potential of greater direct involvement. The multi-functional role of local authorities is demonstrated for example by the work of the Access to Land Network (e.g. see Access to Land Network, 2018). The Erasmus+ project A2L finds potential stakeholders include: farmers, rural development organisations, local authorities, local communities, national public agencies, environmental organisations and consumer groups.

However, community-centric land policy also can meet challenges and has limitations for rural regeneration which are important to consider. In the Scottish context Bryden and Geisler (2007) discuss land reform in the Scottish Highlands which allows communities certain rights to purchase land. They find social capital is an important component in realising the community right to buy, which is being eroded in some rural communities. The community right to buy may hinder wider regeneration issues (e.g. attracting newcomers to farming and rural areas). Newcomers or returnees to communities can face challenges to join community groups that exercising community right to buy. Newcomer communities and existing communities can end up competing for land. The definition of community means who can purchase land is a collective of people who physically live in the area concerned. This also holds significant challenges for seasonal residents and conservation actors who have a legitimate interest in the land.

Strengthen the role of public land

EP (2015) argue land owned by public bodies should be used and allocated in a way that benefits new entrants to farming. However given competing priorities in reality in some contexts trends exist where public land is sold to release the financial value for other purposes. For example, in the UK context, a Food, Farming and Countryside Commission (2019) report highlights this issue and calls for sales of government owned County Farm Estates to end so this public land is made available to new farm entrants. But alongside this, other measures are also recommended: "This move should also include support for local councils or community trusts with grants to acquire land, and collaboration with estates and institutional land owners, to rebuild a diverse and tiered range of opportunities for entry and progression" (Food, Farming and Countryside Commission, 2019, p.58). In the French context Baysse-Lainé (2018) explores how growth of issues around local food have impacted the management of

access to land to facilitate re-localised agriculture that sees cooperation between local public authorities, civil society organisations and farmers. Baysse-Lainé and Perrin (2018) demonstrate how public land can be managed aligned with wider objectives (local food production and short food supply chains in this case) having a strong impact on farming style permitted on these lands. Publically owned land can be managed in ways that prioritises access for new entrants. In addition depending on the wider objectives sought by the public body, potential exists to tag wider rural regeneration objectives on to how the land is used, as demonstrated by the French case.

Strengthen the role of land leasing

Improving access to land is not just framed in terms of increasing less concentrated private ownership. The important role of land leasing is also emphasised, albeit under certain, market, legal and policy arrangements. According to Bahner et al. (2014), high levels of land leasing is not an issue, once costs of leasing are not too high impacting farm sustainability and there is tenure security and adequate lease length. Availability of land to new entrants can also be an issue where in the UK context Ilbery et al. (2010) find that existing farmers wanting to expand compete with new entrants for land available for rental. In France, agricultural land leases are a minimum of nine years; in addition, renewal can only be refused if the owner or their children intend to farm the land (The Greens/EFA, 2016). Tenancy arrangements vary from short to long term and across Europe there are numerous different types with different levels of tenure security for farmers. Helms et al. (2018, p.37-8) review types in the UK, noting that Scotland in particular has tight regulations. Ilbery et al. (2010) identify a complex range of tenancy arrangements in the UK context. While tenancy laws protect the rights of tenants, leasing also has disadvantages where owing land gives security and impacts borrowing capacity (van Boxtel, 2016). In the context of competition for land, land leasing can also bring further issues such as the illegal practice of commodification of leaves which Barral and Pinaud (2017) highlight in the French context. While in a housing tenancy law context, the TENLAW project (Fact Sheet 49, Part B) provides potential strong learnings for access to land through tenancies, putting forward for example principles for the development of tenancy law and good tenancy regulations (Schmid, 2015).

Innovative tax and land laws

Laws to protect agricultural land in different ways can differ at the MS level (EC, 2017a). For example, the pre-emptive right to buy means that before other buyers, certain buyers are given first refusal to purchase land that is due for sale (Access to Land Network, 2017). For example, in Scotland land reform in 2003 introduced the community right to buy and the crofting community right to buy (Reid, 2015). In France, relevant regional members of the SAFER (Sociétés d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural) Federation, leaseholders and immediate neighbours are notified of land sales prior to their addition to the land register as for sale and once their case is justified have a pre-emptive right to purchase the land (Blot et al. 2016; The Greens/European Free Alliance (EFA), 2016). The pre-emptive right to buy can for example be given to institutions that operate land portage (Access to Land Network, 2017). This enables farmland to be temporarily 'stored' or held by a public institution, which they purchase and/or manage until an appropriate new entrant, successor or institution (e.g. a land bank) is available to take on and purchase the farm themselves (Blot et al. 2016; Access to Land Network, 2017). For example, the new entrant may need to complete educational

training and/or accrue capital before they are in a position to purchase farmland (Blot et al. 2016). Such institutions in France for example could be members of the SAFER Federation who have formal agreements to carry out land portage with the wider objective for example to facilitate entry into farming (Blot et al. 2016; The Greens/EFA, 2016). Tax relief can also play a role in facilitating access to land for new entrants decreasing the capital burden of land access (McKee et al. 2018).

De-linking farm size and farm viability

Growing farm size is a well-documented trend linked to farmers attempting to maintain a viable enterprise. However, land fragmentation can mean smaller parcels of land are more accessible in some instances. Small farms are not necessarily lacking viability; evidence suggests the business model is crucial. For example, see Greenfield and Carman (2017) in relation to micro-dairies in the UK and Di Pierro (2017) in relation to short supply chains/direct selling and small Italian farms. In the French context Blot (2016) observe that newcomers predominantly seek small farms. Opportunities may exist to matching available land with specific farm business models as part of wider local and national food policy.

Direct policy focus on innovative approaches to land mobility

Measures that focus directly on land mobility and transfer between generations are important as part of addressing access to land (Zagata et al., 2017). Enabling land access for new entrants and successors through farmer retirement issue is also discussed in section 4.2.2. This discussion points to issues with previous schemes focused on older farmer retirement and land transfer (e.g. early retirement schemes). This suggests more innovative measures are called for. Farm match-making schemes, such as in Ireland, the UK and France that allow gradual farm take-over and collaboration between entering and exiting farmers are highlighted as not without challenges but also effective tools (Ingram and Kirwan, 2011; Zagata et al., 2017; Land Mobility Service, 2019). More broadly to encourage land mobility, tax interventions can also be used to provide incentives to landowners/existing farmers to make land available for leasing, tenancy or sale (McKee et al. 2018). Zagata et al. (2017, p.56) point to a number of innovative, more integrated approaches (land trusts, starter farms, farm incubators, land matching) that can encourage land mobility. But importantly they also note these practices are nationally or regionally based and their impact “could be increased through formal EU recognition and financial support”.

Land fragmentation and consolidation

The issues of physical land fragmentation and subsequent potential need for consolidation are referred to briefly above in relation to land availability. More broadly these are complex processes and an issue of significant policy relevance, particularly highlighted in some contexts. Focused after the 1989 reforms, there is much analysis carried out in the Central and Eastern European (CEE) context. Hartvigsen (2014, p.332) identifies two core approaches to CEE land reform “restitution of land rights to former owners and distribution of land rights to the rural population”, alongside six sub-categories within this, which can be inter-linked and seen in combination. Land fragmentation is also considered a side effect of land reform in CEE contexts and land consolidation as a solution where fragmentation leads to land use issues. A distinction is also made by van Dijk (2003a; 2003b) between ownership and land-use fragmentation and even in contexts where ownership is fragmented use can be consolidated

through land leasing. This issue is further emphasised by Hartvigsen (2014, p.340) as a core consideration in agricultural and rural development contexts “land fragmentation is often hampering land market development and agricultural and rural development when both the ownership and the use of agricultural land is highly fragmented”. Hartvigsen (2014, p.340) goes on to say when this is the case in CEE countries “it can be well justified to address the land fragmentation problems through a wide range of instruments from incentives to support development of rural land markets to public programs for land consolidation and land banking. Such programs can, however, not stand alone and must be seen in an integrated local development approach which also includes other instruments than the re-allotment of parcels”.

6 Policy instruments and governance approaches

This final section turns to governance issues. It provides a classification, based on an ideal (typical) approach, of existing or emerging governance approaches and instruments including those provided by official authorities but also by more informal governance groups. We present a classification of governance approaches developed by Bouwma et al. (2012). Based on our review we also present a tentative classification of rural governance instruments. The ideal type conforms to Weber's (1949) conceptualisation. This is where ideal types help to organise ideas and bring together the characteristics of phenomena into defined 'types' or a classification. It is not the intention the constructs can be found exactly in reality, but they are a way to categorise diverse phenomena providing an analytical tool helping to assess how real world phenomena conform or divert from the ideal type (Weber, 1949).

6.1 Rural governance

A move away from hierarchical 'government' and towards different modes of 'governance' (e.g. self-governance, network-governance) is a generally observed pattern of rural governance (Bouwma et al., 2012; Cheshire, 2016; Scott et al., 2019). This is reflected in how Cheshire (2016, p.708) defines governance in a rural context as: "a new mode of governing that is no longer enacted solely through the formal, coercive powers of the nation state, but is exercised through a range of government and non-governmental actors and entities".

More broadly, rural governance is multi-faceted. It is not static but dynamic and changing in nature (Scott et al., 2019). Wider characteristics of contemporary rural governance include:

- *Increasing roles at community level:* There is increasing involvement of communities in governance in a number of ways. They are involved in policy design, provision of services through different organisational forms (e.g. social enterprise, cooperatives, voluntary organisations) and community ownership (and management) of rural assets (e.g. community land trusts) (Bock, 2019; Moore, 2019; Scott et al., 2019).
- *Decrease in central government as the locus of power:* There is a move towards multi-level governance models involving local, regional and national agencies, as well as less hierarchical, top-down modes of delivery with more emphasis on bottom-up approaches (Copus et al., 2011b). However this has also led to a change in the nature of the institutions of control. They are not centralised institutions but a range of "managerialist institutions of control, such as formal targets, contracts and indicators of performance" (Kahila et al., 2009, p. 9).
- *Operates on a variety of scales:* Leading on from the decreasing role of central government as the locus of power, governance operates at different spatial scales which can operate on vertical (e.g. actors/bodies involved above or below the nation state) and horizontal (range of local and regional actors, both state and civil society involved in governance) levels (Cheshire, 2016).
- *Increasing market-orientation:* This sees a stepping back of the state (e.g. from rural service provision) with policies more market oriented and consequently governance instruments are more market-based (Scott et al., 2019).

- *Increasing use of a diversity of organisational forms:* Most notably, a broad move towards partnership-based approaches and organisational models (Shucksmith, 2000; Copus et al., 2011b; Pemberton, 2019).
- *Diverse, multi-actor involvement:* There is increasing focus on involvement of different types of actors or multi-actor approaches. For example not just communities or state actors, but a combination of actors that share different knowledge and skill bases (Scott et al., 2019; Cheshire, 2016).
- *Increasing place of fixed-term projects:* This for example sees funding allocated on a competitive basis to places or organisations tied to achieving particular policy goals (Copus et al., 2011b).

New approaches, new challenges and considerations

Traditionally government actors and procedures steer and control governance in a more hierarchical, top-down, non-participatory manner (Torfing et al., 2012). As the characteristics of contemporary rural governance described above indicate, bottom-up, participatory approaches are now also a rural governance trend. New, more collaborative forms of governance have emerged in response to deficiencies of other approaches to governance (Ansell and Gash, 2007; Bock, 2019). That said, different forms also have their own challenges. For example, there is precarity associated with reliance on the voluntary community to deliver essential services through community self-governance (Bock, 2019). A tendency towards marginalisation of those traditionally marginalised is also identified as a central critique of the participatory move in rural governance where local institutional and community capacity impacts engagement. Although a range of actors can be involved, new elites or a 'project class' can emerge that possess better capacity to participate and emerge as more powerful (Shucksmith, 2000; Copus et al., 2011b; Cheshire, 2016). In the environmental policy context, Bouwma et al. (2012, p.9) argue "successful policy uses a variety of instruments and is based on one or several collaborating modes of governance; from coercive public law to voluntary self-regulation, voluntary agreements between actors, financial and legal support and by supporting actors to engage in innovation trajectories". In the EU Cohesion policy context, Crescenzi and Giua (2014, p.3) argue that "EU policy makers in all fields should constantly look for the best mix of bottom-up and top-down measures in order to tackle structural disadvantage".

Gender and rural governance

RURALIZATION aims to understand how overcoming traditional gender roles can support rural generational renewal and regeneration. Wider issues discussed related to traditional gender roles, attitudes and inequalities in rural areas (in section 2.2.2 on gender and rural regeneration, as well as in relation to farm succession, new entrants and access to land) also enter and impact the rural governance arena. Rural governance spaces potentially present greater issues of imbalance than women's wider participation in western economies (Aagaard-Thuesen, 2016). Unbalanced participation in rural governance is acknowledged as a reducing problem, yet persistent one (Bock, 2015). Aagaard-Thuesen (2016) also suggests perhaps issues may reduce as we move through the next generations and into the near future as more traditional gender norms reduce. Nevertheless, the spaces of rural politics, representative groups and participatory rural development can be masculinised acting as a barrier to women's participation (Bock, 2015; Oedl-Wieser, 2015). Gender balanced

involvement in governance organisations is thought to be a particular issue in the agriculture sector but also more generally in rural development decision-making raising the need for greater focus on achieving equal participation, such as in local politics, state boards, cooperatives, farming organisations (Oedl-Wieser, 2015; EIGE, 2017; Shortall, 2018). Some suggest gender quotas are needed (Oedl-Wieser, 2015; Shortall, 2018). Also beyond the issue of participation, Aagaard-Thuesen (2016, p.460) raises the broader question of when access is gained can women and men equally “have a say” and also that women themselves may self-exclude because of wider cultural issues. More broadly, gender mainstreaming means that at the EU level a gender perspective should be present in all policies, from design to implementation and evaluation, to promote gender equality (EIGE, 2016). Some are quite critical of this process noting attention to can amount to little more than rhetoric (Shortall, 2015). In the Austrian rural policy context, Oedl-Wieser (2015) argues gender mainstreaming meets challenges because of existing barriers (institutional, political and social) and rather than enable change reproduces existing issues. It is suggested to help overcome institutional barriers, women’s networks and organisations should be involved in the policy process at different scales (e.g. regional, provincial) through a process of institutional learning.

6.2 Classifying rural governance approaches and instruments

Governance approaches

Using the ideal-type method, Bouwma et al. (2012) distinguish five modes of governance characterised by their core coordinating principle (see Table 6). While developed in the context of European environmental policy, the types are derived from two key domains (political science and economics) of wider literature on modes of governance. Within the different approaches, sub-categories may also exist. For example in relation to network governance, collaborative and interactive governance might be associated with it as sub-types. Asnell and Gash (2007, p.544) define collaborative governance as: “A governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets”. Torfiing et al. (2012, p.2-3) define interactive governance as: “The complex process through which a plurality of social and political actors with diverging interests interact to formulate, promote, and achieve common objectives by means of mobilising, exchanging, and deploying and range of ideas, rules, and resources”.

Governance approach	Description
Hierarchical	More closely linked to the concept of government than governance, hierarchical governance relates to top down governance, such as by elected governments at the nation state level.
Network	Many, diverse, interdependent actors involved and collaborate in governance where there is shared decision-making bringing together the agendas of different actors. This is not without challenges as actors can have competing agendas and attempt to strategically steer decision-making.
Market	Governance linked to how markets operate based around for example economic principles of supply and demand and systems such as pricing and competition. Also non-market traded services can be managed via market governance (e.g. payment for environmental services). Financial incentives are a common instrument.
Self	Actors govern themselves independently of government such as relating to governance of particular issues or resources (e.g. community self-governance of common natural resources).
Knowledge	Governance embedded in social learning where multi-actor networks come together to develop knowledge that can emerge as novel, feasible solutions to complex problems, which could then be used to driver wider change.

Table 6: Different types of governance approaches.

Derived from Bouwma et al. (2012).

Another potential way to classify governance approaches is by the type of actor involved. But this is difficult in reality. For example, Bouwma et al. (2012) argue that all types of actors (e.g. government, business, civil society) can be involved in each governance approach they distinguish. The classification ‘multi-actor’ governance cuts across many of the modes of governance presented in Table 6. In rural governance contexts, it is important a range of actors are involved, such as those linked to the state, civil society and economy. A challenge for rural governance is that effective structures exist to enable the multi-actor nature of rural governance to function (Pollermann et al. 2014). For example, in the context of the European Commission’s European Innovation Partnership for Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability (EIP-AGRI) programme and multi-actor governance, the LIAISON project (Factsheet 16, Part B) is working to understand how interactive innovation partnerships can most effectively work.

A further cross-cutting consideration is that the scale of rural governance is often multi-level in nature. Governance actors are involved and governance instruments can emerge from many levels, local, regional, national and European. For example in the LEADER context, EU regulations feed into national and regional programmes but also local development strategies emerge from Local Action Groups (Pollermann et al. 2014).

Governance instruments

Governance approaches are distinguished from policy instruments, which are the tools of policy implementation (Bouwma et al., 2012). The dynamic and changing nature of rural

governance also extends to see a range of rural policy instruments used in rural development (Scott et al. 2019). Therefore, thinking in terms of ideal forms is also useful when it comes to governance instruments. Specific instruments can be linked to particular modes of governance. In relation to community self-governance, Clark et al. (2007) identify different instruments of delivery involving different actors (e.g. state-sponsored rural community partnerships; community based development trusts). Instruments can be associated with specific modes of governance, but can also cross between governance modes with a range used in policy implementation (Bouwma et al., 2012). In reality, also distinct lines may not exist between instruments and hybrids can exist, such as combined legal and economic instruments (Bouwma et al., 2012). A number of types and examples are outlined in Table 7 detailing the six types (legal/regulatory; economic/fiscal; agreement/cooperative; information/communication; knowledge) identified by Bouwma et al. (2012).

Instrument type	Description
Legal and regulatory	Range of laws and regulations that have binding requirements (e.g. out-rule or require certain behaviour) and sanctions for non-compliance. Links to hierarchical mode of governance (Bouwma et al., 2012). Also, regulations that set out provisions for certain EU funds and polices.
Economic and fiscal	Financial measures such as tax incentives, subsidies/income supports or loans. Can be targeted to reward or discourage certain behaviour. Agri-environmental schemes cited as an example (Bouwma et al., 2012).
Agreement based/ Cooperative	Actors jointly agree to actions based on a shared agenda, which are defined through an agreement. Achieving goals is generally voluntary and depends on cooperation among actors. Links to network mode of governance. Public-private partnerships cited as an example (Bouwma et al., 2012).
Information/ Communication	Information dissemination and education aiming to simulate behaviour change. Certification and product labelling is also included (Bouwma et al., 2012).
Knowledge/ Innovation	Co-learning and co-creation among actors. EIP-AGRI cited as an example (Bouwma et al., 2012).

Table 7: Different types of governance instruments

Derived from Bouwma et al., 2012.

A simplified approach accommodating existing and emerging governance

RURALIZATION is concerned with governance instruments not just emerging from policy and official authorities, but also other actors such as from civil society that can be classed as informal governance groups. This aligns with how Cheshire (2016, p.708) describes governance as involving “a range of government and non-governmental actors and entities”. It also links to the ‘multi-actor’ nature of rural governance, where also there may not always be divisions between for example state and non-state actors as the implementers of instruments. Throughout this review in the sections addressing rural newcomers, new entrants, succession and access to land governance issues have been explored. This has brought to light some existing and emerging governance approaches and instruments. Looking

at the ideal-types of governance approaches and instruments developed by Bouwma et al. (2012), they do not fit comfortably into one type. Take community ownership of assets, this connects with a mode of governance that could be classed as both self and network governance. In terms of the governance instruments outlined, the fit is more difficult. In the RURALIZATION context, we put forward a tentative, more simplified model that emerges directly from our review. It cuts across the areas of rural newcomers, new entrants to farming, succession and access to land (Table 8).

Approach	Type of instrument	Examples
Individual Predominantly individual benefits	Financial	Tax/financial incentives (e.g. for forming a farm partnerships, for relocation to a rural area); farm income support, result-based farm payments; farmer early retirement schemes; business start-up support (e.g. for newcomers, for new entrants to farming)
	Knowledge/skills	Farmer discussion groups, professional development training, farm advisory supports; entrepreneurship training for newcomers
	Social/cultural	Social/cultural integration programmes for newcomers
	Legal	Pre-emptive right to buy land; Land portage
	Integrated	Land matching schemes; Economic and social integration programmes for newcomers
Hybrid Society and individual benefits	Community owned assets	Community land trusts, Community owned services;
	Consumer-producer partnerships	Community Supported Agriculture; Participatory Guarantee Schemes
	Network/Partnership based approaches	Local development partnerships, policy networks; Public-citizen partnerships
	Interactive innovation projects	EIP-AGRI
	Incubators	Farm incubators; Rural business incubators
	Community-led local development	LEADER; Smart Villages
	Shared-value business models	Social enterprise; Cooperatives

Table 8: Classification of existing/emerging governance approaches and instruments

This approach distinguishes governance approaches as either predominantly focusing on benefits for the individual or for both the individual and wider society (hybrid). It is intended to provide a way to understand governance with who benefits as the starting point. The individual and hybrid instruments outlined also are not intended to be exhaustive, but illustrative of the range of instruments that can be classified under either domain. The classification does not suggest a hierarchy where either hybrid or individual approaches should be prioritised over another. However, generally speaking local needs and circumstance

would be a key principle to determine the balance and combination of instruments. Beyond this, determining if a hierarchy appears logical, and in what way, is a question needing further exploration.

7 Conclusion

The 'RURALIZATION' perspective links to the wider concept of a process of 'ruralisation'. This sees the current negative spiral of rural decline shift into a positive spiral of new rural opportunities. More opportunities for new generations result in less young people moving out and more rural newcomers moving in. This results in a relatively younger population, that is, a renewal of the rural population, which results in further, also diverse, economic activities. This creates a flywheel effect, with more opportunities for new generations (Figure 5).




Figure 5: The RURALIZATION perspective

Currently new generations move away from rural areas due to lack of opportunities. Novel policy options developed through RURALIZATION, based on tools, policy arrangements and good practices, will enable new opportunities to be created in rural areas. These opportunities will be aligned with the rural dreams of youth and aim to improve quality of life, socio-economic prospects, resilience to climate change, job diversity and the attractiveness of rural areas. These policy options will aim to work towards the development of a new rural frontier, the development of rural areas that provide exciting opportunities to new rural generations to realise their dreams. However, this review has made clear that realising the RURALIZATION ambition is complex. That said some promising findings emerge around potential ways forward.

- To create more opportunities, the review has highlighted the importance of different actors (e.g. public agencies, policy-actors, civil society, enterprise), and similar actors operating in different areas (e.g. public agencies dealing with inter-linked issues) working together in collaboration. This is found to have relevance across diverse issues. For example, this could be in relation to dealing with youth unemployment or access to land.

- Linked to this point, approaches that look at issues from their many sides appear important. Recognising the reciprocal nature of different aspects of issues appears important to effectively creating more opportunities for new generations. For example when considering farm succession the entering and existing farmer is important. We must be concerned with why youth leave rural areas but also why they do not return. If rural newcomers create new jobs, capacities and skills in the rural population must match the demands of these jobs. Another example is that access to land is not just about gaining access but also maintaining it, which links the access to land issue with farm viability.
- While rural areas can face issues around their attractiveness, they still can be places that are attractive to new generations. This also however appears to have life-stage and life-ambition dimensions. The more social aspects of opportunities provided by rural areas (e.g. place to raise a family, place for realisation of an eco-lifestyle) can differ depending on the stage of life. This emphasises the importance of seeing 'opportunities' that lead to more youth moving in and less moving out as more than just about the economic and job dimensions.
- Research reviewed identified the need for a more feminised and youth-friendly labour market in rural areas. This signals that viewing the rural economy from the perspective of new generations and what are the sectors (e.g. agriculture, forestry, tourism and creative economy) and approaches within particular sectors (e.g. organic farming, agroecology, smart farming) that can provide the opportunities these new generations hope for is important.
- The review also reinforces some well-established observations on approaches to rural development – that context matters, rural areas are different and so are the populations currently and potentially living there as part of new generations. This does not mean we cannot generalise, without this developing policy approaches would be unmanageable, but we must still keep this view embedded within the research and policy-making agenda.

8 References

Aagaard-Thuesen, A. 2016. Gender and Rural Governance, in eds. M. Shucksmith and D. Brown, *Routledge International Handbook of Rural Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, p. 459-69.

Access to Land Network and Urgenci, 2017. Access to Land and Community Supported Agriculture: Stories From Europe. Retrieved on 04/07/2019 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/a2l_csa_report_june2017.pdf

Access to Land Network, 2017. Supporting access to land for farmers in Europe: Experiences and potential of local authorities. Retrieved on 27/01/2020 from <https://www.accesstoland.eu/Local-authorities-role-to-secure-access-to-land-for-farmers>

Access to Land Network, 2018. Europe's new farmers: Innovative ways to enter farming and access land. Retrieved on 27/01/2020 from <https://www.accesstoland.eu/Access-to-land-for-new-entrants>

Access to Land Network, no date. Countries. Retrieved on 22/01/2020 from <https://www.accesstoland.eu/-Countries-16->

Adams, N., Bjørnsen, H.M., Jansone, D., Johansen, D., Pinch, P., Valtenbergs, V. 2012. PURR: Potentials of Rural Regions. Final Report. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/targeted-analyses/purr-potential-rural-regions>

AEIAR, 2015. Status of Agricultural Land Market Regulation in Europe: Policies and Instruments. Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/aeiar_land-market-regulation_en.pdf

Agreste, 2015. Comment les exploitants de 55 ans et plus en 2010 envisagent-ils leur succession? Les Dossiers N° 29. Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from http://www.aude.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/dossier29_succession.pdf

Anderson, M., Lavesson, N. and Niedomysl, T. 2018. Rural to urban long-distance commuting in Sweden. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 59, p. 67-77.

Annes, A. and Redlin, M. 2012. Coming out and coming back: Rural gay migration and the city. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28(1), p. 56-68.

Ansell C. and A. Gash. 2007. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 18, p. 543– 571, doi:10.1093/jopart/mum032

Argent, N., Tonts, M., Jones, R., Holmes, J. 2013. A creativity-led rural renaissance? Amenity-led migration, the creative turn and the uneven development of rural Australia. *Applied Geography*, 44, p. 88-98.

