

POLICY LEARNING SYNTHESIS REPORT



Comhairle Contae Thiobraid Árann
Tipperary County Council



provincie HOLLAND
ZUID

SUMMARIZING THE EXPERIENCES OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING

This document is a synthesis report of the policy learning in the Sustainable heritage management of Waterway REgions (SWARE) project. The project deals with the management of natural and cultural heritage along inland waterways and regions adjacent to these waterways and is supported by the INTERREG Europe programme. In total six (6) partners of five (5) different European countries participate in the project. The project has a continued focus on three subthemes:

- (1) Governance;
- (2) Connecting infrastructure with tourism and heritage;
- (3) Marketing, PR and development of destinations.

Within the SWARE project life cycle, two phases have been planned. That of Interregional knowledge transfer (from April 2016 – September 2018) and that of the Implementation and monitoring of actions through Regional Action Plans (from October 2018 – September 2020).

In relation to the interregional knowledge exchange, the SWARE project's methodology also has a sharp focus on a cross-sectoral approach.

This document, as stated in the Application Form, summarizes the experiences during the first 2,5 years of interregional knowledge transfer and evaluates the good practice exchange methods and processes. Therefore, this document focuses on all the *contact-moments* (in person and on-line) between partners (which contributed to the exchange), outside communication and regional knowledge transfer.

Knowledge transfer through partner meetings

- I. Kick-Off meeting (18th and 19th of May 2016)
- II. Launching conference (21st of September 2016)
- III. Thematic Working Group meeting (22nd of September 2016)
 - a. *Method: Interactive training on Stakeholder involvement*
 - b. *Method: Joint methodology for Regional Roadmaps*
 - c. *Method: Methodology of State of Art (analysis)*
- IV. Thematic Working Group meeting (2nd of March 2017)
 - a. *Method: Guidelines on good practice transfer*
 - b. *Method: Methodology and match-making KES*
 - c. *Method: Menu of Good practices*
- V. Online Thematic Working Group Meeting (20th of March 2017)
- VI. Interregional Exchange Sessions (3 in total)
 - a. *Method: Visit GP (walkshops)*



- b. *Method: Workshops (different forms)*
 - c. *Method: Casus discussions*
- VII. Thematic Working Group meeting (14th of November 2017)
 - a. *Method: Recommendation paper and interactive training on action planning*
 - b. *Method: Walt Disney Method*
- VIII. Online Thematic Working Group meeting (8th of February 2018)
- IX. Thematic Working Group meeting (24th of May 2018)
 - a. *Method: Joint interactive problem solving*
 - b. *Method: Cross reading exercise*
 - c. *Method: Self-Analysis tool*
 - d. *Method: Joint interactive discussion on Policy Recommendations*
- X. Thematic Working Group meeting (20th of September 2018)

Knowledge transfer in partner regions

- I. SIG meetings
 - a. *Method (SIG roadmaps)*
- II. Synergy sessions

Partners had different roles and responsibilities during the project, but always worked in cooperation with each other. **Tipperary County Council** was responsible for the stakeholder training and the organization of KESI. **Pons Danubii EGTC** was responsible for the analysis drafting/state of the art guidelines. **Metropolitan City of Milan** was responsible for the process of action plan drafting and the organization of KESII. **Vidzeme Planning Region** was responsible for the project communication. **Association Regio Water** was responsible for the good practice transfer process. **The Province of Zuid-Holland** was a supporting partner and responsible for the organization of KESIII.

Within the SWARE project, communication guidelines have been drafted at an early stage to ensure the communication goals to be reached. The communication outputs stimulate the knowledge transfer within the participating partner organizations, to regional stakeholders and to interested people in the project (locally, regionally and interregionally). Communication has been an integral part of the overall implementation methodology to ensure strong coherence between thematic and communication actions.

Knowledge transfer through communication activities

- I. Regular updates of the project's website
- II. Interactive presentations
- III. Regular newsletter

Altogether **29** documents (joint methodologies and guidelines, good practice manual, summary reports, state of arts etc.) drafted during the project's lifetime and partners' experiences (through questionnaire and interactive discussion during the 5th TWG) will serve as an input for summarizing the above mentioned knowledge transfer and evaluation of described methods. Thus this document is solely based on the information provided and created by the partners.

GENERAL AND COMMUNICATION

General activities

During the start-up phase of the project, two (2) project meetings had a central role, namely:

- (1) Kick-Off meeting;
- (2) Launching conference.

