



RURALIZATION

RURALIZATION

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

D3.1 Assessment Framework



"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 | 24-10-2019 | First draft | NUI Galway |
| 0.2 | 27-10-2019 | Minor revisions | NUI Galway with input from RURALIZATION Consortium |
| 0.3 | 31-10-2019 | Timeline for further revision added | NUI Galway with input from RURALIZATION Consortium at Cosenza meeting. Input sought from SAB and supporting stakeholders. |
| 0.4 | 10-12-2019 | Further minor revisions | NUI Galway with input from RURALIZATION Consortium. |
| 0.5 | 25-02-2020 | Extensive revisions to promising practice assessment model | NUI Galway with input from RURALIZATION Consortium and supporting stakeholders. Also circulated to SAB. |
| 0.5 | 01-04-2020 | Extensive revisions to region assessment model | NUI Galway with input from RURALIZATION Consortium. |
| 0.6 | 03-03-2020 | Finalised promising practice assessment model | NUI Galway and final check by RURALIZATION Consortium. |
| 0.7 | 18-02-2020 | Finalised promising practice assessment model and final draft of region assessment model | NUI Galway and final check by RURALIZATION Consortium. |
| 1.0 | 27-05-2020 | Final version | NUI Galway |
| 1.1 | 01-04-2021 | Final version resubmitted after receiving comments from the EC | NUI Galway |

Project Acronym

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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 | T3.3 Formulation of Assessment Framework |
| Deliverable | D3.1 Assessment Framework |
| Due Date | 31/10/2019 |
| Submission Date | Version 0.3 submitted on 31/10/2019 Final version 1.0 submitted on 03/06/2020 Final version 1.1 resubmitted on 01/04/2021 |
| Dissemination Level ¹ | PU |
| Deliverable Responsible | NUIG |
| Version | 1.1 |
| Status | Final version |
| Author(s) | Aisling Murtagh, Maura Farrell, Marie Mahon, John McDonagh, Therese Conway, Shane Conway (NUI Galway) and Willem Korthals Altes (TU Delft) |
| Contributor (s) | Florian Ahlmeyer, Clara Blasco, Aline Brochot, Alessandra Corrado, Miquel Correa, Adrienne Csizmady, Kim Graham, Krzysztof Janc, Dóra Karsa, Anne Kinsella, Imre Kovách, Alice Martin-Prevel, Nicole Mathieu, Szocs-Boruss Miklos Attila, Irene Quesada, Andrzej Raczyk, Veronique Rioufol, Jofre Rodrigo, Pertti Ruuska, Silvia Sivini, Petra Tas, Levente Viszló, Annamaria Vitale, Hans-Albrecht Wiehler, Titus Bahner. |
| Reviewer(s) | RURALIZATION Consortium and input sought from SAB and supporting stakeholders on promising practice assessment model. |

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 Tables | 4 |
| Acronyms and Abbreviations | 4 |
| 1 Introduction | 5 |
| 2 Assessment of promising practices | 6 |
| 2.1 Normative assessment model..... | 6 |
| 2.2 Principles | 7 |
| 2.2.1 Efficiency | 8 |
| 2.2.2 Legitimacy | 8 |
| 2.2.3 Rooted..... | 9 |
| 2.2.4 Interconnected..... | 9 |
| 2.2.5 Innovation | 10 |
| 2.2.6 Adaptability..... | 11 |
| 2.3 Using the Assessment Framework to assess practices | 11 |
| 3 Assessment of regions for reflection | 14 |
| 3.1 Overview of regions and case studies..... | 14 |
| 3.2 Comparable contexts | 18 |
| 3.3 Less successful contexts | 21 |
| 3.4 Contexts favourable for success | 23 |
| 4 Gender analysis | 24 |
| 5 References | 25 |
| 6 Annexes | 32 |
| Annex 1 - Promising Practice Assessment Framework: Template for assessment of practices 32 | |
| Annex 2 – Promising Practice Assessment Framework: Further information on criteria and examples | 42 |
| Annex 3 – Less successful context assessment template | 57 |
| Annex 4 – Contexts favourable for success assessment template | 59 |
| Annex 5 - Gender analysis tools | 61 |

List of Tables

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: Principles of the Assessment Framework | 7 |
| Table 2: Overview of WP4 regions | 15 |
| Table 3: Overview of WP5 promising practice case studies and confrontations | 16 |
| Table 4: Overview of WP6 case study procedure | 17 |
| Table 5: Overview of policy tools, new policy design and policy assessment | 17 |
| Table 6: Options and measures of region comparability | 20 |
| Table 7: Indicators to potentially identify less successful contexts | 22 |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------------------|
| EC | European Commission |
| ECA | European Court of Auditors |
| EEA | European Environment Agency |
| EIGE | European Institute for Gender Equality |
| EP | European Parliament |
| EU | European Union |
| SAB | Stakeholder Advisory Board |
| WP | Work Package |

1 Introduction

About RURALIZATION

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. This is done specifically in relation to the future dreams of rural youth, facilitating rural newcomers 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. 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.

Role of the Assessment Framework

RURALIZATION must assess and then select case studies and different regional contexts for study. Combined with tasks in each work package (WP) related to promising practice and region selection, the RURALIZATION Assessment Framework provides a way to assess practices as 'promising' in relation to case studies and regions as 'less successful' for reflection. It also provides guidance to other WPs on the analysis of gender issues.

2 Assessment of promising practices

2.1 Normative assessment model

Importance of normative assessment

The promising practice Assessment Framework consists of a normative model that underpins the basis of assessment. Normative thinking and ideas relate to what we understand as desirable or positive. Normative models help guide our evaluation and judgement in this direction and outline the conditions that give us the basis for a normative assessment.

Normative ideas, and models that encompass them in particular contexts, are also important to help us rationally assess what interests us. This is important from the respect of controlling our preferences, biases, preconceptions and assumptions. For example, Bock's (2016, p.553) observations in the social innovation context are illustrative noting how there is a careful balance needed in our assessment of interesting, panacea-like civic initiatives: "There are certainly reasons to be critical and look beyond overly romantic stories of civic initiatives. However, there is also reason to keep an open mind and investigate what social innovation may or may not be able to achieve". The normative assessment framework will help to keep potential case study assessment tailored to a specific logic and driven by the project aims.

Developing the assessment criteria

The normative model for RURALIZATION consists of a set of multi-dimensional principles built in light of the aims of economic, social and territorial cohesion, as well as smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, and more specifically on the RURALIZATION project aim of renewal of generations in rural areas, which contributes to these aims.

Few opportunities for new generations in rural areas inevitably reinforce the urbanisation trend and threatens EU economic, social and territorial cohesion. The core concepts (regeneration, resilience, rural innovation and capital) detailed in 'D3.2 Detailed Conceptual Guidelines' are built on the core RURALIZATION project aim. That is, to develop policies, instruments and strategies that can contribute to the development of a new frontier and the development of rural areas that provide opportunities to support renewal of generations triggering a process of ruralisation as a counterforce to urbanisation. Therefore, the Assessment Framework is informed by the conceptual guidelines.

The principles of 'rooted' and 'interconnected' draw on aspects of our conceptualisation of rural regeneration. 'Innovation' emerges directly from our core concept of rural innovation. 'Adaptability' links to resilience thinking, but also the concept of resourcefulness that aims to address some deficiencies in how resilience is more traditionally conceptualised. These principles are also interconnected. For example, rooted focuses on the use of resources and how benefits are rooted locally. These locally rooted benefits may also support adaptability and the strengthening of local capacities. Capital or local resources, assets and capacities are

linked closely with the rooted and adaptability principles and how they can be realised in rural settings.

This Assessment Framework also operationalises the principles of efficiency, i.e. costs to pursue the aims, and legitimacy, which is operationalised beyond, but including, the rule of law, and involves principles of participative, inclusive (also related to gender), accessible, transparent, consensus-oriented and accountable governance. Both link closely to the idea of good governance. Knickel et al. (2008, p. 123) outlines that good governance must be effective and efficient where: “Processes and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal”.

2.2 Principles

The RURALIZATION promising practice Assessment Framework is made up of six principles (Table 1). It provides a multi-faceted set of principles that can be used as a whole or as a subset to guide assessment of practices in rural regeneration contexts. To assess practices as ‘promising’ the principles are expanded as a set of qualitative indicators. To help with their identification they are illustrated by criteria (see Annex 1 for the template to assess practices and Annex 2 for more information and examples). The criteria included in the Annexes are not exhaustive but illustrative and other criteria can be added. Each principle and sub-dimension are next described.

| Principle | Dimension |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Efficiency ‘Investment’ to pursue aims and use of resources efficiently. | Investment is justified |
| | Sustainable natural resource use |
| 2. Legitimacy A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy. | Evidence-based |
| | Governance |
| | Local legitimacy |
| 3. Rooted Resources underpinning development and locally rooted benefits. | Local resources |
| | Local benefits |
| 4. Interconnected Addressing interconnected decline issues and strengthening rural networks. | Integrated |
| | Creates connections |
| 5. Innovation Vital importance of innovation and its potential transferability. | Technological and non-technological innovation |
| | Innovation transferability |
| 6. Adaptability Strengthening local capacities to adapt and respond. | Capacities |
| | Diversity |

Table 1: Principles of the Assessment Framework

2.2.1 Efficiency

The Assessment Framework operationalises the principle of efficiency i.e. costs to pursue the aims. This relates to how practices must use resources effectively. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Investment is justified

This dimension looks beyond simple financial costs to a more integrated view on value for investment. Investment of resources is understood beyond financial costs, but also investment of social resources such as community or key individual's time in civil society practices. Investment through public funding should provide value for this investment. Or for example in the context of bottom-up, grassroots initiatives without public funding if they are 'promising' they must have effects that show community investment of time and skills is meeting, or beginning to meet, the aims of the practice.

Sustainable natural resource use

Efficiency also relates to not using natural resources in an unsustainable manner. Knickel et al. (2008, p. 123) also relates good governance, effectiveness and efficiency to "sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment".

2.2.2 Legitimacy

The Assessment Framework operationalises the principle of legitimacy. This is assessed through an approach that has a basis in evidence, an appropriate governance approach or has wider local legitimacy. Three sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Evidence-based

There should be an identified need for the practice, such as through local knowledge, anecdotal evidence, more formal needs assessment or research base. The existence of grassroots practices or those that involve groups of individuals (e.g. new entrants that have come together without a formal organisation structure) are by their nature responding to local need. Their existence is an evidence-base in itself.

Governance

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". A pattern of the increasing role of community is also identified in rural governance (Scott et al. 2019). But this does not make more top-down governance redundant. For example, 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". Bottom-up, grassroots, community initiated and driven

practices are also important, which can exist completely outside of state funding programmes. More broadly, participative, network-based governance involving local community is important in regeneration contexts (Furbey, 1999). In community-led initiatives the state can have more of a facilitative rather than directing role (Woods, 2005; Powe et al., 2015). Community-led practices can mean community actors shape development actions and/or how they are implemented. Different types of actors, such as from public, private and community can come together. Involving different stakeholders can bring together diverse, complementary knowledge (Powe et al., 2015). Governance also links to the rooted principle. For example, in rural town regeneration projects drawing on local and external resources can be important for success, but drawing on external financial resources should not compromise the locally-led nature of regeneration (Woods, 2005).

Local legitimacy

Effectively and comprehensively assessing the idea of ‘promising’ in a rural regeneration context is challenging. RURALIZATION views rural areas as highly diverse and holding unique local characteristics. The local legitimacy dimension is important to allow local context to be captured and allow room for local factors not captured by the overall principles.

2.2.3 Rooted

The rooted principle links closely with the idea of ‘bottom-up’ neo-endogenous development, but in a more nuanced way where resources underpinning regeneration beyond the local are also potentially important. It also identifies the importance of rooting the benefits of regeneration locally. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Local resources

Place-based, local resources are important in rural regeneration. There is also a danger of not capturing development opportunities if too narrowly focused on local resources. Important resources can also originate outside of rural areas. Local and non-local resources can combine. Local resources could be used to harness non-local opportunities. Using local and non-local resources together can tap into opportunities created by major trends such as urbanisation and digitisation (e.g. uses built (digital) capital to overcome remote location and tap into opportunities in urban economies).