- Aspinall, R. and Staiano, M. A. 2017. A Conceptual Model for Land System Dynamics as a Coupled Human–Environment System. *Land*, 6 (4) 81, <https://doi.org/10.3390/land6040081>
- Aure, M., Førde, A. and Magnussen, T. 2018. Will migrant workers rescue rural regions? Challenges of creating stability through mobility. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 60, p.52-59, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.03.005>
- Bacco, M., Barsocchi, P. Ferro, E., Gotta, A. and Ruggeri, M. 2019. The Digitisation of Agriculture: a Survey of Research Activities on Smart Farming, *Array*, 3-4, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.array.2019.100009>
- Bahner, T., Diermayr, X., Schmid, T., Schwedeler, A., Zaiser, M. and Zucker 2014. Releasing the True Value of Land. The Land Market and new Forms of Ownership for Organic Agriculture. A Shortened International Version. Translation by Bernard Jarman, Stroud. Retrieved on 20/12/2019 from http://forum-synergies.eu/docs/releasing_true_value_of_land_-_20141218.pdf
- Bakre, O. and Dorasamy, N. 2019. Transforming the European Migrant Crisis into Rural Developmental Opportunities: The Case of Latvia. *International Relations and Diplomacy*, 7(9), p.431-439, doi: 10.17265/2328-2134/2019.09.005
- Ball, J.A. 2019. Women farmers in developed countries: A literature review. *Agriculture and Human Values*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-019-09978-3>
- Barbosa, R.,A., Domingues, F.,H.,C., Correra de Silvia, M., Foguesatto, R.,C., Pereira, A., M., Gimenes, T.,M.,R., Borgess, R.,A.,J. 2020. Using Q-methodology to identify rural women’s viewpoint on succession of family farms. *Land Use Policy*, 92, DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104489>
- Barral, S. and Pinaud, S. 2017. Accès à la terre et reproduction de la profession agricole: Influence des circuits d’échange sur la transformation des modes de production. *Revue Française de Socio-économie*, 1(18), p.77-99.
- Baud, I.S.A., K. Pfeffer, J. Sydenstricker-Neto, D. Scott. 2011. Developing Participatory ‘Spatial’ Knowledge models in metropolitan governance networks for sustainable development. Literature Review, March, Working Paper, EU programme Chance2Sustain.
- Baysee-Laine, A., and Perrin, C. 2018. How can alternative farmland management styles favour local food supply? A case study in the Larzac (France). *Land Use Policy*. 75 p.746-756.
- Bayse-Lainé A. 2018. *Terres nourricières? La gestion de l’accès au foncier agricole en France face aux demandes de relocalisation alimentaire*. Enquêtes dans l’Amiénois, le Lyonnais et le Sud Est de l’Aveyron. LED – Thesis University Lyon.
- Bender, O. and Kanitscheider, S. 2013. Amenity Migration in the Southern Andes and the Southern European Alps – A Key Factor for Sustainable Regional Development? *Mitteilungen*

der Österreichischen Geographischen Gesellschaft, 155, p.105-124, doi:10.1553/moegg155s105

Bika, Z. 2007. The Territorial Impact of the Farmers' Early Retirement Scheme. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 47(3), p.246-272, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2007.00436.x>

Bisoffi, S. 2019. A meta-analysis of recent foresight documents in support of the 5th SCAR Foresight Exercise. Study carried out under the Project Support Action to a common agricultural and wider bioeconomy research agenda (CASA). Retrieved on 20/12/2019 from <https://scar-europe.org/index.php/foresight/documents>

Blot, M., Sanglier, M. and Rioufol, V. 2016. Newcomers in Search of Small Farms: How to Match the Discrepancy on a Market of Large Farms? The Experience of Terre de Liens France. Access to Land Network and Terre de Liens. Retrieved on 11/11/2019 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/newcomers_in_search_of_small_farms.pdf

Bock, B. 2015. Gender mainstreaming and rural development policy; the trivialisation of rural gender issues, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 22(5), p.731-745, DOI:10.1080/0966369X.2013.879105

Bock, B. 2019. Rurality and multi-level governance: Marginal rural areas inciting community governance, in eds. M. Scott, N. Gallent, and M. Gkartzios. *Routledge Companion to Rural Planning*. Oxon: Routledge, p.103-113.

Bogue, P. 2013. Land Mobility and Succession in Ireland. Macra na Feirme Research Report. Retrieved on 07/11/2019 from <https://www.ifa.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Land-Mobility-and-Succession-in-Ireland-Report.pdf>

Bori, K. 2019. Generational Renewal and CAP. ENRD Workshop on Generational Renewal, 22 February, Athlone, Ireland. Retrieved on 09/09/2019 from https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/ws_gen_ren_cap-dgagri_bori.pdf

Bosworth, G. 2010. Commercial counterurbanisation: an emerging force in rural economic development. *Environment and Planning*, 42, p. 966– 981, <https://doi.org/10.1068/a42206>

Bouwma, I.M., Gerritsen, A.L., Kamphorst, D.A. and Kistenkas, F.H. 2012. Policy instruments and modes of governance in environmental policies of the European Union. Past, present and future. Wot-technical report 60. Wageningen UR. Retrieved on 02/02/2020 from <https://edepot.wur.nl/373629>

Bryden, J., and Geisler, C. 2007. Community-based land reform: Lessons from Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, 24, p. 24–34.

Burton, R. and Walford, N. 2005. Multiple succession and land division on family farms in the South East of England: a counterbalance to agricultural concentration? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21, p. 335-347, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2005.04.004>

Carson, D.A. and Carson, D.B. 2018. International lifestyle immigrants and their contributions to rural tourism innovation: Experiences from Sweden's far north. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.230-240, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.08.004>

Carson, D.A., Carson, D.B. and Eimermann, M. 2018. International winter tourism entrepreneurs in northern Sweden: Understanding migration, lifestyle, and business motivations. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 17, (4) p. 183-198.

Cassidy, A. 2019. Female successors in Irish family farming: four pathways to farm transfer, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 40(2), p.238-253, DOI: 10.1080/02255189.2018.1517643

Cassidy, A., Srinivasan, S. and White, B. 2019. Generational transmission of smallholder farms in late capitalism. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 40(2), p.220-237, DOI: 10.1080/02255189.2019.1592744

Cheshire, L. 2016. Power and Governance: Empirical Questions and Theoretical Approaches for Rural Studies, in eds. Shucksmith, M. and Brown, D. *Routledge International Handbook of Rural Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, p.705-713.

Chevalier, P. and Dedeire, M. 2017. Dynamiques endogènes et exogènes contemporaines de la "renaissance rurale" : un essai typologique des régions françaises, espagnoles et italiennes. *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, 61 (174), p.529 551.

Chiswell, H. 2018. From Generation to Generation: Changing Dimensions of Intergenerational Farm Transfer. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 58 (1), p.104–125. doi:10.1111/soru.12138

Chiswell, H.M. and Lobley, M. 2018. "It's Definitely a Good Time to Be a Farmer": Understanding the Changing Dynamics of Successor Creation in Late Modern Society. *Rural Sociology*, 83(3), p630-653.

Ciaian, P., Kancs, D.A., and Espinosa, M. 2017. The Impact of the 2013 CAP Reform on the Decoupled Payments' Capitalisation into Land Values, *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, DOI: 10.1111/1477-9552.12253

Clark, D., Southern, R. and Beer, J. 2007. Rural governance, community empowerment and the new institutionalism: A case study of the Isle of Wight. . *Journal of Rural Studies*, 23, p.254-266, doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2006.10.004

Cohn T. J. and Leake, V. S. 2012. Affective Distress Among Adolescents Who Endorse Same-Sex Sexual Attraction: Urban versus Rural Differences and the Role of Protective Factors. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Mental Health*, 16(4), p. 291-305.

Conway, S.F., McDonagh, J., Farrell, M. and Kinsella, A. 2018. Till death do us part: Exploring the Irish farmer-farm relationship in later life through the lens of 'Insideness', *International Journal of Agricultural Management*, 7(1), p.1-13.

Conway, S.F., McDonagh, J., Farrell, M. and Kinsella, A., 2019. Human dynamics and the intergenerational farm transfer process in later life: A roadmap for future generational renewal in agriculture policy, *International Journal of Agricultural Management*, 8 (1), p.22-30.

Coopmans, I., Dessein, J., Bijttebier, J., Antonioli, F., Appel, F., Berry, R., Bertolozzi, D., Bohateret, V., Ibruma, J., Courtney, P., Casonato, C., Dinulescu, C., Dinu-Vasiliu, C., Dobay, K., Dolleans, E., Fiorini E., Florian, V., Gavrilesco, C., Gradziuk, P., Heinrich, F., Izvoranu A., Johansson, S., Klein, K., Manevska-Tasevska, G., Matei, D., Meuwissen, M., Neumeister, D., Paolini G., Peneva, M., Petitt, A., Pineau, E., Pitson, C., Severini, S., Slijper, T., Soriano, B., Tanasa, L., Toma, C., Tudor, M., Urquhart, J., Zawalinska, K. and Wauters, E. 2019. SURE-Farm D3.2 Report on a qualitative analysis in 11 case-studies for understanding the process of farm demographic change across EU-farming systems and its influencing factors. Retrieved on 07/07/2019 from <https://surefarmproject.eu/deliverables/publications/>

Copus, A. K., Dax, T. and de Lima, P. 2015. Future Cohesion Policy as the appropriate response to current rural trends, in eds. A. K. Copus, and P. de Lima, 2015. *Territorial Cohesion in Rural Europe: The Relational Turn in Rural Development*. Oxford: Routledge, p.236-248.

Copus, A. K., Shucksmith, M., Dax, T., Meredith, D. 2011a. Cohesion Policy for rural areas after 2013. A rationale derived from the EDORA project (European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas) – ESPON 2013 Project 2013/1/2. *Studies in Agricultural Economics*, 2, p. 121- 132.

Copus, A., Courtney, P., Dax, T., Meredith, D., Noguera, J., Talbot, H. and Shucksmith, M. 2011b. EDORA: European Development Opportunities for Rural Areas, Applied Research 2013/1/2 Final Report Parts A, B and C. Luxembourg: ESPON. Retrieved on 20/6/2019 from <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/applied-research/edora-european-development-opportunities-rural-areas>

Coto Sauras. M. 2019. Best Immigration Practice can help Alleviate Rural Depopulation. ARC2020 Rural Dialogues. Retrieved on 23/01/2020 from <https://www.arc2020.eu/rural-dialogues-best-immigration-practice-can-help-alleviate-rural-depopulation/>

Crescenzi and Giua, 2014. The EU Cohesion policy in context: regional growth and the influence of agricultural and rural development policies. LEQS Paper No. 85/2014. Retrieved on 02/02/2020 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/159466671.pdf>

De Rossi A., eds, 2018. *Riabitare l'Italia. Le aree interne tra abbandoni e riconquiste*. Roma: Donzelli.

Di Pierro, M. 2017. Small Farms and Short Chain. Lazio /Access to Land Network. Retrieved on 28/01/2020 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/small_farms_and_short_chain.pdf

DIVERCITIES, 2019. About DIVERCITIES. Retrieved on 28/01/2020 from <https://www.urbandivercities.eu/about-divercities/>

Dolci, P. and Perrin, C. 2018. Neo-farmers: drivers of farming systems innovation and of the transition to agro-ecology? The case of Alentejo (Portugal). European IFSA Symposium. Retrieved on 27/01/2020 from <https://prodira.inra.fr/?locale=fr#!ConsultNotice:435462>

Dwyer, J. 2015. The role of funding under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for women in agriculture, in eds. DG for Internal Policy, *Women's right and gender equality: International Day of Rural Women 2015*, European Parliament, p. 35-69. Retrieved on 27/11/2017 from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/536466/IPOL_STU\(2015\)536466_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/536466/IPOL_STU(2015)536466_EN.pdf)

Dwyer, J., Micha, E., Kubinakova, K., van Bunnem, P., Schuh, B., Maucorps, A., Mantino, F. 2019. Evaluation of the impact of the CAP on generational renewal, local development and jobs in rural areas. Technical Report, European Commission. Retrieved on 19/11/2019 from <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/7547/>

EC, 2017a. Commission Interpretative Communication on the Acquisition of Farmland and European Union Law, C/2017/6168. Retrieved on 12/09/2019 from <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/64a826e8-b3ba-11e7-837e-01aa75ed71a1>

EC, 2017b. Young farmers in the EU – structural and economic characteristics, EU Agricultural and Farm Economics Briefs, 15. Retrieved on 28/11/2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/food-farming-fisheries/farming/documents/agri-farm-economics-brief-15_en.pdf

EC, 2019. EU agricultural outlook for markets and income, 2019-2030. , Brussels: European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development. Retrieved on 23/01/2020 from https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/food-farming-fisheries/farming/documents/agricultural-outlook-2019-report_en.pdf

EC, no date. The EC Megatrends Hub. Retrieved on 21/01/2020 from https://ec.europa.eu/knowledge4policy/foresight/about_en#contributetothemegatrendshub

ECA, 2017. EU support to young farmers should be better targeted to foster effective generational renewal, European Court of Auditors, Luxembourg. Retrieved on 04/07/2019 from https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR17_10/SR_YOUNG_FARMERS_EN.pdf

ECA, 2018. Broadband in the EU Member States: Despite progress, not all the Europe 2020 targets will be met. Special report no.12. Retrieved on 07/04/2020 from https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR18_12/SR_BROADBAND_EN.pdf

Ecorys, 2010. Study on Employment, Growth and Innovation in Rural Areas (SEGIRA). Study Commissioned by DG AGRI. Rotterdam: Ecorys. Retrieved on 18/07/2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/external-studies/2010/employment/summary_en.pdf

EEA, 2007. Land-use scenarios for Europe: qualitative and quantitative analysis on a European scale. EEA Technical report No.9/2007. Retrieved on 08/11/2019 from [http://projects.mcrit.com/esponfutures/documents/European%20Studies/EEA%20\(2007\)%20Land-use%20scenarios%20for%20Europe%20qualitative%20and%20quantitative%20analysis.pdf](http://projects.mcrit.com/esponfutures/documents/European%20Studies/EEA%20(2007)%20Land-use%20scenarios%20for%20Europe%20qualitative%20and%20quantitative%20analysis.pdf)

EEA, 2015. The European Environment: State and Outlook 2015. Retrieved on 21/01/2020 from <https://www.eea.europa.eu/soer#tab-thematic-briefing>

EIGE, 2016. What is gender mainstreaming? Retrieved on 12/10/2019 from <https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/mh0216878enn.pdf>

EIGE, 2017. Gender in agriculture and rural development. Retrieved on 12/10/2019 from <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/gender-agriculture-and-rural-development>

Eimermann, E. 2016. Two sides of the same coin: Dutch rural tourism entrepreneurs and countryside capital in Sweden, *Rural Society*, 25:1, 55-73, DOI: 10.1080/10371656.2016.1152033

Eimermann, M. and Kordel, S. 2018. International lifestyle migrant entrepreneurs in two New Immigration Destinations: Understanding their evolving mix of embeddedness. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.241-252, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.04.007>

EIP-AGRI, 2016. New entrants into farming: Lessons to foster innovation and entrepreneurship. EIP-AGRI Focus Group Final Report. Retrieved on 09/01/2020 from https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/sites/agri-eip/files/eip-agri_fg_new_entrants_final_report_2016_en.pdf

Eistrup, M., Sanches, A.R., Muñoz-Rojas, J. and Pinto Correia, T. 2019. A “Young Farmer Problem”? Opportunities and Constraints for Generational Renewal in Farm Management: An Example from Southern Europe. *Land*, 8(70), p.1-13, doi:10.3390/land8040070

Elshof, H., Haartsen, T., van Wissen L., J., G. and Mulder, C., H. 2017. The Influence of village attractiveness on flows of movers in a declining rural region. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 56, p. 39-52.

Engel, A., Harteisen, U., Maas, K. 2019. Gehen oder Bleiben? Was Jugendliche im ländlichen Raum hält. ZZHH – Working Paper Nr. 1. Holzminden: Zukunftszentrum Holzminden-Höxter.

ENRD, 2019. Youth and Generational Renewal: The European Agriculture Fund for Rural Development Projects Brochure. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved on 21/6/2019 from https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/enrd_publications/projects-brochure_08_youth_en_web.pdf

EP and EC, 2013. Regulation EU No 1305/2013. Retrieved on 03/02/2020 from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:347:0487:0548:en:PDF>

EP, 2015. Extent of Farmland Grabbing in the EU. Study requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development. Directorate-General for Internal Policies. Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved on 06/01/2020 from

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/540369/IPOL_STU\(2015\)540369_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/540369/IPOL_STU(2015)540369_EN.pdf)

EP, 2017. European Parliament resolution of 27 April 2017 on the state of play of farmland concentration in the EU: how to facilitate the access to land for farmers (2016/2141(INI), Retrieved on 04/07/2019 from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0119_EN.pdf

EPRS, 2017. Global Trends to 2035. Geo-politics and international power. Global Trends Unit. Retrieved on 08/11/2019 from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_STU\(2017\)603263](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_STU(2017)603263)

Eraydin, A., 2016. Policy Brief 5: Diversity in Entrepreneurship. Utrecht: DIVERCITIES. Retrieved on 28/01/2020 from <https://zenodo.org/record/437931#.XjBTAtP7S72>

Eurofound, 2019. Is rural Europe being left behind? European Quality of Life Survey 2016. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. Retrieved on 06/08/2019 from <http://eurofound.link/ef18024>

FAO, 2008. Opportunities to mainstream land consolidation in rural development programmes of the European Union. FAO Land Tenure Policy Series. Retrieved on 03/02/2020 from <http://www.fao.org/3/i0091e/i0091e00.htm>

FAO, 2012. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. Rome. Retrieved on 06/01/2020 from <http://www.fao.org/3/i2801e/i2801e.pdf>

FAS, 2017. Joint Venture Farming: An opportunity. Scottish Government Retrieved on 09/01/2019 from <https://www.fas.scot/downloads/joint-venture-farming-sandy-ramsay-presentation/>

Ferreira, I., Kirova, M., Montanari, F., Montfort, C., Moroni, J., Neiryneck, R., Pesce, Arcos Pujades, A., Lopez Montesinos, E., Pelayo, E., Diogo Albuquerque, J., Eldridge, J., Traon, D. 2019. Research for AGRI Committee. Megatrends in the agri-food sector. Brussels: European Parliament Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved on 11/08/2019 from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU\(2019\)629205](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU(2019)629205)

Findlay, A., Short, D., Stockdale, A., 2000. The labour market impact of migration to rural areas. *Applied Geography*, 20, p.333–348.

Food, Farming and Countryside Commission, 2019. Our Future in the Land. London: Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufacturers and Commerce (RSA). Retrieved on 20/09/2019 from <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/future-land>

Forstie, C. 2018. Ambivalently post-lesbian: LBQ friendships in the rural Midwest. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 22(1), p.54-66.

Forward Thinking Platform, 2014. A Glossary of Terms commonly used in Futures Studies. Full Version. Retrieved on 08/11/2019 from <http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/315951/Glossary%20of%20Terms.pdf>

Franić, R. and Kovačićek, T. 2019. The professional status of rural women in the EU. Study requested by the FEMM committee of the European Parliament. Retrieved on 26/09/2019 from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/608868/IPOL_STU\(2019\)608868_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/608868/IPOL_STU(2019)608868_EN.pdf)

Furbey, R. 1999. Urban 'regeneration': reflections on a metaphor. *Critical Social Policy*, 19(4), p.419-445.

Gambino, M. and Demesure, O. 2012. Habiter les espaces ruraux : les enjeux des formes de mobilité des jeunes. Regards interdisciplinaires. *Norois*, 233,p.25-35.

Gieling, J., Vermeij, L., and Haartsen, T. 2017. Beyond the local-newcomer divide: village attachment in the era of mobilities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 55, p.237–247.

Gioia, A. 2017. Small Farms in Europe: Time for a Re-Definition. *Eco Ruralis*. Retrieved on 15/04/2020 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/comparative_analysis_of_small_farms_in_europe.pdf

Gorman-Murray, A. 2007. Rethinking queer migration through the body. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 8(1), p.105-121.

Górny, A. and Kaczmarczy, P. 2018. A known but uncertain path: The role of foreign labour in Polish agriculture. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.177-188, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.12.015>

Gosnell, H. and Abrams, J 2011. Amenity migration: diverse conceptualizations of drivers, socioeconomic dimensions, and emerging challenges. *GeoJournal*, 76, p.303-322, DOI 10.1007/s10708-009-9295-4

Greenfield, H. and Carman, T. 2017. Small Scale and Land Access: Micro-dairies in the UK. Real Farming Trust/Access to Land Network. Retrieved on 28/01/2020 from https://www.accesstoland.eu/IMG/pdf/uk_small_scale_farming_-_microdairies.pdf

Gretter, A., Dalla Torre, C., Maino, F., and Omizzolo, A. 2019. New Farming as an Example of Social Innovation Responding to Challenges of Inner Mountain Areas of Italian Alps. *Journal of Alpine Research*, 107 (2), DOI : 10.4000/rga.6106

Gueringer, A. Hamdouch, A. and Wallet, F. 2016. Foncier et développement des territoires ruraux en France. *RERU – Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, 4, p. 693-712.

Haartsen, T. and Stockdale, A. 2018. S/elective belonging: how rural newcomer families with children become stayers. *Population, Space and Place*, 24 (4) <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2137>

Halfacree, K. 2001. Constructing the Object: Taxonomic Practice, 'Counterurbanisation' and Positioning Marginal Rural Settlement. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 7, p.395-411.

Halfacree, K. 2006. From dropping out to leading on? British countercultural back to-the land in a changing rurality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30 (3), 309-336.

Halfacree, K. 2008. To revitalise counterurbanisation research? Recognising an international and fuller picture. *Population, Space and Place*, 14, p.479-495.

Halfacree, K., and Rivera, M. J. 2012. Moving to the countryside....and staying. Lives beyond representations. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52(1), p.92–114, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00556.x

Halliday J. and Coombes, M., 1995. In search of counterurbanisation: some evidence from Devon on the relationship between patterns of migration and motivation. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11 (4), p. 433-446.

Handl, B. van Boxtel, M., and Hagenhofer, K. 2016. The Process of Farm Transfer, in eds. M. van Boxtel, K. Hagenhofer and B. Handl eds., *Farm Succession: Tools and Methods to Promote a Successful Farm Succession. Examples from France, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands*, p. 6-8. Retrieved on 12/11/2019 from <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details/#project/2014-1-FR01-KA204-002570>

Hartvigsen, M. 2014. Land reform and land fragmentation in Central and Eastern Europe. *Land Use Policy*, 36, p.330-41.

Heggem, R. 2014a. Diversification and re-feminisation of Norwegian farm properties. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(4), p. 439-459.

Heggem, R. 2014b. Exclusion and inclusion of women in Norwegian agriculture: Exploring different outcomes of the 'tractor gene'. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, p.263-271

Heley, J., and Jones, L., 2012. Relational rurals: Some thoughts on relating things and theory in rural studies. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28, p208-217.

- Helms, C., Pölling, B., Curran, T., Lorleberg, W. 2018. NEWBIE: Deliverable 2.1: Desktop research: national literature reviews and analyses of educational resources. Retrieved on 10/06/2019 from <http://www.newbie-academy.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/D2.1.national-literature-reviews.pdf>
- Hennessy, M., Roche, B. and O'Donovan, T. no date. Share Farming "A new land access option". Teagasc. Retrieved on 23/01/2020 from https://www.teagasc.ie/media/website/rural-economy/farm-management/ShareFarming_paper_for_NTCv4.pdf
- Herslund, L., 2012. The rural creative class: Counterurbanisation and entrepreneurship in the Danish countryside. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52 (2), p. 235-255.
- Him, M.S. and Hoşgör, A.G. 2019. Challenging Geographical Disadvantages and Social Exclusion: A Case Study of Gendered Rural Transformation in Mountain Villages in the Western Black Sea Region of Turkey. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(3), p. 540-559.
- Hoffman, M. 2013. Why community ownership? Understanding land reform in Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, 31, p. 289– 297.
- Hulko, W. and Hovanes, J. 2018. Intersectionality in the Lives of LGBTQ Youth: Identifying as LGBTQ and Finding Community in Small Cities and Rural Towns. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65(4), p. 427-455.
- Hunt, R. 2019. Neglected rural geography: Exploring the quiet politics of 'out-dwelling'. *Politics and Space C*, 37(2), p.219-236, DOI: 10.1177/2399654418784944
- Ilbery, B., Maye, D., Watts, D. and Holloway, L. 2010. Property matters: Agricultural restructuring and changing landlord–tenant relationships in England, *Geoforum*, 41, p. 423-434.
- Ingram, J. and Kirwan, J. 2011. Matching new entrants and retiring farmers through farm joint ventures: Insights from the Fresh Start Initiative in Cornwall, UK. *Land Use Policy*, 28, p. 917-927, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2011.04.001
- InPACT, 2014. Des idées pour transmettre sa ferme. Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from <http://www.agriculturepaysanne.org/files/TRANSMISSION-BD.pdf>
- InPACT, 2019. Des idées pour transmettre Si on restructurait les fermes? Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from <https://terredeliens.org/trois-nouvelles-publications-sur.html>
- Johansson, M. 2016. Rural Exodus and Young Women- Swedish Experiences. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p.291-300.
- JRC EU Science Hub, 2018. Soil erosion costs European farmers €1.25 billion a year. Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/news/soil-erosion-costs-european-farmers-125-billion-year>

Kahila P, Nemes G, and High C. 2009. Institutional capacity. EDORA Working Paper 7. Retrieved on 04/02/2020 from <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/applied-research/edora-european-development-opportunities-rural-areas>

Källander, I. 2008. Participatory Guarantee Systems – PGS. Swedish Society for Nature Conservation. Retrieved on 13/04/2020 from https://www.ifoam.bio/sites/default/files/page/files/pgsstudybyssnc_2008.pdf

Kay, S. 2016. Land grabbing and land concentration in Europe: A Research Brief. Transnational Institute for HOTL. Retrieved on 11/11/2019 from <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/land-grabbing-and-land-concentration-in-europe>

Kuhmonen, T. 2019. Research and innovation guidelines for WP4 (Foresight analysis). RURALIZATION project internal report.

