

**REGALP**  
**Contract No QLK5-CT-2001-02329**

**ANNEX 6**  
**to Work Package 6 Report**

**National Report Slovenia**  
**Proposing Policy Adjustments**

**Mojca Golobic, Damjana Bacnar, Barbara Cernic**

**Ljubljana, 16.08.2004**



Table of contents:

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Synthesis of preparatory steps.....	3
2.1	Methodology overview.....	3
2.2	Achievement and deficits of the policies and identification of reasons.....	4
3.	Final recommendations.....	9
3.1	Transversal recommendations.....	9
3.2	Principle: “supporting agriculture”.....	13
3.3	Principle: “protected areas”.....	21
3.4	Principle: “spatial planning”.....	25
3.5	Other recommendations:.....	31
4.	Conclusions and comments.....	32
5.	Sources:.....	34
6.	Appendix:.....	37
6.1	Achievements and deficits, further input from other WPs and existing recommendations (steps 1-4).....	37
6.2	List of draft recommendations.....	64
6.3	Cross check results: transferability, existing recommendations, feasibility.....	67

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Slovenian national report of the final, 6<sup>th</sup> work package of the RegAlp project contains recommendations as were proposed for Slovenian national context with consideration of European as well as regional and local inputs. Besides the results of all previous steps of the 6<sup>th</sup> work package working procedure, which are synthesised in the following chapter, the results of all previous packages; in particular WP3 and WP5 were used as inputs for this report. According to work distribution among the partners as decided in WP3, the Slovenian team concentrated on the following policy principles: *Supporting agriculture*, *Spatial planning as conciliatory process* and *Nature protection areas*. Transversal recommendations were also elaborated. Since we aim at comprehensive view of RD/CL interrelation, we also cross checked transferability of partners' recommendations for policy principles that were not the focus of our analysis. As a result of this cross-check we included the most relevant ones in our list of recommendations.

Each of the proposed recommendations is presented by key line and short explanation. The text is structured in paragraphs trying to address the most important elements of each recommendation: *why* the recommendation should be applied and what is supposed to achieve gives a short argumentation for proposal. *Who* should implement the recommendation identifies the target institutions/public. *How* we imagine the recommendation should be implemented, explains the main steps and required inputs. Finally, *reference* relates the recommendation to partners' proposals as well as existing recommendations.

## 2. SYNTHESIS OF PREPARATORY STEPS

### 2.1 Methodology overview

The inputs of the previous work packages were summarized in the **first step**. The aim of this task was to identify the achievements and the deficits of the analysed policy principle and its devices. Achievements or positive items can be regarded as “good practice”; deficits are concrete starting points for deriving recommendations for improvements. The first step was based on the results of WP3, which were further explored and reformulated. These conclusions were updated in **step 3** by additional information from WP2, 4 and 5. **Step 2** aims at deeper examination and verification of the reasons for the detected deficits and achievements. These reasons provide further input (technically, thematically etc.) for the recommendations. A review of relevant existing recommendations was carried out in **step 4**. This list was later used to cross check our recommendations and to position them relative to existing ones. In **Step 5** the first version of recommendations, “draft” was elaborated. This list of draft recommendation was then subject of a rigorous cross-checking from the perspectives of transferability, feasibility and existing recommendations. In **step 6** the feasibility cross-check was performed, representing a kind of filter of “realism”. The following criteria were used: “quality” of the recommendation, overall effort required for the implementation, “price-performance ratio”, political / administrative situation, financial resources, human resources, attitude of relevant target groups

and other relevant items. Information on these items was collected in available literature and data as well as from the national expert workshops and interviews. **Step 7** finally consisted of developing proposals for recommendations. In this step, further cross-checks were performed: cross-check with existing recommendation in order to see whether our proposal repeat, complement or contradict existing proposals; and a transferability cross-check to see whether proposals of other partners support, complement or contradict ours and whether any of their proposals are relevant for the national situations and could be therefore added to the final list. For final recommendations' list, the order was revised so as to put the more general and/or urgent recommendations in the top positions, followed by minor / more specific ones.

A short summary of the steps 1-3 results is given below and represents the main input for development of recommendations. The results of steps 4 - 7 (5: The list of "draft" recommendations with short explanation of each recommendation, 4, 6-7: Transferability, existing recommendations and feasibility cross check) are included in the appendix of this report.

## **2.2 Achievement and deficits of the policies and identification of reasons**

### **2.2.1 Supporting agriculture**

Main aim of the principle is preservation of (agri) cultural landscape by supporting specific agricultural practices. Multifunctionality of agriculture, suitable land cultivation and environmentally friendly technologies are explicit concepts within this policy principle. Multifunctional agriculture also includes the socially important services of agriculture, such as preservation of traditional settlements, cultural landscape and environment quality. Suitable land cultivation and environmentally friendly technologies aim at preservation of cultivated agricultural land with environmentally friendly agricultural practices, conservation of soil fertility, water resources and biodiversity.

Devices of this principle are in their objectives as well as impacts relevant for sustainable development, however more in its environmental and cultural landscape aspect and less so in terms of social and economic objectives. The economic (the costs of attaining the objectives) as well as social (the social and psychological impacts) sustainability of the direct payments, which put farming in a position of public service, dependent on budget financing, has still not been openly questioned in public let alone answered. Integration of environmental considerations into sector-based policies (agriculture) and maintenance and management of land traditionally cultivated by man are the primary strategies of sustainable development.

The principle is not entirely coherent: agricultural subsidies are often complementary measures, but might also be competitive to each other (extensification-intensification). The strongest opposition is between administrative and financial instruments (subsidies) functioning against measures for economic strengthening of farms and active land policy.