Local benefits

It is also important benefits are rooted locally. The benefits of resource use should be felt locally creating new or improving existing opportunities in the local rural economy. Ideally, maximum benefits are retained locally (Ray, 2006).

2.2.4 Interconnected

The ‘interconnected’ principle sees rural decline problems as potentially interconnected and influencing each other. It is also about the importance of networks in rural regeneration and innovation. This principle also links with the rooted principle where developing external

networks to tap into other resources and ideas is important. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Integrated

This dimension expresses the idea that regeneration approaches should ideally be multi-dimensional and integrated, seeking to develop mutually supportive measures that assist with alleviation of a number of aspects of decline. Regeneration should ideally work to simultaneously support different aspects of decline. Integrated regeneration does not treat rural decline issues in isolation. More than one type of rural decline issue (e.g. economic, social, environmental, cultural) is tackled either directly or indirectly (e.g. spin-off value).

Creating connections

Networks are important in rural regeneration. These networks can be within rural areas or outside the local area. For example the activities of social entrepreneurs can involve networks both at local and extra-local levels. Being a part of such networks can allow them “to mobilise ideas, resources, and support in other contexts to the benefit of rural regions” (Fink et al., 2017, p.10). This dimension also links very closely to the innovation principle. Networks are understood as an important driver of rural innovation (Murdoch, 2000; Esparcia, 2014). For example, networks that are ‘translocal’ in nature but there is ‘organised proximity’ can play a role in the learning process that underpins innovation providing access to external knowledge supporting local innovation (Copus et al., 2011). Copus et al. (2011 p.122) argue “...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”.

2.2.5 Innovation

The innovation principle sees the vital importance of innovation to support positive reinvention and change in rural areas. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Technological and non-technological innovation

The presence of innovation in rural areas comes in many forms. It goes far beyond science and technology and has both “technological (products and processes) and non-technological (marketing and organisation)” aspects (OECD, 2014, p.50). Organisational innovation through innovative governance or new ways of organising is important (OECD, 2014). Social, cultural and environmental innovation are important. Innovation and entrepreneurship are strongly connected processes. Rural entrepreneurship is important to stimulate rural innovation and can emerge from innovation (North and Smallbone, 2006; OECD, 2014; Atterton, 2016). Innovation in rural contexts can also mean “the transfer and adaptation of innovations developed elsewhere, the modernization of traditional forms of know-how, or finding new solutions to persistent rural problems” (EC, 2006b, p.12). Innovation and knowledge/expertise in rural contexts is also understood beyond scientific/formal expertise. Other forms of knowledge and local context is important (Tovey, 2008).

Innovation transferability

The issue of regeneration of rural areas is not new and many actors have devoted efforts to developing innovative solutions. RURALIZATION is set-up to find these solutions, assess and develop these jointly, both with the actors that are currently using them and with actors in potential new contexts of application. The key issue is to find innovative practices that are valid to be used in a number of comparable contexts. This raises the importance of considering in our assessment of ‘promising’ the potential transfer of promising innovations. In assessing transferability it is important to look for some evidence of how the innovation may transfer, such as it has worked in other places or has it been adapted in different contexts. Practices could also be at an early stage of development, are beginning to show impact and could potentially work/be adapted in other contexts. The resources that support the practice can also provide evidence of transferability, such as the fact that key resources driving the practice are not unique to its current context of application.

2.2.6 Adaptability

Local capacities to adapt and respond proactively to change are crucial for regeneration. Two sub-dimensions are distinguished.

Capacities

Regeneration must be conscious of weaknesses in specific local resources and seek to address these gaps which introduces the importance of the adaptability principle. This can give rural actors for example the ability to tap into previously un-used or under-used resources. Adaptability involves developing new capacities (e.g. skills, changing norms) and/or resources (e.g. infrastructure, finance) to enable adaptation to take place in response to rural decline, or to more proactively to drive change or be prepared for it.

Diversity

Diversity is also important to adaptability. For example a diversified rural economy can be less vulnerable to wider economic shocks. According to Eraydin (2016, p. 1) “Diverse neighbourhoods represent significant opportunities for different forms of entrepreneurship, which can contribute to their economic regeneration”.

2.3 Using the Assessment Framework to assess practices*Promising practices*

Promising practices in rural areas are activities that improve, or may improve, the status quo in rural areas by fostering economic, social, demographic, and/or ecological improvements which ameliorate opportunities for younger generations. Beyond this, a promising practice in a rural area can mean multiple things. Promising practices can be, but do not need to be

bounded to a specific location. Although promising practices could still be in the initial phase, they should have some effect already allowing us insight into their potential future impacts. Promising practices could have been initiated by all sorts of people (such as initiatives to farm by hiring land), businesses (such as initiatives that end the cycle of ever-increasing intensiveness in farming), NGOs or governments (such as innovative policies of local authorities in declining regions to facilitate new generations).

Assessing practices as 'promising'

Annex 1 provides a template for assessment of practices to identify 'promising' practices. General information on the practice is recorded. To provide a coherent method to assess 'promising practices' each dimension of the six principles is linked to an indicator. This helps to point to more specific criteria that can be identified in practices to show they meet the indicators. Indicators are multi-dimensional and can be met by criteria beyond those listed. Each indicator includes an 'other' criteria which allows for wider criteria to be added to justify that an indicator is met.

RURALIZATION aims to develop knowledge that can work towards closing the gender gap in rural opportunities. This will include analysis and assessment of specific projects to support opportunities for new generations of women. Indicators are added to facilitate the identification of practices that are driven by, involve, support or target women.

Annex 2 provides further information where each indicator and criteria is illustrated by a range of examples. The examples are not exhaustive, but intend to further illustrate each indicator in practice and help with identification of the dimensions in practice.

This model will be used in a variety of promising practice assessment contexts in the RURALIZATION project (e.g. newcomers, new entrants to farming, succession). The Assessment Framework should be used as fully as possible. But partners in national contexts decide from their own contexts what principles/dimensions/indicators should be met to deem a practice promising (e.g. all or a sub-set). This may also differ depending on the type of practice. Further guidance can also be provided from specific WPs as necessary.

There must be some information available on the practice to assess it. But fieldwork should not be carried out to complete the assessment. However if assessment is being carried out on practices where very little information is available an email and/or phone call to actors involved in the practice could be necessary to enable assessment. The Assessment Framework should be used as fully as possible. But we also adopt a more open approach to assessment so that practices are not overlooked because during assessment we are not confident they meet certain indicators because of a lack of evidence at the assessment stage.

The Assessment Framework is used to assess and identify promising practices. Selection of case studies is a separate step carried out in line with RURALIZATION and WP specific requirements.

Wider potential use

Outside of the RURALIZATION project, this Assessment Framework could also potentially be of use in other contexts to assess practices, with specific principles and dimensions selected as appropriate. The process of developing this framework in collaboration with the multi-actor RURALIZATION partners has strongly helped to refine it. However, its use as a framework for assessment of RURALIZATION promising practices represents its more in-depth testing phase. As WPs progress and as RURALIZATION uses the Assessment Framework learning may also be achieved from this to refine and expand the principles further, or add additional principles.

3 Assessment of regions for reflection

3.1 Overview of regions and case studies

In the RURALIZATION context, a **range of regions for reflection will be selected**. Core within the idea of ‘regions for reflection’ is that these are **areas where further learning can be gained from the experiences already developed** as part of RURALIZATION’s research up to this point. Bringing the findings to regions for reflection provides an opportunity to, for example, **sharpen the lessons learned**, examine the relevance and potential of the **findings as potential solutions for transfer**, as well as **gain insights on why certain practices may not perform well in these contexts**. In WP4 this relates to the insights developed from the inventory of youth dream futures and the foresight analysis. In WP5 this relates to the 30 case studies of promising practices related to rural newcomers, new entrants to farming and succession. In WP6 this relates to the access to land promising practice case studies involving 5 major and 5 smaller actions. This will **solidify in WP7** where the findings will be translated into development of new policy options (from WP4), practical policy tools (from WP5 and WP6) and informing wider policy assessment (from WP4, WP5, WP6).

However alongside this, the regions for reflection also come from different starting points and different factors come into consideration. In **WP4 20 regions in 10 EU Member States** representing a **diversity of regions** (based on the urban-rural typology) have **been selected** for the inventory of future dreams by youth. These **already selected areas will overlap with the case study regions for policy development in WP4** (and also used in and WP7). The same regions are used again, with some deviations possible. The case study regions for policy development will be in most EU Member States and at a scale (either NUTS 2 or NUTS 3 level) where there is a relevant policy actor. **These issues will be addressed in the selection of regions (WP3 task 3.8, milestone 5, January 2021)** with the Assessment Framework used as relevant. A summary of the selection procedure is provided in Table 2, with a more detailed graphic and description provided in Kuhmonen (2019).

| Countries | Futures dreams of youth workshops ^a | Type of regions - urban-rural typology (NUTS 3) ^b | Regional futures workshops ^{a, c} |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Finland | 20 regions | Predominantly urban regions (5) Intermediate regions (8) Predominantly rural regions (7) | 20 regions |
| France | | | |
| Germany | | | |
| Hungary | | | |
| Ireland | | | |
| Italy | | | |
| The Netherlands | | | |
| Poland | | | |
| Romania | | | |
| Spain | | | |
| ^a <i>Regions where the future dreams workshops and the regional futures workshops take place will mostly overlap but some deviations are possible.</i> | | | |
| ^b <i>To ensure diversity of contexts, workshops are organised in both urban and rural locations in each region</i> | | | |
| ^c <i>The scale of the regions will be chosen that there must be a relevant policy actor at this level. Depending on the national context this can be NUTS 2 or NUTS 3. The regions will be in most EU states.</i> | | | |

Table 2: Overview of WP4 regions

In **WP5 less successful contexts** will be identified as **areas for confrontations**. This involves the outcomes of promising practice case studies being discussed with stakeholders in **20 other areas**. These are **comparable areas, but do not show the promising results**. Therefore the considerations in section 3.2 on comparable regions and section 3.3 on less successful contexts are relevant to WP5. Once case studies are selected, and the understanding of their local contexts develops, **the specific approach taken will be addressed in the selection of regions (WP3 task 3.8, milestone 6, June 2021)**. A summary of the selection procedure is provided in Table 3.

| Promising practice ^a case studies | Regional teams | Countries | 30 promising practice ^a case studies | 20 confrontations in comparable, less successful contexts ^b |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 30 case studies: Newcomers (10) New entrants (10) Succession (10) | Team 1: UNICAL, XCT, CE | Italy and Spain | 4 | 3 |
| | Team 2: UNDEB, MTA TK, Eco Ruralis, Pro Vértes | Hungary and Romania | 4 | 3 |
| | Team 3: ILS, Kulturland | Germany | 4 | 3 |
| | Team 4: CNRS, TdL | France | 4 | 3 |
| | Team 5: NUIG, Teagasc, SA | Ireland and UK | 4 | 2 |
| | Team 6: TU Delft, Landg | The Netherlands and Belgium | 4 | 2 |
| | Team 7: UTU | Finland | 3 | 2 |
| | Team 8: UWR | Poland | 3 | 2 |
| ^a 'Promising practice' determined based on the Assessment Framework promising practice assessment model (see section 2 and Annex 1) | | | | |
| ^b Initial guidance provided by the Assessment Framework (section 3.2 and 3.3, also Annex 3) and final approach decided in task 3.8 selection of case studies and case regions | | | | |

Table 3: Overview of WP5 promising practice case studies and confrontations

In **WP6** areas for confrontation will also be selected. This involves the outcomes of the novel, innovative practice case studies being discussed with stakeholders in **10 other areas**. These areas will be contexts where it is expected the practices are **favourable for success** and **may provide solutions**. Therefore the considerations in section 3.4 on contexts favourable for success are relevant to WP6. Once case studies are selected, and the understanding of the local contexts develops, **the specific approach taken will be addressed in the selection of regions (WP3 task 3.8, milestone 6, June 2021).**

| 10 novel innovative practices | Proposed teams ^{a, b} | Countries | Focus group discussions in 10 other areas |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 promising approaches with: 5 major actions 5 smaller pilot actions | XCT and <i>Kulturland</i> | Spain and Germany | Regions where the practices are favourable for success and may provide solutions ^c |
| | TdL and <i>EcoRuralis</i> | France and Romania | |
| | SA and <i>Landg</i> | UK and Belgium | |
| | EcoRuralis and <i>XCT</i> | Romania and Spain | |
| | Kulturland and <i>TdL</i> | Germany and France | |
| ^a Planned that organisations in bold develop the major action, but the composition of teams and work repartition on novel innovative practices may be revised upon final selection of 10 novel approaches, after finalising deliverable D6.1 (Typology of actions based on analysis of current innovative actions and discussion with stakeholders). | | | |
| ^b Planned that organisations in italics develop the smaller, pilot action, but still to be finalised (as outlined above). | | | |
| ^c Initial guidance provided by the Assessment Framework (Section 3.4 and Annex 4) and final approach decided in task 3.8 selection of case studies and case regions. | | | |

Table 4: Overview of WP6 case study procedure

After the assessment process, in relation to **region selection** within RURALIZATION as a whole the confrontation areas of WP5 and focus group discussion areas of WP6 **can overlap** with each other and with the regions in WP4. However, there will be **no complete overlap to allow for incorporating a larger set of regions**. Overall, region selection will be based on a balanced set of geographical (in relation to Mediterranean, Central and Eastern Europe, North-West Europe; but also to areas located more remote or close to the city) and socio-economic situations across the EU.

