(New, rural) business models, their mechanisms and impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BM</th>
<th>Trans-territorial, rural-urban business partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Business partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Cross-sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational scale</td>
<td>A great variety of organisational forms that might be more or less formalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short description</td>
<td>Rural-urban business partnerships address spatially extended trans-territorial relations and interdependencies through commercial activity. Rural amenity valorisation is often a key component of shared commercial activities, thereby going beyond pure economic revenue seeking. Other key features are a range of sectoral backgrounds, a broad spectrum of initiators, geographical distance, and often a relatively loose structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Rural-urban business partnerships seek to incorporate specific rural qualities into product and service characteristics and simultaneously aim to share its accompanying financial revenues in more equitable ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>Innovativeness resides primarily in novel ways to valorise rural-urban relations with particular attention paid to rural imaginations, narratives and distinctive qualities. The collaboration among very different groups such as consumers, public authorities, institutions and associations as commercial partners represents another important innovative feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value creation</td>
<td>A mixture of economic, social and cultural values, with a focus on rural amenity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers, product/service, revenue streams and main cost items</td>
<td>Urban dwellers, consumers and visitors. Only more incidentally rural dwellers might be the principle target group, e.g. as users of distance working facilities. Products and services encompass material and immaterial components with a prominent place for cultural connectivity and social justice. Revenue streams are characterised by more mutually beneficial value flows and by going, in this way, beyond extractive rural-urban relations. Main cost items are the transaction costs related to developing novel, trust-based partnerships. Material investments vary depending on the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Societal impact | Beneficial  
- Increased prospects for more remote rural areas  
- Value and employment generation  
- Spatially extended knowledge exchange and innovation networks  
- Novel manifestations of cultural connectivity  
Negative  
- Little additional opportunities for amenity poor remote rural areas |
| Connections with labour market and employment effects | More balanced rural-urban growth in employment opportunities, with attention paid to employment generation in remote rural areas. |
| Enabling factors | • Urban appreciation of rural cultural capital  
|                  | • Trust-based rural-urban relationships  
|                  | • Rural spatial quality and amenities  
|                  | • Leadership  
| Limiting factors | • Cultural barriers between rural and urban dwellers  
|                  | • Lack of continuity in partnerships  
|                  | • Local controversies around partnerships  
|                  | • Necessary time required for building trust-based relations  
| Key partners and actors directly involved | Rural and urban actors with rather diverse backgrounds and motivations for engaging in novel ways to valorise rural amenities. Private, public and civil society sector might be part of commercial activities.  
| Role of (local) government | Sometimes as facilitator. Providing financial support. In few cases as initiator (e.g. in the case of remote working facilities).  
| Connections with the institutional / policy environment | Rural-urban business partnerships may be difficult to align with institutional and policy environments, as the latter, by their very nature, operate in territory bounded spheres. Institutional support, therefore, critically depends on novel institutional arrangements that also allow to support more distant rural-urban cooperation.  
| Internal/network governance arrangements | Some more universally applicable internal governance features are:  
|                  | • joint targets, agreed upon from both sides  
|                  | • a considerable degree of consensus, involvement and participation  
|                  | • a high degree of shared responsibilities to achieve the targeted results  
| A typical example | Ongoing initiatives encompass a broad range of commercial activity including food catering, rural leisure, remote working facilities, agritainment, fashion shopping and lifestyle fashion design. Dutch Taste of Van Gogh: [https://www.holland.com/global/tourism/holland-stories/van-gogh/taste-of-van-gogh.htm](https://www.holland.com/global/tourism/holland-stories/van-gogh/taste-of-van-gogh.htm)  
| BM references | Danish Thorupstrand Fishermen's Guild: [https://wayback.archive-it.org/12090/20191113214540/]  
|                  | Danish Black Safari: [https://www.romo-tonder.dk/en/listing/sort-safari](https://www.romo-tonder.dk/en/listing/sort-safari)  
|                  | Scientific info on trans-territorial rural-urban business partnerships: [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0269094216686528](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0269094216686528)  
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