The Kick-Off meeting served as a start of the project for the project team and the implementation processes. The Kick-off meeting was rated with a **9,0**. During the Kick-Off meeting the rules of procedures of the Thematic Working Group were discussed and approved and preparation for the launching conference was started.

The Launching conference, organized by **Association Regio Water** in Zuid-Holland, was used as a dissemination event to stakeholders and partner region officials. During the Launching conference more than 70 participants attended the conference to learn about the ideas and the main aspects of the project. Participants were generally most interested in concrete good practices from, for instance Pons Danubii (bike sharing routes) and the Netherlands (public transport in inland waterways – Waterbus). Therefore, the dissemination of good practices stays an important task for the SWARE project team during and after SWARE. For this reason the SWARE project team is also participating in the Policy Learning Platform of Interreg Europe, which stimulates this action. The Launching conference was rated with a **8,6** by project partners in terms of usefulness. In essence it paved the way for future exchange of good practices.

Communication activities

One document was essential during the start-up of the project: the *SWARE communication strategy*, which was drafted by **Vidzeme Planning Region**. During the project (and continuing in phase 2) **VPR** was responsible for the monitoring of communication activities, updating the project's website and drafting the regular newsletter and interactive presentations.

Within the communication strategy five objectives were summarized:

- (1) Raise awareness of SWARE's stakeholders on the importance of sustainable heritage valorization in waterway regions as an essential tool for ensuring the sustainability of heritage conservation;
- (2) Provide strong evidence based inputs/messages to the public bodies responsible for the relevant policy instruments;
- (3) Foster the behavior change and contribute to the capacity building of the public actors involved, in order to better understand the functions and operation of integrated governance structures in the field of heritage management;
- (4) Raise awareness on sustainability issues of the communities and visitors of the waterway regions involved in SWARE;
- (5) Disseminate knowledge and information towards the general public, the media and other regions about the project achievements.

According to the Application Form, a stronger focus during Phase 1 was put on the communication with the identified stakeholders as it was important to raise their awareness and involve them in drafting the envisaged policy changes linked to the management of natural and cultural heritage assets. It was mostly done via face to face meetings, and the elaborated briefing brochures, posters, visual materials and video supported this communication. Also, the five (5) eNewsletters issued gave insight about the news of the project for the stakeholders, as well as to the Programme and wider public. We had 11 subscribers to the eNewsletter apart from the stakeholders directly involved in the project. Partners shared the eNewsletters with their stakeholders as well through all possible channels.

Contact with active stakeholders is also maintained through the project's website and social media. The most effective platforms turned out to be Facebook and Twitter (project's Facebook page has 123 followers), as well as project's webpage (average sessions per period: 677). Regarding the aim to reach also general public, press

releases were produced by VPR about the project's achievements in general, and also each partner itself tried to establish contacts with media about local topicalities. Altogether, project had 75 media appearances in Phase 1. For the knowledge exchange purposes, as well as with an aim to raise awareness about the themes tackled by the project, partners participated at the annual Interreg Europe Programme events and other relevant national/regional events. There were a total of 15 participations at other events by the SWARE project team. To foster cross-border knowledge exchange all project partners and stakeholders were also incited to join the Interreg Policy Learning Platform and informed about the benefits and possibilities it offers.

The regular updates of the project's website are very much appreciated by partners and their stakeholders and rated with a **9**. The interactive presentations, drafted by **VPR** and continuously disseminated by the partners were rated with a **8,8** and the regular newsletters with an **8,8** as well.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Kick-Off meeting | 9,0 |
| Launching Conference | 8,6 |
| Regular updates on the project's website | 9,0 |
| Interactive presentations | 8,8 |
| Regular newsletter | 8,8 |

ANALYSIS PHASE

During the analysis phase, one meeting had a central role (1st TWG meeting on the 22nd of September 2016). During this meeting in The Hague (The Netherlands), **Pons Danubii EGTC** presented the *Methodology of the State of Art*. This very detailed document was discussed and used in semester 2 of the project by partners to develop their own *Regional State of Arts*. Included within the Regional State of Arts were the regional good practices, which have been used in future documents, as well as for the Good Practice Database of the Policy Learning Platform. The *Methodology of State of Art* was valued with an **8**. A *Menu of Good Practices* was presented by **Pons Danubii EGTC** during the 2nd TWG meeting in Clonmel (Ireland). This menu offered a great overview which stimulated the discussion on good practice transfer and the decision on match-making for the Interregional Exchange Sessions. Partners valued the *Menu of Good Practices* positively with an **8,2**. Both documents have shown their value for the preparation of the interregional knowledge exchange. Furthermore, during the 2nd TWG, **Association Regio Water** presented two documents:

- (1) Methodology and match-making KES (Knowledge Exchange Sessions).
- (2) The guidelines on good practice transfer;

During the 2nd semester, partners participated in the match-making process for the Interregional Knowledge Exchange Sessions. This was done through the *Methodology and match-making* activity. On the basis of the cross-reading of each other's Regional State of Art, and through discussions during the meetings, partners listed their most valuable practices which could be useful for other partners and listed their knowledge needs. This culminated into a document which summarized the partners knowledge sharing possibilities and knowledge needs. The discussion of this led to three themes and three KES regions:

- (1) Governance (**Tipperary, Ireland**);
- (2) Connecting infrastructure with tourism and heritage (**Milan, Italy**);
- (3) Marketing, PR and development of destinations (**Zuid-Holland, The Netherlands**).

The success of the transfer process was highly important as it has led to the concrete action plans, based on real needs and inputs of the project partners. The *guidelines on good practice transfer* provided the partnership with the basic requirements on participation and preparatory activities for all project partners and the methodological reasoning linked to the objectives of the INTERREG Europe programme, as well as the Application Form (AF). The guidelines matched the good practices identified at an earlier stage with knowledge needs of all project partners

and formalized three partner regions selected for hosting the Interregional Exchange Sessions (also providing basic guidelines for these sessions, as to ensure consistency).

At the end of phase 1, partners agreed that the analysis phase was of the utmost importance, especially the mentioned methods were very useful. The *Guidelines on good practices* were valued with an **8,4** and the Methodology and match making KES with an **9**. These documents strongly encouraged the knowledge exchange by introducing partners with good practices outside of their own region, which stimulated critical thinking.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Methodology of State of Art | 8,0 |
| Menu of Good Practices | 8,2 |
| Guidelines on Good Practice Transfer | 8,4 |
| Methodology and match-making KES | 9,0 |

KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE PHASE

Derived from the methods used and discussion in the analysis phase, from the months of May until October, three (three-day) Interregional Knowledge Exchange Sessions were organized. These sessions have been important for future process and for the further and deeper integration and involvement of the regional experts and stakeholders. The visited partners followed the *guidelines on Good Practice Transfer* which made sure two important aspects were present in every visit:

- (1) Walkshops;
- (2) Workshops.

Afterwards, partners mentioned the fact that it is necessary to visit a place (good practice) in person. It stimulates thought, exchange of ideas and possible change of policy and/or implementation even more. The stakeholders who were present during the KES meetings, were selected by the partners in relation to the discussed topic as to maximize the effect of the in person exchange of good practices. The stakeholders proved, for the project team, a valuable asset. A total of 23 good practices have been visited during the three (3) Interregional Exchange Sessions. Several of them have been uploaded to the GP database of the Policy Learning Platform of INTERREG Europe. Many more have been discussed during workshops.

Visiting the Good Practices gave a good insight of what was discussed within the *Regional State of Arts* the partners drafted during the analysis phase. Overall the walkshops/visiting of good practices was rated with an **9,8** by the partners.

Within the Application Form several workshop-methods were disseminated. Organizing partners, together with the Lead Partner, chose the most valuable methods for the particular Interregional Exchange Sessions. At the first Interregional Exchange Session in Tipperary, during the workshops, partners were asked to present and discuss regional cases. These case-studies were very meaningful and also acted as a catalyzer for further exchange of good practices between the partners **and the stakeholders/experts**. More information about these cases was shared en marge of the dedicated workshops (both formally and informally). An important factor for this was the face-to-face contact the **partners' stakeholders** had during this first KES.

