

PreservatiOn and promotion of cUltural and natural heRitage through GreenWAYS **OUR WAY**

Regional references and recommendation of Good Practices

Regional benchmarking and Recommendation paper

The contents of this document include:

- ✓ **Good Practice Recommendations**, with potential overlaps between partners (import-export), i.e. with potential links between those partners who have a good practice and those who might be interested in transferring this good practice to their territory.

This Recommendation Document will be analysed in depth by the project partners, together with their regional and local actors, and will be the basis for organising study visits in the coming semesters.

- ✓ **Benchmarking regional.** The aim is to provide a comparative regional analysis (SWOT analysis) on the situation of greenway policies in the partner regions.

It is done in a joint document, due to the linkage of the recommendations of good practices (export / import) with the *SWOT analysis*, and the context of the policies related to greenways in the regions of the partners, so that the proposal of good practices (potential matching's) is motivated. The Project Partners (PP) thus have the key elements that have been considered when making the proposal (export / import) and will be able to decide that Good Practices among the proposals, consider it more convenient to "import" into their territories, or that they may opt for other different GOOD PRACTICES, in a reasoned manner.

In a complementary way you can review the summary table of GOOD PRACTICES presented in Ireland, and the individual sheets of Good Practices and Regional Analyses, which are available to all partners. (common folder in Dropbox).

Index:

I. Good practices recommendations.

*Proposal for import-export, potential pairing between partners
Methodology.*

II. Regional benchmarking. On the situation of greenway policies in the regions of the partners...

III. Recommendations by project partners.

- Regional Analysis.
- Strengths / What can they export?
- Weaknesses What do you want to improve/implement?
- GOOD PRACTICES of possible interest.. Potential matching's between partners

➤ **Next steps.**

I. Good practices recommendations.

Import-export proposal. Potential matching's between partners

Methodology.

- i. Partners presented their proposals for GOOD PRACTICE, SWOT and Regional Analysis forms.
- ii. The AEVV, advisory partner, has reviewed the GOOD PRACTICES presented by the project partners (PP). Partners were asked to complete the information in advance of the Ireland meeting with an uneven response. It was also reiterated at and after the meeting. Complementary information has been received from partners in Poland and Bulgaria.
- iii. The **proposal for recommendations** (potential matching's between partners import-export), which is presented in this report, is based on the GOOD PRACTICE sheets proposed by the partners. In addition, the following information has been taken into account:
 - The SWOT and Regional Analysis forms carried out by partners that include reference to potential GOOD PRACTICES, not included in the GOOD PRACTICES sheets presented for the 3 axes, in particular in the case of HU and BU partners.
 - Presentations by project partners and stakeholders on good practice in Ireland. In the case of the host territory (Ireland) they largely complement

- the GOOD PRACTICES information in the fiches, and in the case of Bulgaria they include new GOOD PRACTICES not included in the fiches made by the partners.
- Other complementary documentation provided by the partners (brochures, maps), individualized conversations with the partners and also direct knowledge (e.g. Murcia, France) and through other sources (internet).
- iv. The recommendation incorporates the first reasoned selection of GOOD PRACTICES made by the PPs at the Irish meeting, i.e. the initial proposal they would make to their stakeholders from the GOOD PRACTICES fiches made by the PPs. This first selection of GOOD PRACTICES was made for the two axes on which the *Interregional Learning* seminar in Ireland focused (cooperation and funding), only the Polish PP has proposed for the three axes; Hungary only selected for the cooperation axis.
 - v. It should be noted that in the first selection made by the PPs GOOD PRACTICES were proposed from all the territories represented, i.e. all the partners have GOOD PRACTICES that interest other project partners, so in principle all the PPs should organise study visits to welcome/inform project partners and facilitate the "export/import" of GOOD PRACTICES.
 - vi. Some partners are more exporters and others more receivers depending on Greenways experience.
 - vii. The recommendations have taken into account the objectives and expectations of the PPs for the project, indicated in Regional Analysis, in order to integrate activities and information that can help transform difficulties into opportunities thanks to the good practices proposed by the various partners.
 - viii. With this information, concrete actions/tools are proposed to be "exported" by the partners who have the experience and "imported" by the PPs, in order to have a more detailed and practical knowledge in this action/methodology, which can be of help in relation to the problems and/or weaknesses that the different PPs want to solve or improve thanks to the project. They have been formulated as concretely and clearly as possible, taking into account the starting situation of the PPs and their different contexts - geographical, human and economic resources, organisational, etc. In this way, the practical experience of other PPs can really and concretely contribute to their improvement.
 - ix. The Good Practices will be the basis for the organization of ulterior partner visits to the territories. The partners who are going to visit this territories will need detailed information on the good practices in their visits, and the "hosted" partners must be able to provide it.
 - x. In addition, the Good Practices must be used to define the regional Action Plans, in order to identify a set of actions to improve the weaknesses mentioned in their analysis and achieve the objectives that each of the PPs