Kuhmonen, T., Kuhmonen, I., and Luoto, L. 2016. How do rural areas profile in the futures dreams by the Finnish youth? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 44(Supplement C), p.89-100.

Küpper, P., & Tautz, A. 2015. Sicherung der Nahversorgung in ländlichen Räumen Europas: Strategien ausgewählter Länder im Vergleich. *Europa Regional*, 21.2013(3), p.138-155.

Land Mobility Service, 2019. Land Mobility 2019 Report. Options for Land Owners and Opportunities for Young Farmers Working Towards a Shared Future. Retrieved on 15/04/2020 from <http://landmobility.ie/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/LAND-Mobility-2019-Report.pdf>

Laoire, C.N. and Stockdale, A. 2016. Migration and the life course in rural settings, in eds. M. Shucksmith and D. Brown, *Routledge International Handbook of Rural Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, p. 66-79.

Laoire, C.N., 2002. Gender issues in Irish rural out-migration, in eds. P. Boyle and K. Halfacree, *Migration and Gender in the Developed World*. Oxon: Routledge, p.195-206.

Lasanta, T., Arnaez, J., Pascual, N., Ruiz-Flano, P., Errea, M.,P., Lana-Renault, N. 2017. Space-Time process and drivers of land abandonment in Europe. *Catena*, 149, p. 810-823.

Le Mouël, C., de Lattre-Gasquet, M. and Mora, O. 2018. Land Use and Food Security in 2050: A Narrow Road. Agrimonde-Terra. Retrieved on 14/04/2020 from <https://agritrop.cirad.fr/588816/1/ID588816.pdf>

Lee Peluso, N. and Lind, C. 2011. New frontiers of land control: Introduction. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38, 4, p. 667-681. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2011.607692

Leibert, T. 2016. She Leaves, He Stays? Sex-selective Migration in Rural East Germany. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p.267-279.

Leibert, T., and West, K. 2016. The interplay of gender and migration in Europe's remote and economically weak rural regions – Introduction to a special issue. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p. 261-266.

Leonard, B., Kinsella, A., O'Donoghue, C., Farrell, M. and Mahon, M. 2017. Policy drivers of farm succession and inheritance. *Land Use Policy*, 61, p.147-159, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.09.006>

Li, Y., Westlund, H. and Liu, Y. 2019. Why some rural areas decline while some others not: An overview of rural evolution in the world. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 68, p.135-143.

Lobley, M. 2010. Succession in the Family Farm Business. *Journal of Farm Management*, 13(12), p.839-851.

Lobley, M. and Potter, C. 2004. Agricultural change and restructuring: recent evidence from a survey of agricultural households in England. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20, p.499-510.

Lomba A., Moreira, F., Klimek, S., Jongman, R.H.G., Sullivan, C., Moran, J., Poux, X., Honrado, J.P., Pinto-Correia, T., Plieninger, T. and McCracken, D.I. 2019. Back to the future: rethinking socioecological systems underlying high nature value farmlands. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 18(1), p.36-42, <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2116>

LRRG, 2014. The Land of Scotland and the Common Good. Report of the Land Reform Review Group. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government. Retrieved on 21/12/2019 from <https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0045/00451087.pdf>

Luhrs, D. E. 2016. Consider the daughters, they are important to family farms and rural communities too: family-farm succession. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 23(8), p.1078-1092.

M'barek, R., Barreiro-Hurle, J., Boulanger, P., Caivano, A., Ciaian, P., Dudu, H., Espinosa, M., Fellmann, T., Ferrari, E., Gomez y Paloma, S., Gorrin Gonzalez, C., Himics, M., Louhichi, K., Perni, A., Philippidis, G., Salputra, G., Witzke, P., Genovese, G. 2017. Scenar 2030 - Pathways for the European agriculture and food sector beyond 2020. Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved on 21/01/2020 from <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/scenar-2030-pathways-european-agriculture-and-food-sector-beyond-2020>

Maggio A., Van Criekinge T. and Malingreau J.P. 2015. Global Food Security 2030; Assessing trends with a view to guiding future EU policies. JRC Science and Policy Reports. Foresight Series. Retrieved on 21/01/2020 from <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/global-food-security-2030-assessing-trends-view-guiding-future-eu-policies>

Martin-Prével, A., Rioufol, V., Korthals Altes, W. and de Wolff, H. 2019. Research and Innovation Guidelines for Work Package 6. RURALIZATION project internal report.

Matthews, A. 2013 Wasting Money on Young Farmers? CAP Reform.eu. 2013. Retrieved on 06/09/2019 from <http://capreform.eu/wasting-money-on-young-farmers/>

McKee, A., Sutherland, L.A., Hopkins, J, and Flanigan, S. 2018. Increasing the Availability of Farmland for New Entrants to Agriculture in Scotland. The James Hutton Institute: Aberdeen. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from https://landcommission.gov.scot/downloads/5dd6a2d2ac866_McKee-et-al.-Final-report-to-SLC-Increasing-land-availability-for-new-entrants-2.5.2018.pdf

McNerney, C. and Gillmor, D. 2005. Experiences and perceptions of rural women in Rep. of Ireland: Studies in the Border Region. *Irish Geography*, 38(1), p. 44-56.

Membretti, A., Kofler, I. and Viazzo, P.P., 2017. *Per forza o per scelta: l'immigrazione straniera nelle Alpi e negli Appennini*. Aracne editrice.

Mettenberger, T. and Küpper, P. 2019. Potential and Impediments to Senior Citizens' Volunteering to Maintain Basic Services in Shrinking Regions. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(4), <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12254>

Midgley, J. 2006. Gendered Economies: Transferring private gender roles into the public realm through rural community development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, p. 217-231.

Milone, P. and Ventura, F. 2019. New generation farmers: Rediscovering the peasantry. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 65, p.43-52.

Mitchell, C. 2004. Making sense of counterurbanization. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20 (1) p. 15–34, doi:10.1016/S0743-0167(03)00031-7

Monllor i Rico, N. and Fuller, A.M. 2016. Newcomers to farming: towards a new rurality in Europe, *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, 62(3), p.531-551.

Monllor, N. 2011. Explorant la jove pagesia: camins, pràctiques i actituds en el marc d'un nou paradigma agrosocial. Estudi comparatiu entre el sud-oest de la província d'Ontario i les comarques gironines. Doctoral thesis. Girona, Universitat de Girona. Retrieved on 27/01/2020 from <http://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/70011>

Moore, T. 2019. Community ownership of rural assets: The case of community land trusts, in eds. M. Scott, N. Gallent, and M. Gkartzios. *Routledge Companion to Rural Planning*. Oxon: Routledge, p.135-141.

Moosburgger, R. 2019. Migrant Social Inclusion: Experiences from the Bregenzerwald and EU-Funded Projects, in eds. M. Perlik, G. Galera, I. Machold, and A. Membretti *Alpine Refugees: Immigration at the Core of Europe*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, p.121-125.

Munkejord, M. C. 2017. Local and transnational networking among female immigrant entrepreneurs in peripheral rural contexts: Perspectives on Russians in Finnmark, Norway. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 24(1) 7–20.

National Rural Network. 2013. National Rural Network Case Study: Women in Agriculture. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from <http://broadmore.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Final-Case-Study-Women-in-Agriculture1.pdf>

NEWBIE, no date. Retrieved on 27/01/2020 from <http://www.newbie-academy.eu/>

Ní Fhlatharta, A.M. and Farrell, M. 2017. Unravelling the strands of ‘patriarchy’ in rural innovation: A study of female innovators and their contribution to rural Connemara, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 54, p.15-27.

Ní Laoire, C. 2002. Young Farmers, Masculinities and a Changing Rural Ireland. *Irish Geography*. 35(1), p.16-27

Ní Laoire, C. 2007. The ‘green green grass of home’? Return migration to rural Ireland. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 23, p.332-344.

Noack, E. 2011. Are Rural Women Mobility Deprived? – A Case Study from Scotland. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 51(1), p.79-97.

OECD, 2013. Rural-Urban Partnerships: An Integrated Approach to Economic Development. OECD Publishing.

OECD, 2014. Innovation and Modernising the Rural Economy. OECD Rural Policy Reviews. OECD Publishing. Retrieved on 11/06/2019 from <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264205390-en>

OECD, 2016a. Horizon Scan of Megatrends and Technology Trends in the Context of Future Research Policy. Retrieved on 20/01/2020 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301363577_An_OECD_Horizon_Scan_of_Megatrends_and_Technology_Trends_in_the_Context_of_Future_Research_Policy

OECD, 2016b. OECD Science, Technology and Innovation Outlook. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved on 20/01/2020 from https://doi.org/10.1787/sti_in_outlook-2016-en

OECD, 2018. Edinburgh Policy Statement on Enhancing Rural Innovation. 11th OECD Rural Development Conference. Retrieved on 10/06/2019 from <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/Edinburgh-Policy-Statement-On-Enhancing-Rural-Innovation.pdf>

OECD, 2019. OECD Regional Outlook 2019: Leveraging Megatrends for Cities and Rural Areas. OECD Publishing. Retrieved on 15/04/2020 from <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264312838-en>

Oedl-Wieser, T. 2015. Gender equality: a core dimension in Rural Development Programmes in Austria? *Gender, Place and Culture*, 22 (5), p.685-699, DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2013.879103

Osborne, O., Williamson, A. and Beattie, R. 2004. Community Involvement in Rural Regeneration Partnerships: Exploring the Rural Dimension. *Local Government Studies*, 30 (2), p.156-181, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0300393042000267218>

Osborne, S., Williamson, A. and Beattie, R. 2002. Community involvement in rural regeneration partnerships in the UK: Key issues from a three nation study. *Regional Studies*, 36(9), p.1083-1092, DOI: 10.1080/0034340022000024303

Pellervo Economic Research, 2019. Työvoiman liikkuvuus ja monipaikkaisuus muuttuvat - tietoa ilmiöstä puuttuu. Retrieved on 15/04/2020 from <https://www.ptt.fi/julkaisut-ja-hankkeet/kaikki-julkaisut/muistio-tyovoiman-liikkuvuus-ja-monipaikkaisuus-muuttuvat-tietoa-ilmiosta-puuttuu.html>

Pemberton, S. 2019. *Rural Regeneration in the UK*. Oxon: Routledge.

Perlik, M. Galera, G., Machold, I. and Membretti, A. 2019. *Alpine Refugees: Immigration at the Core of Europe*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Perpiña Castillo C., Kavalov B., Ribeiro Barranco R., Diogo V., Jacobs-Crisioni C., Batista Silva F., Baranzelli C., Lavalle C., 2018. Territorial Facts and Trends in the EU Rural Areas within 2015-2030. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved on 19/11/2019 from <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/territorial-facts-and-trends-eu-rural-areas-within-2015-2030>

Píša, J. and Hruška, V. 2019. Entrepreneurial in-migration and rural development in Czechia: A challenge of integrating the local and extra-local in rural planning. *Geographia Polonica*, 92 (3), p.347-363.

Pistre, P. 2012. *Renouveaux des campagnes françaises : évolutions démographiques, dynamiques spatiales et recompositions sociales*. Thèse Université Paris-Diderot - Paris VII.

PlurAlps, 2019. Fostering pluralism as a key to local development in the Alpine Space. White paper of the transnational Alpine Space project PlurAlps. Retrieved on 29/01/2020 from https://www.alpine-space.eu/projects/pluralps/results/t4-capacity-building/pluralps_o.t4.1_white-paper_final_en.pdf

Pollermann, K., Raue, P., Schnaut, G. 2014. Multi-level Governance in rural development: Analysing experiences from LEADER for a Community-Led Local Development (CLLD). Paper presented at the 54th European Regional Science Association (ERSA) Congress, 26-29 August, St. Petersburg. Retrieved on 29/01/2020 from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/wiw/wiwrsa/ersa14p1071.html>

Pop, A. 2019. Key Results from the ESPON YUTRENDS Research. Presentation at the Regions and Cities European Week, 7-10 October. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/rest/cms/upload/14102019_120859_local_youth_works_youth_unemployment.pdf

Pop, A., Kotzamanis, B., Muller, E., McGrath, J., Walsh, K., Peters, M., Girejko, R., Dietrich, C. 2019. YUTRENDS – Youth unemployment: Territorial trends and regional resilience. Draft Final Report. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from <https://www.espon.eu/youth-unemployment>

Poux, X. and Aubert, P.M. 2018. An agroecological Europe in 2050: multifunctional agriculture for healthy eating. Findings from the Ten Years For Agroecology (TYFA) modelling exercise. IDDRI Study No. 09/18. Retrieved on 28/11/2019 from <https://www.iddri.org/en/publications-and-events/study/agroecological-europe-2050-multifunctional-agriculture-healthy-eating>

Powe, N., Pringle, R. and Hart, T. 2015. Matching the process to the challenge within small town regeneration. *Town Planning Review*, 86 (2), p.177-202, doi:10.3828/tpr.2015.11

Price, C. 2014. An option for enterprising farmers: CLA's assessment of share farming. Country Land and Business Association. Retrieved on 23/01/2020 from [https://www.farminguk.com/content/knowledge/CLA's%20assessment%20of%20share%20farming\(6608-9656-7981-265\).pdf](https://www.farminguk.com/content/knowledge/CLA's%20assessment%20of%20share%20farming(6608-9656-7981-265).pdf)

Rauhut, D. and Littke, H. 2016. 'A one way ticket to the city, please!' on young women leaving the Swedish peripheral region Vasternorrland. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 43, p. 301-310.

Regidor, J.G. 2012. EU Measures to Encourage and Support New Entrants. DG Internal Policies Policy Department B Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved on 02/02/2020 from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/note/join/2012/495830/IPOL-AGRI_NT%282012%29495830_EN.pdf

Reid, 2015. SPICe Briefing: Land Reform in Scotland. The Scottish Parliament. Retrieved on 29/11/2019 from http://www.parliament.scot/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_15-28_Land_Reform_in_Scotland.pdf

Ribot, J.C. and Lee-Peluso, N. 2003. A Theory of Access. *Rural Sociology*, 62(2), p.153-181.

Rioufol, V. and Volz, P. 2012. Civic initiatives on Access to Land for Local, Sustainable Farmers in Western Europe, Proceedings of the 10th European IFSA Symposium, Aarhus, 1-4 July 2012, . Retrieved on 04/07/2019 from http://ifsa.boku.ac.at/cms/fileadmin/Proceeding2012/IFSA2012_WS3.2_Rioufol.pdf

Roberts, P. 2000. The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration, in eds. P. Roberts and H. Sykes, *Urban Regeneration: A Handbook*, London: Sage, p. 9–36.

Rotmans, J., van Asselt, M., Anastasi, C., Greeuw, S., Mellors, J., Peters, S., Rothman, D. and Rijkens, N. 2000. Visions for a sustainable Europe. *Futures*, p.809-831, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287\(00\)00033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(00)00033-1)

Rye, J.F. 2018. Labour migrants and rural change: The “mobility transformation” of Hitra/Frøya, Norway, 2005–2015. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.189-199.

Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2002. Consolidation initiatives after land reform: Responses to multiple dimensions of land fragmentation in Eastern European agriculture. *Journal of International Development*, 14(7), p.1005-18.

Sacchi, G. 2019. Social innovation matters: The adoption of participatory guarantee systems within Italian alternative agri-food networks. *Strategic Change*, 28(4), p. 241-248, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2265>

Sanchón Ortas, P. 2019. Living Villages: A project to stop depopulation and promote the installation of new settlers in rural areas of the Aragon region (Spain). Presentation at ENRD Workshop on Combatting Rural Depopulation: Creating new opportunities for vibrant rural areas, May 21. Retrieved on 23/01/2020 from https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/news-events/events/enrd-workshop-combatting-rural-depopulation-creating-new-opportunities-vibrant_en

Saritas, O. and Smith, J.E. 2011. The Big Picture – trends, drivers, wild cards, discontinuities and weak signals. *Futures*, 43, p.292-312, doi:10.1016/j.futures.2010.11.007

Schmid, C. U. 2015. Towards a European Role in Tenancy Law and Housing Policy? Bremen: Universität Bremen. Retrieved on 29/04/2020 from https://www.uni-bremen.de/fileadmin/user_upload/fachbereiche/fb6/fb6/Forschung/ZERP/TENLAW/EuropeanRole.pdf

Schuh, B., Maucorps, A., Münch, A., Brkanovic, S., Dwyer, J., Vigani, M., Khafagy, A., Coto Sauras, M., Deschelle, P., López, A., Severini, S., Antonioli, F., Gaugitsch, R., Powell, J., Kubinakova, K., Derszniak-Noirjean, M., Salasan, C., Gaupp-Berghausen, M., Hsiung, C.H., Fasching, F., Keringer, F. 2019. Research for AGRI Committee – The EU farming employment: current challenges and future prospects, , Brussels: European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved on 19/11/2019 from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU\(2019\)6_29209](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU(2019)6_29209)

Schweighofer, K. 2016. Rethinking the Closet: Queer Life in Rural Geographies, in eds. M. L. Gray, C. R. Johnson, and B. J. Gilley, *Queering the Countryside: New Frontiers in Rural Queer Studies*. New York: New York University Press, p. 223-243.

Scott, M., Gallent, N., and Gkartzios, M. 2019. Part II: The state and rural governance, in eds. M. Scott, N. Gallent, and M. Gkartzios. *Routledge Companion to Rural Planning*. Oxon: Routledge, p. 99-102.

Shortall, S. 2014. Farming, identity and well-being: Managing changing gender roles within Western European farm families. *Anthropological Notebooks*, 20(3), p.67-81.

Shortall, S. 2015. Gender mainstreaming and the Common Agricultural Policy. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 22(5) p.717-730, DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2014.939147

Shortall, S. 2016. Gender and Identity Formation, in eds. M. Shucksmith and D. Brown, *Routledge International Handbook of Rural Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, p.400-411.

Shortall, S. 2018. How can women achieve their full potential in the agriculture sector? Policy and Practice Note No. Centre for Rural Economy: Newcastle University. Retrieved on 15/10/2019 from <http://www.relu.ac.uk/landbridge/PPN%203%20Women%20in%20Agriculture%20on%20line.pdf>

Shortall, S., Sutherland, L.-A., McKee, A. J. and Hopkins, J. 2017. Women in Farming and the Agriculture Sector. Final report for the Environment and Forestry Directorate, Rural and Environmental Science and Analytical Services (RESAS) Division, Scottish Government. Retrieved on 21/12/2019 from <https://www.fas.scot/downloads/women-in-farming-and-the-agriculture-sector-report/>

Shucksmith, M. 2000. Exclusive Countryside? Social Inclusion and Regeneration in Rural Areas. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved on 09/07/2019 from <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/exclusive-countryside-social-inclusion-and-regeneration-rural-areas>

Shucksmith, M. 2010. Exemplar Regions Report: Skye & Lochalsh, Scotland, UK. Scientific Working Paper No. 22 – In: ESPON & UHI Millennium Institute (2011): EDORA – European Development Opportunities for Rural Areas. Applied Research Final Report 2013/1/2. Annex 1 (Part C: Scientific Working Papers), Version 2, p. 639 - 655.

Shucksmith, M. 2018. Re-imagining the rural: From rural idyll to Good Countryside. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 59, p.163-172.

Sikor, T. and Müller, D. 2010. The Limits of State-Led Land Reform: An Introduction. *World Development*, 37 (8), p.1307-1316, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2008.08.010

Šimon, M. 2014. Exploring Counterurbanisation in a Post-Socialist Context: Case of the Czech Republic. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(2), p.117-42.

Smith, D.P. 2011. What is Rural Gentrification? Exclusionary Migration, Population Change, and Revalorised Housing Markets. *Planning Theory and Practice*. 12 (4), Interface, p.596-605.

SoCo Project Team, 2009. Addressing soil degradation in EU agriculture: Relevant processes, practices and policies. Report on the project 'Sustainable Agriculture and Soil Conservation (SoCo). JRC Scientific and Technical Reports. Retrieved on 09/07/2019 from https://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/eusoils_docs/other/EUR23767_Final.pdf

Steinicke, E., P. Cede and Fliesser, U. 2009. Development patterns of rural depopulation areas. Demographic impacts of amenity migration on Italian peripheral regions. *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Geographischen Gesellschaft*, 151, p. 195-214.

Stockdale, A. 2006. Migration: pre-requisite for rural economic regeneration? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, p.354– 366.

Stockdale, A. 2014. Unravelling the migration decision-making process: English early retirees moving to rural mid-Wales. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, p. 161-171.

The Greens and EFA, 2016. Land Rush: The Sellout of Europe's Farmland. Retrieved on 11/11/2019 from <http://www.arc2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/20160411Landrush.pdf>

Timar, J. and Velkey, G. 2016. The relevance of the political economic approach: The interpretations of the rural in the migration decision of young women and men in an economically backward region. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p.311-322.

TNI, 2012. The Global Land Grab: A Primer. Retrieved on 28/04/2019 from <https://www.tni.org/es/node/2744>

Torfin, J., Peters, G., Pierre, J., Sorensen, E. 2012. *Interactive Governance, Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TRANSMANGO, 2018. The TRANSMANGO Game jam Tour Video. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=4&v=AkJeoeVVOLk

Trauger, A., Sachs, C., Barbercheck, M., Kiernan, E., N., Braiser, K., and Findeis, J. 2008. Agricultural education: Gender identity and knowledge exchange. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, p. 432-439.

Tuitjer, G. 2018. A House of One's Own- The Eigenheim within rural women's biographies. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 62, p.156-163.

UK Government Office for Science, 2017. The Futures Toolkit: Tools for Futures Thinking and Foresight Across the UK Government. Edition 1.0. Retrieved on 08/11/2019 from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/674209/futures-toolkit-edition-1.pdf

UN, 2018. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas. UN Human Rights Council 39th session, Geneva. Retrieved on 28/04/2020 from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1650694>

UNCCD, 2017. Global Land Outlook. Executive Summary. Retrieved on 29/11/2019 from https://knowledge.unccd.int/glo/GLO_first_edition

UNDP, 2017. Global Trends: Challenges and Opportunities in the Implementation of the SDGs. Retrieved on 21/01/2020 from

<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/sustainable-development-goals/global-trends--challenges-and-opportunities-in-the-implementation.html>

Valero, D. and López-Marco, L. 2018. Social innovations focusing on women in marginalised rural areas across Europe and the Mediterranean. SIMRA project. Retrieved on 29/04/2020 from <http://www.simra-h2020.eu/index.php/2018/03/09/social-innovations-focusing-on-women-in-marginalised-rural-areas-across-europe-and-the-mediterranean/>

van Boxtel, M. 2016. Farm succession in our countries compared, in eds. M. van Boxtel, K. Hagenhofer and B. Handl, Farm Succession: Tools and Methods to Promote a Successful Farm Succession. Examples from France, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands, p. 12-14. Retrieved on 12/11/2019 from <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details/#project/2014-1-FR01-KA204-002570>

van der Ploeg, J.D. 2018a. From de-to repeasantization: The modernization of agriculture revisited. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 61, p.236-243, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.12.016>

van der Ploeg, J.D. 2018b. *The New Peasantries. Struggles for autonomy and sustainability in an era of empire and globalization*. Second Edition. London: Earthscan.

van der Ploeg, J.D., Franco, J.C and Borrás Jr, S.M.2015. Land concentration and land grabbing in Europe: a preliminary analysis, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 36 (2), p.147-162, DOI:10.1080/02255189.2015.1027673

van der Ploeg, J.D., Barjolle, D., Bruil, J., Brunori, G., Costa Madureira, L.M., Dessen, J., Drag, Z., Fink-Kessler, A., Gasselin, P., Gonzalez de Molina, M., Gorch, K., Jürgens, K., Kinsella, J., Kirwan, J., Knickel, K., Lucas, V., Marsden, T., Maye, D., Migliorini, P., Milone, P., Noe, E., Nowak, P., Parrott, N., Peeters, A., Rossi, A., Schermer, M., Ventura, F., Visser, M., Wezel, A. 2019. The economic potential of agroecology: Empirical evidence from Europe. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 71, p.46-61, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.09.003>

Van der Zanden, E.H., Verburg, P.H., Schulp, C.J.E. and Verkerk. P.J. 2017. Trade-offs of European agricultural abandonment. *Land Use Policy*, 62, p.290-301, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.01.003>

van Dijk, T. 2003a. *Dealing with Central European land fragmentation: A critical assessment on the use of Western European Instruments*. Doctoral thesis TU Delft, Eburon, Delft.

van Dijk, T. 2003b. Scenarios of Central European land fragmentation. *Land Use Policy*, 20(2), p.149-58.

- Van Eupen, M., Metzger, M. J., Pérez-Soba, M., Verburg, P. H., Van Doorn, A., and Bunce, R.G.H., 2012. A rural typology for strategic European policies. *Land Use Policy*, 29(3), p.473-482, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2011.07.007>
- Van Vliet, J. A., A.G. Schut, P. Reidsma, K. Descheemaeker, M. Slingerland, G. van de Ven and Giller, K. E. 2015. De-mystifying family farming: features, diversity and trends across the globe. *Global Food Security*, 5, p. 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2015.03.001>
- Vervoort, J. and Helfgott, A. 2017. TRANSMANGO: Deliverable D5.4 – Report on potential transition pathways generated by EU stakeholders. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from <https://transmango.files.wordpress.com/2017/09/d5-4-report-on-potential-transition-pathways.pdf>
- Vervoort, J., Helfgott, A., Brzezina, N., Moragues-Faus, A., Lord, S., Avermaete, S. and Mathijs, E. 2016. TRANSMANGO: Explorative EU Scenarios. Retrieved on 10/04/2020 from <https://transmango.files.wordpress.com/2017/09/d5-3-eu-senarions.pdf>
- Villa, M. 1999. Born to be farmers? Changing expectations in Norwegian farmers' life courses. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39 (3), p.328-342, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9523.00111>
- Vironen, H. and Kah, S. 2019 Meeting the Challenges of Digitalisation: Implications for Regional and Rural Development. European Policy Research Paper No. 111. Retrieved on 11/07/2019 from <http://www.eprc-strath.eu/Publications.html>
- Vuin, A., Carson, D.A., Carson, D.B. and Garrett, J. 2016. The role of heritage tourism in attracting “active” in-migrants to “low amenity” rural areas. *Rural Society*, 25 (2), p.134-153, DOI: 10.1080/10371656.2016.1194324
- WDC, no date. LookWest.ie. Retrieved on 03/02/2020 from <https://www.lookwest.ie/>
- Weber, M. 1949. Objectivity' in social science and social policy (Die 'Objektivität' sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis), original 1904, in eds. E.A. Shils and H.A. Finch. *Max Weber on the Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, p.50-112.
- Webster, N. A. 2017. Rural-to-rural translocal practices: Thai women entrepreneurs in the Swedish countryside, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 56, p.219-228, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.09.016>
- Weingarten P. and Rudloff B. 2018. Die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik: vergangene Entwicklung, gegenwärtiger Stand und weiterer Reformbedarf, in eds. Becker P. and Lippert B. *Handbuch Europäische Union*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, p. 1-27.
- Wienke, C. and Hill, G., J. 2013. Does Place of Residence Matter? Rural–Urban Differences and the Wellbeing of Gay Men and Lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(9), p. 1256-1279.