The most important observed and/or expected positive impacts of devices are: improved economic opportunities for permanent crops and pastures, revitalization of agricultural land,

preserved typical landscapes and habitats in less favored (mostly mountain) areas; better knowledge and understanding of environment and ecology among farmers, improved farm management, secured economic base for preservation of population. The less positive impacts include impeding the ability of agriculture to consolidate and function as economic activity and therefore increasing “passivity” of farmers (suppression of initiative, innovation and diligence).

The most important reasons for deficits were identified as follows:

- direct transcription of the EU policy without public verification of objectives in national context, and lack of assessment of possible negative impacts
- lack of coordination among sectors (spatial planning, environment and nature protection, economy); lack of integrative approaches
- competitiveness of certain devices (subsidies vs. land fund)

The achievements on the other hand can be attributed to:

- comprehensive set of measures, supported with relatively extensive financial and administrative sources
- functioning of support service on local / regional level (agri-advisory service)
- the existence (and growth) of market demand for environmentally grown products
- accompanying measures (compulsory education courses for involved farmers about ecological aspects of agriculture).

### 2.2.2 Spatial planning as a conciliatory process

This principle’s main objectives are rational and suitable land use. The planning principle is a hierarchy of devices, providing a framework for implementation of objectives which are defined on several levels according to the needs of stakeholders and adjusted to spatial potentials. Some sectoral policies also embedded their objectives directly into spatial planning, using spatial planning instruments for their implementation. Administrative measures such as zoning and planning regulations prevail. The requirement for public participation is traditionally a part of planning legislation.

Spatial planning principle deals with both development as well as conservation aspects, thus addressing all the major issues of sustainable development. On the one hand this is an opportunity to achieve synergistic and integrative action, but can on the other hand prove to be inefficient (too rigid, complicated, irrelevant) or yield unwanted side effects. The indifference of spatial planning towards economic issues often shows as relatively strong draw-back in practice.

Judgement on impacts is especially difficult for this principle, as the regulation on spatial planning has been recently changed. The assessments given here refer to impacts of those devices, which haven’t changed significantly with the new regulation. The main achievement of the planning principle is that planned development in general reduces impacts on environmentally sensitive areas and landscape as well as limits natural hazards and urban expansion. The planned land use is compatible with physical characteristics of space, thus protecting agricultural land, cultural landscape and natural heritage from degradation. But the devices are not uniformly effective. There are also cases where planning restrictions cause more

damage by inhibiting rational land-use, diversification of activities and reducing efficiency of investments, thus hindering activation of local resources. In some cases, the rigid planning restrictions provoke evading the rules, which lead to inappropriate development (illegal housing, expansion of activities...), that could not be prevented due to (too) weak control.

The reasons for deficits were identified as follows:

- long procedures for designation and adoption of planning documents: the resulting documents are outdated from the very beginning; they often lag behind initiatives; also problem of different time-scales (spatial plans: long term vs. development plans short and medium term)
- lack of (input) of development opportunities and initiatives,
- long hierarchical chains can contribute to misinterpretations between documents
- long and complicated procedures even for simple improvements of people's living conditions
- emphasis on administrative and restrictive measures, lack of other types of measures
- different (sectoral) interests are not appropriately conciliated before they are transcribed as requirements in plans, they do not consider local situation
- insufficient participation of public in planning processes and resulting opposition from locals

Achievements could be attributed to hierarchical and coherent structure of the devices as well as the nature of planning process, which allows incorporation of objectives from different levels and sectors as well as identifying possible negative impacts in advance. Binding nature of most measures is another reason for their effectiveness.

### 2.2.3 Nature protection areas

Main objectives are nature conservation and preservation of CL including environment protection. The consideration of regional development is usually implicit and can be assessed via indirect impacts. Nature conservation is the prevailing sector, implementing majority of its objectives through establishment and management of protected areas. 8% of the Slovenian territory is at the moment under some nature protection measure (half of this area being Triglav national park, which covers a large proportion of Slovenian Alps), while 36% is proposed as Natura2000 sites. All sectors, individuals as well as (public and private) organizations are most often addressed; be it by the restrictions, which are the strongest lever of action or by incentives and projects for promotion and information.

Clearly, this principle complies with those parts of the sustainability reference system, which address conservation aspects. Due to its protective nature, it also contradicts the sustainability framework in parts, addressing development (i.e. the objectives of nature conservation can conflict with the diversification of activities and rational land use). Also, several sustainability strategies are not adequately applied or even hampered by this principle, specifically integrative approach and regional planning. This principle is successful in protecting nature, but much less in dealing with issues where active approach is needed to maintain and/or develop valuable cultural assets or conciliate development and protection requirements. Therefore the principle is of high relevance for peripheral and tourist areas while not so much for the areas where active development is under way or is desired (local centers, suburban areas, some tourist areas). Principle is much more successful if there is a holistic approach and good cooperation with locals (TNP).

The achievements of the principle objectives are difficult to judge reliably since the legislation for environment (1993-2004) and nature protection (1999-2004) is very recent. (Presumed) impacts of nature protection areas include: conserved landscape- and bio-diversity, natural structures, habitats and ecological connections; suitable living condition for species as well as populations of endangered species are maintained<sup>1</sup>; land uses and activities within these areas are conciliated with protection considerations, reduced pressures on endangered species in critical periods; raised awareness among inhabitants, visitors and general public. Triglav national park in particular could be deemed generally successful in preventing the process of urbanization within its borders, preserving nature as major (national and) local asset, as well as attracting consumers in the area, providing market for local resources, supporting development of ecological agriculture and preserving traditional crafts.