aims to achieve thanks to the project. It is important to remember what the project PP wants to achieve and how the Good Practices of other partners can help them achieve them.

- xi. For the definition and implementation of the Action Plans, the PPs must also take into account the stakeholders and their capacity and commitment to action.
- xii. In the specific proposals of Good Practices to be exported, made for each PP, it is indicated if they are any of the Good Practices presented in the cards, to which axis/s they correspond and the area (regional, local). The proposals by the PA, derived from its direct knowledge or derived from the information provided in the regional analysis sheets, are indicated with a (*); the PP will have to indicate if it considers that it does not contribute value, and in that case it will be eliminated from its "offer" of Good Practices.
- xiii. In the case of HU, comments are included regarding the proposed Good Practices, since all of them are located in territories not represented in the project, so that it can be taken into account in the event that they have to organize visits to these areas. These comments were expressly indicated to this PP and were previously indicated to all partners in general to take into account the location of the Good Practices.

II. Regional benchmarking. On the situation of greenway policies in the regions of the partners.

✓ Great diversity of situations.

The SWOT and regional analysis have a very different level of detail, but they show together with the proposed Good Practices, the presentations made at the Irish seminar by partners and *stakeholders*, and the direct exchange during it, the great differences in the starting conditions of the partners, in terms of experience and knowledge of the *greenway* concept and its advantages; also geographical, human and material resources, competences and integration of these accessible infrastructures in their regional priorities.

Also the differences in the way partners and stakeholders who participated in the seminar work. With initiatives and infrastructure development promoted from public administrations, to initiatives promoted by local rural action groups based on local participation and work with non-profit entities, without physical realization of infrastructures.

The results of the project will have to take into account logically the starting conditions, the human and material resources as well as the priorities established in

their regional policies and the competences of the different partners in relation to the subject.

The most experienced partners have an interest in moving forward and improving concrete issues. The partners with less experience are interested in learning more about the concept of greenways and the opportunities they offer for the enhancement and promotion of the cultural and natural heritage of their environment and therefore for local development. Its objectives are more aimed at getting to know the concept better and its interest with real examples, in order to be able to disseminate it among its *stakeholders* and lay the foundations for its implementation in their territories, as far as possible.

- Three of the partners indicate that they do not have Greenways in their territory, according to the concept promoted by the EGWA¹ (Bulgaria, Hungary) or that very few sections of their cycle paths would meet the requirements to be considered "greenway" (Poland).
- They point out that the OurWay project is an opportunity to get to know the concept, to make it known and to integrate the Greenways in their territories.
- These three HU / BU/ PO partners have a valuable cultural and/or natural value in their territory and indicate as strength the value of the local cultural identity (*community values*) as a basis for local cooperation.
- They also include as a threat the migration (BU) of qualified personal to different countries / availability of human staff in long term. (HU).
- The other three partners (Murcia, Ireland, France) have greenways and have extensive experience in their implementation and management. The greenways managers are well identified and have collaboration between the different levels of administration, with different levels of involvement. They also have the collaboration of the private sector, also on a different scale.
- In all three cases the level of promotion and availability of tourism products and structured service offerings linked to greenways and other cycle routes is very different. With an example of collaboration and great success in Ireland and with a deficit of promotion and tourist product in Murcia and L'Herault.
- Land ownership and/or conflicts with ranchers is a difficulty cited by IR, PO, HU and ES (in this case the high cost of land rental) for the extension of the network or for the creation and/or management of greenways.
- The lack of local involvement is almost universally cited by PPs.
- The need for **sustainable funding** over time and the search for different sources of income is an essential need pointed out by all partners.
- Likewise, all the territories represented have natural and/or cultural values in their territories that are not valued or whose value can be improved.