- Wiest, K. 2015. Migration and everyday discourses: Peripheralisation in rural Saxony-Anhalt from a gender perspective. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p.280-290.
- Wiest, K., Leibert, T., Johansson, M., Rauhut, D., Ponnikas, J., Timár, J., Velkey, G. and Gyórfy, I. 2013. SEMIGRA: Selective Migration and Unbalanced Sex Ratio in Rural Regions. Final Report. Retrieved on 29/11/2019 from <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/targeted-analyses/semigra-selective-migration-and-unbalanced-sex-ratio>
- Wilbur, A. 2013. Growing a Radical Ruralism: Back-to-the-Land as Practice and Ideal. *Geography Compass*, 7(2), p.149-160, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12023>
- Wilbur, A. 2014. Cultivating Back-to-the-Landers: Networks of Knowledge in Rural Northern Italy. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54 (2), p.167-85, <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12024>
- Willett, W., Rockström, J. and Loken, B., et al. 2019. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*. 393 (10170), p.447-492, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)33179-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)33179-9)
- Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., Bogaardt, M.J. 2017 Big Data in Smart Farming: A review. *Agricultural Systems*, 153, p.69-80, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.023>
- Woods, M. 2005. *Rural Geography: Processes, Responses and Experiences in Rural Restructuring*. London: Sage.
- Woods, M. 2018. Precarious rural cosmopolitanism: Negotiating globalization, migration and diversity in Irish small towns. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.164-176, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.03.014>
- Woods, M., 2011. *Rural*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Wright, W. and Annes, A. 2014. Farm Women and Agritourism: Representing a New Rurality. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(4), p.477-499.
- Zagata, L., Hrabák, J., Lošťák, M., Bavorová, M., Ratinger, T., Sutherland, L., McKee, A. 2017. Research for AGRI Committee – Young farmers- policy implementation after the 2013 CAP reform. Brussels: European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved on 21/06/2019 from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/602006/IPOL_STU\(2017\)6020_06_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/602006/IPOL_STU(2017)6020_06_EN.pdf)
- Zondag, M.J., Koppert, S., de Lauwere, C., Sloom, P., Pauer, A. 2015. Needs of young farmers: Report I of the Pilot project: Exchange programmes for young farmers. Report produced for the European Commission. Retrieved on 12/08/2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/evaluation-policy-measures/farmers-and-farming/pilot-project-exchange-programmes-young-farmers_en



RURALIZATION

RURALIZATION

The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms

D3.3 Review Report and Fact Sheets based on previous European projects

Part B: Fact Sheets



"The project RURALIZATION has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N° 817642."

Version history

Ver.	Date	Comments/Changes	Author/Reviewer
0.1	22.04.20	First draft	NUI Galway/Consortium
1.0	30.04.20	Minor revisions made	NUI Galway/Consortium

Project Acronym	RURALIZATION
Project Title	The opening of rural areas to renew rural generations, jobs and farms
Project Number	817642
Instrument	Research and Innovation Action (RIA)
Topic	RUR-01-2018-2019 Building modern rural policies on long-term visions and societal engagement
Project Start Date	01/05/2019
Project Duration	48 months
Work Package	WP3 Framework for Research and Innovation
Task	T3.1 Review of literature and previous projects at European level
Deliverable	D3.3 Review Report and Fact Sheets based on previous European projects
Due Date	30/04/2020
Submission Date	30/04/2020
Dissemination Level ¹	PU
Deliverable Responsible	NUI Galway
Version	Part B, version 1.0
Status	Final
Author(s)	Aisling Murtagh, Maura Farrell, Marie Mahon, John McDonagh, Natasha Keenaghan, Therese Conway, Shane Conway
Contributor(s)	Florian Ahlmeyer, Clara Blasco, Aline Brochot, Alessandra Corrado, Miquel Correa, Adrienne Csizmady, Kim Graham, Krzysztof Janc, Dóra Karsa, Anne Kinsella, Willem Korthals Altes, Imre Kovách, Alice Martin-Prevel, Nicole Mathieu, Szocs-Boruss Miklos Attila, Irene Quesada, Andrzej Raczky, Veronique Rioufol, Jofre Rodrigo, Pertti Ruuska, Silvia Sivini, Petra Tas, Levente Viszló, Annamaria Vitale, Hans-Albrecht Wiehler
Reviewer(s)	RURALIZATION Consortium members

¹ PU= Public, CO=Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services), CL=Classified, as referred to in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC

Table of Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	4
Introduction	5
Fact sheets	10
Fact sheet 1: A2L	10
Fact sheet 2: BOND	11
Fact sheet 3: Farm Success	12
Fact sheet 4: Farm Succession in Europe	13
Fact sheet 5: FarmPath	14
Fact sheet 6: FEAL	15
Fact sheet 7: HNV-Link	16
Fact sheet 8: Land Strat	17
Fact sheet 9: LeALand	18
Fact sheet 10: Learning Platform	19
Fact sheet 11: LIFE ELCN	20
Fact sheet 12: MULTIAGRI	21
Fact sheet 13: SURE-Farm	22
Fact sheet 14: AGRI-SPIN	23
Fact sheet 15: COFAMI	24
Fact sheet 16: LIAISON	25
Fact sheet 17: LIVERUR	26
Fact sheet 18: NEWBIE	27
Fact sheet 19: RUBIZMO	28
Fact sheet 20: RURINNO	29
Fact sheet 21: SIMRA	30
Fact sheet 22: CHANCE2SUSTAIN	31
Fact sheet 23: GILDED	32
Fact sheet 24: PLUREL	33
Fact sheet 25: RURAGRI	34
Fact sheet 26: RURBAN	35
Fact sheet 27: SUPURBFOOD	36
Fact sheet 28: TRANSMANGO	37
Fact sheet 29: TURAS	38
Fact sheet 30: VOLANTE	39
Fact sheet 31: CORASON	40
Fact sheet 32: DERREG	41
Fact sheet 33: EDORA	42
Fact sheet 34: ETUDE	43
Fact sheet 35: FARO EU	44
Fact sheet 36: GLOBAL-RURAL	45
Fact sheet 37: NEWRUR	46
Fact sheet 38: PURR	47

Fact sheet 39: RUFUS	48
Fact sheet 40: RURALJOBS	49
Fact sheet 41: BUILDING RURBAN RELA	50
Fact sheet 42: RURITAGE	51
Fact sheet 43: RUSDELA	52
Fact sheet 44: DIVERCITIES	53
Fact sheet 45: IMAJINE	54
Fact sheet 46: MIGRARE	55
Fact sheet 47: RELOCAL	56
Fact sheet 48: SELMA	57
Fact sheet 49: TENLAW	58
Fact sheet 50: YUTRENDS	59

Acronyms and abbreviations

Erasmus+	European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students
ERC	European Research Council
ESPON	European Spatial Planning Observation Network
EU	European Union
FP5	Fifth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development
FP6	Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development
FP7	Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development
H2020	Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation
LIFE	L'Instrument Financier pour l'Environnement (EU funding instrument for the environment and climate action)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

Introduction


RURALIZATION deliverable D3.3 'Review Report and Fact Sheets' provides a review of literature and previous projects at the European level. Part A is the main literature review report. This is Part B and provides a series of Fact Sheets based on our review of previous projects at the European level. This review has helped to integrate the results of previous projects, relating to rural regeneration and more broadly on foresight analysis, succession, new entrants to farming, newcomers to rural areas and access to land, into the findings of our research review. They have also helped to inform the development of conceptual guidelines for RURALIZATION (deliverable D3.2).

The Fact Sheets also provide a resource for the RURALIZATION project to provide a quick overview of a range of previous European research relating to rural development, regeneration and generational renewal in agricultural and non-agricultural contexts. They help work packages to evaluate if useful to delve deeper into the learnings from the outcomes of these projects.


The Fact Sheets are grouped into five main themes – farming, rural innovation, sustainability, rural development and finally economic and social cohesion. The themes covered by the projects are multiple and projects intersect with other themes apart from the main theme they are categorised within. For each project, a series of broader themes is also highlighted.


Some of the projects reviewed are ongoing and the findings discussed represent the results of our review carried out in 2019 and early 2020. For ongoing projects, we have indicated their current and planned outcomes. For these projects the further information section provides links to locate more recent outcomes. In addition, some of projects were completed more than 10 years ago. In these cases, access to resources was sometimes limited but we have focused on key outcomes and resources still accessible.


The tables that follow provide a list of the projects reviewed, as well as an overview of the main and other themes touched on in the fact sheets.

Main theme	No.	Project	Other themes
 Farming	#1	A2L: Fostering access to land for a new generation of agroecological farmers	Access to land; entry into farming; new farmers; agroecology; rural development
	#2	BOND: Bringing Organisations and Network Development to higher levels in the farming sector in Europe	Collective action; cooperation; social capital, networks.
	#3	Farm Success: Tools and knowledge for young farmers supporting succession in family farms	Training; succession; access to land; online training
	#4	Farm Succession in Europe: Better understanding farm succession and transfer	Farm succession; farm transfer; young farmers; new entrants
	#5	FarmPath: Farming Transitions: Pathways Towards Regional Sustainability of Agriculture in Europe	Sustainability; future visions; transition pathways; young farmers; new entrants
	#6	FEAL: Multifunctional Farming for the sustainability of European Agricultural Landscapes	Sustainability; multifunctionality; online training
	#7	HNV-Link: High Nature Value Farming: Learning, Innovation and Knowledge	Land management; biodiversity; sustainability; multifunctionality
	#8	Land Strat: Collaborative Learning about Innovative Land Strategies	Access to land; agroecology; food sovereignty; land struggles; land policy; collaborative approach
	#9	LeALand: Learning towards Access to Land	Access to land; new entrants to farming; community supported agriculture; experience sharing
	#10	Learning Platform: Setting up a Learning Platform for Farmers' Access to Land	Access to land; capacity building; educational materials; mentoring
	#11	LIFE ELCN: Development of a European Private Land Conservation Network	Private land conservation tools; HNV farming; networks
	#12	MULTIAGRI: Rural Development through Governance of Multifunctional Agricultural Land-Use	Ecosystem services; biodiversity; public goods; ecological intensification
	#13	SURE-Farm: Towards Sustainable and Resilient EU Farming systems	Resilience; sustainability; food value chains

Main theme	No.	Project	Other themes
 Rural Innovation	#14	AGRI-SPIN: Space for innovations in Agriculture	Best practices; innovation support systems
	#15	COFAMI: Encouraging Collective Farmers Marketing Initiatives	Collective marketing, cooperation; market knowledge; networking, food supply chain
	#16	LIAISON: Better Rural Innovation: Linking Actors, Instruments and Policies through Networks	Interactive innovation; co-creation; co-learning
	#17	LIVERUR: Living Lab research concept in Rural Areas	Business models; living labs; open innovation; public-private partnership; smart rural development
	#18	NEWBIE: New Entrant netWork - Business models for Innovation, entrepreneurship and resilience in European agriculture	New entrants to farming; farm entrepreneurship; sustainable farm business
	#19	RUBIZMO: Replicable business models for modern rural economies	Business models; entrepreneurship; smart rural development
	#20	RURINNO: Social Innovations in Structurally Weak Rural Regions	Social enterprise, social innovation, marginal rural regions
	#21	SIMRA: Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas	Social innovation; governance; rural development; marginalised rural areas


Main theme	No.	Project	Other themes
 Sustainability	#22	CHANCE2SUSTAIN: Urban Chances: City growth and the sustainability challenge; Comparing fast growing cities in growing economies	Participatory governance; planning; knowledge
	#23	GILDED: Governance, infrastructure, lifestyle dynamics and energy demand: European post-carbon communities	Energy use; agent-based policy; governance; post-carbon communities; climate change
	#24	PLUREL: Peri-urban Land Use Relationships - Strategies and Sustainability Assessment Tools for Urban-Rural Linkages	Peri-urban areas; urbanisation; policy; planning; integrated development
	#25	RURAGRI: Facing sustainability: new relationships between rural areas and agriculture in Europe	Farming; rural development; diverse rural areas
	#26	RURBAN: Partnership for sustainable urban-rural development	Rural-urban interaction; integrated development
	#27	SUPURBFOOD: Towards sustainable modes of urban and peri-urban food provisioning	Short food supply chains; multifunctional agriculture; rural-urban interaction
	#28	TRANSMANGO: Sustainable Pathways to Changing the Food System	Food systems; Future scenarios; Drivers of change; Food security
	#29	TURAS: Transitioning towards Urban Resilience and Sustainability	Sustainable urban living; urban resilience; green infrastructure; urban growth
	#30	VOLANTE: Visions Of LANd use Transitions in Europe	Land use; future pathways; land management

Main theme	No.	Project	Other themes
 Rural Development	#31	CORASON: A Cognitive Approach to Rural Sustainable Development the dynamics of expert and lay knowledges	Knowledge; innovation, sustainability
	#32	DERREG: Developing Europe's Rural Regions in an Era of Globalization	Globalization; Rural Business; Migration; Environmental Capital; Capacity Building.
	#33	EDORA: European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas	Rural typologies; rural change; meta-narratives
	#34	ETUDE: Enlarging the theoretical understanding of rural development	Territorial capital; theory; sustainability
	#35	FARO EU: Foresight analysis for rural areas of EU	Rural policy; Rural futures; rural ICT
	#36	GLOBAL-RURAL: The Global Countryside: Rural Change and Development in Globalisation	Globalisation; Migration; Rural change; Rural concept
	#37	NEWUR: Urban pressure on rural areas - mutations and dynamics of periurban rural processes	Rural-urban interaction; peri-urban areas; sustainable development
	#38	PURR: Potential of Rural Regions	Rural potentials; territorial capital; local knowledge
	#39	RUFUS: Rural Future Networks	Integrated development, rural diversity; policy
	#40	RURALJOBS: New sources of employment to promote the wealth-generating capacity of rural communities	Job creation; rural economy; policy
	#41	BUILDING RURBAN RELA: Building new relationships in rural areas under urban pressure	Rural-urban interaction; governance; territorial sustainability
	#42	RURITAGE: Rural regeneration through systemic heritage-led strategies	Rural regeneration; heritage; innovation
	#43	RUSDELA: Rural Sustainable Development for Local Actors	Sustainable development; agroecology; resilience

Main theme	No.	Project	Other themes
 Economic and Social Cohesion	#44	DIVERCITIES: Governing Urban Diversity: Creating Social Cohesion, Social Mobility and Economic Performance in Today's Hyper-diversified Cities	Diversity; social cohesion; economic performance; governance
	#45	IMAJINE: Integrated Mechanisms for Addressing Spatial Justice and Territorial Inequalities in Europe	Spatial justice; territorial cohesion; regional development
	#46	MIGRARE: Impacts of Refugee Flows to Territorial Development in Europe	Refugees and asylum seekers inflows; integration
	#47	RELOCAL: Resituating the local in cohesion and territorial development	Spatial justice; territorial cohesion
	#48	SELMA: Spatial deconcentration of economic land use and quality of life in European metropolitan areas	Urban sprawl; land use; quality of life; rural-urban interaction
	#49	TENLAW: Tenancy Law and Housing Policy in Multi-level Europe	Housing law, tenants, social cohesion, affordable housing, right to housing
	#50	YUTRENDS: Youth Unemployment: Territorial Trends and Regional Resilience	Youth; Unemployment; Migration; Regional resilience.

Note: Icons by OpenClipart-Vectors sourced from Pixabay

Fact sheet #1: A2L*Fostering access to land for a new generation of agroecological farmers*

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€421, 812
Timeframe	2014-2017
Coordinator & Country	Terre de Liens, France
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Access to land; entry into farming; new farmers; agroecology; rural development

Context

The A2L project was concerned with [issues](#) of preserving land for farming, organising land access for a new generation of agroecological farmers and maintaining small-scale peasant agriculture. It brought together civic initiatives concerned with access to land and aimed to strengthen practical knowledge and build citizen support for farmers' access to land as well as influence the policy support system.

Results

The A2L project highlights the importance of proactive land use planning and land mobilisation to achieve the goals of rural regeneration. It finds preserving farming and focusing on who accesses land for what type of farming is key to creating a range regeneration benefits (economic, social, environmental). It assessed the role of local authorities in identifying, holding and providing farmland, as well as supporting land access. It also found that diverse stakeholders can have a role in preserving land and facilitating access (e.g. farmers and rural development organisations, local authorities, communities, public agencies, environmental organisations, consumer groups).

A2L identifies a range of models for managing land as a commons, with the joint involvement of stakeholders. The concept of 'public-citizen partnership' is put forward as a model where farmland and local food systems can be jointly acquired and/or managed.

It identifies difficulties (e.g. access to land, capital, training, social networks) facing a new generation of prospective farmers and existing supports as not effectively dealing with these issues. A2L calls for new policies and public support mechanisms. The diverse stakeholders it finds already playing a role need support from new policy mechanisms. The importance of participatory land and territorial planning, as well as food policy councils are also signalled, including the need for CAP to re-focus as Common Food and Agricultural Policy.

The project also explored the diverse nature of different European situations, such as in relation to [land markets](#) and [policy](#) as well as how concepts and experiences of [small farms](#) and differ across Europe.

Further information

[Map of good practices](#)

[Infographics](#)

[Interactive quiz on land issues](#)

[Film - The Land for our Food](#)

Access to Land Network, 2018. [Access to land for new entrants: Innovative ways to enter farming and secure land.](#)


Access to Land Network, 2017. [Local authorities' role to secure access to land for farmers.](#)

Access to Land network and URGENCI, 2017. [Access to Land and Community Supported Agriculture: Stories from Europe.](#)

Access to Land Members, 2017. [Series of articles on small farms: Recognising the viability of small farms and their territorial impacts.](#)

Fact sheet #2: BOND

Bringing Organisations and Network Development to higher levels in the farming sector in Europe

Funder	H2020
Grant	€2,890,691.25
Timeframe	2017-2020 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Coventry University, UK
	<p>Main theme: Farming</p> <p>Other themes: Collective action; cooperation; social capital, networks.</p>

Context

Collective action can have mutually beneficial impacts for the different actors involved. The underpinning objective of BOND is to assess and find ways to better harness the potential for collective action and networking in the farming sector. It has three focus areas - sustainable farming, market access and environmental sustainability.

“The aim of this project is to reach higher levels of organization and networking, and develop a healthier, and more productive and harmonious farming sector in Europe for the long term” (BOND Project, 2019a).

BOND will actively work to strengthen social capital where it is low, but also alongside this work to build skills and foster innovation to support rural development. BOND also aims to generate innovative policy proposals for rural regeneration.

“Farmers and land managers play a key role in the environmental and economic sustainability of the farming sector in Europe. The way they organize and network, and their ability to combine individual and collective work, both mutually reinforcing, will critically influence the future of Europe’s foods and landscapes” (BOND Project, 2019a).

Results

BOND works to actively strengthen social capital for collective action. The first stages of the project involved ‘learning from success’ where representatives from farmer networks and organisations came together to participate in study tours exploring examples of collective action good practice. Some of the practices visited during the study tours are collected together as case studies in [The Barn](#) section of the project website. This is a repository of stories on collective action in the areas of sustainable agriculture, marketing and the environment.

BOND also organises its activities on a number of scales. The [study tours](#) represent a local level activity bringing actors together, but [national thematic workshops](#). Transnational activities also include [policy roundtables](#) and [Youth Forum for Young farmers](#). Findings emerging from BOND and tools developed will be tested and refined in the ‘[lab experiment](#)’ in Moldova to see how the tools work in a real world context.

BOND also explores innovative methods to engage stakeholders, such as serious play and the re-mixing play approach. [Tools](#) are also available on the BOND website to guide others on use of these methods.

Further information


[BOND website](#)

BOND Project, 2019a. [About BOND](#)

BOND Project, 2019b. [BOND Playful Resources.](#)

Fact sheet #3: Farm Success

Tools and knowledge for young farmers supporting succession in family farms

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€372,958
Timeframe	2016-2018
Coordinator & Country	Technische Universität München, Germany
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Training; succession; access to land; online training

Context

Farm Success focused on developing tools and knowledge to support the process of family farm succession.

“The Farm-Success project develops strategies to train farmers for a sustainable succession process, to enable and to motivate young farmers to continue the family business of their parents” (Farm Success, 2018b).

Results

To help gain an understanding of the European situation, Farm Success carried out national level analysis in Germany, Spain, Italy, the Czech Republic and Slovenia. The project finds that succession is influenced by a diverse range of factors, from personal to economic considerations.

Differences emerge between the countries highlighting the importance of national context. However, time taken for the succession process did emerge as a common issue for a few countries. In the German context, for example an important factor impacting the effectiveness of the succession process relates to the time it takes for the successor to gain control over the farm which can also result in demotivation. In Spain, reaching agreement between all family members was found to take time, which can slow the process.

Key take-ways from the project include the importance of succession planning and developing a strategy for the farm to enable future farm sustainability. The human side of succession is a crucial consideration, with effective communication to ensure conflict can be managed and there is a ‘safe space’ for discussion so that all parties can air their wishes and reservations. It is also emphasised that guidelines or educational resources are important to support succession to make clear the phases of the process and what to expect. The project makes the point that it is important government provides such guidelines so that they provide clear and reliable information on legal issues.

Farm Success developed [online training modules](#) as an educational tool to support farm succession targeted towards successors. Modules focus on basic facts about the succession process, sustainable farm entrepreneurship, analysing personal goals and skills, opportunities and challenges of succession, communication, conflict management and business planning. They are designed to be flexible so all can be taken together or studied separately. It also developed a ‘[serious game](#)’ as a creative tool to explore the process of succession, as well as [case studies](#) proving real-world experiences of the succession process.


Further information

FarmSuccess, 2018a. [Farm Success - Training farmers for sustainable succession processes.](#)

FarmSuccess, 2018b. [Summary Report](#)

Fact sheet #4: Farm Succession in Europe

Better understanding farm succession and transfer

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€109, 870
Timeframe	2014-2017
Coordinator & Country	CIVAM network (Innovative Centres for the Valorisation of Farming and Rural areas), France
	<p>Main theme: Farming</p> <p>Other themes: Farm succession; farm transfer; young farmers; new entrants</p>

Context

The Farm Succession in Europe project brought different actors together from four European countries to better understand farm succession and transfer rural areas. The project identifies a need for new tools to support farm succession because of changes in succession patterns, such as succession outside the family, succession to more than one successor or to different types of farming practices. Also new challenges and needs emerge to support farm succession, such as raising capital and funding new finance models, as well as sharing knowledge and working collectively (van Boxtel et al., 2016).

Results

Farm succession is conceptualised a long, complex and multi-stage process. Handl et al. (2016) identify eight phases as part of the farm succession process (awareness, wish, education, experience, search/decision, form, handling/takeover and running the farm). For example, 'awareness' involves successors viewing farming as a viable profession and transferors are aware of the need for succession. Experience on the other hand is the phase of education to enter the farming profession through formal/informal learning.

A total of 12 tools to support new entrants and succession are detailed by van Boxtel et al. (2016). It is argued these tools can provide important ideas to underpin the development

of a supportive environment to facilitate new entrants and succession. These include farms to practice skills, such as a school farm or test farm for agriculture students or potential new entrants/successors to develop their skills. Another tool is matchmaking platforms that help to match successors and transferors, but also relating to work or learning opportunities on farms.

Land Funds are also identified as a tool. Land Funds involve an organisation raising funds to buy farmland that can be leased to farmers on long-term contracts. The specific example of Terre-en-vue in Belgium is presented as a tool to support successor land access. Terre-en-vue consists of a cooperative company, NGO and charitable foundation. Through the cooperative structure investment generated through member shares is used to buy farmland (Roels, 2016).

Further information


[Farm Succession in Europe project on the Erasmus+ website.](#)

van Boxtel, M., Hagenhofer, K. and B. Handl, B. eds. 2016. [Farm Succession: Tools and Methods to Promote a Successful Farm Succession. Examples from France, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands.](#)

Handl, B. van Boxtel, M., and Hagenhofer, K. 2016. The Process of Farm Transfer, in eds. M. van Boxtel, K. Hagenhofer and B. Handl, Farm Succession: Tools and Methods to Promote a Successful Farm Succession. Examples from France, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands, p. 6-8.

Roels, M. 2016 Tool 12 - Land Fund: Land Co-op Terre-en-vue, in eds. M. van Boxtel, K. Hagenhofer and B. Handl, Farm Succession: Tools and Methods to Promote a Successful Farm Succession. Examples from France, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands, p. 46-47.

Fact sheet #5: FarmPath*Farming Transitions: Pathways Towards Regional Sustainability of Agriculture in Europe*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€ 1,498,893
Timeframe	2011-2014
Coordinator & Country	The James Hutton Institute, UK
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Sustainability; future visions; transition pathways; young farmers; new entrants

Context

The FarmPath project was concerned with understanding pathways towards regional sustainability of European agriculture. The project proposed that for future sustainability it is important to enable 'flexible combinations of farming models' reflecting local and regional opportunities and resources such as culture, ecology and governance. FarmPath also had specific focus on young and new entrants into farming, as well as a visioning exercise relating to future farming pathways towards sustainability (Cordis, 2019).

Results

Research for FarmPath involved 21 case studies focused on regional initiatives. The visioning exercise built on the findings of the case studies to develop regional visions for agriculture in 2030. Overall, three consistent visions emerged: farming competitiveness and profitability; conservation of the environment and natural resources; and increasing the connectedness between farming and rural communities. What differed at regional levels were the emerging policy measures to realise them (Sutherland, 2014).