Negative impacts on the other hand include increased conflicts over use of space due to restrictive measures, narrowed opportunities for RD and rational land use and hampered local development initiative, increased development pressures on the bordering areas, causing negative environmental impacts, rule violations and evasions - illegal development, attracting newcomers (permanent as well as weekend residents), causing conflicts with residents.

The deficits are related to the following reasons:

---

<sup>1</sup> These impacts are difficult to measure and prove empirically, especially if there are no time –series of monitoring data available. However, according to some expert opinions, they are sufficiently achieved at least within TNP as well as natural and forest reserves.

- Principle is applied on large and diverse areas with complex problems, while being under competence of only one sector (nature conservation), which does not consider other priorities, neither possesses adequate instruments. The lack of trans-sectoral cooperation, conciliation and integrative approaches is therefore of significant importance
- inadequate communication with local communities and involved public, lack of public participation,
- rigid restrictions, not tuned to local needs
- lack of management plans and documents, weak organization,
- lack of evaluation of impacts (presumably not needed for protection measures)
- violations and evasions of legislation due to low effectiveness of inspection and control
- lack of adequate supportive instruments (subsidies, incentives, compensations)
- lack of trust in the NC sector and its negative image in public opinion as being too restrictive for regional development and non cooperative with local interest groups.

Achievements of the principle were mainly identified in the case of TNP, where they can be attributed to its long tradition and relatively independent status with rather trans-sectoral attitude, resulting in good image and acceptance by locals. Part of TNP's success is also related to its ability to provide jobs and carefully planned and implemented promotional activities, which attract tourists to the area as well as increase consciousness of local residents for natural and CL values.

### 3. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 3.1 Transversal recommendations

##### 3.1.1 Balancing economic, landscape and environmental issues requires future perspectives

**Why?** The policy analysis and interviews with local actors confirmed that presently there is too much orientation into solving existing problems instead of anticipating and reacting to the problems of the future. This seriously hinders the ability of the policies to influence development. The accelerated changes demand more flexible thinking: knowing the past and present are necessary but not sufficient condition to direct our actions and processes. In order to meet future challenges, the policies need to be highly responsive and take a proactive, future oriented approach. The scenario exercise in WP4 proved that devising today's action requires future perspective and that these can and should go beyond general statements and take a rather bold and concrete forms. Future trends, emerging values and lifestyles require new theories and concepts, new policy approaches and adequate instruments for action. Trend extrapolations do not suffice any longer: there are radical changes in life-styles, value systems and technologies that we have to anticipate and find answers to cope with. For example: if we stick to maintaining the rural character and image of the settlements, we are at risk to loose inhabitants as well as cultural landscape, since people do require environment which will be suited to their changed / modern life-style.

**Who?** This recommendation addresses a very wide public; but policy makers in all related sectors and levels and scientific community seem to be the key target groups. The present discussion about CL reflects a prevailingly conservative attitude of policy makers as well as NGOs and some experts, which is slow to change.

**How?** It is a specific recommendation that can not be formally or normatively put into force, but requires recognition and acceptance of the actors. The experts and academics in concerned fields should promote new approaches and stimulate future oriented perspectives. The concepts and methodologies should be integral part of research and education, not only in individual fields (economy and demography for example, and partly environment already include future-oriented studies) but as an integrated, cross-sectoral approach.

**Reference:** Surprisingly enough, such recommendation is only rarely mentioned. The obviousness of approach might have been the reason if the practice didn't show the opposite. Despite the lack of explicit support by partners' proposals or by existing recommendations (or even because of it) we consider it worth mentioning. A minor example of considering changing concepts in the future is the proposal from Slovenian Spatial development strategy concerning transformation of valuable objects of cultural heritage (vernacular architecture) to secondary homes to support development and maintain built heritage in declining areas.

3.1.2 The regional level is a necessary, although lacking level to address RD/CL issues: it needs consolidation as well as more administrative power

**Why:** Several issues regarding CL and RD are regional in scope and should be dealt with on appropriate level. The region's role is crucial in improving social and economic development. Enhancing the role of endogenous potential for development calls for the greater decentralisation of the state; care for natural resources (for example drinking water) on the other hand can not be left over to local communities only. The trend analysis as well as scenario development and workshops in pilot regions showed the need to deal with these issues on the level, which is integrative for local communities yet more specific than national strategies. The past polycentric development in Slovenija spawned many small municipalities while at the same time weakened their competences and neglected regional level. The regional level should therefore be strengthened and given more competences as well as financial resources. The subsidiarity principle should be respected: what can be solved on local level should not be transferred to regional; and the national level should not try to take competence over regional issues.

**Who?** The implementation of this recommendation largely depends on formal (administrative) framework: the national bodies (government, parliament) have to provide legal framework for regions to be established. Local communities should act constructively to speed-up the process of regionalization. Although officially all the involved actors support the idea of regions, when it comes to realization it is obvious that they are not really willing to hand over their competences. Existing regional bodies such as Regional development agencies, public institutions, NGOs should stimulate the formal process while expand the work on regional projects.

**How?** There is at present still a formal barrier since the regional level of administration is not yet established. Regionalisation requires redistribution of competences accompanied by corresponding redistribution of resources. This may take some time since these are politically sensitive questions, which require a lot of conciliation and favourable distribution of political powers. Nevertheless, the cooperation and action on regional level could still be improved despite this lack of legal base. Voluntary projects of several local communities and the state could provide valuable starting point and experience for functioning of formal regions.