- All partners, except Poland, have included, directly or indirectly, Greenways as one of their priorities in their Regional Plans, i.e. they can invest in these infrastructures.
- In the case of Ireland, the development of Greenways is a priority for the Northern and Western Regional Assembly and the need and strategy for the development of Greenways is integrated into the 'Regional spatial and economic strategy'.
- In the case of Podkarpaskie region, not having it included as a priority has paralysed its possibility to invest in these infrastructures in the current financial period (2014-2020). If they cite infrastructure built in the previous period. (2007-2013). They also include as GOOD PRACTICES an initiative promoted by a group of municipalities to be able to invest in cyclable roads through improvements in access roads to rural farms, with promotion for tourism, in collaboration with the private sector.
- For the rest of the partners the greenways are indirectly integrated into their PO, with an objective linked to nature tourism, new thematic itineraries, (...), which allows their authorities to invest in these itineraries.
- The results of the project must take into account the starting conditions of the partners, the human and material resources and the regional priorities established by each of the regions, as well as the competences of the different partners in relation to the implementation of greenways in their territories.
- We are very close to the end of the period (2014-2020) and the elaboration of the next regional programmes (2021-2027) is an opportunity to consolidate or integrate the Greenways as regional priorities.

The recommendations of actions to be imported are made for the three axes considered in the project:

1. Cooperation
2. Funding
3. Promotion

Some recommendations are transverse.

It is also generally recommended to reinforce the identification of the natural and cultural values and traditions of their communities' "*community values*" and to integrate them into the promotion of greenways or other non-motorised itineraries for cyclists, walkers and other users that the partners wish to implement, in order to contribute to the preservation and promotion of these resources and to achieve a positive impact on the social-economic development of the territories represented.

III Recommendations by project partners.

1 Region of Murcia

1.1. Regional Analysis

- Clear greenways concept, with well-established Greenways and in the process of expanding the network.
- It has 4 greenways (the longest 76.8 KM and 6.7 km the shortest) and a specific website.
- It has a management body (consortium of the Greenways of the Region of Murcia), with voluntary assignment of the municipalities through which the greenways of the region run.
- The GW are not a regional priority but are indirectly integrated as a priority in its Regional Development Plan, as nature and religious tourism.
- It links cultural and/or natural heritage, in the environment of the VV as a resource for the local population and tourism.
- In phase of extension of the GREENWAYS and its connection at regional level, with interregional connections, and taking into account the EuroVelo network.
- Initiatives of interest - Via Compromiso - public-private collaboration, and collaboration with penitentiary institutions, for the maintenance of the VV.
- Limited use of European funds from international projects, but wide and varied use of European funds under national management (in particular the ESF).
- Systematic contact with national (FFE) and European (EGWA) greenways promoters, and informal contact with neighbouring regions.
- Significant problem of the cost of renting very high ground, which conditions maintenance and management; the rental budget decreases the availability of maintenance budget, which is essential and can be high after torrential rains that deteriorate the VV.
- Outstanding weakness lack of tourist product linked to natural/cultural values and structured service offer.
- Financial constraints and need for continued funding.

1.2. Strengths / What can you export?

"Exportable" good practices:	Axis	GP	Scope
a. The very configuration of the Consortium. Stable management framework, with a clearly identified manager and public stakeholders involved.	1	1	Reg
b. Experience in planning and management. Extension process to connect Greenways to each other and to neighboring regions.	1 / 3	*	Reg / local Interreg.
c. Innovative experiences for the maintenance and improvement of the Green Ways with the help of a) convicts serving sentences for carrying out social work, and b) through the corporate social responsibility of companies, which finance specific actions, in particular reforestation (this is an area with average rainfall of 300 mm. This is an area with an average rainfall of 300 mm, which is very irregular, with torrential rains that cause erosion problems and direct impact (climate change cited as a risk).	2	2	Reg / local
d. Rehabilitation of old railway stations, such as hostels (accommodation, basically designed for young people). Carried out with public funds and private collaboration for the management and operation of these hostels.	2 / 1	*	Reg
e. Monitoring, use of eco-counters to monitor uses in the VV; of interest to evaluate the profitability of investments.	1 / 2 / 3 transversal	-	Reg / Local
f. Diverse initiatives of use of European funds of national management, for improvement and promotion of the green ways (schools workshop, active policies of employment for unemployed, including diverse types of activities.	2	-	Reg
g. Organisation of sports activities (marathon), in collaboration with private sports organisations.	3	3	REg / Local
h. Organisation of greenways activities for different groups (schools, seniors,...) in combination with national/international events.	3	*	REg / Local / Nat. /Intern.

