

## AlpCity meeting

Besançon, 12-13 December 2005

### Proceedings of the SSC meeting

The SSC met twice :

**On the first day to discuss about the follow-up to the working groups held in Milan,  
On the second day to plan the work for the next months.**

We pointed up :

- The need of a strong methodology to compare the different projects. We have to demonstrate the integration of the case studies. So they must be evaluated according to the interfaces between them, to take common conclusions in the final report.

- It would be interesting if the SSC could write an own 20 pages synthesis about AlpCity findings and propositions for ongoing work. It could be included in the final report.

- The SSC took some recommendations about best practises data base and final report :

- ❖ BP have to provide decision makers and future applicants with a complete review of topics already developed in order to avoid duplication and start always from zero ;
- ❖ we have to issue a common paper concerning the interaction among the case studies sharing the same topic
- ❖ to include in the paper also other projects dealing with the same topic especially Interreg
- ❖ Enhance the dissemination of BP within and outside the Alpine Space
- ❖ Help decision makers to elaborate regional strategies according to the territorial demand
- ❖ Stress the problem of non uniformity of data

***The BP data base is not the main output. The main aim of the work must be to have some answer to “How to improve the development of small towns ?”***

***For instance :***

- ***to adopt the participation process as method***
- ***at first to improve the capacity building of the local authorities***

**In the next months (until June) :**

- To contribute to the final report and to make its own opinion, **each SSC member must contact the different case studies leaders** in the “regions” he is responsible, and then discuss with them, to know very clearly how the operations involved. We do not make a questionnaire (they never received an answer, or not always a sincere answer). It is better **to discuss** –at the free initiative of the expert, in the way that he will think the better-.

In this discussion, each one must give a great importance to the participatory process, and to the exchanges between the different partners of the AlpCity projects. We have to clear up if knowledge transfers took place throughout project and had consequences in the course of process ?

**We ask the lead partner to recommend each public authority to invite other partners (from the some WP for example, but it could be either partner there is something to exchange and to share with) when having their internal synthesis meeting.**

We know that it is the intention of Rhône-Alpes and Friuli-Veneto. We ask that each partner does so, if possible.

**We shall have an internal SSC meeting at the beginning of march to discuss about the BP and our conclusions. We shall see what is the better place : Torino or Grenoble ?**

**We ask everybody to read the draft of the final report which is on the web site ;**

**We ask Marie-Hélène de Sède to give some scientific recommendations about the BP data base.**