The research and innovation activities will also form the basis of WP7 where the findings will be translated into informing policy assessment, development of new policy options and practical policy tools (see Table 5).

| Policy tools, design and assessment | Informed by WP results |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Design of new polices at regional level to accommodate dream futures of new generations | 4 |
| Good practice guide on rural newcomers, new entrants to farming and succession | 5 |
| Handbook for local authorities on supporting access to land for farmers | 6 |
| Report on assessment of policies (CAP strategic plans, specific EU regulations) | 4, 5 and 6 |
| Further specific actions to address policy makers and new rural generations | 4, 5 and 6 |

Table 5: Overview of policy tools, new policy design and policy assessment

The region assessment aspect of the Assessment Framework therefore must develop a number of assessment options. This looks at assessment of: **1. Comparable contexts; 2. Less successful contexts** and **3. Contexts favourable for success**. Based on current knowledge, the next sections detail options for how assessment could be guided.

3.2 Comparable contexts

Comparable areas can be more likely to learn from each other's experiences. Regions deemed comparable can be arrived at in different ways, such as by using typologies, cluster analysis or wider data using indicators such as population density, urbanisation rate, economic or employment structure.

The **urban-rural typology** is a rural classification based on the share of population that live in rural areas (predominantly rural, intermediate and predominantly urban). It includes all areas outside of urban clusters and can include urbanised places. It is applied to NUTS level 3 regions. The NUTS system subdivides the EU into three hierarchical levels (1, 2 and 3) which respectively encompass larger (level 1) to smaller (level 3) areas (Eurostat, 2018). This typology helps to classify European rural diversity in a harmonised way across the EU. Given the **aims of the Assessment Framework, to conduct assessment in light of the aims of territorial cohesion and smart growth, the diversity dimension within our assessment of comparable regions is particularly important**. Smart growth in a rural context must recognise the distinct nature of rural areas. For example, the smart villages concept is presented as moving beyond one-size fits all approaches and a policy concept that is tailored to rural place-potentials supporting innovation, resilience and building on "existing strengths and assets as well as on developing new opportunities" (EC, 2017, p.3). Copus et al. (2011) highlight an underpinning principle of territorial cohesion is to turn diversity into a strength, which also suggests looking to the distinctiveness of regions to support it. The **urban-rural typology is used to guide selection** of a diverse set of rural regions where the **inventory of youth dream futures (WP4)** and the **newcomer, new entrant and succession case studies (WP5)** are carried out. To select comparable regions for confrontations in WP5 it is also appropriate that this typology may be used again. If deviations from the original 20 regions selected in WP4 are made, the typology may also be used again.

Also potentially useful in the context of selecting comparable regions while also recognising the diversity of European rural areas is the **Smart Specialisation Platform's Benchmarking Regional Structure interactive tool**. It can be used to identify comparable regions at the **NUTS 2 level**, either including or excluding regions from the same country. Regions are deemed comparable based on **structural similarities relevant for innovation-driven development**. These are social, economic, technological, institutional and geographical characteristics that impact innovation and economic change while not readily changing in the short-term. The base year of data used varies depending on the variable, the most recent being 2012. A distance index provides an assessment of how comparable other regions are with a selected region, where a lower the index value indicates greater comparability (EC, 2013; Navarro et al. 2014).

The **activities of RURALIZATION can also feed into the identification of comparable regions.** WP4 is carrying out a trend analysis identifying relevant trends for rural regions resulting in a spatial cluster analysis to identify regions that share common trend influences. This is due for completion in January 2021 and could be useful for WP5 confrontation region selection in June 2021. As part of WP5 task 5.1 analysis of rural newcomers, new entrants into farming and successors is being carried out based on European (e.g. Eurostat, FADN) as well as national level data and published analysis. In June 2020 deliverable 5.1 (report on analysis on rural newcomers, new entrants and successors in farming at European level) is due for completion. As part of WP6 task 6.3 quantitative analysis of land holdings and land market trends will be carried out identifying differences between regions and EU Member States.

Depending on the type of case study (e.g. related to new entrants to farming), typologies focused on topographical aspects of regions are also a potentially useful tool to identify comparability. Regional typologies also exist of coastal and mountain regions (Eurostat, 2018a). Regions with protected sites for their ecological value is also a potential indicator of comparability (European Environment Agency (EEA), 2020).

A number of options therefore emerge that can be used in isolation or combination for how RURALIZATION distinguishes comparable regions. The currently emerging options discussed above are summarised in Table 6.

| Options/Tools | Comparability measure | Scale |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Rural-urban typology | Proportion of population living in rural areas (Eurostat, 2018a) | NUTS 3 |
| Smart Specialisation Platform Regional Benchmarking Tool | Structural similarities relevant for innovation-driven development (EC, 2013) | NUTS 2 |
| Mountain typology | Proportion of topographic mountain regions and/or proportion of population that live in topographic mountain regions (Eurostat, 2018a) | NUTS 3 |
| Coastal typology | Regions classed as costal (has a coastal border/a strong maritime influence/over half of population live within 50km of coast (Eurostat, 2018a) | NUTS 3 |
| Natura 2000 protected areas | Sites protected under the Birds Directive i.e. Special Protection Areas (SPA) and the Habitats Directive i.e. Sites of Community Importance or (SCI), and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). (EEA, 2020) | Varies |
| Cluster analysis showing shared trend influences based on WP4 foresight analysis | Demographics, economic, socio-economic, farming, technologies etc. | NUTS 2 or 3 |
| Outcomes of WP5 deliverable 5.1 (report on analysis on rural newcomers, new entrants and successors in farming at European level) | Various data as available, such as data on farm structures (e.g. average physical or economic size) or wider analysis shows comparability | Various as available |
| Outcomes of WP6 deliverable 6.3 (Technical report on quantitative analysis of land holdings and land market trends) | Various data as available, such as land holdings, prices (sale and rent), land loss, capitalisation of CAP payments, access to land markets. It is also planned that a typology will be developed. | Various as available; Typology built at NUTS 3 level |

Table 6: Options and measures of region comparability

The Assessment Framework presents options for identifying comparable regions. The specific approach taken will be addressed in the selection of regions. This is because once case studies are carried out, we will have greater understanding of their local contexts. It **may emerge** that a **harmonised approach** by all partners is adequate to identify comparable regions e.g. use of the **urban-rural typology** where for example case studies in intermediate regions are confronted in other intermediate regions. But the urban-rural typology provides **one way to assess comparability**. It is a population based typology and does not give us insight on for example the economic structure of these regions. In the context of the EDORA project, Copus et al. (2011) argue that generalising about rural areas should be underpinned by more nuanced typologies. The EDORA project developed more a multifaceted approach to categorising rural regions. This includes a structural typology providing a rural economic structure categorisation (e.g. agrarian, consumption countryside) but is applied to intermediate and predominately rural areas only. The base year of indicators varies however, the most recent being 2008 (Copus and Noguera, 2010). This fact is a significant drawback for

currently using this tool in practice. Nevertheless, the example does illustrate how comparability can be more precisely identified.

Overall, **greater understanding of local contexts should also give indications on which tools are more appropriate to identify comparable regions, as well as further tools that could also be useful in specific contexts.** For example, in some national contexts case studies may be in more remote locations, which could make the urban-rural typology including remoteness (Eurostat, 2018b) relevant to identify comparable regions more precisely. A governance dimension may also be of relevance in some cases, which could make a tool such as the Regional Authority Index of relevance. It provides a national level ranking of the authority that regional, sub-national governments have in territorial and national governance (Liesbet et al. 2016; Schakel, 2020). A regional typology of border regions also exists (Eurostat, 2018a).

3.3 Less successful contexts

This section outlines **options for how less successful contexts can be identified.** It may emerge that a harmonised or semi-harmonised approach is appropriate across the regional contexts within the RURALIZATION project. But given our current knowledge, and similar to the approach taken in relation to identifying comparable contexts as outlined above, **the specific approach taken will be addressed in the selection of regions.**

Firstly, **less successful contexts** are areas that **do not show the more successful results identified in the promising practice case studies.** Secondly, less successful also goes beyond the absence of similar types of successful practices and **extends to the wider local context.** This means less successful is also understood as **less successful in the European or national context based on certain indicators of rural decline, capacity for regeneration and/or poor generational renewal.** This may mean the confrontation area is not less successful compared to case study context, which also could be a less successful context from this second perspective. In WP5 case studies have been selected on the basis of ‘promising practices’ (determined by the framework from section 2). Therefore, they may be located in both more or less successful contexts based on the wider European and national context. Confrontation areas are however still considered less successful by the fact that they are areas that do not show the more successful results identified in the promising practice case studies.

The **identification of less successful contexts goes beyond the more structural data** (e.g. economic structure of the region) that **helps identify comparable contexts** and looks at indications of being less successful in relation to rural decline (e.g. declining population, unemployment, level of health services (e.g. doctors per head), risk of poverty, environmental decline indicators), resources supporting regeneration (e.g. broadband access, infrastructure) and/or poorer generational renewal (e.g. ratio of young to old farmers, age dependency ratio). One specific statistical measure (e.g. population change) providing a contextual indicator of rural decline could be used a measure of less successful in the RURALIZATION context. However given the range of areas of concern to WP5 (newcomers, new entrants, succession) one measure is unlikely workable in terms of being specific enough. Regions may be ‘less successful’ in some respects and not others. Regions may show overall population decline, which provides a potentially appropriate indication of less successful in the context of rural

newcomers, but looking to other data the region may have a higher than European average ratio of young to old farmers which suggests it is more successful in relation to succession and new entrants. This calls into question the appropriateness of a generalised measure. That said, we could find identifying a core indicator for each area (newcomers, new entrants and successors) is appropriate. Data availability at European regional levels will also limit the potential indicators that can be used. A list of potentially useful quantitative data indicators at the European regional level (NUTS 2 or 3 level) is provided in Table 7.

| Indicator | Scale | Latest available year | Source |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Total population change (Crude rate of total population per 1 000 persons) | NUTS 3 | 2017 | Eurostat |
| GDP per inhabitant, average change per annum 2008-2017 | NUTS 2 | 2017 | Eurostat |
| Working-age population (%; people aged 20-64 years as a share of the total population; percentage points, change of this share between 2008 and 2018) | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Ratio of farm managers <35 years old/farmers >55 years old | NUTS 2 | 2016 | CAP Context Indicators |
| Gender employment gap | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Young people neither in employment nor in education or training (NEETs) | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Employment rate of recent graduates | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Unemployment rate (%; share of labour force aged 15-74 year) | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Households with broadband access (%; share of private households) | NUTS 2 | 2018 | Eurostat |
| Change in self-employment, 2011-2017 | NUTS 2 | 2011-2017 | CAP Context Indicators |

Table 7: Indicators to potentially identify less successful contexts

However, further to these more generalised considerations, depending on the case study and national context, less successful contexts may need to be understood with more specific, tailored differences. Indications of less successful contexts could be quantitative, statistical measures and/or more descriptive, qualitative observations of local and regional trends (e.g. based on existing research and anecdotal evidence). As part of task 5.1, WP5 will analyse European and national level data and published analysis relating to rural newcomers, new entrants into farming and successors in national contexts. This analysis can also provide indications of less successful contexts. WP4 task 4.1 involves identifying trends and weak signals relevant to rural regions at national, regional and local contexts that could also provide useful observations. Drawing on four of the Assessment Framework principles (rooted, interconnected, innovation and adaptability, see section 2) Annex 3 provides an initial set of open ended questions to assess 'less successful' contexts in a more flexible way. It intended to provide an open, yet guided format for assessment of 'less successful' contexts while making use of the data and analysis developed within other RURALIZATION tasks. As WP5 progresses, adaptations and additions can be made.