FarmPath also looked at the role of young farmers and new entrants in innovative initiatives. From previous research, FarmPath identified a trend suggesting young farmers are more innovative than older farmers. However based on the initiatives studied, FarmPath

found that the innovation process was not solely driven by young farmers, but involved a wider network of players with young farmers not exclusively the drivers of innovation. In relation to new entrants, on the other hand they emerged as bringing ideas from their experience outside of farming and being important drivers of innovation. New entrants who were 'hybrid actors' and had connections with sectors outside agriculture or in different parts of the food chain were important innovation actors. FarmPath also argue more research is needed to better understand the different roles of young farmers and new entrants in agricultural innovation. Economic barriers also faced young farmers and new entrants to develop innovative initiatives.

FarmPath also outlines policy recommendations relating to young farmers and new entrants. This includes calling for more research to better understand the 'young farmer problem' and for a distinction to be made between young farmers and new entrants in research. Also it is suggested these two groups have differed needs and effective measures to support them should recognise this (Zagata and Lostak, 2013).

Further information

Cordis, 2019. [FarmPath Factsheet](#).

Range of reports available on the [FarmPath website](#)


Some include:

FarmPath [Policy Brief: Young Farmers and New Entrants: Contributing to Transition Processes Towards Sustainability of Agriculture in Europe](#).

Sutherland, L.A. 2014. [FarmPath Final Report](#)

Zagata, L. and Lostak, M. 2013. [WP4 Final Report: Farming Models for Young Farmers and New Entrants in Europe](#).

Fact sheet #6: FEAL*Multifunctional Farming for the sustainability of European Agricultural Landscapes*

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€374,469
Timeframe	2016-2019
Coordinator & Country	Technical University in Zvolen, Slovakia
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Sustainability; multifunctionality; online training

Context

Agriculture is crucial for the emergence and maintenance of cultural and environmental landscapes. These landscapes are interconnected. Improving knowledge of the cultural and environmental value of European Agricultural Landscapes (EAL) among farmers, rural entrepreneurs and landowners was central to the FEAL project. FEAL worked to provide young farmers, young rural entrepreneurs and family farmers with a Vocational Education and Training (VET) system supporting a gap in current education.

“Agricultural production depends on many natural conditions, and the sale of agricultural products from farms is not easy. These reasons motivate farmers to start doing business in non-agricultural activities. FEAL shall provide an educational tool for how to apply knowledge on landscape values in different landscape types into daily farming activities through the example of case studies” (Kruse et al., 2017, p.3).

Results

FEAL investigated sustainable and multifunctional farming in five national contexts (Germany, Italy, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain). The research highlighted the importance of good practice exchange and access to knowledge on EALs, with online tools growing in importance, particularly for young farmers (Kruse et al., 2017).

A good practice [case study](#) database provides examples of approaches to managing sustainable and multifunctional farms.

The [E-Atlas](#) provides a classification of EALs across 16 landscape types, such as highlands, meadow, moorland and vineyards. European landscapes are diverse, but can be classified based on common characteristics. This can help to improve understanding of the specific value of particular landscape types. It also addresses the gap that current information available on these landscapes is designed for ‘experts’ and the E-Atlas is more oriented towards practice (Kruse et al., 2017).


FEAL developed an [open-source training system](#) to improve understanding of the value and implementation of sustainable and multifunctional farming practices. The [FEAL training modules](#) bring together knowledge developed in other parts of the project. This includes a self-assessment questionnaire to help evaluate the learning achieved.

Further information

Range of resources available in seven languages (English, Slovak, German, Spanish, Italian, Slovenian and French) via the [Erasmus+ website](#) and the [FEAL website](#).

Kruse A., Renes H., Gaillard B., Sigura M., Slámová M., Belčáková I., Ambrožič A., Finale R., Canalicchio M., Rojas Pino I., Dreer J., Wenz J., Morand S., Budniok M., P 2017. [Summary report. The state of the Art of the relation between sustainable/multifunctional farming practices and European Agricultural Landscapes.](#)

Fact sheet #7: HNV-Link*High Nature Value Farming: Learning, Innovation and Knowledge*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€2,230,218.38
Timeframe	2016-2019
Coordinator & Country	Centre International des Hautes Etudes Agronomiques Méditerranéennes, France
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Land management; biodiversity; sustainability; multifunctionality

Context


High Nature Value (HNV) farming supports biodiversity and conservation occurring most often in areas where natural constraints hinder intensive production. HNV farms are multi-functional (e.g. produce food, conservation benefits and public services). A major challenge for HNV farming is to increase socio-economic viability while also maintaining ecological values. Public policy could play a greater role in addressing the multiple pressures on HNV farming to preserve its future. Adopting innovations of all types (technical-scientific, agronomic, institutional, market-based and regulatory) are needed. The HNV-Link multi-actor project worked on development and sharing innovations that support HNV farming systems.

Results

HNV-Link engaged 10 HNV territories as '[Learning Areas](#)' aimed at exchanging and applying suitable solutions to improve HNV farms viability and contribute to sustainable rural development. In each Learning Area a baseline assessment was carried out and an innovation report providing examples of innovations. These learnings are also brought together to develop [further resources](#). This includes a [comparative collection of the innovations](#) across the Learning Areas to draw together the experiences, needs and lessons learned. This also involves highlighting

innovations not currently used in HNV farming but show potential. In some Learning Areas a deficit in social/institutional and regulatory/policy innovation was found (Beaufoy and HNV-Link Partners, 2017).

“Addressing the challenges of HNV farming through innovation is not merely a question of individual initiatives. The reality is more complex - different types of innovation feed off each other, creating synergies. In the most successful cases there is a long-term, multi-actor “HNV innovation process” integrating the four innovation themes” (Beaufoy and HNV-Link Partners, 2017, p.6).



The HNV Link Innovation Themes. Source: Beaufoy and HNV-Link Partners, 2017

The HNV-Link [educational materials](#) aim to facilitate a greater focus on HNV farming by education and advisory services.

Further information


Range of resources available on the [HNV-Link website](#)

Such as:

[Research and Policy Outputs](#)

Beaufoy, G. (eds.) and HNV-Link Partners. (2017). [THE HNV-LINK COMPENDIUM: Comparative collection of High Nature Value innovations, experiences, needs and lessons, from 10 European Learning Areas.](#)

Fact sheet #8: Land Strat*Collaborative Learning about Innovative Land Strategies*

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€249, 282
Timeframe	2018-2020 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Terre de Liens, France
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Access to land; agroecology; food sovereignty; land struggles; land policy; collaborative approach

Context

The Land Strat project works to build and disseminate knowledge that supports access to land for agroecology and food sovereignty. Agroecology involves combining sound ecological farm management with principles of social, cultural and economic justice. Agroecology can be defined differently, but the project works particularly with the [Nyéléni](#) and the [CIDSE](#) coalition for global justice perspectives on agroecology.

The Land Strat approach relies on successful dialogue between different types of organisations (organic farming, peasant farming, community supported agriculture, research institutes and community land initiatives) with project knowledge and emerging resources built collaboratively using the bottom-up approach.

Results

National analysis on land policy, land structures and innovative local land initiatives is being carried out to result in eight country dossiers (The Netherlands, France, UK, Romania, Germany, Poland, Hungary and Spain). This brings together the historical land policy perspective with current issues relating to land reform and land regulation. Analysis is carried out from the grassroots organisation perspective. This involves analysis of implementation, benefits and limitations of policy and initiatives to build strategic

knowledge to better realise access to land for agroecology.

The activities of Land Strat also operate at the local level. A Local Land Strategies Handbook builds on lessons learned from a multi-actor seminar (e.g. farmers, activists, researchers, policymakers). It presents 12 different approaches to protecting and managing land for agroecology and food sovereignty.

The project is also concerned assessing EU policy, both CAP and other frameworks (e.g. treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, territorial cohesion policies, the Natura 2000). Land Strat organises specific discussion on the connection between the local scale and EU-level policies and will examine the possibility of creating an EU Land Directive

The last phase of the Land Strat project is focused on drawing together the innovative tools and learnings for policy as well as recommendations for future policy. The national analysis and local land strategies work provide the building blocks for a policy report detailing a Transformative Vision for Land for Agroecology in the EU.


Further information

[Land Strat Summary](#)

[The Netherlands country dossier \(short version\)](#)

Upcoming publications (country dossiers, handbook, policy report and other materials) all made available via the [Access to Land](#) network website

Fact sheet #9: LeALAND*Learning towards Access to Land*

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€76,025
Timeframe	2016-2018
Coordinator & Country	Asociace místních potravinových iniciativ, o.p.s. (AMPI), Czech Republic
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Access to land; new entrants to farming; community supported agriculture; experience sharing

Context

European level organisations working on the issue of access to land have been in existence for different periods of time. There are some newer and longer-established organisations. LeALAND was established to facilitate the sharing of approaches, tools and experiences of well-established organisations with emerging organisations and those beginning to work on the issue of access to land.

Results

LeALAND connected emerging organisations facilitating access to land in the Czech Republic, Scotland and Greece with established organisations in France and Germany, as well as wider European initiatives and informal networks.

The project helped to transfer knowledge both between and among new and emerging organisations, develop knowledge through mutual cooperation and more broadly share and compare ideas. Also important was to reinforce and build the networks between these organisations helping to increase the transnational capacities to work together.

Field-visits enabled LeALand partners to explore innovative ways of preserving

farmland and mobilising land for new entrants, particularly newcomers to farming. Themes explored through field visits were based on prior assessment of needs and priorities of participants. Visiting groups included rural development organisations but also farmers who gained direct insight into successful experiences such as how community support for new farmers can be mobilised facilitating access to land and entry into farming. This direct experience was a core part of the project approach, as well as allowing time for exchange and wider discussion on the local context and policy framework.


The project brought innovative solutions (e.g. community supported agriculture and community land trusts) to light where new solidarities between different actors could facilitate access to land such as between land-owners, communities, as well as farmers existing and new. One visit was to [l'Atelier Paysan](#) a cooperative harnessing the innovation capacity of farmers, building and preserving skills relating to tools and machinery used in organic farming aiming to achieve self-sufficiency in relation to skills. LeALand also provided the opportunity to explore how initiatives may be relevant and feasible to adapt in different contexts.

Further information[LeALand Summary](#)

No specific publications but results emerging from some activities available via the [Access to Land](#) network website.

Fact sheet #10: Learning Platform

Setting up a Learning Platform for Farmers' Access to Land

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€386,983
Timeframe	2018-2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Terre de Liens, France
	<p>Main theme: Farming</p> <p>Other themes: Access to land; capacity building; educational materials; mentoring</p>

Context

Learning Platform works to build on the long existing and effective collaboration among European organisations working on access to land issues. New organisations are also emerging in more recent years.

Learning Platform is focused on the practical tools and skills needed to support the staff and wider work of these organisations with potential farmers and new entrants. The resources and learnings emerging from the project are anchored in the realities of these organisations. This includes the use of peer-learning to develop educational resources to address emerging challenges.

Results

Learning Platform commenced by working to understand the needs of European access to land organisations. Internal organisational priorities were highlighted (e.g. financial strategies, communications strategies, advocacy and influencing policy) as well as wider issues (e.g. how to manage and finance land purchase and land sales; how to assess economic viability of proposed farm businesses). The [survey](#) of organisational needs highlighted priority topics for the learning resources of the Learning Platform project to focus on.

Learning platform is concerned with 'start-up land initiatives' and how their creation can be enabled, such as in Eastern European countries where greater challenges can exist. The Learning Platform beginners' kit for new access to land initiatives provides resources to support newly emerging access to land organisations. Learning Platform is also creating EU and country-level learning packs, as well as delivering wider training and webinars.

Learning Platform is also conscious that much of the work of access to land organisations is localised, such as at the farm level. This also shapes the Learning Platform project and develops resources tailored to this local scale. A peer-to-peer mentoring programme enables partners with experience in one domain to provide custom-fit resources and advice to others.

More broadly, the Learning Platform survey also found the need for a contemporary narrative about the importance of agroecological farming and generational renewal. Learning Platform is also concerned with the topic of assessing impact. Both are important tools to engage stakeholders and engage the public.


Further information

[Learning Platform Summary](#)

Access to Land Network, 2019. [Setting up a Learning Platform for Farmers' Access to Land: A survey of organisational needs.](#)

Upcoming publications all made available via the [Access to Land](#) network website

Fact sheet #11: LIFE ELCN*Development of a European Private Land Conservation Network*

Funder	LIFE
Grant	€620,000
Timeframe	2017-2020 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	NABU Bundesverband, Germany
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Private land conservation tools; HNV farming; networks.

Context

LIFE ELCN develops a European network on private land conservation. This covers nature conservation practices on privately owned land, either individuals, companies or other non-governmental organisations. The network is also developed with a clear long-term strategy (i.e. sustainability after funded LIFE project) and strong international partners.

LIFE ELCN is also testing a number of private land conservation tools and their potential for replication, as well as proposing policy actions to support these tools. These tools could prove promising for access to land in high nature value (HNV) farming contexts or protected environments.

Results

LIFE ELCN carried out a census of private land conservation in Europe. The results are [mapped](#) and provide examples of initiatives across Europe.

[Pilot test actions](#) being explored by LIFE ELCN focus on: promotion of historic heritage and nature conservation as sources for eco-tourism; facilitating incentives to private landowners to farm for conservation and commercial incentives for private landowner cooperation in nature conservation. These pilot test actions are potentially interesting from the perspective of helping both land conservation and rural regeneration through

the direct creation of jobs in farming and forestry or induced jobs in related spin-off areas such as tourism.

Better financial support for private land conservation can also promote greater levels of land conservation and feed into rural regeneration benefits. Other pilot test actions look at for example using easements for private land conservation and tax incentives for stewardship agreements.

Another innovative pilot test action focuses on a [participatory guarantee scheme](#) for marketing produce from HNV farmland or protected environments presenting a novel and interesting governance approach.

LIFE ELCN also explored the European context on conservation easements and national mechanisms that support or could support their further application (Račinska and Vahtrus, 2018).


Further information[LIFE ELCN website](#)

Range of resources available in the [downloads](#) section of the LIFE ELCN website.

Such as:

Račinska, I. and Vahtrus, S. 2018. [The Use of Conservation Easements in the European Union. Report to NABU Federal Association](#)

Fact sheet #12: MULTIAGRI*Rural Development through Governance of Multifunctional Agricultural Land-Use*

Funder	FP7 (RURAGRI ERA-NET)
Grant	€899,999
Timeframe	2013-2016
Coordinator & Country	Lund University, Sweden
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Ecosystem services; biodiversity; public goods; ecological intensification

Context

The MULTIAGRI project focused on issues related to multifunctional agricultural landscapes, ecological intensification and rural development. MULTIAGRI was concerned with how to adapt policy to ensure complementary objectives are met around public goods and ecosystem services linked to farmland as well as agricultural sustainability and competitiveness. It worked to understand how governance of agricultural landscapes can promote these inter-linked rural development objectives. MULTIAGRI took an interdisciplinary approach involving researchers in for example ecology, economics and agronomy.

Results

The MULTIAGRI view is that effectively generating ecosystem services in agricultural contexts must go beyond actions at the individual farm level. A wider spatial scale should be adopted with more coordinated actions implemented across landscapes, also taking into account differences in local farming conditions. It therefore identifies a deficiency in European policies of cross-compliance and agri-environmental schemes (MULTIAGRI, 2014).

A MULTIAGRI [policy brief](#) recommends the adoption of a landscape perspective where interventions focus on collaboration at scales larger than individual farms, but also that landscape characteristics are also taken into

account and adaptations made to measures as relevant. A multi-level approach to governance is also recommended where there is local implementation but also integration of goals at the wider level fitting into national or international policy objectives (Dänhardt and Smith, 2016).

Another MULTIAGRI [policy brief](#) looked at governance challenges related to managing agricultural landscapes to protect biodiversity and enhance ecosystem services. It highlights deficiencies in the CAP from the perspective that measures do not support collaboration among farmers relating to biodiversity management as individuals are targeted. A re-think is recommended promoting more collaborative measures and reducing wider barriers to collaboration (e.g. duration of tenure agreements). It is also suggested a mix of governance approaches (e.g. top down versus bottom up, centralised versus decentralised) are needed, but also that the approach is not prescriptive and can be adapted as appropriate to specific contexts (Leventon et al., 2016).

Further information

[MULTIAGRI website](#)


[List of MULTIAGRI publications.](#)

Brady, M.V., Hristov, J., Sahrbacher, A. and Schläpfer, F. 2016. [CAP impacts on farm structure, agricultural income and public goods. MULTIAGRI Policy Brief.](#)

Dänhardt, J. and Smith, H.G. 2016. [Ecological interventions in agricultural landscapes - scale matters! MULTIAGRI Policy Brief.](#)

Leventon, J., Newig, J., Schaal, T. and Velten, S. 2016. [Governance approaches to address scale issues in biodiversity management. MULTIAGRI Policy Brief.](#)

Fact sheet #13: SURE-Farm*Towards SUSTainable and RESilient EU FARMing systems*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€4,875,616.25
Timeframe	2017-2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Wageningen University, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Farming Other themes: Resilience; sustainability; food value chains

Context

SURE-Farm is developing a number of resilience assessment tools to assess policy, farm demographics, integrated impact assessment, farm risk management and decision support. It is working to understand the enabling environment conditions needed to support farm and farm system resilience. It is designing farm resilience policy recommendations for resilience enabling governance and implementation roadmaps.

Results

SURE-Farm argues the complexity of farming systems is not captured by how resilience is currently assessed. SURE-Farm has developed an EU farming system resilience analysis framework. It distinguishes three types of resilience (robustness, adaptability and transformability) and three farming system adaptive cycle processes (agricultural, farm demographics and governance processes) (Meuwissen et al., 2018).

SURE-Farm's Resilience Assessment Tool (ResAT) provides a tool to assess how EU and Member State policy supports farm system resilience helping identify areas for policy change (Termeer et al., 2018).

The SURE-Farm Agricultural Policy Simulator (AgriPoliS) is a tool to assess the impacts of policy measures on farm system resilience at the regional level focusing on structural change of farm regions and generational renewal. It

aims to help address a knowledge gap because of the focus on the family level in analysis of generational renewal but nearly half of European agricultural land is composed of farms reliant on farm labour (see Pitson et al. 2019).

SURE-Farm project results also provide insights on farm generational renewal and succession. Cases analysed as part of SURE-Farm found that while farm succession is inevitable, plans for this transition are uncommon. Additionally, when farm succession occurs this is often combined with adaptations to the farm. Analysis of farmer biographical narratives show a variety of complex influences on farm succession. What is termed the 'intergenerational stretch' lengthens the farm succession transition cycle and retirement of the principal farmer (Coopmans et al., 2019).

Further information

[SURE-Farm website](#)

[SURE-Farm short reports and policy briefs](#)


Coopmans, I. et al. 2019. D2.2 [Report on analysis of biographical narratives exploring short- and long-term adaptive behaviour of farmers under various challenges.](#)

Meuwissen, M. et al. 2018. D1.1 [Report on resilience framework for EU agriculture: Sure-Farm project report. \(Sustainable and resilient EU farming systems\).](#)

Termeer, K.; Candel, J.; Feindt, P. and Buitenhuis, Y. 2018. [D4.1: Assessing how Policies enable or constrain the Resilience of Farming Systems in the European Union: the Resilience Assessment Tool \(ResAT\).](#)

Pitson, C., Appel, F., Dong, C., Balman, A. 2019. [D3.4 Open-access paper on the formulation and adaptation of an agent-based model to simulate generational renewal.](#)

Fact sheet #14: AGRI-SPIN*Space for Innovations in Agriculture*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€1,994,306.25
Timeframe	2015 -2017
Coordinator & Country	L&F SEGES, Denmark
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Best practices; innovation support systems

Context

A major concern of AgriSpin was working to understand how to create the space where initiatives for innovations can flourish. The project focused on examining farm innovation and stimulating farmers to innovate. ‘Learning by doing’ was a key principle of the project focusing on learning from and with each other.


Results

AgriSpin developed the idea of an ‘innovation spiral’ (involving the initial idea, inspiration, planning, development, realisation, dissemination and embedding). It also found that the environment is crucial to stimulating innovation, with supports important at different stages of the spiral, as well as nurturing synergies among funding sources to achieve innovation (Wielinga and Parea, 2016; Pennington, 2017).

Through AgriSpin every participating country hosted a ‘cross visit’ where all partners met to evaluate the host country’s best practice innovation cases.

In the context of stimulating farmer innovation, the findings of the AgriSpin project highlighted how innovation initiators need to find the right partners at the inspiration stage of the innovation spiral. The group needs to come together and find space for experimentation at planning stages of innovation, but also that this part of the

process lacks attention. EIP-AGRI is highlighted as an important programme to potentially fill this void (Wielinga, 2017).



The Innovation Spiral. Source: Wielinga and Parea, 2016

The project also made [25 recommendations](#) identified as crucial for an agri-innovation process to succeed.

Further information

Range of resources available at: <https://agrispin.eu/>

Such as:

Asensio, P. Fisel, T., Wielinga, E. 2017 [Training Toolkit on Innovation](#)

Pennington, P. 2017. [How to Create a Community Conducive to Innovation](#)

Wielinga, E. 2017. AgriSpin Deliverable 2.5: [Towards a Professional Network](#)

Wielinga, E. and Parea, P. 2016. AgriSpin Deliverable 2.4 - [The Cross Visit Method: An Improved Methodologic Approach](#)

Wielinga, E. and Robijn, S. eds. 2018 [Stories From All Corners To Start With: Fifty two stories about innovations from European innovation support agencies in agriculture and rural development.](#)

Fact sheet #15: COFAMI*Encouraging Collective Farmers Marketing Initiatives*

Funder	FP6
Grant	€858,641
Timeframe	2005 -2008
Coordinator & Country	Wageningen University, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Collective marketing, cooperation; market knowledge; networking, food supply chain

Context

COFAMI responded to market-related challenges facing European farmers by examining collective farmers marketing initiatives (COFAMIs) as a potential solution. COFAMIs provide a range of advantages to farmers allowing them for example to pool ideas and capital, provide scale advantages and strengthen their collective bargaining power. It also examined limiting and enabling factors, as well as appropriate support measures for COFAMIs.


Results

COFAMI carried out 18 case studies across North-Western, Central and Eastern Europe covering a representative balance of COFAMIs in Europe. Different clusters were studied, such as initiatives focused on high quality food production (e.g. distinctive products, quality labels) regional food production (e.g. local, unique products to a territory) and non-food markets (e.g. tourism, energy).

Traditional style COFAMIs co-exist (e.g. traditional farmer cooperatives) with more recently emerging new approaches (e.g. organic and territory linked initiatives) to collective organisation among farmers. Newer practices can be understood as active responses to contemporary issues such as consumer demands and concerns as well as markets for public goods generated by agriculture (Schermer et al., 2011).

“European agriculture is facing a range of new challenges. Farmers have gradually lost control over supply chains, due to the growing power of retailers...there is a need to respond to changing consumer demands...Again, collective action may help in finding appropriate answers to these new challenges” (Jann et al., 2007, p.2).

Different contextual factors and capital assets come together to impact the emergence and dynamics of COFAMIs:



Source: Schermer et al., 2011

Further information

[COFAMI website](#)


[COFAMI publications - including national reports and case studies](#)

[Collective Farmer's Marketing Initiatives – Special Issue of the International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food](#)

Jahn, G. Zerger, C. Peter, S. and Knickel, K. 2007. [Status Quo Analysis \(WP3\) European Comparative Report](#)

Schermer, M., Renting, H. and Oostindie, H. 2011. [Collective Farmers' Marketing Initiatives in Europe: Diversity, Contextuality and Dynamics. Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food, 18 \(1\), p. 1–11](#)

Fact sheet #16: LIAISON*Better Rural Innovation: Linking Actors, Instruments and Policies through Networks*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€ 4,999,143.75
Timeframe	2018 -2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Hochschule für nachhaltige Entwicklung Eberswalde
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Interactive innovation; co-creation; co-learning

Context

At the core of the European Commission's European Innovation Partnership for Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability (EIP-AGRI) programme is the interactive approach to innovation. Interactive innovation involves co-design and co-creation of new ideas and innovations and means working together in partnership is crucial to innovation. This approach works well in practice, but LIAISON works to understand how it can be optimised by building better governance and ways to work in partnership successfully when there are multiple actors (LIAISON, 2020).

"The LIAISON project aims to understand better what makes a successful partnership for innovation. Why do some partnerships have the ability to organise themselves, to capture new ideas, to nurture them and create something new? How do they test this and turn it into something with real practical application?" (LIAISON project flyer).

Results

LIAISON has worked to find innovative projects across the Europe that fit with its outlook. The [European Rural Innovation Contest](#) invited projects to put themselves forward and 175 projects were identified. The project is combining a light touch (200 projects) and more in-depth review (32 projects) as part of its analysis of interactive innovation projects

(LIAISON, 2020). To showcase the diversity of projects in existence LIAISON is developing an online 'story map'.

"Innovation has many elements and encompasses many processes. It is also about networking, information exchange, collective intelligence and the co-creation of new knowledge and ideas. It is about farmers/foresters, advisors, researchers and others working together in partnership to find solutions to day-to-day needs, challenges and opportunities" (LIAISON project flyer).

LIAISON is focused on producing practice ready tools for enabling the optimisation of interactive innovation. These tools could be used by projects funded under the EIP-AGRI programme, but also beyond this in any interactive innovation context. The project is developing an [Interactive Innovation Tool Box](#) where all of the practical 'How to' guides produced are accessible (LIAISON, 2020).

The project will also generate policy-relevant evidence and develop policy briefs focused on how improve the institutional environment for interactive innovation projects (LIAISON, 2020).

Further information

[LIAISON project flyer](#)

[CORDIS, 2018. Fact Sheet. LIAISON](#)

[LIAISON, 2020. LIAISON project website](#)

Fact sheet #17: LIVERUR*Living Lab research concept in Rural Areas*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€4,107,005
Timeframe	2018-2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Fundación Universitaria San Antonio, Spain
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Business models; living labs; open innovation; public-private partnership; smart rural development

Context

LIVERUR is focused on expansion of 'living labs' in rural regions. This innovative business model is a tool for open innovation and holds potential to support the economic diversification of rural areas. Living labs depend on collaboration between different kinds of stakeholders, such as policy-makers, enterprises and researchers.