**Reference:** Similar and/or supporting proposals were developed by several partners (Germany, Italy and Austria). Single programming document explicitly calls for 'local self-governance and establishing regions' to enhance the role of endogenous potential in regional development. Other existing recommendations avoid addressing regional level since it is not formally established.

3.1.3 The measures should take into account and be sensitive to the specific regional situations

**Why?** Regional diversity can have strong distorting effects on implementation of certain measures. The results from pilot regions are instructive: the impacts of measures are context dependent; therefore they do not achieve same results in different environments. There should be an ongoing process of adaptation of policies' objectives, instruments and measures to the conditions, current trends, resources and potentials as well as other specific circumstances in the region. Monitoring systems need to consider geographical dimensions and measures should be calibrated accordingly. Especially the areas characterised by specific needs should be identified and targeted with corresponding measures.

**Who?** The recommendation addresses policy makers in all related fields in the first place, but active feedback is needed from the local administration and research community.

**How?** The implementation of this rather general recommendation would differ from sector to sector and measure to measure. Considerable effort is required to implement this recommendation, especially in policy programmes with existing firm procedural rules and criteria. Considering the proverbial rigidity of the administration no radical change can be expected. On the other hand, this approach can be taken gradually and for the measures where it the most significant results and improvement of effectiveness can be expected. The adaptation and fine-tuning of measures require elaboration of complex quantitative and qualitative indicators, describing both morphological aspect of the territory and social or economic features. Indicators should allow the valuation of the effectiveness of the institutional interventions at local level. An effective feed-back loop and information exchange system is required.

**References:** This recommendation is supported by several partners' recommendations (Austria, Italy, Switzerland), mainly proposed under the policy principle "investments in infrastructure, enterprises and business initiatives including tourism". Existing recommendations often refer to regional specifics and identity but they are mostly of protective nature or else they propose development programmes for specific regions. Single programming document is rather specific, adopting "spatial targeting approach", whereby the way of implementation should be adopted to specific development policy in a way that it won't affect overall national productiveness.

In some documents too much of locally specific (development) initiative is also considered as negative (following partial interests and uncoordinated).

#### 3.1.4 Bottom-up approaches have to be strengthened

3.1.5 **Why?** The landscape and regional development issues have to be brought from scientific domain in public debate. Decisions can not be taken in a technocratic way, based exclusively on research and academic knowledge. A reliable knowledge base is inevitable but the problems and the solutions need to be discussed in transparent democratic settings with participation of all involved stakeholders. Although this is a general observation and also one of the initial assumptions of the Regalp project, it was re-confirmed with our local workshops and the conference of regions. The value of bottom-up inputs was also proved. Despite the fact that this is a well known and officially recognized concept, it is frequently marginalized and restricted to the most tokenistic forms of implementation. Besides the lack of formal procedures, the lack of innovative approaches can be identified as main reason for this deficit. The implementation is left over to responsible authorities who often lack the know-how as well as show certain reluctance and fear of losing competence. This can be therefore considered the main barrier on the 'top side'. The 'bottom side' on the other hand is sometimes over-saturated with bottom-up events (workshops, round-tables, meetings etc...), which are often extremely time-consuming and with only limited effects. This could be a problem especially in smaller communities.

**Who?** The recommendation addresses all the potentially involved stakeholders: policy makers on national and local level, professional organisations, NGOs, economic players, local groups...The ones who design policy and decision making processes are the most responsible for changing the existing inadequate procedures and providing adequate formal framework.

**How?** The missing methodologies need to be developed and put into practice by (among others) engaging and training facilitators. Better coordination of bottom-up and top-down approaches could be achieved by strengthening dialogue and participatory process. Improved coordination among different bottom-up projects and improved efficiency would also help motivate people to participate. In order to mobilise the greatest possible number of participants, the common projects could be linked to issues of common importance and territorial identity, including CL.

**References:** Due to its 'obviousness', the recommendation was not originally on the draft recommendations' list, but was transferred and adapted from proposals of Austria, Germany and France. Despite expectations it is not so often mentioned in existing recommendation, therefore we considered it worth mentioning.

## 3.2 Principle: “supporting agriculture”

### 3.2.1 The objectives of agriculture need to be verified and /or re-evaluated

**Why?** An extensive legislative apparatus has recently been established to support the system of subsidies, comparable to EU. Considering that agriculture policy is deemed up-to date and relevant we are aware that this recommendation may seem rather radical. Especially since the fact that it complies with EU is considered a satisfactory and sufficient justification. However we assess that the lack of public verification significantly reduces legitimacy of present agricultural policy, although at present there is no real need or pressure from actors to verify or re-shape the existing policy. Farmers seem rather satisfied with promising subsidies, other actors do not seem to have problems with agricultural measures either. However a lot of measures do not reflect understanding of RD/CL relations or consideration of national and/or regional specific. The assumption underlying this recommendation is that re-evaluation of policy objectives is needed because the money spent is not solving the “right” problems. Sooner or later, the (potential) reduction of financial resources for agricultural subsidies will inevitably bring about the questions of justification of measures and the criteria for money distribution. The reshaping of the policy should bring reallocation of money to achieve better (and socially relevant) results.

**Who?** The recommendation addresses policy makers in agricultural sector in the first place. But it also requires active involvement of other related policy fields (spatial planning, forestry, tourism, regional development) as well as representatives from local and regional level would. In general an open, inclusive public debate is needed.

