

Project fiche

| ſ | | Title and acronym | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| TITLE OF THE PROJECT | | Title and acronym 3R (Reuse – Requalify – Reconnect) | | |
| - | | | | |
| | Funding programme | Indicate the selected funding programme and scheme | | |
| | | Interreg Central Europe | | |
| | | or | | |
| - | | Interreg Alpine Space | | |
| | | Short overview of the project | | |
| | | (max 500 characters) | | |
| 1 | | 3R project originates from the expressed need of Municipalities to | | |
| | | manage in an efficient and sustainable way specific areas (natural and | | |
| | | anthropic) which have been abandoned over the years and that are now | | |
| | Cummany of the musicat | less accessible and usable (i.e. third landscape). Such areas actually | | |
| | Summary of the project | identify attractive points of potential interest whose resources (cultural and / or natural) can be enhanced. | | |
| | | Since the methods of recovery and management of these initiatives can | | |
| | | be often diversified from territory to territory, a common approach to | | |
| | | different areas (and with a transnational scope) can represent an | | |
| | | excellent challenge to be faced jointly by developing paths / itineraries | | |
| | | able to enhance their peculiarities. | | |
| - | | Potential partners or typology of partners and explain why the | | |
| | Partners | selected partners are the best suited to participate in this project and | | |
| | | the rationale behind the choice of countries involved in the project | | |
| | | Municipality of San-Dorligo-della-Valle (IT) | | |
| | | Municipality of Mortegliano (IT) | | |
| | | Austrian Partner TBC | | |
| | | Possible local associations (e.g. Pro-Loco) to be included in addition and | | |
| | | completion of the potential team. | | |
| - | | Challenges to be tackled by the project (max 500 characters) | | |
| | | Negligence and time are two factors that significantly damage the | | |
| | | environmental, cultural and historical resources located in different | | |
| | | territories. 3R challenge is the creation of a series of paths (both physical | | |
| | Challenges | and procedural) by exploiting a network of existing points that require | | |
| | | recovery interventions. The latter, in a shared perspective and cross- | | |
| | | border collaboration, are proposed as common methods and tools of | | |
| | | territorial planning, useful for enhancing natural, cultural local resources | | |
| | | thus contributing in preserving the heritage to future generations. | | |
| | | Furthermore, the adoption of the "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle" approach in a | | |
| | | different context from the one in which it was conceived (i.e. reduction of | | |
| | | waste related to the life cycle of waste), could be a particularly interesting | | |
| | | challenge too. | | |
| ſ | | General and specific objectives of the project | | |
| | Objectives | The general objective of the project is to create a transnational | | |
| | | cooperation among the different municipalities involved, with the aim of | | |



| | jointly facing the methods of recovering potentially attractive and resource-rich areas (specific for each territory) through the realisation of ad hoc paths able to enhance them by creating networks of attractive points ("connecting the dots"). The specific objective is to "Improve integrated environmental management capacities for the protection and sustainable use of natural heritage and resources" set by the III Priority of Interreg Central Europe programme (Culture and Environmental), since the sharing of methods and strategies for identifying attractive points and their subsequent recovery, will lead to an enhancement of the cultural resources and heritage present in the area. The specific objective is to "Enhance the protection, the conservation and the ecological connectivity of Alpine Space ecosystem", set by the III Priority of the Alpine Space Programme, through planning tools able to facilitate the recovery of the attractive points as well as the creation of specific paths which will allow these areas to be functionally connected to the local and cross-border tourist network. |
|--|--|
| The same of the sa | Describe the project contribution to the achievement of the |
| | programme's objectives |
| | The project will contribute in enhancing the historical, cultural and |
| Contribution to programme's | natural resources existing in the various territories, providing common |
| objectives | strategies and models for territorial planning and functional recovery of |
| | attractive areas that have been deteriorated over the years, leaving |
| | abandoned landscapes and structures with high historical potential and |
| | natural value. |
| | Explain why is transnational / cross-border cooperation needed and why only a transnational project can face the identified needs (max 500 |
| A 500 | characters) |
| | Cross-border cooperation is an essential element of the project because |
| | exchange of knowledge and experiences will benefit partners involved in |
| European dimension of the | project implementation. |
| project / European added | Moreover, in the frame of the initiative, some common guidelines and |
| value | methodologies will be realised in order to facilitate the transferability of the initiatives in other contexts. |
| | Finally, pilot actions have the purpose of enhancing different sites but |
| | with a common approach, thus allowing both the development of good |
| | practise – models – and a greater flexibility for those who want to |
| | implement further similar initiatives. |
| | Project contribution and complementarity to European, national and |
| | regional policies / programmes / initiatives / strategies (max 500 |
| | characters) The project is in line with the European Union Territorial Agenda, since it |
| Contribution to other policies | promotes territorial development oriented towards culture and |
| | environment. For this reason, the project seeks to comply with the |
| | problems associated with the abandonment of neglected areas, focusing |
| | on the enhancement of landscapes of cultural and historical interest, also |
| | through active collaboration and a shared process of recovering of these |
| | areas. |