LIVERUR also views the success of living labs as impacted by the local context they emerge from, as well as the goals set that the living lab works towards achieving. LIVERUR works to address a gap in knowledge and better understand rural living labs, compare how they are approached in rural contexts and their future potential.

Results

LIVERUR makes connections between living labs and supporting social innovation, as well as emerging policy concepts such as Smart Villages:

"Living Labs are understood as integral in the processes of using local assets and strengths for the future development of rural areas and for enhancing the implementation of the Smart Villages concept...Living Labs are seen as one of the important building blocks of smart rural development" (Zavratnik et al. 2019, p.2).

LIVERUR's initial analysis focused on business models in the context of areas such as social inclusion, agri-tourism, handicrafts and organic farming. This resulted in helping develop deeper understand of the living lab concept. It also identified [weaknesses and challenges](#) relating to rural business models more broadly to help support future development, as well as direct approaches to rural living labs.

LIVERUR also assessed the existing nature of rural living labs characterising them depending on user involvement, real life contexts and public-private-people partnership (categories developed by Almirall and Wareham, 2008) to arrive at a definition for rural contexts.

The rural circular economy and the values it embodies is also a central concept within LIVERUR. The project also developed the new business model concept [Regional Circular Living Lab \(RAIN\)](#). [Guidelines](#) were developed to implement the RAIN business model. These are also being tested in [pilot regions](#).

Further information

[LIVERUR website](#)

[LIVERUR scientific outputs](#)

Cordis, 2020. [LIVERUR Fact Sheet and Results](#)

Almirall, E. and Wareham, J. 2008. Living Labs and open innovation: roles and applicability. *The Electronic Journal for Virtual Organizations and Networks*,10(3), p.21-46.

Zavratnik, V., Superina, A., and Stojmenova Duh, E. 2019. [Living Labs for Rural Areas: Contextualization of Living Lab Frameworks, Concepts and Practices](#). *Sustainability*, 11, 3797, doi:10.3390/su11143797

Fact sheet #18: NEWBIE

New Entrant netWork - Business models for Innovation, entrepreneurship and resilience in European agriculture

Funder	H2020
Grant	€1,995,040.75
Timeframe	2018 -2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Wageningen Research, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: New entrants to farming; farm entrepreneurship; sustainable farm business

Context

NEWBIE responds to barriers facing new entrants to farming, such as access to land, capital, information and markets. It brings different actors together, such as farmers, advisors and researchers, to identify good practice that can help new entrants overcome barriers and develop a sustainable farm business.

“The main goal of the NEWBIE network is to increase innovation, entrepreneurship, and resilience in the European farming sector by enabling new entrants to successfully establish sustainable farm businesses in Europe” (NEWBIE website).

Results

A core part of the NEWBIE project is development of a network of new entrants and other farming professionals. The network can be joined through the [membership](#) section of the NEWBIE website. Regional/national new entrant support networks are also being established in the project partner countries. In addition, spaces for information sharing and networking are being organised such as exchange visits, field visits, seminars and conferences.

Visual storytelling is also part of the NEWBIE project. It has produced [story map](#) featuring video-based stories from new entrants across Europe exploring for example their farm, motivations and overcoming barriers.

NEWBIE will assess new entrant business and entry models at the European level. It is developing resources (e.g. toolkits) for a range of actors, such as farmers, educators, policy-makers to enable lessons learned and good practice to transfer helping overcome barriers for new entrants.

“Business models or entrepreneurial models describe the rational of how an organisation creates, delivers and captures value” (NEWBIE website).

“New entry models are here defined as approaches, methods and/or instruments, which can help to overcome resource access barriers for new entrants in farming” (NEWBIE website).

Practice descriptions detailing initiatives that facilitate new entrants across Europe are being developed by NEWBIE. These respond to specific themes and questions within the NEWBIE dynamic learning agenda. They are available on the [publications](#) section of the NEWBIE website.


Further information[NEWBIE website](#)

Helms, C., Pölling, B., Curran, T. and Lorleberg, W. 2018. [NEWBIE: Deliverable 2.1 - Desktop research: national literature reviews and analyses of educational resources.](#)

Helms, C., Pölling, B. and Lorleberg, W. 2019. [NEWBIE: Deliverable 2.2 - Inventory of new entrant case studies.](#)

Teagasc and Fachhochschule Südwestfalen, 2019. [NEWBIE: Deliverable 2.3 - Collection of strategic planning of advisory services.](#)

Fact sheet #19: RUBIZMO*Replicable business models for modern rural economies*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€ 3,928,852.04
Timeframe	2018-2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	RISE Research Institutes of Sweden AB, Sweden
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Business models; entrepreneurship; smart rural development

Context

RUBIZMO sees innovative business models as important to harness the potential for rural economy growth and sustainability. The RUBIZMO project is focused on sectors it sees as having particular potential for sustainable rural jobs alongside also creating social value in the context of rural communities. These sectors are food and agriculture, bio-based value chains and ecosystem services.

Results

RUBIZMO has worked to analyse the impact of different rural businesses in terms of socio-economic and environmental aspects. Differences and but also complementary impact from various types of businesses in rural areas are highlighted:

“Financial indicators confirm that a larger scale of operations favours greater labour productivity, but from a social point of view it is important that in micro and small enterprises despite their smaller assets, lower generated profit per enterprise or lower labour productivity per employee, their activity is important because of its positive impact on the local labour market” (Dyjakon and Minta, 2019, p.45).

RUBIZMO assessed research relating to rural development, innovation, entrepreneurship and the bio-based economy to develop an understanding of the modern rural economy and where opportunities lie. Opportunities

identified were in particular linked to emerging technologies (e.g. enabling overcoming distance to market issues faced by rural areas and wider innovations such as related to the bioeconomy). But crucially, the policy brief also signals:

“...the realization of opportunities needs to build on the simultaneous engagement of various stakeholders in business development, research, and public administration. Successful developments require an integrated development approach which combines opportunities into a comprehensive development program” (RUBIZMO, 2018, p.2).

The RUBIZMO project is also developing business model tools to support rural business model innovation designed to assist rural entrepreneurs, networks, investors and policymakers. This includes a [virtual library](#) of existing business models including interactive resources and examples as well as [training resources](#) to help build capacity to effectively implement new business models. The [‘transformation support tool’](#) helps to enable assessment of what business models best fit in different circumstances.

Further information[RUBIZMO website](#)

Cordis, 2020. [RUBIZMO Fact Sheet, Results and Reporting](#)

Dyjakon, A. and Minta, S. 2019. [Report on socio-economic analysis](#). RUBIZMO project deliverable 3.1.

RUBIZMO, 2018. [Anticipated Futures for Modern Rural Economies](#). Short Policy Brief derived from RUBIZMO extended report D1.2.

Fact sheet #20: RURINNO

Social Innovations in Structurally Weak Rural Regions: How Social Entrepreneurs Foster Innovative Solutions to Social Problems

Funder	H2020
Grant	€225,000
Timeframe	2016 -2018
Coordinator & Country	Leibniz-Institut für Raumbezogene Sozialforschung, Germany
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Social enterprise, social innovation, marginal rural regions

Context

RURINNO sees social enterprise as a promising yet neglected potential driver of social innovation in marginal rural regions (RURINNO, 2018b). Social enterprises can play a social innovation role in structurally weak rural regions by addressing gaps in public service provision and/or introducing innovative new solutions for service delivery. Beyond the services provided they also can have wider added-value for rural areas, such as job creation, community empowerment and workforce skill development (Fink et al. 2017).

Results

RURINNO offers insights on how rural innovation is generated in the social enterprise context. The findings highlight how social enterprises are also part of networks inside and outside of their own rural area which: “allows them to mobilise ideas, resources, and support in other contexts to the benefit of rural regions” (Fink et al., 2017, p.10). RURINNO finds this facilitates innovation in rural regions that often involves adaptation of ideas and knowledge from elsewhere to a specific rural context (Richter, 2019; RURINNO, 2018b).

“Social enterprises are hybrid organisations at the intersection of state, market and civil society. Their ability to systematically cross boundaries is a crucial precondition for developing innovative solutions and foster social change” (RURINNO, 2018b, p.1).

RURINNO highlights the need for a stable, supportive facilitative environment for rural social enterprise development. Fink et al. (2017) also argue that rural social enterprise should be subject to different, more supportive institutional conditions (e.g. simplified accounting procedures, social clauses in public procurement, access to funding schemes, or tax breaks).

The project also developed a **toolkit** to help social entrepreneurs overcome key challenges commonly faced when establishing a social enterprise (RURINNO, 2018a) and a **policy brief** on social entrepreneurship as a potential driver of change in marginalised rural Europe (RURINNO, 2017).

Further information

CORDIS, 2016. [RURINNO Factsheet and Results](#)

Fink, M., Lang, R. and Richter, R. 2017*. [Social Entrepreneurship in Marginalised Rural Europe: Towards Evidence-Based Policy for Enhanced Social Innovation](#). *Regions*, 306 (1), p. 6-10.

Richter, R. 2019*. [Rural social enterprises as embedded intermediaries: The innovative power of connecting rural communities with supra-regional networks](#). *Journal of Rural Studies*, 70, p.179-187.


RURINNO, 2017. [Policy Brief on Social Entrepreneurship as a Driver of Change in Marginalised Rural Europe](#).

RURINNO, 2018a. [Rural Social Enterprise Experiences from the Field: An Experiential Report Created by Practitioners for Practitioners in the Field of Social Enterprise](#).

RURINNO, 2018b. [RURINNO Report Summary](#).

*open access articles available via the EC CORDIS website– see the ‘results’ section and ‘documents and reports’ sub-section [here](#)

Fact sheet #21: SIMRA*Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€5,575,828.75
Timeframe	2016-2020
Coordinator & Country	The James Hutton Institute, UK
	Main theme: Innovation Other themes: Social innovation; governance; rural development; marginalised rural areas

Context

Social innovations present a potential novel response to quality of life and well-being challenges in rural areas. The SIMRA project is concerned with social innovations and innovative governance in marginal rural areas. The underpinning idea is that social innovation can introduce new opportunities and new solutions to the decline of marginal rural areas.

Results

SIMRA used an integrated set of methods for the evaluation of social innovation in marginal rural areas assessing its impacts on economic, social, environmental, institutional and policy. This was tested through [case studies](#).

SIMRA recognises that social innovation often happens at local level (Secco et al., 2014). The SIMRA [online database](#) demonstrates this with the majority developed at local level, on relatively limited territory and size (Valero et al., 2017).

SIMRA highlight that social innovation outcomes can ameliorate social services and favour the inclusion of marginalised groups. Social innovation can be stimulated with the correct enabling conditions, however cannot be planned directly and should not be strictly regulated ensuring 'room for manoeuvre' and avoid a 'top down' logic (Ludvig et al., 2018).

SIMRA has produced a [practical guide](#) to social innovation in marginal rural areas and [policy briefs](#) on social innovation in rural areas. This includes a policy brief on how policy can help bring about rural social innovation focused on nine key messages and calls for action.

"The third sector is a key driver of social innovation and provides a vital contributor to wellbeing, especially in areas where markets are weakest, and state and municipalities struggle to deliver key goods and services...the simplistic binary model of market and state needs to be replaced by a model that recognises the third sector and the important role of citizen-led or socially motivated activities" (Slee and Mosdale, 2020, p.6).

Further information[SIMRA website](#)

Range of resources available at: <http://www.simra-h2020.eu/index.php/resources/>

Such as:

[Database: Social innovations in marginalised rural areas](#)

Ludvig et al., 2017. [Report D6.1. Political Framework Conditions, Policies and Instruments for SIs in Rural Areas](#)


Secco et al., 2017. [Demonstrator D4.2. Set of Methods to Assess SI Implications at Different Levels: Instructions for WPs 5 and 6.](#)

Slee, B. and Mosdale, L. 2020. [Policy brief How policy can help bring about social innovation in rural areas.](#)

Valero D., Bryce R. and Gorriz E., 2017. [R3.1: Final Selection of Case Studies.](#)

Fact sheet #22: CHANCE2SUSTAIN

Urban Chances: City growth and the sustainability challenge; Comparing fast growing cities in growing economies

Funder	FP7
Grant	€2,600,600
Timeframe	2010-2014
Coordinator & Country	European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI), Germany.
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Participatory governance; planning; knowledge

Context

CHANCE2SUSTAIN focused on how participatory spatial knowledge (PSK) management can help to shape urban governance and impact sustainable development. This includes different types of knowledge of an expert and non-expert nature. Spatial knowledge is also highlighted as important because it reflects local contexts and more broadly can reflect how trends present in different geographies.

“Spatial knowledge management (consisting of knowledge construction, exchange, contestation, and use) is a critical domain for supporting more sustainable urban development. It provides resources that enable actors to develop knowledge management configurations, with city governments as one of the strategic actors, to address the complex interplay of economic, social and environmental processes” (Peyroux et al. 2014, p.6).

While an urban-focused project, CHANCE2SUSTAIN offers potential insights for exploration in relation to rural governance and improving the effectiveness of participatory approaches relating particularly to knowledge management as a resource.

Results

CHANCE2SUSTAIN highlights the role of mapping to envision future pathways for development in urban contexts. City vision maps can integrate different perspectives, but the process of creation is also highlighted as important in terms of what range of stakeholders were involved and at what scales (Baud et al. 2014).

The project also draws attention to the place of digital data in spatial planning. This can encompass more traditional digital data, but also newer sources such as ‘big data’. Using this type of data can enable trends to be identified and responded to in shorter time periods. However, it also comes with challenges such as working with new partners to source data, as well as resource issues (Taylor, 2014).

Further information

Cordis, 2017. [CHANCE2SUSTAIN Results in Brief](#).

Reports, policy briefs etc. available via the [CHANCE2SUSTAIN](#) website.


Baud, I. Denis, E., Pfeffer, K., Sydenstricker-Neto, J., Scott, D., Sutherland, C., Sara, L. M. and Richter, C. 2014. [Mapping City Visions: Integrating Megaprojects in Urban Development](#). CHANCE2SUSTAIN Policy Brief.

Taylor, L., 2014. [Sustainable Data Science for Sustainable Cities: Big Data and the Challenge of Urban Development](#). CHANCE2SUSTAIN Policy Brief.

Peyroux, E. Scott, D., Baud, I. and Jameson, S., 2014. [Spatial Knowledge Management and Participatory Governance: Rethinking the Trajectories of Urban, Socio-economic and Environmental Change and the Politics of ‘Sustainability’ in Southern Cities](#). CHANCE2SUSTAIN Analytical Framework.

Fact sheet #23: GILDED

Governance, infrastructure, lifestyle dynamics and energy demand: European post-carbon communities

Funder	FP7
Grant	€1,426,647
Timeframe	2008-2012
Coordinator & Country	The James Hutton Institute, Scotland
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Energy use; agent-based policy; governance; post-carbon communities; climate change

Context

GILDED identified a gap in existing research around energy consumption and lifestyle at household level. It aimed to identify what impacted consumption and the changes that could lead to reducing household-level carbon-intensive energy demand. GILDED focused on both urban and rural contexts.

GILDED research was based on five European case study sites in the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. These all consisted of a medium-sized city and surrounding rural areas. GILDED worked to model outcomes of European energy policies within these case study regions. The project also examined the infrastructure and governance restraints affecting energy demand reduction.

Results

GILDED highlights the importance of information at household level on the collective impact of individual actions on energy use. People did not feel their actions could make a big impact (Cordis, 2014; 2015). The project also highlighted that to support behaviour change focusing on how energy use can lead to unsustainable use and wasted energy and could be a better approach than wider focus on the issue of climate change. GILDED also identified general acceptance of

strong government action to reduce energy use (Cordis, 2014).

The context of the GILDED project highlights the potential role of policy and funding supports for how rural communities might be shaped places supporting low-carbon living. A general need for funding support was identified at the level of household and community, and also in relation to stakeholder engagement.

The case studies analysed did not identify an ideal approach, but findings suggested that good practice is useful but also should be assessed in context (Cordis, 2014).

Further information

Cordis, 2015. [GILDED Results in Brief](#).

Cordis, 2014. [GILDED Final Report Summary](#).

Project completed in 2012, currently limited open access resources, some academic publications:


Fischer, A., Peters, V., Neebe, M., Vávra, J., Kriel, A., Lapka, M. and Megyesi B. 2012. Climate change? No, wise resource use is the issue: Social representations of energy, climate change and the future. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 22 (3), p.161-176.

Steg, L., Perlaviciute, G., Van der Werff, E. and Lurvink, J. 2012. The significance of hedonic values for environmental attitudes, preferences and actions. *Environment and Behavior*, 46 (2), p.163-192.

Fischer, A., Peters, V., Vávra, J., Neebe, M. and Megyesi, B. 2011. Energy use, climate change and folk psychology: does sustainability have a chance? Results from a qualitative study in five European countries. *Global Environmental Change* 21 (3), p.1025-1034

Fact sheet #24: PLUREL

Peri-urban Land Use Relationships - Strategies and Sustainability Assessment Tools for Urban-Rural Linkages

Funder	FP6
Grant	€7,000,000
Timeframe	2007-2011
Coordinator & Country	University of Copenhagen, Denmark
	<p>Main theme: Sustainability</p> <p>Other themes: Peri-urban areas; urbanisation; policy; planning; integrated development</p>

Context

PLUREL responded to the growing significance of the urbanisation trend and the impact on rural areas, as well as changing how rural and urban areas interact. It was particularly concerned with how peri-urban regions worked to enable a better understanding of the dynamics of change and more effective policy in this context.

Results

The PLUREL synthesis report brings together the results of the project (see Piorr et al. 2010). It identifies key trends in peri-urban regions. Overall it is observed that peri-urban space is expanding rapidly which creates uncoordinated urban sprawl and other associated negative impacts on environment and society. However, policy can help overcome negatives and harness opportunities, according to PLUREL.

“Overall, the challenges of the peri-urban need to be addressed at the wider strategic level of the surrounding ‘rural-urban region’. This requires more effective local government, alongside new forms of social enterprise and cooperation, for ‘integrated development’ (i.e. ‘joined-up policy’) in the rural-urban region. Achieving this is a multilevel agenda, from local to national and European” (Piorr et al., 2010, p.10).

PLUREL suggests the trends identified call for a multi-level policy agenda with policies and programmes at different levels such as local, national and European, as well as looking across scales to integrated policy developing the ‘rural-urban region’. It makes very specific recommendations. The first option presented, for an EU Directive for Integrated Rural-Urban Development, is suggested the most effective. This would provide a legal mandate and operational structure for development in rural-urban regions and is conceptualised based on the Water Framework Directive example. Other recommendations include the establishment of a system of EU conditionality for integrated rural-urban development where as part of policy programmes rural-urban integrated development plans must be prepared and this scale provides the main territorial basis for programs. It also recommends the establishment of a dedicated fund for rural-urban development.

PLUREL developed scenarios relating to land use change and development of the built environment up to 2025. One finding was the projected high increases in ‘artificial surfaces’ or built development in peri-urban regions. PLUREL also looked at patterns of change in peri-urban regions in relation to: economy and employment; population and migration; housing and communities; mobility and transport; food and farming; and landscape, ecology, recreation and tourism.


Further information

[PLUREL overview via the PEER website](#)

[PLUREL overview and results via TRIMIS](#)

Piorr, A., Ravetz, J. and Tosics, I. eds. 2010. [Peri-urbanisation in Europe – Towards European Policies to Sustain Urban-Rural Futures. Synthesis Report.](#)

Fact sheet #25: RURAGRI*Facing sustainability: New relationships between rural areas and agriculture in Europe*

Funder	FP7 (ERA-NET)
Grant	€999,565
Timeframe	2009-2014
Coordinator & Country	Institut national de la Recherche Agronomique, France
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Farming; rural development; diverse rural areas

Context

At the time of its conception, RURAGRI responded to the fragmented nature of agriculture and rural development research on the European level and worked to improve coordination across projects through the RURAGRI network and arrive at a common future research agenda. It also explored emerging topics and worked to map and examine existing research.

Results

The RURAGRI project identified challenges associated with balanced regional development at a number of levels – within agriculture, rural areas and urban areas but also at regional, EU and global levels.

The research agenda for RURAGRI uncovered a range of future research questions, such as those related to: barriers to innovation; the impact of mobility and community on quality of life, culture and identity; urban-rural relationships and their impact on potential sustainable development; and innovative land use and management practices (RURAGRI, 2014).

A call for research projects was also part of RURAGRI and it funded a number of projects such as MULTIAGRI, TASTE, RETHINK and MERIT. [Results](#) of these projects are also available. Following RURAGRI's analysis of

existing research, these projects responded to research priorities identified which were related to: ecosystem services/public goods; socio-economic development and land use/land management. The cross-cutting issues of diversity, rural-urban relationships and governance were also identified.

RURAGRI also highlighted the [role of rural spatial typologies](#) to facilitate co-ordination and cooperation within the EU. It aimed to identify typologies of relevance to the RURAGRI network and identified a number (EU LUPA and EDORA) but also suggested no single typology provides a perfect solution in all circumstances (Meredith and Salas Olmedo, 2012).

Further information

[RURAGRI website](#)


[Main RURAGRI deliverables](#) such as:

Dax, T. 2014. [Shaping rural development research in Europe: acknowledging the interrelationships between agriculture, regional and ecological development](#). *Studies in Agricultural Economics* 116, p. 59-66.

Meredith, D. and Salas Olmedo, M. 2012. [Understanding the potential role of spatial typologies in responding to the RURAGRI Call](#)

RURAGRI, 2014. [Final Project Report - Facing sustainability: new relationships between rural areas and agriculture in Europe](#).

Fact sheet #26: RURBAN*Partnership for sustainable urban-rural development*

Funder	OECD
Grant	€ not found
Timeframe	2010-
Coordinator & Country	European Commission
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Rural-urban interaction; integrated development

Context

Rural and urban areas are not distinct, separate spaces but increasingly interconnected. RURBAN worked to promote urban-rural linkages to support sustainable development. Fostering urban-rural relationships enables development in both areas to benefit building on their different assets and needs (OECD, 2013).

Results

RURBAN assessed case studies in a number of different types of regions (large metropolitan regions, network of small and medium-sized cities and sparsely populated areas with market towns). Each region was viewed in a different way in terms of the rural-urban relationship. The proximity of the regions can impact potential relationships. The focus of case studies included networks between medium cities and rural areas, such as the Italian case of Forlì-Cesena builds connections in local agri-food and tourism economy to improve products, services and competitiveness. Cases also demonstrated how cooperation can improve services, such as the case of central Finland where municipalities including small towns and remote rural areas work together to improve broadband availability.

Another study carried out as part of RURBAN identifies a range areas of rural-urban cooperation, such as spatial planning,

economic development, transport, health and renewable energy. It also emphasises the approach is not without difficulties but effective approaches can realise common goals. A range of success factors are also identified such as shared problems, tradition of cooperation, a set form of governance and cooperation between different kinds of actors (Artmann et al., 2012).

Part of RURBAN involved an OECD study looking at how urban-rural partnerships can support development. The different yet complementary assets held by urban and rural regions provide a basis for relationships that can support economic development. The OECD study also recommended a set of actions to better harness urban-rural linkages to support sustainable development. These include government assessment of urban-rural opportunities to increase awareness of the opportunities for development. Also frameworks that enable cooperation across more traditional boundaries are recommended, alongside a supportive environment (e.g. spaces for dialogue, innovative flexible governance approaches helping to overcome challenges) (OECD, 2013).


Further information

General information, videos and reports available via the [RURBAN](#) webpage.

Artmann, J. Huttenloher, C, Kawka, R and Scholze, J. 2012. Partnership for sustainable rural-urban development: existing evidences.

OECD, 2013. [Rural-Urban Partnerships: An Integrated Approach to Economic Development](#). OECD Publishing.

Fact sheet #27: SUPURBFOOD*Towards sustainable modes of urban and peri-urban food provisioning*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€ 1,499,651
Timeframe	2012-2015
Coordinator & Country	Wageningen University, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Short food supply chains; multifunctional agriculture; rural-urban interaction

Context

SUPURBFOOD was concerned with understanding more sustainable approaches to food provisioning in particular short food supply chains and multifunctional agriculture in city-region contexts. SUPURBFOOD notes that this topic is more often addressed in the rural development context, but is concerned with addressing a gap by focusing on urban development. It sees sustainable food provisioning as key part of the urban agenda. SUPURBFOOD examined urban and peri-urban contexts and therefore links to the theme of rural-urban relationships supporting development. In addition, some of the wider observations could have relevance for policy and governance relating to sustainable food systems in rural contexts.

Results

SUPURBFOOD assesses practices across different parts of the food chain from reducing and optimising use of food waste to ways of shortening food supply chains and protecting land for agriculture. Research was based on European city-regions involved in the project were: City-region Rotterdam (The Netherlands), Metropolitan Area Rome (Italy), City-region Ghent (Belgium), Metropolitan Area Vigo (Spain), City-region Bristol (United Kingdom), City-region Zürich (Switzerland), Greater Riga Region (Latvia). A series of [case studies](#) were developed in each region.

Key messages for policy emerging from SUPURBFOOD are presented in a [policy brief](#) where it is argued city authorities are key players with responsibility for enabling the creation of more sustainable food systems. The need for better use of existing and innovative new policy instruments is also highlighted. In terms of scale of action, the city-region level is presented as key. The idea of creating synergies is also advocated as an important principle to support urban food sustainabilities, where creating multiple benefits is reached for:

“Local governments, in partnership with gardeners, civic groups, charities, and food producers can use food initiatives to provide wider societal goods such as community building, social inclusion, education, nature conservation, improved health outcomes and enhanced quality of life” (SUPURBFOOD, 2015a, p.4).

SUPURBFOOD identifies opportunities and a key role for SMEs in sustainable urban food provisioning, alongside the need for specifically tailored support measures to realise this (SUPURBFOOD, 2015b).