**How?** Involved actors do not seem to have the need to open these questions at present. It is therefore difficult to initiate change at least in short terms. The feasibility of this measure is therefore assessed as low, also due to the political support that the agriculture policy presently enjoys. Changes would require improved insight into CL/RD issues, and cooperation between spatial planning (as well as other) sectors, which is traditionally weak. There are examples in agricultural policy that show some consideration of effects: definition of restricted conditions, water protection areas and nature conservation areas. Other possibilities, such as valuable landscapes or recreation areas need to be discussed. The merits of multifunctionality concept need to be defined and explored.

**References:** There are several recommendations that address this issue, especially as regards definition of multifunctionality (Austria), the role of CL, the criteria of eligibility for subsidies etc. However not many recommendations explicitly require re-assessment. This may also be due to the recent adoption of EU agri-policy in Slovenija: the agricultural policy does not question or argument its overreaching objectives. There is some relativization of agricultural objectives in spatial documents trying to justify or specify the objectives according to characteristics of an area and requirements of other users.

### 3.2.2 Joint measures are needed; existing contradictions need to be removed

**Why:** Majority of CL/RD objectives are by their nature cross-disciplinary. This recommendation is therefore a part of a more general request for better cooperation and conciliation of action among the sectors, with specific aim to remove the systemic barriers to renovation and/or restructuring of countryside. This recommendation could as well be considered transversal, since a lot of problems appear due to contradictory legal requirements. An illustrative case, often mentioned in the pilot regions as well as in the expert interviews, is diversification and modernisation of farms, which are often hindered by tax policy and health requirements, while renovation or re-utilisation for any other purpose is made difficult by the planning documents. Programme for integrated rural development and village renewal (CRPOV), which works through cooperation and adjustment of different activities and contents and supports restructuring of agriculture and introduction of supplementary activities, experiences significant administrative barriers related to spatial planning documents/permits, sanitary restrictions and tax system. There seem to be certain lack of awareness of importance of this particular problem on the side of agricultural as well as other authorities. The solutions should namely prove valuable in terms of keeping countryside vital; and preserving cultural heritage. On the other hand there are cases of good practices, such as measures in agri-environmental programme to reach joint objectives of agriculture, cultural landscape and biodiversity.

**Who:** policy makers on national and local level from agriculture, spatial planning and other sectors (environment, protection of cultural heritage, nature conservation...), agricultural advisory services, individual farmers.

**How:** The implementation is connected to more individualized, context sensitive and flexible approach towards permitting changes. The new regulation on national level (“spatial order”) provides for several solutions concerning diversification of activities and solving spatial problems of farms. The coherence problem between the aim of diversification of activities and several provisions for protection of agricultural land / planning regulations often needs to be resolved on case by case basis. So it is mainly the task for agricultural advisory services and local planners to find the common solutions with individual farmers and promote these solutions in plans. The present framework already provides for some sort of joint measures (mainly in terms of “lending” the agricultural financial instruments for achieving intersectoral objectives), which could be further explored without requirement for much adaptation of legislation. Another set of problem has to be resolved on national level by veterinary and health requirements to enable farmers to process and sell food on farms. The tax measures should be conceived to support diversification of farmers’ activities.

**References:** The need for improved cooperation was stressed as a general recommendation, with the case of multi-functionality often presented as symptomatic case due to restrictive provisions from different sectors (spatial planning, protection of cultural heritage, nature conservation...). Slovenian Spatial development strategy encourages more effective agriculture management through improvement of property structure, better technologies, and other structural measures of agricultural policy, but under condition that these are in accordance with the spatial potentials. Strategy for development of Slovenija formulates similar recommendation

by proposing integral spatial planning system for rural areas including systemic and financial possibilities for managing building plots. Same document mentions Natura2000 program as an opportunity to develop integrated measures for eco-agriculture and forestry.

### 3.2.3 Resources should be allocated to provide basic services as well as jobs in the countryside

**Why?** As the findings from our pilot regions confirmed, the inhabitants' decision to stay in the countryside is not exclusively dependent on ability to grow and sell agricultural products, but also to other aspects of life quality: accessibility, services, infrastructure, jobs and education etc. Lack of these services can not be compensated by higher subsidies. Therefore, adequate provision is often crucial to prevent depopulation in remote areas. The general agreement that basic services are needed to prevent depopulation does not reflect accordingly in the devised measures. The main barrier is lack of established links and cooperation between agriculture and other relevant sector (regional development, infrastructure, social services, education...), related to the prevailing attitude that the countryside is exclusively the competence of agriculture. While the price of investments in infrastructure (transport, public transport, social infrastructure, services) could be rather high, we may assume that it should bring better results than the same amount of money invested in subsidies for agriculture.

**Who?** The targeted public are policy makers on national level from several sectors: agriculture, spatial development, regional development, transport, possibly also tourism, social services, education.

**How?** This recommendation requires some rearrangements of priorities and policy objectives as well as cooperation and coordinated approach of several sectors. The objectives may or may not be considered agricultural, but the agricultural population would have evident benefits, so it does make sense to provide resources from agricultural budget as well as from other related sectors. The projects should include allocation of public services, securing supply of building lots and providing adequate infrastructure, renewal of buildings, protection of cultural heritage; and need to be coordinated on regional level (state + local communities).

**References:** Many of partners' proposals were in line with this recommendation, Austrian & Swiss teams proposed similar under the Principle "investments in infrastructure, enterprises and business initiatives including tourism". There are also some existing recommendations following this idea: *Spatial development strategy* and *National development programme* stress stimulation and diversification of employment possibilities in the countryside and improvement of infrastructure to reduce migrations. In agricultural policy, a renewal of villages is a part of the CRPOV programs and diversification of activities (including new jobs) is already one of the measures. Resources are already being allocated accordingly (SAPARD, CRPOV).