3.4 Contexts favourable for success

This section reflects briefly on how contexts favourable for success can be identified. This most directly relates to WP6 on access to land where the innovative practices analysed through case study are discussed in 10 other areas where the practice may provide a solution. In addition, considerations from section 3.2 on comparable contexts could also be useful here. Comparability is potentially important in assessment of regions that are favourable for success of the practice. Considerations from section 3.3 could also be useful here. Underpinning the idea of confrontations in 'less successful' contexts is that practices may provide solutions in these regions. But this final section takes a slightly different viewpoint looking more specifically at contexts favourable for success.

To better assess 'favourable for success' in local contexts we draw again on the Assessment Framework principles (see section 2) elaborating them in the context of identifying regions that appear more favourable for successful uptake of practices. Annex 4 includes a set of open-ended questions that can help inform assessment. This approach can be added to and refined within WP6 based on the preceding task findings, as well as the wider work of the RURALIZATION project. Again, the specific approach taken will be addressed in the selection of regions.

4 Gender analysis

An objective of the RURALIZATION project is to harvest potential growth that can be unlocked by overcoming traditional gender roles in the generational renewal of rural areas. Gender will be part of the quantitative analysis, the foresight analysis (WP4), the analysis of rural newcomers and new entrants (WP5) and access to land (WP6). It will also play a role in policy design and assessment (WP7). Specific projects to support new generations of women in rural areas will be analysed and assessed. To this end, the RURALIZATION Assessment Framework for promising practices (section 2) has a specific focus on women in its assessment of practices as promising. This is to feed into the selection of specific projects that support new generations of women.

The Assessment Framework also guides WPs about the analysis of gender issues.

- The Assessment Framework introduces the principles on gender in the research content developed in the European Commission Toolkit for Gender in EU-funded Research. This helps to provide a broad over-arching framework of key principles to guide the integration of gender analysis into the project from research design to dissemination (see Tool 1, Annex 5).
- The Assessment Framework also provides more generalised guidance on analysis of gender issues. It does this by providing check-list type tools related to data collection and analysis (see Tool 2 and 3, Annex 5) alongside further gender analysis resources (see Tool 4, Annex 5).
- The Assessment Framework will be used in conjunction with Deliverable D3.3 Review Reports and Factsheets to feed into the analysis of gender issues, as well as more specific guidance provided in WPs on how gender will be brought into the WP. Deliverable D3.3 Review Reports and Factsheets reviews current knowledge on gender issues impacting rural regeneration, also more specifically in relation to rural newcomers, new entrants into farming, succession and access to land. It will also look to address gender issues beyond binary conceptualisations. This provides an important knowledge base on gender issues emerging in current research relating to rural regeneration and generational renewal.

5 References

- 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>
- Adinolfi, F. and Capitanio, F. 2009. Innovation vs opposition: the role of women in the family farms regeneration process. An Italian experience. *New Medit*, 8 (2), p.22-30.
- Anthopoulou, T. 2010. Rural women in local agrofood production: Between entrepreneurial initiatives and family strategies. A case study in Greece. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(4), p.394-403.
- Atterton, J. 2016. Invigorating the New Rural Economy: Entrepreneurship and Innovation, in eds. Shucksmith, M. and Brown, D. *Routledge International Handbook of Rural Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, p.217-235.
- 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>
- BEPA, 2011. Empowering people, driving change: Social Innovation in the European Union. Retrieved on 12/02/2020 from <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/librarydoc/empowering-people-driving-change-social-innovation-in-the-european-union>
- 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, 2016. Rural Marginalisation and the Role of Social Innovation; A Turn Towards Nexogenous Development and Rural Reconnection. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56 (4) p.552-573. DOI: 10.1111/soru.12119
- Bosworth, G. and Glasgow, N. 2012. Entrepreneurial Behaviour among Rural In-Migrants, in eds. M Shucksmith, D. Brown, S. Shortall, J. Vergunst and M. Warner, *Rural Transformations and Rural Policies in the US and UK*. London: Routledge, p. 138–155.
- Braithwaite, K. 2009. Building on What You Have Got: A Guide to Optimising Assets. Carnegie UK Trust: Dunfermline, UK. Retrieved on 07/08/2019 from: <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/building-on-what-you-have-got-a-guide-to-optimising-assets>
- 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.

Coopmans, I., Desein, 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., Gavrilescu, 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. and Noguera, J. 2010. Scientific Working Paper No. 24: A Typology of Intermediate and Predominantly Rural NUTS 3 Regions. EDORA Final Report Annex 1 Part 24. Retrieved on 20/08/2019 from: <https://www.espon.eu/programme/projects/espon-2013/applied-research/edora-european-development-opportunities-rural-areas>

Copus, A. K., Shucksmith, M., Dax, T., Meredith, D. 2011. 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.

Crescenzi, R. and Giua, M. 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>

Csurgo, B. and B. Megyesi. 2016. The role of small towns in local place making. *European Countryside*, 8(4), p.427-43.

Dargan, L. and Shucksmith, M. 2008. LEADER and Innovation. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48 (3), p.274-291, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2008.00463.x

Dematteis, G., and Magnaghi, A. 2018. Patrimonio territoriale e coraltà produttiva: nuove frontiere per i sistemi economici locali. *Scienze del territorio*, 6, p.12-26, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/Scienze_Territorio-24362

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

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, 2006a. Employment in rural areas: closing the jobs gap. Commission Staff Working Document: COM(2006) 857 final. Retrieved on 21/10/2019 from: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/reports/ruralemployment/sec1772_en.pdf

EC, 2006b. The LEADER Approach: A Basic Guide. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

EC, 2011. Toolkit Gender in EU Funded Research. European Commission Retrieved on 01/03/2020 from: https://eige.europa.eu/library/resource/aleph_eige000000269

EC, 2013. Benchmarking Regional Structure. Smart Specialisation Platform. Retrieved on 23/09/2019 from <https://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/regional-benchmarking>

EC, 2017. EU Action For Smart Villages. Retrieved on 15/07/2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/looking-ahead/rur-dev-small-villages_en.pdf

EC. 2010. Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. COM (2019) 2010. Brussel: European Commission. Retrieved on 20/06/2019 from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:EN:PDF>

ECA, 2010. Implementation of the LEADER approach for rural development. Special Report No. 5. Luxembourg: European Court of Auditors. Retrieved on 23/10/2019 from https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR10_05/SR10_05_EN.PDF

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

EEA, 2020. Natura 2000 data - the European network of protected sites. Retrieved on 17/05/2020 from <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/natura-11>

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

EP, 2019. The professional status of rural women in the EU. Study requested by the FEMM committee. Retrieved on 26/09/2019 from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/dd3d08da-90ac-11e9-9369-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF>

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

Esparcia, J. 2014. Innovation and networks in rural areas. An analysis from European innovative projects, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, p.1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2013.12.004>

Eurostat, 2018a. Methodological manual on territorial typologies. 2018 Edition. Luxembourg: European Commission. Retrieved on 09/12/2019 from <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-manuals-and-guidelines/-/KS-GQ-18-008>

- Eurostat, 2018b. Regional typologies overview. Retrieved on 09/12/2019 from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Regional typologies overview](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Regional_typologies_overview)
- 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/>
- Findlay, A., Short, D., Stockdale, A., 2000. The labour market impact of migration to rural areas. *Applied Geography*, 20, p.333–348.
- 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, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13673882.2017.11878963>
- Furbey, R. 1999. Urban ‘regeneration’: reflections on a metaphor. *Critical Social Policy*, 19(4), p.419-445.
- Goodwin-Hawkins, B. 2019. Strengthening rural-urban cultural connections: Three lessons from ROBUST’s Cultural Connections Community of Practice. Retrieved on 15/02/2020 from: [https://rural-urban.eu/sites/default/files/Strengthening RuralUrban Cultural Connections JULY2019.pdf](https://rural-urban.eu/sites/default/files/Strengthening_RuralUrban_Cultural_Connections_JULY2019.pdf)
- Guirado González, C., Badia Perpinyà, A., Tulla i Pujol, A. F., Vera Martín, A., Valldeperas Belmonte, N. 2014. Social farming in Catalonia (Spain): social innovation and agroecological dynamization as employment for exclusion. *Ager*, 17, p. 65-97.
- Hausner, V.A. 1993. The future of urban development. *RSA Journal*, 141 (5441), p.523-533.
- Heggem, R. 2014. Diversification and re-feminisation of Norwegian farm properties. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(4), p.439-459.
- Knickel, K., Simone, S., von Münchhausen, S., Vihinen, H. and Weberin, A. 2008. New Institutional Frameworks in Rural Development in eds. J. D. van der Ploeg and T. Marsden, *Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*. Assen: Van Gorcum, p. 111–128.
- 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.
- Lai, M. 2018. Making the most of project and good practice examples. European Network for Rural Development National Rural Network Meeting. Retrieved on 12/02/2020 from: [https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/w31_nrn-project-examples capitalisation lai.pdf](https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/w31_nrn-project-examples_capitalisation_lai.pdf)

Lang, R. and Fink, M. 2019. Rural social entrepreneurship: The role of social capital within and across institutional levels. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 70, p.155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.03.012>

Leibert, T. 2015. She leaves, he stays? Sex-selective migration in rural East Germany. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 43, p.267-279.

Liesbet, H., Marks, G., Schakel, A.H., Chapman-Osterkat, S., Niedzwiecki, S. and Shair-Rosenfield, S. 2016. *Measuring regional authority. Volume I: A postfunctionalist theory of governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little, J. 2009. Gender and Rurality, in eds. R. Kitchin and N. Thrift. *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography*. Oxford: Elsevier, p.315-319.

Mahon, M. and Hyyryläinen, T. 2019. Rural Arts Festivals as Contributors to Rural Development and Resilience. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59 (4), <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12231>

Marsden, T. 2012. Third Natures? Reconstituting Space through Place-making Strategies for Sustainability. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*. 19 (2), p.257-274.

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/>

McCarthy, J. 2019. EIP-AGRI: Exploring emergent European policy tools and their potential to support collaborative agro-ecological innovation. Paper presented at the European Society for Rural Sociology Conference, June 27th.

McKee, A., Sutherland, L.A., Hopkins, J., Flanigan, S. Rickett, A. 2018. Increasing the Availability of Farmland for New Entrants to Agriculture in Scotland: Final report to the Scottish Land Commission. The James Hutton Institute. Retrieved on 09/01/2020 from https://landcommission.gov.scot/downloads/5dd6a2d2ac866_McKee-et-al.-Final-report-to-SLC-Increasing-land-availability-for-new-entrants-2.5.2018.pdf

Murdoch, J. 2000. Networks – a new paradigm of rural development? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, p.407-419.

Navarro, M., Gibaja, J.J., Franco, S., Murciego, A., Gianelle, C., Hegyi, F.B. and Kleibrink, A. 2014. Regional benchmarking in the smart specialisation process: Identification of reference regions based on structural similarity. JRC Technical report. S3 Working Paper Series No. 03/2014 Retrieved on 20/10/2019 from: <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/other/regional-benchmarking-smart-specialisation-process-identification-reference-regions-based-structural>

Ní Fhlatharta, A. 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.

North, D. and Smallbone, D. 2006. Developing entrepreneurship and enterprise in European peripheral rural areas: Some issues facing policy makers. *European Planning Studies*, 14(1), p. 41–60.