1.3. Weaknesses What do you want to improve/implement?

- Improve the coordination of all stakeholders
- Financial sustainability. Having other sources of funding European projects managed directly from Europe, the projects also give greater visibility which results in promotion.
- Create relevant tourism products in collaboration with the private sector and improve the economic impact of the VV.
- Increase nature tourism in the region of Murcia
- Create a connected greenways network

1.4. Good practices of possible interest. Potential matching's between partners

- Cooperation:
 - o Ireland: Involvement of local people in the territory
Food: Sale of local produce for consumption - example of Greenways gourmet from Ireland presented at the seminar).
 - o Hungary: food-related initiatives (local food / market place.
- Financial:
 - o France: Use of construction taxes applied to natural spaces
 - o Poland / FR / IR / BU : Experience in European projects
- Promotion
 - o Ireland - collaboration at different levels County with tourism of Ireland / Reg
 - o Poland: Collaboration with private sector/association linked to cultural and natural values, promotion of GreenVelo /

2- Ireland

2.1 Regional Analysis.

- Clear greenways concept. Sector clearly on the rise.
- Greenways expressly integrated as a priority in its regional policy and financing possibilities.
- Objective: to develop a regional plan for developing greenways and to significantly extend the length of the greenway network in the region.
- They have 4 Greenways, one of them very successful (*the Great Western Greenway (GWG) 42km from Westport to Achill*) and are in the process of expanding the network.
- Clear identification of managers and stakeholders
- Promotion of cultural and natural values of the environment, also local products.

- Collaboration with the private sector, which takes advantage of the infrastructure (bicycle rental, sports activities, hotels, restaurants)...
- GWG greenway website with information on cultural and natural values, (what to do and what to visit) and abundant and useful information on the area.
- The accommodations inform their clients about the VV and how to get around it (where to rent bikes, for example).
- Offer of services and activities to enjoy the VV.

2.2 Strengths What can you export?

Good practices What can you export?	Axis	GP	Area
a. The concrete experience of creating a successful greenway (GWG), which has involved the collaboration of stakeholders, and which has integrated the private sector that directly exploits the GREENWAYS and has developed a tourism product, <i>(even though, according to their own assessment, they are not very integrated)</i> .	1 / 3	3	Reg. / Local
b. North West Greenway project in a framework of institutional collaboration, continuous.	1/ 2	1	Reg /Nat.
c. Identification of financing and financial instruments. Ulster Greenway Channel		2	
d. Participation in Ireland's National GREENWAYS Strategy involving all levels of government and across sectors, with specific funding for VV.	1 / 2		Reg /Nat.
e. Organisation of tourism promotion - local, national and international collaboration through Failte Ireland (National Tourism Agency).	1 / 3		Local
f. Development of tourist products and enhancement of cultural and natural heritage, as a basis for the promotion of GREENWAYS (story telling); Capturing and transmitting what is truly distinctive about the greenway.	3 /1		Local / Reg / Internat.
g. Very attractive information available on the web. Offer of services linked to the GREENWAYS (private companies)	3		Loc / Nat
h. It has counters, monitoring of uses and economic impact study.	3		Local
i. Greenways gourmet initiative promoted by private sector (restaurant/producers)	3 / 1		Reg/ Local

2.3 Weaknesses What do you want to improve/implement?

- Land ownership and the need for network expansion and improvement
- Difficulties with farmers to implement new GW. Absence of standardized methodology for negotiating land access.
- Insurance increasingly higher cost.
- Continuity of financing.
- Expand the network.
- Scarce local use / difficulty in integrating the GREENWAYS as Smart Travel facility.

