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1.1 Objectives

- Sustainable Regional Development
- take the advantage of synergies of regional potentials
- Nature parks, sustainable tourism, local products
- Cooperation of stakeholders, shape regional identities
- concrete implementation of trademarks, marketing
1.2 Partners

- Coordination: Province of Teramo (I)

- Scientific partners from Austria and Hungary

- Public authorities and NGOs in pilot regions (Italy, Germany, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Hungary, Greece)
1.3 Pilot Regions

- Onferno, Rimini (I)
- Teramo (I)
- Muldental (G)
- Tisza microregion (H)
- Popove Polje (BiH)
- Vratchanski Balkan Park (B)
- Lidoriki (Gr)
- Kysuce (SK)
2.1 Procedures

WP1: Project coordination and dissemination

WP2: Spatial Development and management plans (DEMAP)

WP3: Networking

WP4: Development & Marketing
2.2 Methods WP2

- SWOT Analysis
- Success factor Analysis
- Stakeholder Analysis

DEMAP:
- Objectives
- Strategy
- Actionsplans
- Implementation

Objectives on all levels
Strategies, Priorities, Steering
Implementation measures
3.1 Results and Experience

**Tisza Microregion:**

- **Location:** Heves, western bank of lake Tisza (Eger, Lasko confluence)
- **Sea level:** 86 m
- **6 municipalities, 12,000 inhabitants, 50 km from Eger**
- **GDP 73% of national level, 75% of EU level**
- **Characteristics:** backwaters, sandbanks, islands, dead channels, reed, gallery forests, saline areas, grassland, bird population
- **65% agricultural area, 4% forests**
- **Leader+ region**
3.2 Results and Experience

- SWOT Analysis
- weighed internal factors (Strength / Weakness)
- weighed external factors (Opportunities / Threats)
- 128 quantitative and qualitative indicators in 7 topics:
  - topology and structure of settlement
  - population
  - nature and environment
  - economy
  - technical infrastructure
  - social infrastructure
  - governance
### 3.3 Results and Experience

#### SWOT Analyses - summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kysuce</th>
<th>Lidoriki</th>
<th>Muldenland</th>
<th>Popovo polje</th>
<th>Rimini</th>
<th>Teramo</th>
<th>Tisza</th>
<th>Vratckansky</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TOPOLOGY AND STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF SETTLEMENT</td>
<td>-1.683</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-2.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General data - area</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>-1.296</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater position of the</td>
<td>-4.432</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POPULATION</td>
<td>-0.655</td>
<td>-0.483</td>
<td>-0.575</td>
<td>-0.733</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General data - population</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>-0.559</td>
<td>-1.677</td>
<td>-0.479</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>-0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population development</td>
<td>-1.541</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>-0.935</td>
<td>-0.953</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NATURE AND ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General data - climate</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-1.068</td>
<td>-1.001</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-1.008</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature protection area</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>-1.291</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>-1.291</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ECONOMY</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>-0.601</td>
<td>-0.661</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General data - economy</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.510</td>
<td>-0.729</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>-0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>-0.575</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and culture</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.471</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TECHNICAL INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>-0.485</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
<td>-1.043</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply situation</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>-0.308</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>-0.415</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>-0.625</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>2.439</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional supply situation</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-1.700</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public life</td>
<td>-0.585</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>-1.976</td>
<td>-0.790</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.4 Results and Experience

- **Success Factor Analysis - Tisza Microregion**

![Analysis by success factors](chart.png)

- **Key Actors**
  - 3.0
- **Public Involvement**
  - 2.0
- **Powerful Partners in the Region**
  - 1.0
- **Good Relationship Outside Region**
  - 0.0
- **Adequate Resources**
- **Suitable Basics**
- **Suitable Region**
- **Production Guidelines, Suitable Basics**
- **Communication + PR**
- **Controlling and Evaluation**
3.5 Results and Experience

- **Success Factor Analyses summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success factor</th>
<th>Kysuce</th>
<th>Lidoriki</th>
<th>Muldenland</th>
<th>Popovo Polje</th>
<th>Rimini</th>
<th>Teramo</th>
<th>Tisza Microregion</th>
<th>Vratchansky Balkan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key actors</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public involvement</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful partners in the region</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationship outside region</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable region</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production guidelines, suitable basics</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of products</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication + PR</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling and evaluation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Legend**
  - Red: danger for project success
  - Orange: preventive measures necessary
  - Yellow: neutral
  - Green: better than necessary
3.6 Results and Experience

- **Stakeholder Analysis – Tisza Microregion**

  - **Task:** close cooperation, their involvement in decision-making procedures
  - **Task:** presenting opportunities; their involvement in the project activity
  - **Task:** creating the frameworks of cooperation
  - **Task:** presenting opportunities; their involvement in the project activity
  - **Task:** initiating negotiations
  - **Task:** giving information, initiating cooperation
  - **Task:** presenting opportunities; cooperation
  - **Task:** initiating negotiations
  - **Task:** presenting opportunities; cooperation

- **Municipalities**
- **Providers of accommodation**
- **Neighboring municipalities**
- **NGOs**
- **National park authorities**
- **Lake Tisza Area Development Council**
- **Farmers**
- **Craftsmen**
- **Local gastronomy**
Development and Management Plan Tisza Microregion:

Objectives (derived from previous analyses, indicators for measurements, risk factors)

• Realisation of a nature park,
• participation and acceptance of key actors,
• elaboration and registration of a regional trademark,
• promotion of local and healthy food,
• improving of the relationship local suppliers – customer,
• improvement of controlling and evaluation of a regional trademark

Strategies (time frame, responsibilities, budget, priorities)

Actions (concrete responsibilities, timeframe, budget, funding)
3.8 Results and Experience

**Actionplan Tisza Microregion** (2007/2008: €~16,000,-)

- Study on eco-trademark regarding nature conservation aspects
- Marketing study of the eco-trademark
- Determining the quality requirements of the eco-trademark
- Elaboration of a uniform design
- Ensuring the joining of producers and service providers
- Registration of the official eco-trademark
- Promotion of the eco-trademark
- Study on the nature park regarding nature conservation aspects
- Economic and marketing study of the nature park
- Local workshops for stakeholders
- Contact with the press
- Brochure on the Parks&Economy project results