Further information


Range of reports, policy briefs etc. available via the [SUPURBFOOD website](#)

Cordis, 2016. [Final Report Summary - SUPURBFOOD](#)

SUPURBFOOD, 2015a. [Policy Brief: Sustainable Urban Food Provisioning.](#)

SUPURBFOOD, 2015b. [Practitioners Brief: SMEs and Sustainable Urban Food Provisioning.](#)

Fact sheet #28: TRANSMANGO*Sustainable Pathways to Changing the Food System*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€3,905,234
Timeframe	2014-2018
Coordinator & Country	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Food systems; Future scenarios; Drivers of change; Food security

Context

Diverse global drivers of change such as climate change, geo-political shifts and consumer preferences, have potential effects on the food system.

TRANSMANGO worked to build a comprehensive picture of the effects of global drivers on European food systems vulnerability and resilience. It also built understanding of future challenges and opportunities facing the food system.

Results

TRANSMANGO built exploratory scenarios for future food system change (Vervoort et al., 2016) and transition pathways for European sustainable and equitable food and nutrition futures for Europe (Vervoort and Helfgott, 2017).



Source: TRANSMANGO booklet

Local level analysis came in the form of [case studies](#). Engaging young people, the project

also used applied games to explore the future of food through a European [game jam tour](#).

“In reality, the food we eat is derived from a system which is shaped by a range of distinct policies—including those on agriculture, food safety, public health, trade, environmental protection and employment—developed in silos, in isolation from each other” (Oostindie et al. 2017, p.3).

TRANSMANGO’s work informed the development of strategic [policy recommendations](#), which overall called for an EU-wide food policy (as opposed to agricultural policy) addressing interconnected issues in an integrated way involving a range of stakeholders (Oostindie et al. 2017).

Further information

[TRANSMANGO website](#)

[Key findings – TRANSMANGO Booklet](#)

Range of resources available at: <https://transmango.wordpress.com/deliverables/>


Such as:

Vervoort, J. and Helfgott, A. 2017. [Deliverable D5.4 – Report on potential transition pathways generated by EU stakeholders](#).

Vervoort, J., Helfgott, A., Brzezina, N., Moragues-Faus, A., Lord, S., Avermaete, S. and Mathijs, E. 2016. [Explorative EU Scenarios](#).

Oostindie, H., Hebinck, P., Carroll, B. and O’Connor, D. 2017. D7.1-7.21 [Policy Recommendations](#)

Fact sheet #29: TURAS*Transitioning towards Urban Resilience and Sustainability*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€6,813,819.30
Timeframe	2011-2016
Coordinator & Country	Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Sustainable urban living; urban resilience; green infrastructure; urban growth

Context

The TURAS project was concerned with solutions to improve sustainable urban living and resilience. TURAS examined and piloted a range of innovative and novel tools. The project focused on specific areas relating to sustainable urban living: climate change adaptation; migration; green infrastructure building and urban growth. The sustainability challenge faces both rural and urban areas. In a rural context where rural attractiveness and sustainability are key regeneration issues, findings of TURAS could be of interest.

Results

TURAS brought together different actors to work together, including researchers, local authorities and SMEs. Similar to a multi-actor approach it terms the partnership approach as 'twinning'

"To ensure maximum impact, the TURAS project has developed an innovative twinning approach bringing together decision makers in local authorities with SMEs and academics to ensure meaningful results and real change are implemented over the duration of the project" (Cordis, 2017).

TURAS examined and piloted projects in European urban regions including Spain, Bulgaria, Germany, the Netherlands, Slovenia and the United Kingdom.

TURAS focused on a number of what it viewed as interconnected approaches to improving sustainable urban living and resilience. This included urban green infrastructure projects were a focus such as 'green roofs', 'green walls' and 'green living rooms'. This also resulted in production of green infrastructure guidelines for local authority planners and designers.

TURAS also focused on planning for urban challenges of the future and development of transition strategies and visions for the future. The question of how businesses can help support sustainable urban living and resilience also concerned the TURAS project. The project itself led to the emergence of two spin-off companies.

A broader lesson from the TURAS pilot projects highlighted the significant role of collaborative approaches. Stronger results with regards to resilience and sustainability were found to link to stronger collaborative relationships amongst stakeholders.

Further information

Cordis, 2016. [Europe takes the lead in building urban resilience.](#)

Cordis, 2017. [Fact Sheet and Results.](#)

Project website unfortunately expired, but key findings available here:

TURAS, 2016. [Project Final Report.](#)

Fact sheet #30: VOLANTE*Visions Of LANd use Transitions in Europe*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€ 6,997,101.75
Timeframe	2010-2015
Coordinator & Country	Stichting Wageningen Research, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Sustainability Other themes: Land use; future pathways; land management

Context

The VOLANTE project was driven by the premise that Europe has entered a critical phase where decisions are needed on landscape management. VOLANTE explored alternative visions of a more sustainable future land use in Europe, while looking to evaluate the pathways best suited to ensuring such sustainability.

Results

Land use transitions have diverse drivers including socio-economic and ecological processes. VOLANTE [research](#) involved case studies, country studies and long-term analysis of land system dynamics. VOLANTE observes that a clear visioning process is needed for land use in Europe because at present trends are driving unintended land use futures (e.g. land abandonment, urban sprawl).

VOLANTE brings its findings together in the form of a [roadmap](#) towards better European land management and decision-making. This presents a number of contrasting visions of future sustainable land use – Local Multi-functional; Best Land in Europe and Regional Connected. For example, the ‘Local multi-Functional’ vision is based on the idea that “Land functions are localised in small areas based on innovative approaches to living, working and recreation. There is high diversity in goods and services, land use and society” (Pedroli et al., 2015, p.9). This vision is also

noted to potentially be the most difficult to achieve without significant transformation. It also notes that within each vision is a process where trade-offs also need to be made to achieve the visions (Pedroli et al., 2015).

VOLANTE also presents potential policy and governance approaches to work towards the visions. The VOLANTE roadmap also points out a number of wider actions needed to realise any of the visions put forward. This includes the need for:

“...a broader range of land use policy options and governance structures that balance trade-offs in a transparent and well informed way... , land use policy needs to be sensitive to regional differences across Europe, and based on cross-sectoral strategies that move away from the traditional sectoral policy focus” (Pedroli et al., 2015, p.21).

VOLANTE also produced a range of [fact sheets](#) that delve deeper into specific issues.

Further information

Range of resources available such as reports, case studies and policy briefs via the [VOLANTE](#) website.


Cordis, 2016. [VOLANTE Results in Brief](#).

Metzger, M, Murray-Rust, D, Houtkamp, J, Jensen, A, Riviere, IL, Paterson, J, Perez-Soba, M & Vallurinitzsch, C 2017. [How do Europeans want to live in 2040 ? Citizen visions and their consequences for European land use](#). *Regional Environmental Change*.

Pedroli, B., Rounsevell, M., Metzger, M. Paterson, J., and the VOLANTE consortium, 2015. [The Volante Roadmap: Towards Sustainable Land Resource Management in Europe](#).

Fact sheet #31: CORASON

A Cognitive Approach to Rural Sustainable Development the dynamics of expert and lay knowledges

Funder	FP6
Grant	€1,050,000
Timeframe	2004-2007
Coordinator & Country	Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Knowledge; innovation, sustainability

Context

CORASON focused on understanding the 'knowledge society'. The project looked at this through the prism of rural change and sustainable development (Cordis, 2010).

"The central objective of CORASON was to identify and explain the dynamics of the variety of knowledge forms used in rural projects relevant to rural economic development, rural civil society, and the protection of rural nature. (CORASON, 2006, p.5).

Results

CORASON identifies a shift in understanding in how expertise is understood in development contexts. Local contextualised knowledge has gained prominence and more traditional science-based expertise no longer holds authority. This aligns with the idea that there is more than one way of knowing. There is potentially no one authoritative source of knowledge in rural development contexts but many 'knowledges' (e.g. scientific, traditional or experience-based). Local knowledge is identified as important economic resource in rural development (Tovey, 2008).

For CORASON, this view of knowledge is important in rural sustainable development. Too much focused on 'expert' knowledge has been a problematic pattern. Key is interaction between different knowledge forms, but effectively achieving this is also difficult and a key problem identified by CORASON. The

project identifies the need for greater ways to empower and enable 'lay' actors to participate, drive and control local development (CORASON, 2006).

"Education and learning for Sustainable Development need to be understood as processes involving not just the transformation of 'lay' knowledges and attitudes but also that of the relevant experts involved, so that the different and even contradictory values and purposes underlying each can be made the subject of open dialogue and debate" (CORASON, 2006, p.105).

More specifically in relation to rural sustainable development CORASON identified a need for more specific pinpointing of the specific forms that sustainable development should take in rural areas suggesting concepts such as 'local diversity' and 'sustainable rural livelihoods' can prove useful in policy-focused research contexts (CORASON, 2006).

Further information

Cordis, 2010. [CORASON Factsheet and Reporting](#).

CORASON, 2006. [Final Report](#).


Project completed in 2009, currently limited open access resources, some academic publications:

Csurgó, B., Kovách, M. and Kučerová, E. 2008. Knowledge, Power and Sustainability in Contemporary Rural Europe. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48 (3), p.292-312.

Tovey, H. 2008. Introduction: Rural Sustainable Development in the Knowledge Society Era. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48 (3) p.185-199.

Tovey, H. and K. Bruckmeier, K. 2009. *Rural Sustainable Development in the Knowledge Society*. Surrey: Routledge.

Fact sheet #32: DERREG*Developing Europe's Rural Regions in an Era of Globalization*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€1,499,084
Timeframe	2009-2011
Coordinator & Country	Aberystwyth University, UK
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Globalization; Rural Business; Migration; Environmental Capital; Capacity Building.

Context

DERREG views globalization as framing the challenges for regional development in rural Europe. The balance of threats and opportunities presented by globalization is particularly significant for rural areas (Woods, 2011). DERREG draws on key concepts, which recognise the complexities of globalization and how it changes rural areas, but also how it does not make them all the same. Nonetheless, key actors in rural areas can have the opportunity to intervene in processes of globalization thereby shaping the outcome for their area.

Results

DERREG offers insights on how rural areas and key stakeholders can equip themselves in understanding how globalization works at the local scale in order to respond effectively to the challenges and to embrace potential opportunities. The project findings highlight that international transactions by SMEs vary considerably by regions. Many rural businesses collaborate with both local and international partners, but most still rely on regional and national support networks. Yet, international networking can help to develop opportunities for endogenous rural resources (Dubois et al., 2011).

Mobility and migration study was a key element of the DERREG project and findings show that international migrants are present across rural Europe, but reflect differing

regional dynamics. Frys and Nienaber (2011) suggest that migration is driven by multiple, inter-connected motivations, but experiences vary between individuals and regions. Migrant workers emphasized the benefits of rural locations including the rural environment and mixing with locals in small communities. Some reported problems of integration, cultural misunderstandings and the absence of appropriate support services and networks. If supported appropriately, the project also found that rural return migrants could play a key role in rural business development due to enhanced cultural and economic capital (Farrell et al., 2012). The project also developed the 'rural learning regions' model which describes the interaction between knowledge actors, public administration and regional civil society (Woods, 2012).

Further information

Project reports available via the [Global-Rural Project](#)

Dubois, A., Copus, A. and Hedström, M. 2012. Local Embeddedness and Global Links in Rural Areas: Euclidean and Relational Space in Business Networks, in eds. Hedberg C., do Carmo R. *Translocal Ruralism*. GeoJournal Library, vol 103. Springer, Dordrecht.

Farrell, M., Kairytė, E., Nienaber, B., McDonagh, J. and Mahon, M., 2014. Rural return migration: Comparative analysis between Ireland and Lithuania. *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 3(2), p.127-149.


Frys, W. and Nienaber, B. 2011. Protected areas and regional development: conflicts and opportunities – the example of the UNESCO biosphere Bliesgau, *European Countryside* 3(3), p.208-226.

Woods, M. 2011. [DERREG Project Executive Summary](#).

Woods, M. 2012. [DERREG Policy Brief](#)

Fact sheet #33: EDORA*European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas*

Funder	ESPO
Grant	€699,816
Timeframe	2008-2010
Coordinator & Country	University of the Highlands and Islands, Millennium Institute, United Kingdom
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural typologies; rural change; meta-narratives



The EDORA Cube – a 3 dimensional framework for analysis. Source: Copus et al. 2011b

Context

EDORA responded to the need to understand differences between different kinds of rural areas and what opportunities different rural areas have for development. It was also concerned with rural-urban interaction and how rural opportunities and interaction with urban areas can strengthen rural areas.

Results

EDORA identifies three ‘meta-narratives’ which group together ‘storylines’ of rural change. These are the agri-centric meta-narrative; the rural-urban meta-narrative and the meta-narrative of global competition and capitalist penetration. These help to group diverse drivers of rural change.

EDORA argued that generalising about rural areas should be underpinned by more nuanced typologies. The EDORA project developed more a multifaceted approach to categorising rural regions. EDORA presented three distinct typologies as a three-dimensional analysis framework and as a more evidence-based method of generalisation that works to capture rural difference based on the degree of rurality/accessibility, economic restructuring and performance.

Also emerging from EDORA was a new approach to rural policy termed ‘Rural Cohesion Policy’. This is not seen a radical shift but brings together recently emerging ideas, including territorial capital and urban-rural relationships. Rural Cohesion Policy is presented as a shift in thinking towards seeing rural region’s distinct and important role in the economy, rather than places that need protection.

Further information


All [EDORA project reports](#) available via the ESPON website

Copus, A. K. and de Lima, P. 2015. *Territorial Cohesion in Rural Europe: The Relational Turn in Rural Development*. Oxford: Routledge.

Copus, A. K., Shucksmith, M., Dax, T., Meredith, D. 2011a. [Cohesion Policy for rural areas after 2013. A rationale derived from the EDORA project](#) (European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas) – ESPON 2013 Project 2013/1/2. *Studies in Agricultural Economics*, 2, p. 121- 132.

Copus, A., Courtney, P., Dax, T., Meredith, D., Noguera, J., Talbot, H. and Shucksmith, M. 2011b. EDORA: European Development Opportunities for Rural Areas, Applied Research 2013/1/2 Final Report Parts A, B and C

Fact sheet #34: ETUDE*Enlarging the theoretical understanding of rural development*

Funder	FP6
Grant	€655,636
Timeframe	2007-2009
Coordinator & Country	Wageningen University, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Territorial capital; theory; sustainability


Context

ETUDE responded to the need for a more integrated approach to theorising and analysing rural development processes. This involved moving beyond looking at sectors in isolation such as farming and towards assessment of interactions across the rural economy (e.g. environmental issues, food supply chain beyond the farm-gate, farm diversification, forestry) to inform more integrated policy (van der Ploeg and Marsden, 2008).

Results

ETUDE developed the 'rural web' concept that provides a comprehensive framework to understand and assess the process of rural development. Rural webs are viewed as underlying and driving rural development. The rural web is a complex set of interrelationships both internally and externally generated in rural space. Case studies were carried out to test the framework to explore how different parts of the web interact, reinforce each other and impact the rural economy (van der Ploeg and Marsden, 2008).

The rural web is also discussed at a more abstract level in relation to different forms of resources or capital (ecological, economic, social, cultural and human) needed for rural development. It is suggested they can be summarised around the notion of 'territorial capital'.



The rural web. Source: Marsden, 2010, adapted from van der Ploeg and Marsden, 2008.

The rural web framework has also been applied beyond the academic domain. Messely et al. (2013) used it as a tool for structuring dialogue with the local community in two LEADER areas in Flanders to engage the community in Local Development Strategy (LDS) formulation.

Further information

Cordis, 2013. [ETUDE Factsheet and Results](#)


van der Ploeg, J.D and Marsden, T. eds. 2008. [Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development](#). Assen: Van Gorcum

Project completed in 2009, currently limited open access resources, some related academic publications:

Messely, N. Rogge, E. and Dessein, J. 2013. Using the rural web in dialogue with regional stakeholders. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, p.400-410.

Marsden, T. 2010. Mobilizing the regional eco-economy: evolving webs of agri-food and rural development in the UK. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3, p.225-244.

Fact sheet #35: FARO EU*Foresight analysis for rural areas of EU*

Funder	FP6
Grant	€743,333
Timeframe	2007-2009
Coordinator & Country	Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek, Wageningen UR, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural policy; Rural futures; rural ICT

Context

FARO EU responded to the lack of European-level knowledge, such as harmonised data across the EU, to help assess current and inform future rural development policy. The FARO EU project aimed to reduce uncertainties related to rural development policy and contribute to defining appropriate future policies focus by understanding key processes impacting rural development (Cordis, 2010).

Results

FARO EU emphasised the meaning of rurality varies depending on the context. The term rural has no single definition. The final policy workshop of FARO-EU emphasised the diversity of rural areas and the need for differentiated approaches to rural supports, recognising different needs and challenges.

FARO EU developed a rural typology based on geographic and socio-economic variables with two axes - economic density and accessibility (van Eupen et al., 2012).

FARO-EU highlighted the importance of scenarios as a policy tool, where they provide a range of narratives that can act as discussion tools for thinking about real and potential futures. FARO-EU also found challenges to overcome in the use of scenarios as a policy

tool because available models cannot adequately identify many issues and the relationships between them. It also recognises scenario modelling using indicators is challenging, given for example different governance structures across the EU.

The final policy workshop of FARO EU pointed to the importance of the development of ICT in rural areas linked to job creation and also career development such as using e-learning. It highlighted the non-agricultural economy as important for local development. In areas dependent on agriculture, it also emphasised the importance of economic diversification. In relation to deep rural areas building on their development potential, such as natural and tourism resources, can be hindered by lack of available capital and investment. Also on the other hand FARO EU noted that starting businesses in these areas can have cost advantages, as well as a range of supports available.

Further information[FARO EU website](#)


Cordis, 2010. [FARO EU Fact Sheet](#).

Project completed in 2009, currently limited open access resources, some academic publications:

Van Eupen, M., Metzger, M. J., Pérez-Soba, M., Verburg, P. H., Van Doorn, A., & Bunce, R.G.H. (2012). [A rural typology for strategic European policies](#). *Land Use Policy*, 29(3), p.473-482.

Hazeu, G. W., Metzger, M. J., Múcher, C. A., Perez-Soba, M., Renetzeder, C. H., & Andersen, E. (2011). [European environmental stratifications and typologies: an overview](#). *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 142(1-2), p.29-39.

Fact sheet #36: GLOBAL-RURAL*The Global Countryside: Rural Change and Development in Globalisation*

Funder	ERC
Grant	€ 2,263,107
Timeframe	2014-2019
Coordinator & Country	Aberystwyth University, Wales
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Globalisation; Migration; Rural change; Rural concept

Context

Globalisation has a pervasive influence in transforming rural economies and societies, with implications for the major societal challenges of environmental change and resource security. In comparison to studies of the global city, relatively little research has focused on the 'global countryside'. GLOBAL-RURAL addresses this gap.

Results

The GLOBAL-RURAL [storymaps](#) provide a series of interactive stories showing the impacts of and responses to globalisation in rural areas. Demonstrating the diverse range of ways globalisation connects with rural places and people, storymaps cover a range of themes including: civil society and social movements; economy and trade; land and capital; migration; tourism and culture. Specific stories are also diverse such as the tale of 'How Milk Went Global' to 'Neo-colonialism, land grabbing and rubber plantations in Liberia'. The impacts of globalisation differ greatly in rural areas, from larger impacts because of economic change and jobs losses to everyday impacts such as global consumption of certain goods.

GLOBAL-RURAL also adds to understanding around defining the rural highlighting the importance of the 'relational approach' that sees rural areas as connected to other places through social, economic and political

relations. Also it highlights the idea of rural places as 'complex assemblages' of different relations and networks. GLOBAL-RURAL also points to some 'myths' associated with rural and globalisation – that rural areas are less effected by globalisation; that rural areas benefit from globalisation and that rural areas are victims of globalisation. Generalisation is not accurate and globalisation has different impacts in different rural places:

"...the outcomes of globalisation are not predetermined. With each change there are multiple possible futures that could result, depending on the actions of local and non-local agents and the constraining influence of geography, history and culture. Accordingly, effective rural community responses to globalisation require an awareness of a place's translocal connections, identification of vulnerabilities and opportunities, assessment of possible futures and the mobilisation of the right components and connections to achieve a desired outcome" (Cordis, 2020).

GLOBAL-RURAL demonstrates the impact of globalisation on rural migration patterns where places not usually experiencing inward migration can experience this trend. Also following from can be the issue of limited support structures for new migrants (Woods, 2018).

Further information


[GLOBAL-RURAL website](#)

[GLOBAL-RURAL Storymaps](#)

Cordis, 2020. [GLOBAL-RURAL Fact Sheet](#).

Woods, M., 2018. Precarious rural cosmopolitanism: Negotiating globalization, migration and diversity in Irish small towns. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64, p.164-176.

Fact sheet #37: NEWRUR*Urban pressure on rural areas - mutations and dynamics of periurban rural processes*

Funder	FP5
Grant	€1,039,647
Timeframe	2000-2004
Coordinator & Country	Centre National du Machinisme Agricole, du Genie Rural, des Eaux et des Forets, France.
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural-urban interaction; peri-urban areas; sustainable development

Context

The NEWRUR project was concerned with the interdependence of rural and urban spaces. It sees a need for context-tailored planning policies in rural areas that are considered 'peri-urban'. Broadly speaking, peri-urban areas can be associated with commuter belts and areas beyond suburban zones. NEWRUR also looked at peri-urban development framed in the context of sustainable development.

Results

NEWRUR observes that 'periurbanisation' can be defined differently and is a process identified/discussed to different degrees across Europe. There are also other related concepts associated with periurbanisation, such as 'rurbanisation' and 'suburbanisation'. For NEWRUR the process of periurbanisation was understood as the integration of rural areas into the complex city-region system that includes functional "inter-relationships between city centres, urban sub-centres and peripheries" (Kraemer et al., 2004, p. 7).

Based on research in four countries, NEWRUR finds similarities, but also major differences between peri-urban areas. Similarities included a commuting trend where place of work and residence tended to be in separate areas (urban and peri-urban), showing their economic interconnections. Peri-urban areas

tended to have lower-cost housing attracting young households, but also experienced increasing pressure on house prices. More broadly, economic and cultural change was identified with declining role of agriculture in these regions (Kraemer et al., 2004).

Governance issues emerged as a key importance difference. In some areas local government was small and cooperation between relevant authorities weak. Another critical difference highlighted was the degree to which the planning system was centralised or decentralised and how this impacted the effectiveness of land use planning. Funding shortages can also impact the sale of agricultural land for development (Kraemer et al. 2004).

"Land-use change and its regulation are a major issue for policy-makers and planners in periurban areas; urban pressure and local answers on how to deal with it leads to different development paths that are clearly visible in changing land-use patterns" (Kraemer et al. 2004, p. 11).

Further information


Cordis, 2005. [NEWRUR Fact Sheet](#).

Bertrand N. and Kreibich, V. eds. 2006. *Europe's City-Regions Competitiveness: Growth Regulation and Peri-Urban Land Management*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

Project completed in 2009, currently limited open access resources but main summary report below:

Kraemer, C., Kreibich, V., Bertrand, N., Hoggart, K. and Entrena, F. eds. 2004. [Urban Pressure on Rural Areas: Major Findings. NEWRUR – 5° FPRD – 2001-2004](#)

Fact sheet #38: PURR*Potential of Rural Regions*

Funder	ESPON
Grant	€209,605
Timeframe	2010-2012
Coordinator & Country	Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, Norway
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural potentials; territorial capital; local knowledge

Context

Peripheral rural regions face development challenges and innovative approaches are called for. PURR worked to develop and test ways to assess the potential of rural regions, such as the potential held within territorial assets, as well as ways to realise that potential.

“The concept of rural potential is used for describing desirable regional development perspectives in a rural region. The rural potential depends on which features the region possesses, and how these features can be utilised” (Adams et al., 2012, p.11).

PURR was also conceived around the idea of using existing data to assess rural potentials, such as that generated by ESPON, or by stakeholders at the regional level.

Results

PURR developed a generic method to assess rural potential using existing data, but also a stakeholder-focused method that enables local knowledge to be part of assessment of rural potential.

The stakeholder-focused assessment is built around three themes of people (human capital resources), place (natural resources, landscape

and territorial geographies) and power (governance and institutional assets).

Combining both methods as a two-stage process is understood to provide a way to combine both a more ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ perspective in assessment of rural potential.

A key observation emerging from PURR was the how pairing of local stakeholder insights with broader frameworks of analysis are important to assess rural potentials.


“...assessments of rural potentials cannot be made without inputs from local actors (stakeholders). They know their region...local actors are also the ones that have to make the strategies and plans into which the rural potential assessments are to be applied. On the other hand, these assessments cannot be made without a methodological framework or insights into the broader perspective” (Adams et al., 2012, p.10).

Territorial assets have both hard/tangible and soft/intangible aspects, with the intangible aspects understood as hard to measure. PURR suggests its assessment method also provides a way to help identify and assess intangible assets.

Further information[PURR Project Documents](#)

Adams, N., Bjørnsen, H.M., Jansone, D., Johansen, D., Pinch, P., Valtensbergs, V. 2012. [PURR: Potentials of Rural Regions. Final Report.](#)

Fact sheet #39: RUFUS*Rural Future Networks*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€1,399,331
Timeframe	2008-2011
Coordinator & Country	Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Integrated development, rural diversity; policy

Context

RUFUS emerges in the context of the shifting focus of the CAP away from a central focus on agriculture to a broader rural development agenda. This sees the connections between CAP and other policies grow. RUFUS was concerned with understanding how different policies can complement each other as well as come to conflict. The project also looked to build knowledge for future policy to become more integrated and synchronised (Cordis, 2013; 2019).

Results

RUFUS evidence suggested the need for more regional policy intervention in terms of specific programmes and also their delivery methods as well as greater levels of integration between policies. This recommendation emerges from a core observation emerging from the project - that factors driving change impact different regions differently.

RUFUS also looked at the interplay between different policies at different levels. Policy at different levels could come into conflict and impact outcomes.

Policy recommendations emerging from RUFUS suggested action on three levels – strategic, programmatic and delivery mechanism level.

Strategic level action is concerned with how the EU can facilitate the integration of policies at EU and national levels. Within this, it is suggested a common EU development policy along with guidelines and vision would help to drive greater policy integration. More generally, innovative and integrated approaches as well as approaches that facilitate local cooperation are suggested.

At the programmatic level the recommendation centres on a Council Regulation with provisions for integrated policy approaches. It also acknowledges that integrated approaches come with risk in terms of chances of failure, but also when effective benefits are likely greater.