KES I: Tipperary County Council

| Workshop Group I | Data collection and monitoring: stakeholder participation |
|------------------|--|
| Case I | <i>Ecomuseum Martesana: a managing system of socio-economic assets in the Navigli area</i> |
| Case II | <i>Discovering Naviglio Grande</i> |
| Case III | <i>Értéktár, a method for data collection</i> |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Workshop Group II | Fostering stakeholder involvement in public/policy-making structures |
| Case I | <i>Zoetermeer: proactive planning city centre to outside water bodies</i> |
| Case II | <i>Dutch Water authorities</i> |
| Case III | <i>River contracts as governance instruments</i> |
| Workshop Group III | Investing in green/blue infrastructure to promote sustainable socio-economic activity at local level |
| Case I | <i>Aquapuncture: optimal use and adaptation and management of inland waterways and their waterfronts</i> |
| Case II | <i>Area integrated project for the development of the Navigli Canals System</i> |
| Case III | <i>Green Blue investment in the region of municipality of Moča</i> |

During the second Interregional Exchange Session in Milan, the workshops were dedicated to intriguing questions to stimulate the debate on how to improve the sustainable heritage management of waterway regions. The outcome statements of these discussions led to input (and new ideas) for the regional action plans and the SWARE Overarching Policy Recommendations document. The discussion here was different than in the 1st KES, as it was a more open discussion/brain-storming method, though still very fruitful.

| | | |
|---|--------------|--|
| KES II: Metropolitan City of Milan | | |
| Workshop Group I | table | The feasibility through an effective governance |
| Key question I | | <i>How to manage opposite/different interests in a common aim from an institutional, entrepreneurial, personal point of view?</i> |
| Key question II | | <i>What do institutions, entrepreneurs, politicians need to reach their targets in a social context?</i> |
| Workshop Group II | table | The feasibility through models or instruments |
| Key question I | | <i>How to create a model that leads to social and economic inclusion in all their different facets?</i> |
| Key question II | | <i>Which kind of agreements, contracts, formal or informal network, oriented to put together different aims and interests in an effective and multilateral approach?</i> |
| Workshop Group III | table | The feasibility through sustainable management of waterway systems combined with heritage and infrastructures |
| Key question I | | <i>How to stimulate sustainable tourism along inland waterways rich of culture and history?</i> |
| Key question II | | <i>How to share responsibilities between public and private institutions, private-public partnership?</i> |
| Workshop Group IV | table | The feasibility from a financial point of view |
| Key question I | | <i>How to finance projects and models?</i> |
| Key question II | | <i>How to share and manage sponsorship, private and public funding, crowdfunding, fundraising, additional funding by public and private cooperation?</i> |

During the 3rd KES in the province of Zuid-Holland both elements of the previous Interregional Exchange Sessions were included into the workshops. So, both case studies as well as open discussions on intriguing questions were discussed. Both strengthening each other in the exchange of good practices, new ideas for policy makers, stakeholders and partners (and their stakeholders).

| KES III: Provincie Zuid-Holland | | Case study and discussion |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Workshop I | | Development of strong touristic destinations |
| Workshop II | | River as a tidal park: how the metropolitan region rediscovers the delta |
| Workshop III | | Cooperation on cultural heritage |
| Workshop IV | | Financing blue-green investments |
| Workshop V | | How data and ICT tools can help policy makers |
| Workshop VI | | How open data can be used consumer oriented |

| KES III: Provincie Zuid-Holland | | Open questions and discussion on lessons learnt |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Workshop I | | How to improve programmes and policies on destination development and touristic marketing for sustainable development of waterway regions |
| Workshop II | | How to connect cultural and natural heritage to the touristic branding of waterway regions? |
| Workshop III | | How can big (resp. open) data help to build public and political support both for heritage protection and sustainable valorization thereof? |

In general, the workshops worked great in cooperation with the walkshops. The walkshops stimulated the visual aspect. How does the good practice work in practice (opposed to on paper)? The workshops stimulated the brainstorming and getting acquainted with the good practices of the donor regions. This was one of the strengths of the KES meetings in general within the SWARE project and laid a strong foundation for the Action Planning process. The workshops were rated with a **9,6**.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Visiting good practice through walkshops | 9,8 |
| Workshops during KES | 9,6 |

ACTION PLANNING PHASE

One of the key elements in the projects of the INTERREG Europe Programme is the development of regional action plans. For the purpose of the action planning, Metropolitan City of Milan gave a training during the 3rd TWG meeting in Milan (14th of November 2017). This training, accompanied by the recommendation paper on action planning, served as the guidelines for the action planning phase. Within this document and training, the key elements, which should be included, were disseminated (according to the INTERREG Europe Programme Manual).

During this training, the *Disney Brainstorming Method* was introduced as a method to involve the stakeholders in the Action Plan drafting process. This method breaks down the brainstorming process into three distinct chunks:

- (a) The dreamer;
- (b) The realist;
- (c) The spoiler (or critic).

