

### **ALLEGATO 3: RESULTS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES**

---

The present analysis is based on the questionnaires, entitled “*Networking and future activities*”, filled in by the Interreg IIC Partners <sup>1</sup>. It briefly summarizes on one hand the lessons learned during the project and on the other the suggestions and proposals for developing networking activities and new collaborations and projects.

Apropos the analysis is divided in three parts <sup>2</sup>.

#### Part 1: LESSON LEARNED from the current INTERREG III C ACTIONS

Question 1.1.: According to the Partners the Interreg project created important **opportunities/benefits** especially in term of:

1. promoting best practice;
2. relationship between partners;
3. information sharing.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
n° persons		4	3	<b>Promoting best practice</b>
	1	3	2	<b>Relationship between partners</b>
	2		3	<b>Information sharing</b>

The following issues have not received any preference:

- easier, more effective communication;
- facilitating development of new programmes;
- collaboration across disciplines (among specialists of a given region);
- gain more consideration and effectiveness on the international stage).

Question 1.2.:The two **aspects** which **adversely** affected the development of the Interreg project have been:

1. administrative;
2. organisation size.

---

<sup>1</sup> In particular 10 Partners from Italy, Scotland, Portugal, Norway.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that for the questions 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, there was to select 3 of the issues proposed and mark them with 1 = minimum, 3 = maximum.

At the same time other aspects have had a negative effects:

- weak structuring from the part of lead partner;
- definition of sectors of analysis and objectives;
- size and complexity of the partnership;
- varying commitment of partners throughout the programme.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
n° persons	1	2	4	Administrative
	2	4		Organisation size
	1		3	Other

Nobody has suggested the technical issue and just one person problems of partnership.

Question 1.3.: The most important **activities** in order to **circulate** and share **information** and best practices have been:

1. seminars;
2. written reports;
3. [www.euromountains.net/seminar](http://www.euromountains.net/seminar);
4. other, i.e study trips.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
N° persons	2	2	5	Seminars
	1	4	2	Written reports
	4	2		<a href="http://www.euromountains.net/seminar">www.euromountains.net/seminar</a>
			3	Other: study trips

The **motivation** which attracted the partners most to actively **participate** in **networking activities** has been the possibility to know the problems and solutions affected other mountain areas and to share information and experiences (question 1.4.). Whilst the **difficulty** in **exchanging information** among partners has been connected to the absence of only one language to speak (question 1.5.).

In future in order to **improve** the circulation of **information** it will be important to work on the “internet- site”. It will have to be created properly at the beginning of the project, regularly updated and used in a more dynamic way (question 1.6.).

## Part 2: SUGGESTIONS on FUTURE NETWORKING ACTIVITIES

Question 2.1.: All the partners consider networking activities important in developing new projects even if the reasons are different. In fact networking activities:

- allow: a) a better mutual knowledge and a more efficient and lasting exchange of experience; b) to gain more consideration and effectiveness on the international and political stage; c) to cut down costs and to obtain scale economy;
- are a good way: a) to meet other professionals who work on the same challenges, b) to concretize overlapping challenges and problems and define useful themes for cooperation/projects;
- provide the forum for quality information exchange.

Question 2.2.: In order to strengthened new networks the possible strategies to use are many:

- to have a clear picture of the different potential partners and their needs;
- to fix more focused and common objectives/tasks and well defined projects;
- to identify and define roles within the network, particularly those concerning the co-ordinator and the facilitator; it is important to develop a communication strategies for partners and also for other interested parts;
- to combine virtual and physical meeting places; network members need to meet (physically) from time to time in order to keep the network alive;
- to define a clear common agenda for both the objectives of a partnership and the methods and activities to be undertaken; ensuring all partners have commitment to both the aims and the activities of the partnership from all levels of their organisation – in particular political commitment and officer/operational commitment.

Question 2.3.: Besides there are other networking activities the Partners would be interested to develop:

- activities able: a) to reach concrete objectives; b) to compare policies and their impacts; c) to stimulate debate;
- network between producers and common members of local mountain communities in different countries.

**Part 3: PROPOSALS regarding NEW COLLABORATIONS and PROJECTS**

Question 3.1.: In future the Partners would develop new collaborations and projects principally in the field of:

1. land management governance;
2. tourism linked to mountain food products;
3. diversification of activities and tourism products.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
N° persons		1	3	Land management governance
		1	2	Tourism linked to mountain food products
	2	1	1	Diversification of activities and tourism products

The following issues have not received any preference:

- health care;
- preserving cultural resources;
- enhancing recreational opportunities.

Other areas suggested by the Partners could be the following:

- a) alternatives/innovations for forestry productions: i.e. renewable energies; b) alternatives for agriculture productions: production of renewable energies by cereals; production of services; production of “sustainable/rural tourism”; c) “acquis communautaire”: food security and traceability; d) rules: plans for managing the landscape and the space, plans for managing rivers resources;
- development of second homes and educational training in the tourism sector;
- diversification of income generating activities in mountain communities based on new and non traditional resources, skills, knowledge, etc;
- use-protection: differentiation of models/systems and measures to enable sustainable development;
- digital divide, E-society and E-Government;

Question 3.2.: The partner to be involved would have to be:

1. public administrations at different level (with similar functions, needs.....);
2. community of interest;
3. mountain communities of new EU countries;

Other partners to be involved have to be: public-private partnership; SMEs, private stakeholders and research institute.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
N° persons	2	2	5	Public administrations at different level
	1	3	1	Community of interest
	1	2	1	Mountain communities of new EU countries

All the other issues have received at least one preference.

Question 3.3.: Important areas of activities would have to be the following:

1. promoting pilot projects;
2. sharing of innovation;
3. promoting best practice.

In detail the answers are explained in the table:

	Preference			
	1	2	3	
N° persons		2	6	Promoting pilot projects
		1	3	Sharing of innovation
	3	2	1	Promoting best practice

Nobody has considered important organising seminars.

The most partners prefer:

- to start on a new project as soon as possible (question 3.4);
- to operate under the “new Interreg project” for the period 2007-2013 (question 3.5.).

For all, at the moment it is too early to identify a budget for the project (question 3.6.).