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, 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, 2018. Policy Note: Rural 3.0. A Framework for Rural Development. Retrieved on 27/11/2019 from <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/Rural-3.0-Policy-Note.pdf>

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.

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

Ray, C. 2006. Neo-endogenous rural development in the EU, in eds. P.J. Cloke, T. Marsden and P. Mooney, *Handbook of Rural Studies*, London: Sage, p.278–291.

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

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.

RURINNO, 2018. RurInno Report Summary. Retrieved on 27-6-2019 from <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/199946/reporting/en>

Schakel, A.H. 2020. Regional Authority Index. Retrieved on 20/03/2020 from: <https://www.arjanschakel.nl/index.php/regional-authority-index>

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. 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. and Bock, B. 2015. Introduction: rural women in Europe: the impact of place and culture on gender mainstreaming the European Rural Development Programme. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 22 (5), p.662-669, DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2014.917819

Sida, 2015. Gender Analysis – Principles and Elements. Retrieved on 31/03/2019 from: <https://www.sida.se/contentassets/a3f08692e731475db106fdf84f2fb9bd/gender-tool-analysis.pdf>

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

Tovey, H. 2008. Introduction: Rural Sustainable Development in the Knowledge Society Era. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48 (3) p.185-199.

van der Ploeg, J.D., Barjolle, D., Bruil, J., Brunori, G., Costa Madureira, L.M., Dessein, J., Drag, Z., Fink-Kessler, A., Gasselin, P., Gonzalez de Molina, M., Gorchach, 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>

Woods, M. 2005. *Rural Geography: Processes, Responses and Experiences in Rural Restructuring*. London: Sage.

Woodward, M. and Bremner, C. 2015. Learning from Inland: Redefining Regional Creativity, in eds. J. McDonald and R. Mason, *Creative Communities: Regional Inclusion and the Arts*. Bristol: Intellect Books, p.63-77.

6 Annexes

Annex 1 - Promising Practice Assessment Framework: Template for assessment of practices

To complete assessment of each promising practice:

- **First review Table A.** It provides a summary of the promising practice assessment framework.
- The Assessment Framework should be **used as fully as possible**. But partners in **national contexts decide** from their own contexts **what indicators should be met** to deem a practice promising (all or a sub-set). This may also differ depending on the type of practice. Further guidance can be provided from specific WPs as necessary.
- **Complete the General Information Table B and Tables C to O.**
- For more **information on each principle, dimension and indicator** consult **Annex 2** and **section 2** of the **Assessment Framework main report**.
- **Return to Table A** to complete the final review and arrive at final assessment of the 'promising' nature of the practice.

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A. | | |
| Assessment Review and Final Result | | |
| To meet an indicator, at least 1 criteria (i.e. check boxes) under each indicator in Tables C to O should be identified in the practice. | | |
| Name: [Insert] | | |
| <i>Dimension</i> | Principle: 1. Efficiency | |
| | <i>Investment is justified</i> | Practice provides value for investment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Sustainable natural resource use</i> | Practice focuses on using natural resources sustainably <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Dimension</i> | Principle: 2. Legitimacy | |
| | <i>Evidence-based</i> | Decline issue (s) the practice addresses are identified locally <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Governance</i> | Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of relevant actors <input type="checkbox"/> *Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of women <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Local legitimacy</i> | Practice is promising because of factors not captured by the Assessment Framework that make it a legitimate approach in this context <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Dimension</i> | Principle: 3. Rooted | |
| | <i>Local resources</i> | Practice uses local resources or non-local resources in combination with local <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Local benefits</i> | Practice results in regeneration benefits that are rooted locally <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dimension | Principle: 4. Interconnected | |
| | <i>Integrated</i> | Practice responds to (at least two) rural decline issue(s) <input type="checkbox"/> *Practice responds to (at least two) rural decline issue(s) relating to rural women <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Creates connections</i> | Practice contributes to creating collaborative connections between disconnected actors across space (e.g. urban and rural; rural and rural) or within rural areas <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dimension | Principle: 5. Innovation | |
| | <i>Technological and non-technological innovation</i> | Develops, adopts or adapts innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <i>Innovation transferability</i> | Evidence exists of replicability and adaptability potential <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dimension | Principle: 6. Adaptability | |
| | <i>Capacities</i> | Practice supports strengthening of local capacities <input type="checkbox"/> *Practice supports strengthening of women's capacities <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | <i>Diversity</i> |
| Result | | |
| | Promising practice? <i>Please provide short (e.g. 100-200 words) final explanation for assessment.</i> <i>This is particularly important in cases where aspects of the practice that are 'promising' in the local context don't fit under the current principles/dimensions/indicators. This can help to feed into future improvement of the framework.</i> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> = Promising practice No <input type="checkbox"/> ≠ Promising practice |
| | Meets rural women* indicators? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> *Meets indicators marked with an asterisk (*) (DoA states: "...specific projects to support women new generations in rural areas will be analysed and assessed" (p12, Annex 1, Part B)). No <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| B. General Information | |
| Work package | |
| Type of practice <i>e.g. newcomers, new entrants, succession</i> | |
| Name | |
| Location | |
| Duration <i>e.g. year of establishment if ongoing practice, duration if fixed term project</i> | |
| Scale of case study – <i>as relevant</i> | Regional – NUTS 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Regional – NUTS 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Regional – NUTS 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Local – below NUTS 3 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NUTS region names – <i>as relevant. Note the name and code of the NUTS region (s) the case is located within. Even if the practice operates at a local scale it will still be within a wider NUTS 2 region.</i> | |
| Rural-urban typology <i>Note if the practice is located within a predominantly rural, intermediate or predominantly urban area</i> | |
| EU Member State | |
| Short description <i>General description of practice e.g. 20-40 words</i> | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| C. | |
| Principle: 1. Efficiency - 'Investment' to pursue aims and use of resources efficiently | |
| Dimension: Investment is justified | |
| Indicator: Practice provides value for investment | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Currently achieving/has achieved intended aims <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Currently achieving/has achieved intended aims and has expected spin-off value <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Early-stage practice that is beginning/shows promise to meet intended aims <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Not a 'quick fix' <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Higher cost of delivery, but better outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lower cost of delivery <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Relies on investment of community resources with good outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Interconnects with a wider development framework <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other reason for value for investment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D. | |
| Principle: 1. Efficiency - 'Investment' to pursue aims and use of resources efficiently | |
| Dimension: Sustainable natural resource use | |
| Indicator: Practice focuses on using natural resources sustainably | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Practice supports or within economic sector that is not centrally dependent on non-renewable natural resources and is focused on using natural resources sustainably <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Supports pro-environmental practices <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Supports restorative natural resource use <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other method working towards environmental sustainability <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| E. | |
| Principle: 2. Legitimacy – A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or wider local legitimacy | |
| Dimension: Evidence-based | |
| Indicator: Decline issue (s) the practice addresses are identified locally through: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Local informal knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Local organisation expertise <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Research evidence <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Formal needs assessment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Is a grassroots response to local need <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F. Principle: 2. Legitimacy – A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy | |
| Dimension: Governance | |
| Indicator: Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of relevant actors | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Adopts participative governance approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Adopts participative implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Adopts bottom-up implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Practice involves groups at greater risk of marginalisation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | More top-down emphasis, but relevant to context <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Evidence of broader, informal engagement with relevant actors <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |
| *Indicator: Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of women | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Adopts participative governance approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Adopts participative implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Adopts bottom-up implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | More top-down emphasis, but relevant to context <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Practice targets women directly <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| G. Principle: 2. Legitimacy - A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy | |
| Dimension: Local legitimacy | |
| Indicator: Practice is promising because of factors not captured by the Assessment Framework that make it a legitimate approach in this context | |
| Provide explanation (e.g. 100-200 words) | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| H. | |
| Principle: 3. Rooted – Resources underpinning development and locally rooted benefits | |
| Dimension: Local resources | |
| Indicator: Practice uses local resources or non-local resources in combination with local: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Built capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Human capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Political capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I. | |
| Principle: 3. Rooted – Resources underpinning development and locally rooted benefits | |
| Dimension: Local benefits | |
| Indicator: Practice results in regeneration benefits that are rooted locally | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Creates new jobs or improves quality of existing jobs <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Creates new services or improves quality of existing services <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Fills key infrastructure gaps <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Addresses human skill gaps <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Attracts new residents <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Attracts young residents <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Creates social benefits <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Creates cultural benefits <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Creates environmental benefits <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other local regeneration benefit <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| J. Principle: 4. Interconnected – Addressing interconnected decline issues and strengthening rural networks | |
| Dimension: Integrated | |
| Indicator: Practice responds to (at least two) rural decline issue(s) | |
| Select criteria (at least two) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Demographic decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Economic decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Environmental decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other decline issue <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |
| *Indicator: Practice responds to rural decline issue(s) (at least two) relating to rural women | |
| Select criteria (at least two) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Demographic decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Economic decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Environmental decline <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other decline issue <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| K. Principle: 4. Interconnected – Addressing interconnected decline issues and strengthening rural networks | |
| Dimension: Creates connections | |
| Indicator: Practice contributes to creating collaborative connections between disconnected actors across space (e.g. urban and rural; rural and rural) or within rural areas | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate | Knowledge connections <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Economic connections <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social connections <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural connections <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Organisational connections <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other connections <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| L. | |
| Principle: 5. Innovation – Vital importance of innovation and its potential transferability | |
| Dimension: Technological and non-technological innovation | |
| Indicator: Develops, adopts or adapts innovation that can be classed as: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Organisational innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Technical/product innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Environmental innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Entrepreneurial innovation by core target group (i.e. youth, new entrants to farming, rural newcomers, women) <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other type of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| M. | |
| Principle: 5. Innovation – Vital importance of innovation and its potential transferability | |
| Dimension: Innovation transferability | |
| Indicator: Evidence exists of replicability and adaptability potential | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Is a 'good practice ' <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Is a potential 'good practice' <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Similar resources exist elsewhere <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Flexibility <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Proven adaptations exist <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other evidence <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| N. | |
| Principle: 6. Adaptability – Strengthening local capacities to adapt and respond | |
| Dimension: Capacities | |
| Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of local capacities through improving/building: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection: | Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Built capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Human capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Political capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |
| *Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of women's capacities through improving/building: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection: | Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Built capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Human capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Political capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other capital <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| O. | |
| Principle: 6. Adaptability – Strengthening local capacities to adapt and respond | |
| Dimension: Diversity | |
| Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of diversity in local economy and society through: | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection: | Economic diversity <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Demographic diversity <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Social diversity <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Cultural diversity <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Other way that local diversity is built <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Explanation for selection: |