### 3.2.4 Initial incentives are needed to improve farmers' capacity to participate in diverse markets

**Why:** There is a general agreement that agriculture should be more market oriented. A concept of “vital countryside” requires keeping agriculture an economic activity. Since mass production is an option for only limited number of Slovenian farmers, additional opportunities have to be found for farmers in less favourable areas to win their position in market. Some of the most promising options are regional urban markets and tourism. A wide range of products and services could be sold: home-grown agricultural produce, accommodations on farms, food and wine, homemade crafts, scenery, recreation, health care... But there are additional skills and knowledge needed that farmers presently do not have. Therefore, initial resources have to be allocated to educate farmers and to help them arrange necessary infrastructure and promotion activities to make this markets work.

**Who:** The recommendation is addressed to policy makers (to design measures and provide resources); to agriculture and tourism advisory and promotion services (to organize courses and programmes) and to farmers (to participate). The education and information sectors could participate by financing and organising the education courses.

**How:** The recommendation does not incur (public) costs – on the contrary, it argues for less subsidies or at least reallocation and joining (targeting) resources from agriculture, tourism, education and information sectors. It is expected that these short term-costs should bring higher medium and long-term benefits. An initial set of subsidies should be allocated for three main purposes: (1) capacity building/ complementary education for farmers (language, bookkeeping computer, health care), professional consultancy, obtaining licences; (2) adaptation of farms for tourism purposes (accommodations, recreation & health facilities, food processing, information infrastructure including computer software ...) and (3) promotion and marketing activities (establishing producers' associations and marketing networks, increasing the number of certified products, introduction of product tracking programs, promotion materials, fairs, TV commercials, web-marketing...). The existing strategic documents already provide framework for allocating supports for human resources management, knowledge transfer and investments in equipment. The measure should be well accepted and easily implemented, however there are some barriers that would be especially relevant in remote, declining areas, where there is lack of human resources and reluctance to change existing attitudes and lifestyles. Lack of existing cooperation between agriculture and other sectors (tourism in particular) could also hinder feasibility of this recommendation.

**References:** Different options to foster diversification of income sources for farmers were proposed by several partners. Complementary recommendations include supporting the infrastructure and market structure to support commercial success of farms and the provision of education and formation possibilities (proposed by German and Austrian team). Supports for complementary activities (mainly tourism) are already included among the existing measures of *Slovene agri-environmental programme*. Education and promotion (EKO IV) for farmers, state administration and public institute employees is presently mainly oriented in education and promotion of sustainable/ecological farming. Recent strategic documents (*Single programming*

*document, Strategy for development of Slovenia*) emphasize development of human capital and education as strategies for improving competitiveness – in agriculture as well as in other sectors.

### 3.2.5 Increase competitiveness of mountain farmers by acting on consumers' preferences

**Why:** The price that individual agricultural product can achieve depends on market demand, which is shaped by the consumers' attitudes. In the Alpine space it is especially the selling price of milk, which has the most impact on the future of farms. If people want alpine agriculture to be maintained, they have to be aware of the consequences of their consuming behaviour. The integration of environmental-protection issues in consumer patterns is at present only moderate. Thus, awareness raising measures are required in order to inform about the relation between agriculture, its products and cultural landscape. This, until now largely underused measure has in our opinion high potential since there is existing demand for healthy local products, which needs to be stimulated. By paying higher price for labelled products the consumers would bear a share of costs of agriculture maintenance. This would relieve public budget as well as contribute to healthier market conditions.

**Who:** Policy makers in agricultural sector on national level, marketing agencies, farmers' associations, media, merchants, consumers.

**How:** First the idea has to be introduced and accepted, then suitable measures have to be devised with engagement of marketing companies and media. The measures would include marketing campaigns as well as product labels, distribution networks etc... The measure should be well accepted by the target groups since the approach would only bring benefits to all involved (consumers, producers, policy –makers).

**References:** This recommendation was transferred and adapted from German proposal, and is supported by several others. Among existing recommendations *Single programming document* provides measures for marketing of quality (certified) products as well as programs to raise demand for these products by informing consumers about importance of food quality. *Slovene agri-environmental programme*, (EKO IV) does consider support for promotion of the significance of AE Measures, of quality of agricultural products and sustainable agricultural practices, but the target public as well as concrete measures are not specified.

### 3.2.6 Decentralization of measures: regions as well as local communities should have some competence over allocation of the subsidies

**Why:** The effects of (some) measures could be better if allocated according to local needs. Therefore if regional/local needs are really to be taken care for, these levels should be given certain level of competence over allocation of resources.

**Who:** National policy makers in the first place who should make the redistribution of competences possible; (future) regional and local administration, to provide legal and technical infrastructure and personnel to take over the tasks.

**How:** This is clearly a politically sensitive question, requiring considerable efforts in argumentation for redistribution the competences. There are also major formal barriers, limiting the redistribution of resources to lower levels, especially the lack of administrative regions. Therefore, this recommendation is not considered very feasible at least in short term. One option would be for national administration to call for tenders from local communities and distribute money for tendered programs and projects.

**References:** There were no contradicting proposals. Especially regions were mentioned as most suitable level of dealing with CL/RD issues. *Development Strategy of Slovenia* contains a general statement referring to increased application of subsidiarity principle and a need to decentralize certain competencies. There were no existing recommendations in the reviewed documents referring explicitly to the agriculture. Since these documents are national – level products and because at present all the competences are concentrated on national level, one would assume that there is no real willingness for handing over the control over finances.