The recommendation at the delivery mechanism level is to enable financial engineering for regional budgets and revolving funds.

RUFUS also emphasised the diversity of EU regions and the importance of local level support (Cordis, 2013).

“The diversity of regions should be seen as advantage and asset. All levels of provision of technical assistance to build up solutions should be exchanged between regions of the same type...In addition, the EC will put a higher emphasis on valorisation of regional diversity and endogenous potentials based on typologies” (Cordis, 2013).


Further information

Cordis, 2019. [RUFUS Fact Sheet](#).

Cordis, 2013. [RUFUS Final Summary Report](#).

Fact sheet #40: RURALJOBS

New sources of employment to promote the wealth-generating capacity of rural communities

Funder	FP7
Grant	€1,197,104
Timeframe	2008-2010
Coordinator & Country	Debreceni Egyetem, Hungary
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Job creation; rural economy; policy

Context

RURALJOBS assessed the employment potential and needs in different types of rural areas. It also focused on policy assessment in terms of how policy currently addresses these needs and potentials generating knowledge for future policy (Cordis, 2019).

Results

Based on key findings emerging from RURALJOBS comparing trends in urban and rural regions it identifies more positive development patterns in urban areas, such as relating to employment, income and education levels (Cordis, 2013).

RURALJOBS also conducted a foresight exercise. It suggests the attractiveness of a local rural area is critical factor impacting development. The aspect of quality of life was particularly highlighted and assessed based on GDP per capita levels compared to the EU-27. Also related to higher quality of life were better business demographics (Cordis, 2013).

RURALJOBS assessed demographic patterns in rural areas and found population decline, with natural population changes adding to this issue in rural areas. Encouraging immigration is a potentially helpful measure but RURALJOBS suggests this is unlikely to compensate for the pattern of decline (Cordis, 2013).

In the final report, RURALJOBS identifies five 'Strategic Orientations' for rural job creation based on the capabilities of the rural areas studied. The general 'top level' recommendations were: encouraging the development of key growth sectors; reinforcing the local economy; improve skills and labour market participation; develop infrastructure and services and finally enable strategic planning and support actions to facilitate this. Also underpinning this approach to rural job creation is harnessing and unlocking the value held in natural capital and renewable resources.

The rural diversity factor is also central in the policy findings emerging from RURALJOBS. The project highlights:

"The necessity to adjust rural development policies to the particular characteristics of each territory in order to get the perfect adaptation of the offer of programs to the real necessities of each area" (RURALJOBS, 2010, p.30).

RURALJOBS evidence also generally pointed to the need for diversification of the rural economy beyond traditional sectors to generate new employment.


Further information

Cordis, 2019. [RURALJOBS Fact Sheet](#)

Cordis, 2013. [RURALJOBS Final Report Summary](#)

RURALJOBS, 2010. [Final Report](#)

Fact sheet #41: BUILDING RURBAN RELA*Building new relationships in rural areas under urban pressure*

Funder	FP5
Grant	€849,729
Timeframe	2002-2005
Coordinator & Country	Agricultural Economics Research Institute, The Netherlands
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural-urban interaction; governance; territorial sustainability

Context

BUILDING RURBAN RELA (or RURBAN) explored how to build new relationships between rural and urban areas to better integrate demand and supply of rural goods and services (RGS). It also explored drivers influencing rural areas under urban pressure and their positive and negative influences. RGS are diverse. They can include for example first and second houses, or tourism and gastronomy. RURBAN focused mainly on two types of areas – those in metropolitan surrounding areas and more predominantly rural areas but with a tourist economy (Cordis, 2005; Overbeek and Terluin, 2006). ‘Urban pressure’, a key concept of RURBAN, is found experienced differently.

“In the RURBAN project, the concept of ‘urban pressure’ is used to denote the pressure of new residents, new economic activities, new transport infrastructure and tourists on rural landscapes” (Overbeek and Terluin, 2006, p. 230).

Results

RURBAN also engaged with the concept of rural newcomers and rural-urban relationships. Observations show movement between these spaces is not always permanent and reasons for movement differ between generations and social groups. Case studies show that the revitalisation of rural places (e.g. through

festivals, vineyards) can renew their ‘attractiveness’.

In the case study context, RURBAN also points to the importance of innovative institutions and policies in the creation of sustainable RGS. This also links to governance that enables effective representation of actors. In the context of in metropolitan surrounding areas, to ensure sustainable RGS supply and demand an integrated territorial approach is important (e.g. clear land use planning balancing areas such as agriculture, housing and recreation uses).

In more predominantly rural areas with a tourism economy, a key finding of RURBAN is the idea of ‘commodification without destruction’ as an important part of RGS supply and demand. For example while tourists and second home-owners are temporary residents in rural areas, their presence also leads to jobs and income generation. A sustainable balance is important as part of supply and demand of RGS in these areas to avoid ‘destruction’ (Cordis, 2005; Overbeek and Terluin, 2006).

RURBAN also adds to our understanding of the nature of rural space. The rural relationship with urban space can be important when defining what is rural.


Further information

Cordis, 2005. [RURBAN Fact Sheet and Results](#).

Full results of case studies in Finland, France, Hungary, The Netherlands and Spain, alongside comparative analysis available from:

Overbeek G. and Terluin, I. eds. 2006. [Rural areas under urban pressure, Case studies of rural-urban relationships across Europe](#).

Fact sheet #42: RURITAGE*Rural regeneration through systemic heritage-led strategies*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€9,975,651.25
Timeframe	2018-2022 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Alma mater studiorum, University of Bologna, Italy
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Rural regeneration; heritage; innovation

Context

Heritage can be a resource stimulating innovation and regeneration in rural areas. RURITAGE is concerned with the role of heritage in rural regeneration. It aims to support social and economic development of rural areas through the sustainable improvement and maintenance of local heritage. In doing this, the project is focused on six 'innovation action' areas: pilgrimage, resilience, sustainable local food production, integrated landscape management, migration and festivals/the arts. RURITAGE builds knowledge of heritage-led rural regeneration, but is also focused on policy action. It works to develop and implement a series of regeneration plans at local level, while also seeking to impact regional and national policies.

Results

RURITAGE activities are focused in 38 areas across 14 countries. Areas are classed either as '[role models](#)' or '[replicators](#)'. Role models are areas that have already achieved successful regeneration through cultural and natural heritage in the RURITAGE six systemic innovation areas. Replicators are areas that can learn from the role models. The good practices and experiences can help to inform local regeneration plans in replicator areas.

Analysis of role models has led to a [repository of practices](#) and also an [inventory of lessons learned](#). The lessons learned look across the practices identified and analyse cross cutting issues. The range of considerations for replication of these regeneration practices is made clear by the identification of 70 common lessons. [Baseline assessment](#) of replicator areas has also been conducted which helps to understand these contexts in preparation for future work.

RURITAGE also develops a novel approach to mapping rural landscapes linking cultural and natural characteristics. The RURITAGE ATLAS will bring together maps, pictures, data and information in an interactive format. This forms part of the [RURITAGE Resources Ecosystem](#) that brings together the innovative tools developed within RURITAGE. This will include the RURITAGE replication toolkit that includes a practices repository, inventory of lessons learned, serious games kit and step-by-step replication guide to help support heritage-led regeneration.

Further information[RURITAGE website](#)


CORDIS, 2020. [RURITAGE Fact Sheet](#).

[RURITAGE publications](#) currently available include:

Egusquiza, A, Gandini, A., Zubiaga, M. and de Luca, C. 2019. [D1.1. RURITAGE practices repository](#).

Egusquiza, A, Gandini, A., Zubiaga, M. 2019. [D1.2. RURITAGE Inventory of Lessons Learned](#).

Fact sheet #43: RUSDELA*Rural Sustainable Development for Local Actors*

Funder	Erasmus+
Grant	€137,709
Timeframe	2016-2018
Coordinator & Country	Pro-Cserehát , Hungary
	Main theme: Rural Development Other themes: Sustainable development; agroecology; resilience

Context

RUSDELA aims to promote how local actors can be drivers of rural sustainable development. It focuses on providing relevant information for local decision makers supporting delivery of global frameworks such as sustainable development goals (SDGs). It responds to the need for more tools to support rural sustainability, for example to support green rural towns and villages as compared to urban approaches such as 'green cities'.

RUSDELA recognises that information on sustainability can be accessible, however can also be fragmented and lacking practical focus, which the project seeks to address.

"Bringing both theoretical and practical knowledge about sustainable development directly to the working sphere of rural communities, local municipalities will accelerate the local usage of sustainable practices" (RUSDELA toolkit, Foreword).

Results

Designed with a focus on rural European settings, RUSDELA developed a theoretical and practical toolkit to support implementation of sustainable development in rural contexts. It provides information, but is also intended to provide practical tools supporting change aligned with rural sustainable development.

The toolkit is targeted towards a range of rural 'change-makers' from civil society to government actors who may engage with the concept of sustainable development in their work with rural and peripheral communities.

The RUSDELA toolkit has four key sections: rural development; agroecology; connections; and resilience and change. These sections can also be considered as toolkits in their own right focusing on these specific themes in relation to rural sustainable development. The toolkit also explores national realities from different European contexts in Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Hungary and Bulgaria.

The RUSDELA toolkit is also designed to include tools that can be used in different phases of local work. Community Assessment tools provide ways that communities can reflect and evaluate, such as the FOSET Process and SDG Community Implementation Flashcards. The Engagement and Training tools aim to assist with building connections and relationships within communities to enhance capacity for change with methods such as meta-networking and community councils outlined. Another set of tools is focused on Design and Planning for the future and incorporates co-creation techniques.


Further information

[RUSDELA website](#)

[RUSDELA Toolkit](#)

Fact sheet #44: DIVERCITIES

Governing Urban Diversity: Creating Social Cohesion, Social Mobility and Economic Performance in Today's Hyper-diversified Cities

Funder	FP7
Grant	€6,498,828.50
Timeframe	2013-2017
Coordinator & Country	Universiteit Utrecht, The Netherlands
	<p>Main theme: Economic and Social cohesion</p> <p>Other themes: Diversity; social cohesion; economic performance; governance</p>

Context

DIVERCITIES views social cohesion and diversity as interconnected with the liveability and economic performance of cities. While not focused on rural contexts, DIVERCITIES has potential learnings for rural regeneration. Diversity has potential positive added-value and can support for example social and cultural vibrancy, but can also lead to economic benefits. DIVERCITIES also distinguishes the notion of 'hyperdiversity as "an intense diversification of the population, not only in socio-economic, social and ethnic terms, but also with respect to lifestyles, attitudes and activities" (DIVERCITIES, 2019). Potentially hyperdiversity can contribute to further regeneration and development benefits. DIVERCITIES research is potentially interesting from the newcomer to place perspective. This is an important topic for rural regeneration and generational renewal. The project also focused on gender issues.

Results

DIVERCITIES carried out research on diversity in highly diverse urban districts. This included analysis of innovative policy instruments and governance arrangements that view diversity in a more positive way. Reports have been produced based on the researched cities, such as for London, Zurich, Budapest and Copenhagen. The project also produced a [Handbook for Governing Hyper-diverse Cities](#).

DIVERCITIES also draws together insights from the project for policy-makers and civil society actors. It assesses a number of areas such as social mobility, economic performance and entrepreneurship:

"Local governments and civil society organisations should reflect on the potential of diversity for entrepreneurship and the economic performance of the neighbourhood economy. This requires the building of trust between people with various backgrounds through prodiversity and anti-discrimination policies. Economic policies should be complemented with social inclusion policies that eliminate prejudices" (Oosterlynck et al., 2016, p.55).

DIVERCITIES also assesses diversity in the context of entrepreneurship. [Policy brief 5](#) argues that with diversity also comes opportunities for diverse forms of entrepreneurship and this can support economic regeneration. Research in diverse and deprived urban community contexts shows enterprise diversity in place also has social benefits by attracting a range of people and creating new services (Eraydin, 2016).

Further information

Range of resources such as reports and policy briefs available on the [DIVERCITIES](#) website.


Cordis, 2019. [DIVERCITIES Fact Sheet and Results](#).

DIVERCITIES, 2019. [About DIVERCITIES](#).

Eraydin, A., 2016. [Policy Brief 5: Diversity in Entrepreneurship](#).

Oosterlynck, S., Verschraegen, G., Dierckx, D. Albeda, Y. and Saey, A. 2016. [Cross-evaluation report: Policy and governance implications of the DIVERCITIES research on governing urban diversity](#)

Fact sheet #45: IMAJINE*Integrated Mechanisms for Addressing Spatial Justice and Territorial Inequalities in Europe*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€4,768,397.50
Timeframe	2017-2021 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Aberystwyth University, UK
	<p>Main theme: Economic and Social Cohesion</p> <p>Other themes: Spatial justice; territorial cohesion; regional development</p>

Context

IMAJINE responds to evidence that spatial inequalities within the EU are increasing, contrary to the principle of territorial cohesion embedded as a third dimension of the European Social Model in the Treaty of Lisbon. It is also particularly timely in examining the geographically differentiated impacts of the post-2008 economic crisis and the adoption of austerity policies.

The particular focus on the regional level means that IMAJINE incorporates both rural and urban-based issues, circumstances and concerns. There is a growing consensus for the need to re-examine policies for social cohesion and regional development.

The project takes a uniquely inter-disciplinary approach to studying regional inequalities, combining the expertise of economists, geographers, planners, political scientists and sociologists working both on European-level analysis and detailed case studies in 11 countries.

Results

One of the key components of IMAJINE is the inclusion of a participatory scenario-building component with the intention of not just testing results of preceding work packages but establishing the extent to which the evidence resonates with policy-makers and other

stakeholders. This is in an effort to highlight possible alternative approaches to dealing with the challenges of spatial injustice. As such, it will be challenging existing governance perspectives and promoting alternative ones.

Other elements of IMAJINE include analysis of socio-economic statistics on inequalities and an online survey to explore public perceptions of regional inequalities and cohesion policies. It will also investigate the connections between regional inequalities and migration, and regional inequalities and movements for political autonomy. It is conducting research on how governments use the distribution of public services and resources to address inequalities.

“A spatial justice approach begins with the recognition that the organization of space is a crucial aspect of human societies that reflects social facts and influences social relations. Consequently, both justice and injustice become visible in space. Therefore, an analysis of the interactions between space and society is necessary to understand social injustices and to formulate the territorial policies aimed at tackling them” (Wreckroth and Moio, 2018, p.5).

Further information

[IMAJINE website](#)


[IMAJINE project infographic](#)

Deliverables currently available are [here](#)

Wider project publications and presentations are available [here](#)

Weckroth, M., and Moio, S. 2018. D1.3 Glossary of some of the key terms/concepts related to IMAJINE

Fact sheet #46: MIGRARE*Impacts of Refugee Flows to Territorial Development in Europe*

Funder	ESPO
Grant	€800,000
Timeframe	2018-2019
Coordinator & Country	Valdani Vicari and Associati Europe, Italy
	Main theme: Economic and Social Cohesion Other themes: Refugees and asylum seekers inflows; integration

Context

MIGRARE analysed trends and territorial impacts of refugees and asylum seekers inflows from non-European third countries. It examined how different European regions and cities (located in arrival, transit and destination countries) respond to needs. It assessed the skills and qualifications that refugees have and how the influx of refugees affects regional and local labour markets and demographic imbalances in host countries. MIGRARE also examined the main challenges, good policy responses and best practices for the successful integration of refugees into local communities, societies and labour markets at the regional and local levels.

Results

MIGRARE created different regional typologies to assess the absorption and inclusion capacity of refugees and asylum seekers by European territories. While MIGRARE's focus was not on rural or peripheral areas, some of these typologies deal also with different rural areas. Case studies in different types of regions also assessed how effective territories are at supporting asylum seekers and refugees and individual reports are available with the results.

The Social Progress Index (SPI) is used by MIGRARE to estimate the potential effectiveness of territories in supporting

asylum seekers and refugees through active social policies. The insight provided by the index provides an indication of the quality of support potentially available to assist refugees and asylum seekers. Through case studies, the results found in the index were further investigated and this included analysis in some rural areas.

The results show that the response capacity of territories differs. But also arrival regions particularly experienced challenges to deal effectively with inclusion. MIGRARE identified the main challenges of integration, but also identified good practice policy that can support successful integration (Hausemer et al., eds. 2019a). MIGRARE also developed policy guidelines to help support more effective local and regional level policy (Hausemer et al., eds. 2019b).

Further information

Resources emerging from MIGRARE, such as reports, and case studies, are available via the [ESPO MIGRARE](#) webpage.


Such as:

Hausemer et al. eds. 2019a. MIGRARE Executive Summary.

Hausemer et al. eds. 2019b. MIGRARE Guidelines for local and regional policy makers to practically support the integration and inclusion of asylum seekers and refugees.

Hausemer et al. eds. 2019c. MIGRARE Synthesis Report.

Fact sheet #47: RELOCAL*Resituating the local in cohesion and territorial development*

Funder	H2020
Grant	€ 4,885,750
Timeframe	2016-2020 (ongoing)
Coordinator & Country	Itä-Suomen yliopisto, Finland
	Main theme: Economic and Social Cohesion Other themes: Spatial justice; territorial cohesion

Context

Challenges exist to the European policy goal of achieving more balanced spatial development and territorial, social and economic cohesion. RELOCAL works to build understanding of issues of inequality. This knowledge base can support the development of more effective policy that can work to achieve European socio-economic cohesion.

Results

RELOCAL research is focused on case studies in 33 varied local contexts, such as rural and urban, as well as disadvantaged and better-off contexts. Case studied are grouped around themes covering: stronger urban-rural partnerships; regional economic development strategies; upgrading European neighbourhoods and smarter territorial governance. RELOCAL takes a comparative case study approach and assesses using comparison how local places achieve various local needs.

RELOCAL argues that the level at which analysis of regional inequality occurs does show large income variations but also does not reveal local level differences. It emphasises the need for analysis at different spatial scales. RELOCAL has mapped inequality in a number of regions at different scales, including lower levels (Janssen and Van Ham, 2018).

RELOCAL also provides observations related to governance and case studies have focused on contexts where there is experimental governance and institutional learning. It finds this process of shifting formal modes of governance to be challenging and also a long term process of change. While interestingly, it makes finds differences when it comes to changes related to informal governance practices:

“Shifting informal practices, however, can be a faster and highly effective way of creating new governance tools. Institutional learning of course differs greatly from locale to locale. It can, for example, take the form of voluntarism, governance partnerships and a combination of both” (RELOCAL, 2019, p.1).

Other resources emerging from RELOCAL include policy briefs and a [virtual library](#) of literature on issues around spatial justice and territorial cohesion.

Further information

Cordis, 2019. [RELOCAL Fact Sheet and Results](#)

Range of reports available via the [RELOCAL website](#)

Such as:


Janssen, H. J. and Van Ham, M. 2018. D5.2 [Report on multi-scalar patterns of inequalities. H2020 project RELOCAL – Resituating the Local in Cohesion and Territorial Development.](#)

RELOCAL, 2018. [Policy Brief No.1 - The Role of the Local in Improving Cohesion and Spatial Justice: integrating place-based with top-down approaches to local development.](#)

RELOCAL, 2019. [Policy Brief No.2 - Local Experiences in Achieving Cohesion and Spatial Justice.](#)

Fact sheet #48: SELMA

Spatial deconcentration of economic land use and quality of life in European metropolitan areas

Funder	FP5
Grant	€1,588,935
Timeframe	2002-2006
Coordinator & Country	Utrecht University, The Netherlands
	<p>Main theme: Economic and Social Cohesion</p> <p>Other themes: Urban sprawl; land use; quality of life; rural-urban interaction</p>

Context

SELMA was concerned with understanding and designing strategies for urban planning and management that promoted quality of life as opposed to prioritisation of the economy. It was concerned with different aspects of quality of life as part of the analysis - socio-economic, environmental and resource dimensions. (Cordis, 2005).

The process of 'deconcentration' and how it can be managed to benefit society was also central to the SELMA project. This is not just related to housing moving out to suburban areas, but deconcentration is understood as when: "employment density in the centre is declining, and activities that generate jobs are increasing on the fringes" (Montanari et al., 2006).

While focused in the urban context, SELMA helps to explain the interconnections between urban areas and surrounding areas, which is potentially interesting in relation to rural regeneration.

Results

The SELMA project focused on 14 European cities examining outward diffusion of business and commercial developments and their impact on quality of life. The project produced a simulation model for management of urban

development in three major cities, while contributing guidance on policy for the others.

SELMA found that market forces are the single greatest driver of commercial land use extending into European the outer boundaries of cities. However, SELMA also found that European cities do not display clear uniformity in how such processes emerge. Instead, cultural and historical relationships within European metropolitan regions inform and shape the creation and management of urban development strategies (Montanari and Staniscia, 2006).

SELMA identified some surprising results in relation to the impact of policy on deconcentration. For example in the Italian context studied, it found a lack of policy related to curbing urban sprawl, but little effects of this around cities (Montanari et al., 2006) SELMA did identify good practices, for example Copenhagen and its planning approach that is underpinned by accessibility is one example.

Further information


Project completed in 2006, but some publications emerging from SELMA available via [ResearchGate](#)

Cordis, 2005. [SELMA Fact sheet.](#)

Montanari, A., and Staniscia, S. 2006. Types of economic deconcentration in European urban space. Magnitude, physical form, sectoral composition and governance context. *Die Erde*. 137 (1-2), p. 135- 153.

Montanari, A., Staniscia, B. and Di Zio, S. 2006. [European Project \(FP5\) on spatial deconcentration of economic land use and quality of life in European Metropolitan Areas.](#)

Fact sheet #49: TENLAW*Tenancy Law and Housing Policy in Multi-level Europe*

Funder	FP7
Grant	€2,692,526.45
Timeframe	2012-2015
Coordinator & Country	Universität Bremen, Germany
	<p>Main theme: Economic and Social Cohesion</p> <p>Other themes: Housing law, tenants, social cohesion, affordable housing, right to housing</p>

Context

Tenant housing is important in a European context with one third of European citizens depending on it. However, the rights of tenants differ widely throughout Europe. TENLAW addressed a gap in understanding relating to tenant rights and housing law. There are potential strong learnings from TENLAW in the context of access to land for farming and rural regeneration.

Results

TENLAW carried out in-depth analysis of all legal systems of tenancy law in [all EU member states](#), with comparisons also made between the legal systems (see Schmid, 2015).

Tenancy law is not about protecting the rights of tenants versus that of landlords, or about protecting the rights of landlords versus that of tenants, but about finding a structure of relationships that is beneficial to both. The TENLAW analysis shows that in some legal contexts the system is less beneficial for both landlord and tenant. Better governance structures can be beneficial for many relevant actors for urban regeneration.

TENLAW results show large differences between the rights tenants have. Four main types are found to exist. The first is no legal protection based on tenancy law, but only based on the right to home based on the

European convention on human rights. The second is short-term (typically 6 months) contract structured as a business deal, providing no security of tenure beyond this period. The third is longer-term rental contracts providing certain windows of opportunity to modify rights, but with an end date. The fourth is protected tenants that have security of tenure. Here landlords in practice have a duty to provide suitable alternative accommodation in case they want to use the properties for another purpose (Korthals Altes, 2016).

TENLAW results also put forward some principles for the development of tenancy law and good tenancy regulations (Schmid, 2015).

TENLAW also focused on providing information for citizens on tenant rights producing an information leaflet for all Member States '[My rights as tenant in Europe](#)' (Schmid and Dinse, 2014).

Further information

Range of reports and resources, including country-specific reports, available via the [TENLAW website](#)

Such as:


Schmid, C.U. and J.R. Dinse. 2014. [My Rights as Tenant in Europe: The compiled national Tenant's Rights Brochures from the Tenlaw Project](#) Zentrum für Europäische Rechtspolitik. Bremen: Universität Bremen.

Schmid, C. U. 2015. [Towards a European Role in Tenancy Law and Housing Policy?](#) Bremen: Universität Bremen.

Wider publications:

Korthals Altes, W.K. 2016. [Forced relocation and tenancy law in Europe](#), *Cities*, 52, p. 79-85

Fact sheet #50: YUTRENDS*Youth Unemployment: Territorial Trends and Regional Resilience*

Funder	ESPO
Grant	€499,000
Timeframe	2017 -2019
Coordinator & Country	ICON-INITIUT Public Sector GmbH, Germany
	<p>Main theme: Economic and Social cohesion</p> <p>Other themes: Youth; Unemployment; Migration; Regional resilience.</p>


Context

YUTRENDS identifies territorial patterns and trends of youth unemployment and migration across European regions and cities. It provides a review of causes and consequences of youth unemployment and the factors that appear to strengthen a region's resilience to youth unemployment.

Results

Preliminary findings of the YUTRENDS project (draft final report – Pop et al. 2019) suggest the transition from education to employment is an important period meriting attention when dealing with the question of youth unemployment. It is also however a complex issue to address. If the transition from education to work does not happen effectively, it can have wider impacts. Evidence reviewed by YUTRENDS finds this can impact gaining future work because of unemployment periods when starting into employment. It can also limit chances to develop work-based skills. It may also lead to a move into further education that still does not match labour market needs.

Youth unemployment also has wider regional impact, potentially creating a social exclusion effect and associated social problems. Relating to the regional economy the ineffective transition from education to work is also presented as a wasted opportunity not harnessing young people's potential (Pop et al. 2019).



Consequences for individuals and society of youth unemployment. Source: Pop et al., 2019

An important policy and governance finding is that effective measures to deal with youth unemployment ideally should see different actors collaborate to deliver tailored interventions. The Polish YUTRENDS case study for example identifies a range of regional and local collaboration partners working together to deliver the 'Youth Guarantee'. Employers are also a key collaboration partner, often at the centre of implementation of measures. In addition, there is a need for room for manoeuvre within policy measures so implementation can be tailored to regional needs (Pop, 2019; Pop et al., 2019).

Further information[YUTRENDS on the ESPON website](#)

Pop, A. 2019. [Key Results from the ESPON YUTRENDS Research. Presentation at the Regions and Cities European Week, 7-10 October.](#)

Pop, A., Kotzamanis, B., Muller, E., McGrath, J., Walsh, K., Peters, M., Girejko, R., Dietrich, C. 2019. [YUTRENDS – Youth unemployment: Territorial trends and regional resilience. Draft Final Report.](#)