| | Does the project capitalise the results of past projects or is complementary to other ongoing (preferably European) projects? (max |
|--|---|
| Synergy and complementarity | The project works in synergy and complementarity with the following EU projects, co-financed by the different EU Programs: • SHELTER - Smart rural heritage along tourism routes (Italia-Austria Programme): the methods and tools designed within the project can represent an excellent know-how for the recovery of sites considered important for the historical and cultural |
| | heritage. FRIULI FENS - Conservation and restoration of calcareous fens in Friuli (LIFE Programme): the approach used in the restoration of some important natural areas can be adopted as a reference model for the future implementation of the recovery of the interested areas. |
| | Description of the project and organisation of the activities in work |
| | packages (max 2000 characters) WPM will be responsible for defining, regulating and monitoring the entire project, through day-to-day management, helping to coordinate the activities of the various partners. WPC will deal with communicating and disseminating the project results |
| Description of the project and organisation in WPs | and addressing them to the most appropriate target groups. WPT.1 aims at studying and defining a shared method of identification and justification of the attractive points (needs) of a territory with the purpose of "narrating" an enhancement network according to the connections among the areas considered, with particular reference to the need of decline them according to a logic of macro-themes to be enhanced, which are subject of definition within this WP, too. WPT.2 aims at identifying and creating possible recovery planning tools that consider the need to manage the identified points from an |
| | administrative and functional point of view according to a shared and functional model. Furthermore, it will aim at defining a shared methodology for the management and subsequent large-scale application of the proposed initiatives (e.g. guidelines). WPT.3 will focus on the identification and development of pilot activities that each municipality will be able to implement on its own territory, according to what is identified as a priority need in the previous phases, in order to abstract shared operating methods that can also be exported to other contexts / territories. |
| | For example, pilot activities could concern: Recovery of a mill (e.g.: Mulino di Adegliacco (UD), Mulino Braida (UD)) Creation of a natural park (e.g.: Parco Bosco Romagno (GO)) Creation of paths with illustrative panels |
| Output and result indicators | What is the way of measuring an objective to be met, a resource committed, an effect obtained? (max 500 characters) The main project outputs include in particular: |





| | Definition territories Guideline Reports or guidelines Consequently, man Greater kr | | ne third landscape and valorise the t pilot activities an include: | hird landscape d related |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | in the initi Creation o Possibility | atives f dedicated valoris of exporting the in | sation paths nitiatives to other | |
| | finalised? How v characters) | vi <mark>ll the project o</mark> | ontinue after its | e project has been s end? (max 500 |
| Durability / sustainability | 3R was designed with the idea that its results could be used and reproduced in other contexts / territories. Furthermore, the guidelines on possible tools and methods for planning and recovery of disused sites can be a valid point of reference for other authorities and municipalities that intend to operate similarly. Finally, the pilot activities can be considered as hest practices that can be easily transferred to other regions. | | | |
| Innovative character | as best practices that can be easily transferred to other regions. Explain why the project is innovative (max 500 characters) The innovativeness of the 3R project is represented in particular by the possibility of adopting the "Reduce, Reuse, Recycle" approach in a different context from that in which it was conceived (reduction of waste related to the life cycle of waste). In fact, the generic concept of waste is replaced by the third landscape (disused and abandoned natural and anthropogenic areas) which basically represents a resource to be exploited in a more efficient and systematic way. Therefore, the identification of dedicated tools will allow the development of a certainly innovative enhancement path compared to the original logic of the approach. | | | |
| Target groups | Who will use and or benefit from the outputs? First the communities and local authorities, tourists, schools, local and environmental associations, tour operators. | | | |
| Budget | Describe the rationale and relevance of the budget in relation to the envisaged activities (max 500 characters) The project is proposed to last approximately 36 months. The project budget will be divided according to the following general proposals: Possible budget partition per WPs: Up to WPM 10-20 % WPC 5-10 % WPT.1 20 % | | | |





| WPT.2 | 20 % |
|-------|------|
| WPT.3 | 30 % |

Possible budget partition per cost categories:

| | Up to | Comments |
|------------------|-----------|--|
| Staff | 20 - 50 % | Depending on the type of partner (e.g. |
| External experts | 20 - 50 % | universities generally have a higher incidence of staff costs than other categories of partners) |
| Travel costs | 2-3 % | Depending on the specific Programme and the reference area. |
| Equipment | 5 % | Tend to be limited considering the problems related to the logic of thematic equipment and depreciation. |
| Works | 20-40 % | Very variable according to the types of activities to be carried out. |

Possible budget partition per implementation year:

| | 3 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - | | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--------|--|--|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | | |
| Optimum | 25 % | 40 % | 35 % | | |
| Probable | 20 % | 30 % | 50% | | |