### 3.2.7 Individualized approach and active involvement of farmers

**Why:** The measures have to be generalized in order to fit the majority of targeted population<sup>2</sup>. But the same measure does not achieve optimal results if applied in different contexts (i.e there is no “average” farm). The problem of devising custom-made measures could be partly ameliorated by introduction of consultancy to help farmers use the subsidies in the way that would be most beneficial for their specific situation. Even though the financial input per farm would probably have to be slightly higher, the experience from other countries (Austria, Great Britain) show that such an approach may bring significantly better results. It also has a long term benefits since farmers learn practices that they can use in the future.

**Who:** Policy makers on national level (agricultural sector), agri-advisory services, experts (agronomists, biologists, economists), individual farmers.

**How:** This recommendations requires some adaptation of existing measures (agricultural subsidies). As they are conceived now, they only require performing certain standardized operation. The idea is to assign each farmer an individual adviser that would assess the opportunities and objectives of individual farm, devise alternative strategies and action plan and help the farmer to implement it and monitor the success.

---

<sup>2</sup> in Slovenija, for example, around 85% farmers (67.000 of around 80.000) apply for agricultural subsidies

**References:** There were no contradicting proposals by partners. Many recommendations were aimed at finding “tailor-made” economic and socially viable strategies for farms, which include education and capacity – building of farmers. Similar programs already exist in other countries (Great Britain, Austria) with good results. Agricultural policy *programmes for integrated rural development and village renewal* (CRPOV) are based on cooperation and joint efforts of state and farming community and individual, adapted approach. *Strategy for development of Slovenija* mentions management with human resources and knowledge transfer as strategies for improving competitiveness of agriculture.

### 3.2.8 Circulation of agricultural land has to be stimulated to enable formation of competitive vital farms

**Why:** One of the identified problems of agricultural measures is the internal incoherence between stimulations for economic strengthening of farms and subsidies aimed at maintaining agriculture for ecological, cultural and social reasons. This recommendation is based on assumption that subsidies hinder the land market and function against efforts for its revival. Farmers receiving subsidies are not motivated to sell their property, therefore blocking the opportunities for other farmers to buy the land needed to consolidate their property and run a competitive farm. The farmers’ conservativeness and attachment to land significantly hinders the functioning of the agricultural land market, and this effect is only being augmented by subsidies. The fund of agricultural land and forests is an institution whose aim is to ensure the strategic amount of fertile land and help restructuring and consolidation of agricultural properties. It should help improve the productivity and efficiency of land use and thus economic vitality of farms especially in the mountain areas. The amount of land that the fund presently possesses is too small to have a significant effect in the market. Besides, the fund’s policy has recently been only to purchase the land and not to sell it, partly also due to its obligations in denationalization procedures. Therefore it can presently not perform the function of land provider. The tax policy is another related measure that can significantly revive land market. The registration of property, which is the necessary first step towards its implementation, is soon to be finished.

**Who:** policy makers in agricultural sector on national level, Fund of agricultural land and forests

**How:** The assessment of impacts of subsidies on agricultural land market is needed as the first step. According to results, the adjustments could be proposed. The role of Fund of agricultural land and forests needs to be strengthened in terms of regulating the amount of land on the market and ensuring availability of land for those who are willing to work it, especially in strategically important areas (from all the relevant aspects: food provision, social, ecological, cultural). In shorter term, the measure may require (public) investments in buying land. In the long term, functioning of land market should relieve public budget. As to the feasibility of this recommendation: although there is a theoretical agreement among policy makers, that the land market should be revived it is clear that the current popularity of subsidies makes it difficult to

propose any changes in terms of their reduction. Tax reforms are usually not met with much enthusiasm either.

**References:** There were no explicitly contradicting proposals by the partners. However the concept of subsidies (which was generally supported by all partners) can in itself be considered contradictory to proper functioning of land-market. The only existing recommendation concerning this issue can be found in *Development strategy of Slovenia*, but it refers to the stock of building land in the countryside. The idea is to prevent »I build where I own land« principle and enable alternation and achievable prices for building plots acquisition by more intensive management of abandoned residential and farm-buildings fund.

### 3.3 Principle: “protected areas”

3.3.1 Nature conservation efforts should go beyond sectoral and geographical borders of protected areas

**Why:** This recommendation may seem redundant since officially there is no such confinement. The nature conservation authorities support the idea of integration. They also agree that the approach through protected areas alone is not sufficient and that nature and landscape are best conserved by directing land-uses towards environmentally sound practice in all areas. But in practice and in prospect this recommendation does make sense, since there is a tendency of nature conservation sector to concentrate all the nature conservation efforts and resources within the boundaries of conservation areas while neglecting the nature outside protection areas. There are several reasons for this attitude: it is easier for the sectoral authorities to stay safely within their “yard” where they can execute exclusive power. Therefore they aim at widening this area as much as possible. The reluctance in venturing beyond these borders is partly due to bad experience with development interest groups who enforce their will at the cost of nature conservation, but also due to lack of convincing tools and arguments of the nature conservation sector. The integrative approach might also not be so appealing since the effects can only be measured in long terms and through improvement of decisions in other (development) sectors. This recommendation therefore requires a shift in the way nature conservation sector operates: instead of securing as much competence over as wide territory as possible, it should try to develop ways of cooperation and integration their interests in as many parts of development decision making forums as possible. At present, the situation shows exactly the opposite tendencies.