Partners have used this or different methods during their SIG meetings (whichever worked best for the region itself). Partners found the training and recommendation paper very useful (**8,2**) for the Action Planning process.

During the 4th TWG meeting in Komárno two tools were presented by MCM to further improve upon the action plans:

- (1) Cross-reading exercise;
- (2) Self-analysis tool.

The cross-reading exercise has been used by partners to evaluate each other's action plans. Every Action Plan has been read by two other partners.

| Action Plan | Reader 1 | Reader 2 |
|---------------------|----------|----------|
| Action plan PP1/PP6 | VPR | TCC |
| Action plan PP2 | MCM | VPR |
| Action plan PP3 | ARW/PZH | PD |
| Action plan PP4 | TCC | ARW/PZH |
| Action plan PP5 | PD | MCM |

Partners found this method/exercise useful, as it proved to be valuable input into the action plan. Other partners were able to give feedback to improve the action plans. Which, in general, have made the SWARE Action Plans stronger (partners rated the exercise of cross reading with a **7,6**).

The Self-assessment tool was developed as a final check for partners to check the quality and strength of their final action plans. The self-assessment tool checked for the quality of the:

- (1) Process of the action plan
- (2) Content of the action plan
- (3) Integrated approach
- (4) Finance and planning
- (5) Interreg & EU added value

Metropolitan City of Milan addressed the issue of an Overarching Policy Recommendations towards the European Institutions. The Overarching Policy Recommendations have been discussed in combination with the 4th Thematic Working Group meeting and a draft document was presented during the 5th Thematic Working Group meeting. The Overarching Policy Recommendations will combine the partners' recommendations into one concise document. This document will state the main overarching outcome of the SWARE project which could benefit the European Institutions on the topic of waterway region management.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Recommendation paper and interactive training on action planning | 8,2 |
| Cross-reading exercise | 7,6 |
| Self-analysis tool | 7,6 |
| Join interactive discussion on Overarching Policy Recommendations | 8,0 |

PARTNER (REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER) MEETINGS

For the partner (regional stakeholder) meetings, the 1st TWG was an important moment. During this TWG, **Tipperary County Council** gave an interactive training for the SIG managers and presented the *Roadmap Methodology for Institutional/Stakeholder Involvement*. This document/framework, served as the basis for the five (5) *Regional Roadmaps for Stakeholder Involvement* drafted by all partner regions.

The partners appreciated the TWG meeting (and the interactive training), and the roadmap as it really helped them to not only identity, but also reach them and involve them in the SWARE project. In the questionnaire (done at the end of phase 1) partners rated the usefulness of the Interactive training on stakeholder involvement with an **8**. The roadmap ensured consistency of approach across all regions, which supported inter-regional activities.

In general, the organization of the SIG meetings during the first phase of the project served as a key input into the activities of the project. All partners gathered groups of excited and dedicated stakeholders which took an active part in the project. The way in which partners organized their SIG meetings differed from each other (as regions have different needs). **Tipperary County Council** for instance, organized some meetings, but found it difficult to organize stakeholder meetings where the only topic would be SWARE. SIG meetings had to be brought into a bigger picture (as part of their development of the Green & Blue Study). **Metropolitan City of Milan** used their SIG

meetings to establish a relationship with the water-related stakeholders. Also, they used the *Walt Disney Method* actively within their SIG meetings during the action planning phase. **Pons Danubii EGTC** connected the SIG meetings with current topics within SWARE (e.g. GP transfer, action planning). The key elements within their SIG meetings were presentations and interactive sessions, during which the participants could share their opinions. **Vidzeme Planning Region** focused on creating bonds within the stakeholder group representatives from different levels – national, regional, municipal –, and establishing dialogue among them that would continue also beyond project SWARE lifetime, as insufficient cooperation and lack of synergy between the activities of state institutions, local municipalities and owners of natural and cultural heritage objects was identified. Thematic seminars and discussions were organized with field professionals invited to talk about the overall challenges in natural and cultural heritage management along waterways; also a study visit to the neighboring region was organized. **The Region of Zuid-Holland**, similar to **TCC** organized their meetings in relation to the broader picture.

For **Tipperary County Council** the Synergy Sessions proved more useful than the SIG meetings. For both **Pons Danubii EGTC** and **Association Regio Water** these Synergy Sessions were (due to the size of the organizations) smaller sessions.