Annex 2 – Promising Practice Assessment Framework: Further information on criteria and examples

| C. | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Principle: 1. Efficiency – ‘Investment’ to pursue aims and use of resources efficiently | | |
| Dimension: Investment is justified | | |
| Indicator: Practice provides value for investment | Further information and examples | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Currently achieving/has achieved intended aims <input type="checkbox"/> | Some evidence exists, either published (e.g. programme assessment, wider research, newsletters, local news reports, wider online information) or unpublished (e.g. local knowledge, anecdotal evidence) to show that the practice is achieving (ongoing practice) or has achieved (time-limited practice) a specific aim or outcome. This could be aligned with for example the aims of a specific project, wider funding programme, a grassroots local community or business initiative. This can be interpreted as the core, broad, overarching aim of the practice (e.g. aims to support newcomers to rural areas or improve access to land for new entrants) or more specific aims. |
| | Currently achieving/has achieved intended aims and has expected spin-off value <input type="checkbox"/> | In addition to above, practice is expected to generate/has generated added value/positive synergies beyond the main aims of the practice. |
| | Early-stage practice that is beginning/shows promise to meet intended aims <input type="checkbox"/> | Practices in the initial phases of development can still show strong ‘promise’. Some evidence exists that the practice has already begun to show some effects towards meeting its aims. |
| | Not a 'quick fix' <input type="checkbox"/> | Furbey (1999, p.428) outlines how regeneration has a temporal dimension, which is “not a quick mechanistic fix”. Regeneration should avoid fragmented, short-term project-based initiatives (Hausner, 1993). Grassroots, bottom-up practices that emerge from local communities are important regeneration practices. However this does not exclude short-term projects, such as public investment supports a short-term project acting as a catalyst for a more long-term grassroots project with potential to become self-sustaining financially. |
| | Higher cost of delivery, but better outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> | For example, additional costs arise because of LEADER programme structure (multi-level administration, multi-actor involvement), but justified because of added-value (e.g. local needs better served, local engagement improved) of the approach (ECA, 2010). Need for a longer-term, higher cost project to enable capacities and resources to build towards achieving end goal (Powe et al., 2015). |
| | Lower cost of delivery <input type="checkbox"/> | For example, a community-led project or public service provision through social enterprise. |
| | Relies on investment of community resources with good outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> | Investment is not through public funding but investment of for example time and skills of community members, key individuals in a grassroots practice or informal group. |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Interconnects with a wider development framework <input type="checkbox"/> | Core or wider aims of the practice links with other local, national, EU or international policy objectives (e.g. Europe 2020 strategy goals of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, UN sustainable development goals, local or national development plans). |
| | Other reason for value for investment <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D. | | |
| Principle: 1. Efficiency – ‘Investment’ to pursue aims and use of resources efficiently | | |
| Dimension: Sustainable natural resource use | | |
| Indicator: Practice focuses on using natural resources sustainably | | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Practice supports or within economic sector that is not centrally dependent on non-renewable natural resources and is focused on using natural resources sustainably <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Further information and examples</i> Such as agriculture, forestry, renewable energy |
| | Supports pro-environmental practices <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as low external input farming, more efficient use of internal natural resources of the farm (van der Ploeg et al. 2019), high nature value farming. |
| | Supports restorative natural resource use <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as regenerative farming, agroecology |
| | Other method working towards environmental sustainability <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | Not a natural resource based activity |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E. | | |
| Principle: 2. Legitimacy – A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy | | |
| Dimension: Evidence-based | | |
| Indicator: Decline issue (s) the practice addresses are identified locally through: | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Local informal knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> | Recognised issue among local community. Wider anecdotal evidence exists of the issue (e.g. local media and politics) |
| | Local organisation expertise <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as expertise of civic, public or private industry groups |
| | Research evidence <input type="checkbox"/> | Local, national or international research evidence such as statistics, reports etc. |
| | Formal needs assessment <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as a local development plan |
| | Is a grassroots response to local need <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| F. | | |
| Principle: 2. Legitimacy – A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy | | |
| Dimension: Governance | | |
| Indicator: Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of relevant actors | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| Select criteria (one or more) as | Adopts participative governance approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Multi-actor governance with relevant stakeholders involved such as from public, private and community sectors. Also may go beyond involving relevant local actors (e.g. farmers, wider community) to ensure participation is also inclusive in terms of other factors such as e.g. gender, age, income. |
| | Adopts participative implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Relevant local actors (e.g. farmers, wider local community) are involved in implementing the practice, such as: Practice is community-led with public sector playing facilitative role; Practice is jointly implemented using the multi-actor approach. |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection</p> | Adopts bottom-up implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Relevant local actors (e.g. farmers, wider local community) implement the practice. This includes practices that are initiated at the grassroots level without any public funding or with some public funding. |
| | Practice involves groups at greater risk of marginalisation <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as international migrants, asylum seekers, non-binary genders, LGBTQ, elderly, unemployed, youth. Involvement can play out differently and mean groups at greater risk of marginalisation are for example targeted as beneficiaries of implementation or the practice is developed and/or implemented these groups. |
| | More top-down emphasis, but relevant to context <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Evidence of broader, informal engagement with relevant actors <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as through design or review of practice. |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |
| <p>*Indicator: Practice is developed/implemented by or promotes engagement and inclusion of women</p> | | <p><i>Further information and examples</i></p> |
| <p>Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection</p> | Adopts participative governance approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Supports women’s equal participation in rural development decision-making, such as local politics, state boards, cooperatives, farming organisations (EIGE, 2017; Shortall, 2018). |
| | Adopts participative implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Women are involved in implementing the practice such as: Practice is led by women with public sector playing facilitative role; Practice is jointly implemented using the multi-actor approach. |
| | Adopts bottom-up implementation approach <input type="checkbox"/> | Women implement the practice. This includes practices that are initiated at the grassroots level without any public funding or with some public funding. |
| | More top-down emphasis, but relevant to context <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Practice targets women directly <input type="checkbox"/> | For example, women are targeted as beneficiaries of implementation. |
| | Other method <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <p>G. Principle 2. Legitimacy – A legitimate approach through its basis in evidence, governance approach or has wider local legitimacy</p> | |
| <p>Dimension: Local legitimacy</p> | |
| <p>Indicator: Practice is promising because of factors not captured by the Assessment Framework that make it a legitimate approach in this context</p> | |
| <p><i>Provide explanation (e.g. 100-200 words)</i></p> | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>H. Principle: 3. Rooted – Resources underpinning development and locally rooted benefits</p> | | |
| <p>Dimension: Local resources</p> | | |
| <p>Indicator: Practice uses local resources or non-local resources in combination with local:</p> | <p><i>Further information and examples</i></p> | |
| <p>Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection</p> | <p>Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Financial capital: "Financial capital plays an important role in the economy, enabling other types of capital to be owned and traded" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). Uses financial capital such as: "The liquid capital accessible to the rural population and business community, and that held by community organisations" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> |
| | <p>Built capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Build capital: "Fixed assets which facilitate the livelihood or well-being of the community" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). Uses built capital such as: "Buildings, infrastructure and other fixed assets, whether publically, community or privately owned" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> |
| | <p>Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Natural capital: "Landscape and any stock or flow of energy and renewable or non-renewable resources that produces goods and services, (including tourism and recreation)" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). Uses natural capital such as: "Water catchments, forests, minerals, fish, wind, wildlife and farm stock". Landscape types such as farmland; coastal areas and uplands (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2).</p> |
| | <p>Social capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Social capital: "Features of social organisation such as networks, norms of trust that facilitate cooperation for mutual benefit" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). Uses social capital such as: "Sectoral organisations, business representative associations, social and sports clubs, religious groups" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127), wider formal and informal networks.</p> |
| | <p>Human capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Human capital: "People’s health, knowledge, skills and motivation" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). "Tacit knowledge’ is as important as formal education and training" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). Uses human capital such as local unique knowledge such as of specific groups (e.g. women, youth, newcomers) or specialised local knowledge (e.g. environmental conditions, heritage).</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/> | Cultural capital: "Shared attitudes and mores, which shape the way we view the world and what we value" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). Uses cultural capital such as, entrepreneurial culture (Copus et al. 2011); local cultural capital to symbolise and represent places in rural place-making (Csurgo and Megyei, 2016); harnessing creativity and culture through rural arts festivals (e.g. Mahon and Hyryläinen, 2019). |
| | Political capital <input type="checkbox"/> | Political capital: "The ability of a community to influence the distribution and use of resources" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). Uses political capital such as: "Presence of, and engagement in, 'bottom up' initiatives, the most local part of 'multi-level governance'. Relates to local empowerment v. top-down policy, globalisation" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). |
| | Other capital <input type="checkbox"/> | Other types of capital can interlink with the main forms outlined, for example digital capital can encompass human capital (skills) and built capital (broadband infrastructure) or creative capital a combination of human, social and cultural capital. |
| Explanation for selection: | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I. | | |
| Principle: 3. Rooted – Resources underpinning development and locally rooted benefits | | |
| Dimension: Local benefits | | |
| Indicator: Practice results in regeneration benefits that are rooted locally | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Creates new jobs or improves quality of existing jobs <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as improves the quality of existing jobs that offer sustainable livelihoods (e.g. liveable pay, sustained employment). For example, part of the young farmer and new entrant problem is not a lack of interest in farming as a profession, but not enough farm systems that offer a reasonable income (Matthews, 2013) |
| | Creates new services or improves quality of existing services <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as multifunctional agriculture parks (Dematteis and Magnaghi (2018); social innovation via social enterprise that can address gaps in public service provision and/or introducing innovative new solutions for service delivery (Fink et al., 2017; Lang and Fink, 2019); improves social amenities, such as community meeting spaces. |
| | Fills key infrastructure gaps <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as rural digital infrastructure |
| | Addresses human skill gaps <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as up-skilling of local residents to fill newly created jobs or changing labour market needs; newcomer skills development in entrepreneurship |
| | Attracts new residents <input type="checkbox"/> | Combats rural depopulation. Also potential wider benefits if new residents are self-employed or create small businesses and jobs (Findlay et al., 2000, Stockdale, 2006). The wider networks new residents can bring may also have regeneration benefits. For example, newcomer entrepreneurs can link rural places to external people and places, such as external markets and attracting visitors to rural areas through services they provide (Piša and Hruška, 2019). |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Attracts young residents <input type="checkbox"/> | Combats rural youth depopulation helping address generational renewal in rural areas or specific sectors such as agriculture. |
| | Creates social benefits <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as supporting greater community cohesion and cooperation. |
| | Creates cultural benefits <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as creating new culture or preserving traditional culture of tangible (e.g. food, craft, arts, built heritage) or intangible nature (e.g. skills, language). |
| | Creates environmental benefits <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as preserving the rural environment, restoring degraded environments, improving biodiversity. |
| | Other local regeneration benefit <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| J. | | |
| Principle: 4. Interconnected – Addressing interconnected decline issues and strengthening rural networks | | |
| Dimension: Integrated | | |
| Indicator: Practice responds to (at least two) rural decline issue(s) | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| Select criteria (at least two) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Demographic decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to decline of rural population or certain groups within it (e.g. youth, young farmers) |
| | Economic decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to e.g. limited job opportunities and growth in the rural economy; decline in local human capital skills base. |
| | Social decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to e.g. weakening social connections within community; rural social problems (e.g. crime, weak service provision) |
| | Cultural decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to e.g. distinct local culture weakened; heritage lacking preservation; Presence of problematic cultural conflicts among local population; Dominance of traditional norms that lead to inequalities. |
| | Environmental decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to degrading of environmental resources (e.g. land, water, air, forests, soil, biodiversity) and the need for more sustainable approaches to agriculture that recognise the interdependencies between social, cultural and ecological systems helping address interconnected decline issues (e.g. low farm incomes and environmental degradation) (Marsden, 2012). |
| | Other decline issue <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to cross-cutting issues for example socio-economic decline or wider, more specific issues linked with rural decline such as decline of small farms, decline of rural towns etc. |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | |
| *Indicator: Practice responds to rural decline issue(s) (at least two) relating to rural women | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| Select criteria (at least two) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Demographic decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to the issue of ‘masculinisation’ of rural areas with greater numbers of women migrating out of rural areas (EP, 2019) and a lower proportion of women in rural regions than urban (EIGE, 2017) |
| | Economic decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to e.g. issue of higher rates of female unemployment in rural areas (EIGE, 2017); the gender gap in opportunities for young women in rural areas (Heggem, 2014; Leibert 2015; Kuhmonen et al., 2016) Supports e.g. equal participation of men and women in the rural workforce or specific areas such as farming (EIGE, 2017) or entrepreneurship (Ní Fhlatharta and Farrell, 2017). |
| | Social decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to the need to build social connections between women with shared interests (e.g. farmers, entrepreneurs) supporting for example collaborative entrepreneurial activities, knowledge exchange. |
| | Cultural decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to the need to alter traditional views on the role of men and women in society (Shortall, 2016; EIGE, 2017) such as traditional gender and work identities on family farms around farming as male activity and gendered division of labour (Shortall, 2014; 2018; Coopmans et al. 2019). |
| | Environmental decline <input type="checkbox"/> | Responds to the need for more environmentally sustainable farming practices that also can make farming a more attractive profession for women (e.g. organics, smaller-scale, mixed, extensive farming) |