2.4. Good practices of possible interest. Potential matching's between partners

- Cooperation:
 - o Murcia: Extension of the GREENWAYS network
 - o Bulgaria and Hungary: How to interact with local communities to enhance cultural heritage and other values and traditions at the local level (*Story telling /community values*)
 - o Poland. Long distance cycle routes.
- Financial:
 - o France, tax formula.
 - o Hungary: combination of use of rural development funds at local level.
- Promotion
 - o Poland: promotion of long-distance Cycle lanes (Green Velo)
 - o Murcia: local sports animation activities, and other dynamic events in GW (plantations, schools, seniors)

03-Poland

3.1. Regional Analysis

- Objectives, to increase interest in ecotourism and sustainable tourism, as well as the promotion of Podkarpacie's cultural and natural heritage. Establishment of a Regional Working Group of Stakeholders, whose opinion will be heard when the strategic documents of the Region are modified.
- They have 2 long-distance cycle routes, which they call greenways, but they do not identify non-motorized routes, which can comply with the greenway concept; in some sections of these routes there can be heavy traffic.
- These long-distance cycling routes have been designed to connect and enhance valuable natural and/or cultural resources; one of them is 130 km close to the Biosphere Reserve shared by three countries (Poland, Slovenia and Ukraine).
- The aim is to improve the two lanes.

- International Nature and Culture Trail "**Green Bike**" - Greenway Eastern Carpathians.
 - The Eastern Green Bicycle Trail "**Green Velo**"
Commentary: The denomination of the 2 cycle routes is very similar (Green bike and Green Velo). The name of a cycling route is very important and in this case it is confusing for those who do not know this route beforehand, it is recommended to call e.g Eastern Carpathians cicleroute).
- The Green Velo route has a wealth of information on the web, including attractions.
 - Experience in identifying and financing projects for the enhancement of natural and cultural resources, creating thematic routes and counting on the collaboration of organisations that look after their traditions and the conservation of cultural/natural heritage. They offer accommodation and visits to "traditional farms" along the routes.
 - Experience in grants for the private sector.

In the case of Podkarpacie region, not having Greenways or cycling infrastructure as a priority does not allow investment in these infrastructures in the current financial period (- 2020), despite the interest of the region. In order to lessen the effects of this important constraint, and taking into account the content of its Regional Analysis, the following recommendations are made:

- i. Integrate, as far as possible, actions that contribute to the development of greenways actions in the (very limited) way allowed by the current OP.
- ii. In addition, it would also be strengthened if Greenways were integrated into other "priorities" within the PO's Quality of life:
 - Mobility = soft mobility
 - climate and energy, = use of the bicycle, no emission of greenhouse gases; protection of the climate
 - SUSTAINABLE TOURISM,
 - health = active life, infrastructures for walking, cycling, wheelchairs (...)
 - ICT = e-content relevant to tourism information (apps, etc.), maps,....
- iii. Integrate "Greenways and non-motorised infrastructure" as a priority in the next OP from 2020.

3.2. Strengths / What can they export?

Good practices, what can you export?	Axis	GP	Area
a. Cooperation with the implementation, modification of the running and renovation of the international heritage management of the "green bicycle" Heritage Greenway Eastern Carpathians	1	1	Reg.
b. Experience in mobilization of local funds for roads for cycle roads /GW, in rural areas by local initiative.	2 / 1 / 3	2	Local
c. Experience in Green Velo promotion (cycle-route that runs through several regions) with a contribution of annual budget of the different regions through which the route runs.	3 / 1	3	Reg / Inter-regional
d. Collaboration with various Non-profit associations that look after their traditions and the conservation of the cultural/natural heritage.	1 / 3		Reg. / Local
e. Experience in projects with European funds	2		Reg.
f. Collaboration with the private sector: Entrepreneurial project calls Eastern Poland / incentives for companies.	2		Reg.
g. Green Bicycle route monitoring (East Carpathian bicycle route) with mobiles phones (¿?)	3		Reg / Local
h. Other uses/attractions: exploitation of old FFcc roads by private sector. (Bieszczady Bicycle Railway Trolleys). (to confirm by	3		Loc.

3.3. Weaknesses, what do you want to improve/implement?:

- Not being able to count on funds for the realization of greenways - ciclo-vías, as it is not a priority of the PO.
- Lack of methodology, standards for the design, implementation, management, maintenance, monitoring of *greenways*.
- Lack of interest from local authorities
- Lack of private sector interest.
- Lack of offer of structured services, in great part of the itineraries and concentration in some areas.

- Lack of tourist producto
- Public ownership, land use conflicts with landowners and public land occupations.

3.4 Good practices of possible interest: Potential marching betwen partners

Cooperation:

- Ireland. Different levels of governance and collaboration between authorities (nat/regional/local). The whole methodology of implementation, signposting, ancilliary services...
Interested in the subject matter related to land ownership.
- Murcia: Greenways Consortium
- Financial:
 - Ireland. Integration of the VVs in their OP's allowing the financing of these infrastructures and examples of cross-border projects.
 - Bulgaria. Example of cross-border project - E.bike and other European projects.
- Promotion
 - Ireland. Collaboration with national and local tourism bodies
 - Hungary. Participation of the local population in initiatives of dynamization and involvement of the local population.
 - Murcia: sports activities and other events of dynamization in GW (plantations, schools, seniors, ...)

04-France

4.1 Regional Analysis

- They know the greenway concept.
- They integrate greenways and other cycling and walking itineraries (short and long distance) into the green network of itineraries.
- Interest in enhancing and multiplying the tourist potential of the interior of the department (the very tourist coastal area) and capitalisation of the work done in the creation and signposting of long-distance itineraries.
- The managers have been identified
- Objectives: measures to better protect and enhance their territory, through their itineraries (trails and VV).
- They have an outstanding network of signposted itineraries - 550km of signposted cycle routes (including MB); the GREENWAYS forms part of this network (Passa Païs, with greater use than other cycle routes). It also has 3,000 km of footpaths.
- Territory with great natural values. The itineraries have been linked to natural/cultural values in the public domain to facilitate the use of

visitors. They are currently in the phase of integrating services in these tours to attract visitors.

- The form does not mention the use of other lines of aid/subsidies, but they have extensive experience in the use of European funds (Interreg).
- They are also integrated into national entities for the promotion of cycling (Vélo et Territoires) and the promotion of cycle tourism - France Velotourisme, which includes one of its routes in the French cycle tourism offer.
- They monitor the uses of their cycle paths and greenways, and collaborate with this information in the national observatory. (Note PA: To be confirmed by the PP)

4.2 Strengths, what can they export?

Good practices, what can you export?	Axis	GP	Area
a. Partnership approach in the context of the animation of the Department Commission Spaces sites and Itineraries	1	1	Dep.
b. Management of the Construction Tax (tax) for natural values	2	2	Nat / Dep.
c. Capitalization of experience gained on interregional roaming – promotion	3 / 1	3	Dep. /Reg.
d. Design of itineraries to connect spaces with natural values and signposting (in isolated mountain areas); production of guides and promotional material.	3		Dep
e. Bicycle use monitoring. System at the departmental level and collaboration with the French national observatory. (to confirm by PP).	3 / 1		Dep. / Nat
f. Collaboration with a national public-private partnership for the promotion of cycle tourism (France-Vélotourisme)	3 / 1		Dep. / Nat.
g. Accueil Vélo brand in accommodation - criteria and how it works (examples in L'Herault)	3		Dep. / Nat
h. Collaboration with farms to offer accommodation and services in mountain areas, depopulated areas or areas with low population.	3		Dep.

4.3 Weaknesses, what do you want to improve/implement?

- Lack of private initiative to provide itineraries and welcome tourists along the routes.
- Lack of promotion entity oriented towards tourists/local users.
- Lack of knowledge of these resources/itineraries by the citizens of the Department; lack of animation activities.
- Lack of identity / history of the area; Monotony of the landscape in some areas.
- Uninhabited areas are crossed without population centres. Difficulties with internet connection in large areas (mountain) which makes it difficult to manage / reserve accommodation.
- Integrate new sources of funding.