| | Other decline issue <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| K. | | |
| Principle: 4. Interconnected – Addressing interconnected decline issues and strengthening rural networks | | |
| Dimension: Creates connections | | |
| Indicator: Practice contributes to creating collaborative connections between disconnected actors across space (e.g. urban and rural; rural and rural) or within rural areas | | <i>Further information and examples</i> |
| | Knowledge connections <input type="checkbox"/> | Knowledge connections supporting exchange and flows of information between actors |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection</p> | <p>Economic connections <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Economic connections tapping into external market opportunities, collaboration between remotely located enterprises or rural remote working. Rural product and service connections to urban markets (OECD, 2018). Rural and urban coordinated land use planning to avoid negative spill-over effects (OECD, 2018). Connects farmers and new entrants through joint ventures, such as contract farming, partnerships and share farming (FAS, 2017; McKee et al. 2018).</p> |
| | <p>Social connections <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Urban-rural collaboration on public service provision (OECD, 2018).</p> |
| | <p>Cultural connections <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Cultural connections e.g. between urban and rural areas (Goodwin-Hawkins, 2019); between sectors/actors that are disconnected (e.g. farmers and artists) to share cultural knowledge and create new cultural products (Woodward and Bremner, 2015).</p> |
| | <p>Organisational connections <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Collaborative, multi-actor approach that brings together a range of actors sharing different perspectives and knowledge (e.g. collaborative governance, multi-actor projects). Is a hybrid organisation that sits at the intersection of the state, market and civil society (RURINNO, 2018)</p> |
| | <p>Other connections <input type="checkbox"/></p> | |
| | <p>Explanation for selection:</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| L. | | |
| Principle: 5. Innovation – Vital importance of innovation and its potential transferability | | |
| Dimension: Technological and non-technological innovation | | |
| Indicator: Develops, adopts or adapts innovation that can be classed as: | <i>Further information and examples</i> | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Organisational innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | Innovative governance or new ways of organising that supports local social and/or economic opportunities, such as: Improve efficiency and reduce costs of service delivery (OECD, 2014); Bring disconnected actors together (e.g. new entrants and exiting farmers; entrepreneurs and asylum seekers, remote workers and urban employers); Offer a specific-purpose collaborative business model such as connecting producers and consumers (e.g. community supported agriculture). |
| | Cultural innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | "Improving the rural milieu" (Dargan and Shucksmith, 2008, p.285) or different aspects of cultural capital both intangible (e.g. norms, customs) and tangible (e.g. built heritage). |
| | Technical/product innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | Such as technical innovation that increases productivity; Product innovation that harnesses unique rural assets (e.g. cultural or natural capital). |
| | Social innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | "...new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs (more effectively than alternatives) and create new social relationships or collaborations" (BEPA, 2011, p.33), such as: Social innovation serving the health and social care needs of older residents in rural areas (Bosworth and Glasgow, 2012). For example, care cooperatives in Dutch rural areas focused on providing local care needs to residents such as the elderly and disabled (Bock, 2016). Cross-sectoral social innovation, such as agriculture and social care through social farming (Guirado González et al. 2014). |
| | Environmental innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | Develops innovation to harness previously untapped value or greater value in existing rural natural resources, such as: Collaborative agro-ecological innovation through EIP-AGRI Operational Groups (McCarthy, 2019). |
| | Entrepreneurial innovation by core target group (i.e. youth, new entrants to farming, rural newcomers, women) <input type="checkbox"/> | Innovation through entrepreneurship, such as: rural entrepreneurship where individuals innovate through taking on new roles, such as farmers as environmental project managers, rural tourism or food entrepreneurs (OECD, 2014). Innovative rural enterprise initiated by youth, women, newcomers. For example, on or off-farm female-led entrepreneurial innovation (Ní Fhlatharta and Farrell, 2017; Adinolfi and Capitanio, 2009; Anthopoulou, 2010). |
| | Other type of innovation <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| M. | | |
| Principle: 5. Innovation – Vital importance of innovation and its potential transferability | | |
| Dimension: Innovation transferability | | |
| Indicator: Evidence exists of replicability and adaptability potential | <i>Further information and examples</i> | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection | Is a 'good practice ' <input type="checkbox"/> | Can be broadly considered a 'good practice' by that fact that it has been implemented successfully (i.e. the approach has been tested and validated to work) which has brought positive results to the rural economy and society (Lai, 2018). |
| | Is a potential good practice <input type="checkbox"/> | Practices can still be in the early stages of their development but are already beginning to show impact. For example practices that are currently being implemented but show strong potential for positive regeneration results could be potentially transformative, highly innovative practices. |
| | Similar resources exist elsewhere <input type="checkbox"/> | For example, underpinning assets (e.g. financial, built, social capital etc.) are not unique to place and in theory can be replicated/exist elsewhere. For example, if reliant on public funding equivalent support schemes available elsewhere (e.g. has benefited from EU support) or if reliant on public funding but has potential for reduced reliance or independence through own income generation this indicates transferability. Also the organisational resources it relies on could provide another indication. Such as governance structures are likely to be successful elsewhere, for example adopts an approach that can be identified with typical approaches (e.g. self-governance, network governance, knowledge governance, market governance). |
| | Flexibility <input type="checkbox"/> | Flexibility of structure/approach to scaling up e.g. also appears logical on a larger scale. Flexibility of structure/approach to scaling down e.g. only some aspects taken forward to different contexts. |
| | Proven adaptations exist <input type="checkbox"/> | Not an isolated practice. It has already been adapted in other contexts to some extent. For example it could be a more novel practice yet there is evidence of successful adaptations, such as the Farm Incubators in the US and European context (McKee et al. 2018; Access to Land Network, 2018). Or there could be more extensive proven successful transfer and adaptation of practices to different geographies and scales such as the examples of Food Policy Networks and Community Supported Agriculture. |
| | Other evidence <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Explanation for selection: | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N. | | |
| Principle: 6. Adaptability – Strengthening local capacities to adapt and respond | | |
| Dimension: Capacities | | |
| Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of local capacities through improving/building: | <i>Further information and examples</i> | |
| Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection: | Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Financial capital: "Financial capital plays an important role in the economy, enabling other types of capital to be owned and traded" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2).</p> <p>Strengthens financial capacities such as by strengthening of: "The liquid capital accessible to the rural population and business community, and that held by community organisations" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> <p>For example the availability of grant support such as from research and development funding, farm business start-up support to young farmers and LEADER community-led local development funding.</p> |
| | Built capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Built capital: "Fixed assets which facilitate the livelihood or well-being of the community" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). Such as: "Buildings, infrastructure and other fixed assets, whether publically, community or privately owned" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> <p>Strengthens built capacities such as by strengthening access to - digital technology; equipment that enables new activities or improves efficiency; services (e.g. transport infrastructure, childcare services) helping overcome barriers inhibiting take-up of economic opportunities.</p> |
| | Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Natural capital: "Landscape and any stock or flow of energy and renewable or non-renewable resources that produces goods and services, (including tourism and recreation)" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> <p>Strengthens natural capacities such as by strengthening of the quality of/access to: "Water catchments, forests, minerals, fish, wind, wildlife and farm stock" or landscape types such as farmland; coastal areas and uplands (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). For example supporting restoration of degraded landscapes or use of abandoned land.</p> |
| | Social capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Social capital: "Features of social organisation such as networks, norms of trust that facilitate cooperation for mutual benefit" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> <p>Strengthens social capacities such as building/strengthening community/sectoral organisations; local networks; external, non-local networks; networks among rural groups and wider community at greater risk of marginalisation (e.g. international migrants, asylum seekers, non-binary genders, LGBTQ, elderly).</p> |
| | Human capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Human capital: "People's health, knowledge, skills and motivation" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2). "Tacit knowledge' is as important as formal education and training" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127).</p> <p>Strengthens human capacities such as by supporting the preservation and development of knowledge learned more informally through experience and practice; bringing together more formal and informal knowledge forms enabling better capitalisation of local knowledge; Improving education and skills so the workforce is more adaptable and employable in different roles or emerging/growing economic sectors (EC, 2006a); Supports better harnessing of under-utilised human capital potential (e.g. youth, women, newcomers) in the rural economy.</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Cultural capital: "Shared attitudes and mores, which shape the way we view the world and what we value" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127), for example language, rituals, traditions (Braithwaite, 2009)</p> <p>Strengthens cultural capacities such as by improving/building, entrepreneurial culture (Copus et al. 2011); use of local cultural capital to symbolise and represent places in rural place-making (Csurgo and Megyei, 2016); rural arts festivals, which harness creativity (e.g. Mahon and Hyyryläinen, 2019).</p> <p>Practice that works to reform or restructure existing cultural norms or attitudes to break away from negative consequences they can lead to. For example could promote an attitude shift in relation to rural groups at greater risk of marginalisation (e.g. international migrants, asylum seekers, non-binary genders, LGBTQ, elderly, unemployed, youth).</p> |
| | Political capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Political capital: "The ability of a community to influence the distribution and use of resources" (Braithwaite, 2009, p.2).</p> <p>Strengthens political capacities such as by improving/building local empowerment and inclusion through: "Presence of, and engagement in, 'bottom up' initiatives, the most local part of 'multi-level governance'" (Copus et al. 2011, p. 127). Practice may improve equality of resource access - e.g. preferential land purchase rights for communities and farmers (Reid, 2015; Blot et al. 2016).</p> |
| | Other capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Strengthens other capacities such as improving/building other types of capital and can interlink with the main forms outlined, for example digital capital can encompass human capital (skills) and built capital (broadband infrastructure) or creative capital a combination of human, social and cultural capital.</p> |
| | Explanation for selection: | |
| <p>*Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of women's capacities through improving/building:</p> | | <p><i>Further information and examples</i></p> |
| | Financial capital <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Strengthens women's financial capital such as through supporting equal rights to ownership and control, such as ownership of farms or rural enterprise, inheritance, financial services or other property/productive assets (EIGE, 2017 Ball, 2019; EP, 2019).</p> |
| | Built capital <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Natural capital <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Social capital <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection:</p> | <p>Human capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Supports better harnessing of human capital potential of women in the local agricultural economy for example this might include more ‘feminised’ farm practices (e.g. ‘caring’ practices related to education, environment and community associated with more multi-functional farming) being valued to a greater extent as a core part of farm work (Ball, 2019; Coopmans et al. 2019). Builds human (e.g. training) capital in rural areas helping overcome barriers inhibiting women taking up economic opportunities (such as equal access to agricultural education) and improving the quality of rural life (EIGE, 2017; Shortall, 2018; EP, 2019).</p> |
| | <p>Cultural capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Promotes involvement of women in farming from young age encouraging women to see farm as a career option, building a farming identity from a young age while also gaining farming knowledge and skills to support a future in the profession (Shortall, 2018; Coopmans et al. 2019). Promotes shift in cultural tendency of farms being inherited or passed on to sons meaning women should be more likely to see farm as a career option (Ball, 2019; Shortall, 2018). Addresses implicit messages within wider education reinforcing gender stereotypes and gendered division of labour (Ball, 2019). Builds cultural capital helping alter traditional views on the role of men and women in society (Shortall, 2014; EIGE, 2017) such as traditional gender and work identities on family farms around farming as male activity and gendered division of labour (Shortall, 2014; 2018; Coopmans et al. 2019). Supports gender equality improving issue of invisibility of women’s role in rural economy and society because of their role in the ‘informal’ rural economy, such as recognising unpaid role in supporting the family farm or wider work (e.g. care and community work) (EIGE, 2017; EP, 2019).</p> |
| | <p>Political capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Improves/builds the ability of women to influence the distribution and use of rural resources. Such as e.g. through enhanced involvement in rural governance or supports shared/balanced decision-making of farms or rural enterprise (EIGE, 2017; Shortall, 2018).</p> |
| | <p>Other capital <input type="checkbox"/></p> | |
| | <p>Explanation for selection:</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>O. Principle: 6. Adaptability – – Strengthening local capacities to adapt and respond</p> | | |
| <p>Dimension: Diversity</p> | | |
| <p>Indicator: Practice supports strengthening of diversity in local economy and society through:</p> | | <p><i>Further information and examples</i></p> |
| <p>Select criteria (one or more) as appropriate and provide short explanation (e.g. 50-100 words) for selection:</p> | <p>Economic diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Supports creation of a more diversified rural economy and one that is less reliant on traditional sectors. Such as a more multi-functional approach to farming focusing strongly on both food producing and non-food producing functions (e.g. environmental protection, education, energy production); a diversified farm business e.g. farm tourism, food processing/adding value to farm produce, on-farm education, green care/social farming; selling through shortened supply chains (e.g. local/direct to market initiatives); greater use of diversified farming practices e.g. combining agriculture and forestry, mixed farming (crops, livestock), organic or agroecological production methods.</p> <p>In the wider rural economy, diversification of existing rural enterprise and new enterprise creation, such as by developing enterprise in complementary sectors to traditional rural economy (e.g. tourism, food, energy, bio economy, circular economy) or non-traditional rural economy sectors (e.g. technology, creative, wider 'knowledge' economy).</p> <p>May also involve a degree of specialisation into sectors where local strengths lie (one or a number of related sectors). For example, a smart specialisation approach building on local opportunities and capacities to find the best path for innovative development that could involve focusing on a specific sector or a number of complementary and related sectors.</p> |
| | <p>Demographic diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Supports an age and gender balanced rural population. Such as through supporting generational renewal and the creation of sufficient levels (which is context dependent) of "young people, willing and able to take on farms and farming as a business choice" or "a sufficient range of rural businesses and employment opportunities for young people, to sustain them" (Dwyer et al., 2019, p.4). Extended to gender balance this can be described as sufficient levels of women willing and able to take on farms or sufficient employment opportunities for women to sustain them and achieve gender balance.</p> |
| | <p>Social diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Supports 'diversity' i.e. - presence or coexistence of a number of specific socio-economic, socio-demographic, ethnic and cultural groups within a certain rural spatial entity, such as a rural town or community or 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).</p> |
| | <p>Cultural diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Linked to social diversity, but more specific to diversity of culture and cultural groups within rural areas.</p> |
| | <p>Biodiversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Supports strengthening of diversity of plant and animal life.</p> |
| | <p>Other way that local diversity is built <input type="checkbox"/></p> | |
| | <p>Explanation for selection:</p> | |