4.4. Good practices of possible interest. Potential matching's between partners

- Cooperation:
 - o Bulgaria / Hungary: Public-private integration. History telling, to give history and personality to the itineraries.
- Financial:
 - o Bulgaria /Hungary: Diversify sources of funding.
 - o Ireland / Poland / Hungary : experience in financing European projects
- Promotion
 - o Ireland, collaboration at all levels of administration (infrastructure/tourism)
 - o Murcia activities of animation in green ways.
 - o Poland, promotion of long-distance itineraries.
 - o Bulgaria: Euro - Weg E3 Atlantik - Karpaten - Stara Planina - Black sea

05.- Hungary

5.1 Regional Analysis

- No previous *greenway* experience (according to the Lille Declaration)
- Broad participation of stakeholders, in the framework of OurWay who want to strengthen and coordinate.
- Objective: to identify tools, methods and relevant actors to contribute to the implementation of greenways. To create the bases for the integration of greenways in spatial and municipal planning.
- Priority in the PO through new thematic trails
- Interested in 2 initiatives:
 - o Hajdúbagos Greenway (denomination of work) involving surrounding communities / engaging local neighbours (community engagement).
 - o **Treasures of Hortobágy Greenway**. While they indicate: no funding opportunity, no coordinated community involvement; lack of "leadership". Hortobágy is a national park and has very valuable natural values.
- They also indicate an interest in EuroVelo 11 , in a stretch that runs in their territory (*unites north and south of the country and runs along the river Tisza in landscapes of great beauty, including Natura 2000 areas, traditional buildings, wine-growing regions and recreational areas*).
- The 3 proposed Best Practices (2 cooperation) are developed outside the territory of the PP. While perhaps the concepts and working methodologies that have been highlighted in these GOOD PRACTICES, such as the valorisation of local agricultural products / gastronomy, and cartography to preserve and use the valuable natural and cultural heritage and landscape, can be found in their territory in other concrete examples. (To be confirmed by the PP)

- In the case of the 3rd Good Practice, Baranya *greenway*, the PP's ability to provide detailed information should be confirmed.

5.2. Strengths / What can they export?

Good practices, what can you export?	Axis	GP	Area
a. Mecsek Greenway. (<i>outside the territory of the PP</i>)	1	1	Loc.
b. Mesés Hetés "Greenway" (<i>outside the territory of the PP</i>)	1	2	Loc
c. Baranya greenway. (<i>outside the territory of the PP</i>)	3	3	Intern.
d. Involving the Hajdúbagos surrounding communities/engaging neighbourhood (community engagement).	1/3		
e. Market place – rural farmers and producers in contact with urban consumers	1		Loc
f. Valorisation of local agricultural products / gastronomy (<i>To be confirmed by the PP</i>)	1 / 3		Loc.
g. Mapping, preserve and utilize the valuable natural and cultural heritage and landscape <i>A confirmer por el PP</i>	1/3		Loc

5.3 Weaknesses, what do you want to improve/implement?

- Financial and organisational issues (e.g. lack of funding and cooperation between stakeholders).
- In addition, there is a major challenge in getting local communities interested in the process (*contradiction with the collaboration indicated in good practices*).
- The different land ownership of the planned itineraries.
- Infrastructure must be carried out in different sections.
- Lack of human resources.

5.4. Good Practices of possible interest; potential matchings

- Cooperation:
 - o Ireland, for the integration of the different levels throughout the process.
 - o FR: collaboration of institutions for the enhancement of natural spaces and in the design of itineraries in areas of natural value.

- Murcia: The Consortium.
- Financial:
 - Poland / Ireland/ Bulgaria: identification and management of European projects
- Promotion
 - Poland: cycle routes around areas of high natural value.
 - Murcia: local dynamisation activities on Greenways.

06-Bulgaria

6.1 Regional Analysis

- They don't have Greenways; they're not familiar with the concept.
- Objective to improve the experience, that the stakeholders acquire the necessary knowledge and know the good practices to identify the main obstacles to develop these ecological routes in the region and to promote the cultural and natural patrimony.
- Indicator: Increase the number of SMEs that are part of the greenways and that stakeholders can identify their needs and interests and can solve them. Increase the number of visitors to cultural and natural heritage sites and SMEs along these itineraries. *(Comment: You will need to identify these areas, as Greenways is not currently available.)*
- They point out that in order to start the development of greenways in Bulgaria it is necessary to include the documents and strategies at national and regional level that do not exist right now; and to implement a specific policy with financial resources.
- In the Regional Analysis, they basically focus on EuroVelo, which runs through the north of their territory, along the Danube.
- They refer to collaboration and the prominent role of associations directly involved in the promotion of EuroVelo, in the promotion of cycling and ecotourism. Particularly in the Bulgarian Association for Alternative Tourism (with BAAT), which participates in an interreg project currently under development on the Danube. (It runs partially through the North of its territory).
- They have valuable natural and cultural resources in their territory.