Annex 3 – Less successful context assessment template

This template provides an initial set of open ended questions to guide assessment and identification of 'less successful' contexts. It is intended to provide an open, yet guided format for assessment of 'less successful' contexts making use of the Assessment Framework principles alongside data and analysis developed within other RURALIZATION tasks. Some questions may be relevant in some contexts more than others meaning completing this fully may not be required. The questions should be considered as much as possible in the specific thematic context of the case study (e.g. facilitating newcomers, new entrants, succession). As WP5 progresses, adaptations and additions may also need to be made.

GENERAL INFORMATION

This section provides space to provide general background information on the region (e.g. location, name, type of rural region)

PRINCIPLE: ROOTED

Is there evidence that local or non-local resources are not being harnessed to their best potential in the region? *Here you might address issues such as around financial, built, natural, social, human, cultural or political capital/resources. This might include how untapped/under-harnessed resources exist (e.g. culture/heritage and tourism, abandoned land and farming) or if local or non-local resources are over-relied on in the local economy. Perhaps there are deficits in one type of resource (e.g. human capital) and this could impact on harnessing other types of resources. Or it could mean natural resources are being harnessed unsustainably (e.g. problem of land degradation).*

Is there evidence local benefits are not being generated sufficiently/are weak impacting rural decline? *Here you might address issues around the lack of social and economic opportunities in the region. This might include evidence for example on: unemployment levels; high external commuting patterns because of lack of local jobs; service/infrastructure gaps; skills gaps, environmental protection/regeneration etc.*

PRINCIPLE: INTERCONNECTED

Do rural decline issues interconnect exacerbating decline in the region? Is there a spiral of decline in the region? *Here you might address issues around demographic, economic, social, cultural and environmental decline and how they interconnect.*

Is there evidence networks (e.g. within the region or with external locations) are weak or absent impacting rural decline or hampering regeneration? *Here you might address issues such as: weakness/absence of formal or informal organisations that support knowledge, social or cultural or*

economic exchanges; governance issues such as lack of participatory structures or their effectiveness; lack of emphasis on cross-sector (e.g. tourism/food processing/social care and farming) or cross-regional (e.g. urban and rural) collaborative opportunities etc.

PRINCIPLE: INNOVATION

Is there evidence particular types of innovation are weak or absent within the region? *Here you might address issues relating to local entrepreneurship or wider social, cultural or environmental innovation.*

PRINCIPLE: ADAPTABILITY

Is there evidence of weaknesses in local capacities to proactively drive regenerative change or respond to rural decline issues? *Here you might address issues such as: lack of support schemes or barriers to their uptake; lack/erosion of cultural, social, human or natural capital; local situation relating to local civic/community organisations such as social enterprises, cooperatives, non-profit organisations; barriers to entrepreneurship etc.*

Is there evidence the local economy and society lacks diversity? *Here you might address issues such as: levels of farm diversification; dominance of one sector in the local economy (e.g. primary industries, multi-nationals); wider population diversity in terms of age, gender, cultural groups etc.*

OTHER

This section provides space to provide details of further evidence relevant to assessing 'less successful' in this context not captured above, such as factors relating to the specific case study (e.g. newcomers, new entrants, successors) geographic (e.g. remote, mountain, peri-urban, island, coastal, village) or cultural (e.g. gender issues) contexts.

Annex 4 – Contexts favourable for success assessment template

This template provides an initial set of open ended questions to guide assessment and identification of 'contexts favourable for success'. It intended to provide an open, yet guided format for assessment of 'less successful' contexts making use of the Assessment Framework principles. Some questions may be relevant in some contexts more than others meaning completing this fully may not be required. As WP6 progresses, adaptations and additions may also need to be made.

GENERAL INFORMATION

This section provides space to provide general background information on the region (e.g. location, name, type of rural region)

PRINCIPLE: EFFICIENCY

Is the practice likely to provide value for investment in this region? *Such as is the cost of delivery (financial, time resources) of the practice is likely to be similar in this region compared to the context it was initially studied?*

PRINCIPLE: LEGITIMACY

Are the issues the practice addresses also present in this region? *Such as formal (research) or informal (local knowledge) exists showing the practice addresses decline issues or barriers to regeneration.*

Does the practice represent a form of governance that is likely to have local legitimacy? *For example do similar models of governance exist so this approach is likely to gain cultural acceptance? The local legal context does not present barriers to local legitimacy? The wider cultural context suggests the practice is like to have local legitimacy?*

PRINCIPLE: ROOTED

What core resources (e.g. local/non-local) does the practice depend? Are these resources available in this region? *Here you might address issues such as around financial, built, natural, social, human, cultural or political capital/resources.*

PRINCIPLE: INTERCONNECTED

Can formal organisations or informal groups/networks be identified in this region that could lead the development of this practice and/or be involved as an implementation/collaborative partner? *Such as existence of similar organisations/groups that lead the innovative practice elsewhere or those that deal with issues within their objectives/remit that the practice addresses. If the practice requires a number of active partners is there evidence of these organisations/groups already work together to realise common goals?*

PRINCIPLE: INNOVATION

Does the innovative practice have a degree of flexibility supporting transferability? *For example is it an adaptable model that if not replicated exactly can still in theory achieve its core objectives or meet specific local objectives in this region? Could it work on smaller scale and/or larger scale?*

PRINCIPLE: ADAPTABILITY

What core resources (e.g. local/non-local) does the practice depend? If they are not present, can they potentially be generated in this region? *Here you might address issues such as around financial, built, natural, social, human, cultural or political capital/resources.*

OTHER

This section provides space to provide details of further evidence relevant to assessing 'contexts favourable for success' in this context that are not captured above, such as factors relating to the specific case study, geographic (e.g. remote, mountain, peri-urban, island, coastal, village) or cultural (e.g. gender issues) contexts.

Annex 5 - Gender analysis tools

The Assessment Framework introduces the principles on gender in the research content developed in the European Commission Toolkit for Gender in EU-funded research as an overarching framework of key principles to guide the integration of gender analysis into the project from research design to dissemination (see Tool 1).

The Assessment Framework also provides generalised guidance on analysis of gender issues. Tool 2 provides some general considerations relating to data collection. Tool 3 provides wider general considerations that can be used by WP/task leaders to help shape how they bring gender into the WP or by partners as a brainstorming tool to help analyse the impacts gender has for rural regeneration and generational renewal. Tool 4 provides further gender analysis resources.

Tool 1

A gender sensitive research cycle: Gender in the research content

- Generate gender sensitive ideas for research proposals
- Make research hypotheses gender sensitive
- Formulate gender-sensitive research questions
- Choose a gender sensitive methodology
- Collect gender sensitive data
- Analyse data in a gender sensitive way
- Report data in a gender-sensitive way
- Use gender impartial language
- Disseminate results in a gender sensitive way

Source: EC, 2011

Tool 2

Considerations for data collection

- Data collection tools incorporate gender in a direct way as relevant e.g. collect sex-disaggregated statistical data and/or interview guides include specific questions focusing on gender issues
- Gender neutral language is used in data collection tools
- Data availability impacts the extent gender analysis can be carried out, but gender is incorporated where possible into gathering of secondary and statistical data
- Gender balance is sought in terms of the balance of research participants involved in the project

Sources: EC, 2011; Sida, 2015

Tool 3

Wider general considerations - gender analysis brainstorming list

- What is the degree of relevance of gender to the topic/issue/case?
- Beyond issues with a clear gender dimension, it can be important to consider the gender implications of wider issues.
 - Is the issue gender neutral?
 - Does it impact different genders in the same way? Does this bring different needs to light?
- Do wider issues interact with gender?
 - Does potentially analysing issues (e.g. migration, parenthood, sexuality) and variables (e.g. age) together give added insights on the gender dimension?
 - Does the type of rural area (e.g. remote, accessible) bring different gender dimensions to light?
- Do traditional gender roles appear significant in this context?
 - Such as the expectations and responsibilities in domestic, work or community settings?
- Do gender roles appear significant in impacting social (e.g. recreation) and economic (e.g. jobs) opportunities in rural areas?
- Do gender roles potentially challenge more traditional expectations and norms?
- Do more traditional conceptualisations of femininity and masculinity persist?
 - How significant is this in impacting social and economic opportunities in rural areas?
- Can gender inequality/equality be identified relating to access to (e.g. financial, built, natural, social, human, cultural or political capital) or control of resources (e.g. ownership, decision-making)? What are the drivers/causes of this?
- Do wider rural decline issues (e.g. poor services, limited jobs) exacerbate gender inequality?
- Does economic and social life display gendered power relations?
 - Are they balanced or imbalanced? What are the drivers/causes of this?
- Do tensions exist between achieving gender equality and rural regeneration?
 - Such as how can economic viability and gender equality be made compatible?

Sources: Little, 2009; EC, 2011; Sida, 2015; Shortall and Bock, 2015

Tool 4

Further gender analysis resources

- RURALIZATION deliverable D3.3 Review Report and Factsheets assesses gender and rural regeneration issues from current research.
- Number of toolkits and guides produced by **EIGE**, such as Gender Analysis and Gender Impact Assessment: Available [here](#)
- **EIGE Gender Statistics database**: The EIGE Gender Statistics Database provides a comprehensive gender statistics knowledge centre drawing on Eurostat, Eurofound, EC Eurobarometer survey data, EIGE's own data and wider sources. It does however focus at the national level. Available [here](#)
- **EIGE's report Gender in Agriculture and Rural Development** provides an overview of key issues, relevant policy and a list of further resources: Available [here](#)
- **Agriculture and Rural Development on EIGE's Gender Mainstreaming Platform**. Similar content to EIGE report, but interactive web format with additional links to resources: Available [here](#)
- **Future Agriculture Working Paper Gender Analysis: Engaging with Rural Development and Agricultural Policy Processes**. Emerges from an international development context, yet useful information on approaches to gender analysis: Available [here](#)
- **Toolkit: Gender in EU-funded research**. Toolkit published by DG Research aiming to provide practical guidance on integrating gender into research. Available [here](#)
- **Gendered Innovations** developed practical methods of sex and gender analysis, but focused on science, engineering, health and design: Available [here](#). Nevertheless some of its resources could still be useful to RURALIZATION, such as its checklist for planners to incorporate sex and gender analyses into urban planning and design: Available [here](#)