6.2 Strengths, what can you export?

Good practices, what can you export?	Axis	GP	Area
a. Euro – Weg E3 Atlantik – Karpaten – Stara Planina – Black sea <i>(Note AP: it is suggested to contact the local group(s) that maintain and signpost the</i>	1	1	Lol. / Reg/ Intern.

<i>itinerary)</i>			
b. Project "E-bike Net"	2 / 1	2	Local / Reg / Intern.
c. 100 Tourist Sites in Bulgaria	3 / 1	3	Nata. / Local
d. Funding: Extensive experience in the identification and implementation of European EU projects (e.g., CCMP Europroject)	2		
e. Preservation of traditions and the identity of the territory with specific activities: Festivals, traditions, slow food (...) - Educational programs, related to nature, - Outdoor exhibition of sculptures in the dismantled railway Mezda -Vratza - Ochin dol - transformation of the old school into accommodation for young people. (in a natural park)	1 / 3		Local
f. Direct contact with the private sector (Chamber of Commerce) - training and awareness-raising activities	1		
g. Direct contact with local accommodation and service associations; methodology of work with small rural establishments that maintain the tradition, in particular with - BAAT - Bulgarian Association for Alternative Tourism and BAAT. EcoVeloTour project (Interreg Danube). - BARET - The Bulgarian Association for Rural and Ecological Tourism (BARET)	1 / 3		Nat. / Reg / local / Intern.

6.3. Weaknesses, what do you want to improve/implement?

- Lack of interest from local authorities.
- Lack of private sector interest.
- Lack of tourism product.

6.4 Good practices of possible interest. Potential matching's between partners

- Cooperation:
 - o Murcia. For the integration of municipalities. (*Also experience in erosion and revegetation process in VV, which BU mention as a threat*).
 - o Ireland. The whole process of implementation of VV,

- France: Concertation for the identification and design of the Green network.
- Financial:
 - France. Use of construction taxes applied to natural spaces
 - Murcia. Identification and application of European national management funds (workshop schools, active employment policies, and others).
 - Hungary. Combination of local rural development funds.
- Promotion
 - Ireland, promotion and cooperation.
 - Poland: itineraries integrating natural values and inter-regional collaboration.

Next steps.

What	Who	When
Review with stakeholders the proposal for (import/export). Comment, if necessary, on the proposal and decide on the GOOD PRACTICES of interest in a reasoned manner. Communicate the chosen proposal to PP1 (Murcia) and PP7/ (EGWA). To take into account the number of planned study visits (study visit program) (2 per PP?? to confirm by LP).	PP	29 / May 2019 (Mandatory in the 2nd period)
Make a list of the final decision and proposed visits. <i>Once the partners have chosen the BUENAS PRÁCTICASs that they are interested in, in order to get a balanced participation of the partnership and to ensure that all the project thematic fields are covered, the project coordinator, together with PP7, will make the final selection matrix, reflecting the “matchings” between exporters partners (those who are the owners of the best practice) and importer partners (those interested in transferring the Best practices into their territories).</i>	LP + PA	24-25 / Sep. 2019 (at the meeting in Poland)

Mercedes Muñoz Zamora,
European Association of Greenways, Director
OurWay Project Advisory Partner
26 April 2019

i Declaración de Lille (Declaration of Lille) : *Greenways are communication routes reserved exclusively for non-motorised journeys, developed in an integrated manner which enhances both the environment and quality of life of the surrounding area. These routes should meet satisfactory standards of width, gradient, and surface condition to ensure that they are both user-friendly and low -risk for users of all abilities. In this respect, canal towpaths and disused railway lines are a highly suitable resource for the development of greenways.* Lille Declaration, 12 September 2000 <http://www.aevv-egwa.org/lille-declaration/>