**Who:** Nature conservation policy makers on national level; administrative and professional public institutions, policy-makers in related sectors

**How:** Protection strategies should be coordinated and integrated within other sectors. The ways of integration nature conservation principles in other sectors/areas are sometimes even formally required (i.e. EIA, SEIA, assessment of alternatives), in other cases the ways of integration require less formal and innovative approaches. The instruments and the inputs have to be well prepared and adjusted to be useful also in cases where the sector does not have exclusive decision making power, but has to bring convincing arguments in conciliation process with several other interests. There is already a lot of tradition and experience as well as existing methodologies (mainly from spatial / landscape planning, EIA and SEIA, planning and programming of other sectors etc.) that need to be better explored and put into practice through cross-sectoral studies and integration in development documents.

**References:** There are some supporting recommendations advocating area-wide environmentally sound practices (from German and Swiss teams). German “Alpenplan” is given as an example of a relatively successful case of a coherent strategy combining protected areas and environmentally sound land-use activities. It succeeded to make it very clear for whom it is binding and it generally has a good image.

EKO II and III measures from *Slovene Agri-environmental programme* are a case of trans-sectoral effort. The idea to support nature conservation objectives (within and outside protected areas) by agricultural subsidies seems fine, but the effects have yet to be seen.

3.3.2 The set of nature conservation measures should be more complex and sensitive

**Why:** Exclusively restrictive approach to conservation did not prove to bring satisfying results. In many cases it causes evasion of rules, conflicts or simply doesn't achieve the goals (WP3 policy evaluation and WP5 workshop results). The proposed high share of protected areas could also hinder the development of society. To avoid this, suitable compromises should be searched to enable development and employment for local residents while at the same time achieve nature conservation goals. This recommendation does not apply to specific measure but to the policy as a whole, requiring more sensitive and comprehensive approach, conception of new measures as well as modification of existing ones. Integrated protection strategies, which have to be coordinated with overall spatial strategies and development concepts, are necessary.

**Who:** Policy makers in nature conservation sector on national level, management of protected areas, local administrations.

**How:** The set of nature conservation measures should be more complex and sensitive; i.e. restrictions should be complemented with incentives, alternative options should be offered (e.g. free parking and organized transport should complement traffic restrictions...). The level of protection 'strictness' has to be better adapted to the regional and on-site situation. Spatial zoning according to strictness of restrictions is one possibility for large protection areas. Definition of areas with less strict regime should enable integrative development by adjusted managing, residence and visiting. Flexible environmental protection mechanisms have to be coupled by more effective control. Implementation of new measures would also require additional personnel (rangers, advisors, guides...), which could have additional positive effects in terms of opening jobs for local population in remote areas. Even though this recommendation addresses the whole set of measures within nature conservation policy, it does not require its entire reformulation. In some cases rather small adaptations could bring significant improvements through synergetic effects. The main barriers could be expected on the side of target groups. The nature conservation sector may react with some reluctance due to its tradition of functioning mainly through prohibitive measures and lack of experience with proactive and co-operational attitude. It is expected on the other hand that local inhabitants and visitors of nature protection areas would accept most of the measures well, especially if they are devised in a participative manner.

**References:** There are no contradictory recommendations from the partners. A case of a successful complex approach to protection areas are "Regional Natural Parks" (in France and Italy), which seem to be a suitable instrument to balance the socio-economic aims of regional development and the ecological aims of landscape protection. They promote regional potentials and regional awareness, and keep working places in the region. They would further integrate agriculture policy with the policies of regional development, tourism, nature conservation and landscape protection as well as spatial planning. They include measures such as marketing of

regional products and landscaping services to help maintain cultural landscapes. (This presentation of “best practice” from French, Italian and Swiss partners was originally presented as “project” but seems to be relevant for the nature conservation principle in Slovenian context). Several national documents recognize the problem of managing nature conservation in specific areas such as areas with increasing density of settlements and accelerated development or nationally important cultural landscapes (*Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia, Regional classification of Slovenian landscape types*) as well as express a concern that high share of protected areas could cause restrictions for development (*Development strategy of Slovenija*). Compromises between nature conservation, scientific and tourist requirements, as well as development of economic activities and employment opportunities are considered necessary to avoid conflicts.

### 3.3.3 Improving public participation and involvement of other stakeholders

**Why:** This is a well known and often mentioned recommendation, but still not well implemented. Since we feel that there is the most acute lack of participation in nature conservation policy, the issue is specifically underlined here. Contrary to the planning processes, public participation is not formally required for nature conservation measures. Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of participation, but when it comes to realization it usually takes the form of PR or persuasion. On the other hand there is a growing awareness that benevolent and pro-active attitude of users is required to achieve majority of nature conservation objectives. The prohibitive measures and measures, requiring certain types of land-use, can only partly achieve their aims if they are not accepted and supported by local population and/or users. The price-performance ratio of participatory approaches is difficult to assess. There are not so much direct costs involved, but the processes may take longer and more people have to be engaged. On the other hand, the feasibility of the policy improves significantly if the objectives as well as the measures are devised and conciliated with all stakeholders. The effects may be invaluable in terms of achieving results that may not be achieved at all otherwise.

**Who:** policy-makers in nature conservation sector, NGOs, local administration, local groups, individuals

**How:** Since there is no participative tradition in sectors other than planning, there is certain lack of properly trained professionals to facilitate as well as conceive the bottom-up processes. It is also obvious that there is not enough will on the side of authorities as well as certain reluctance and fear of losing competence. So the acceptance of the participatory idea is a necessary first step, with the implementation to be based on the existing experience from sectors, where participation has longer tradition. Development of NGO-s for motivation, informing and advising to public to enable them equal cooperation in legislative procedures should also be supported.

**References:** This is an adapted version of the transversal recommendation regarding strengthening the bottom-up approaches. There are several similar recommendations by the partners regarding almost all policy principles. The lack of participation in nature conservation

is also not a Slovenian-only problem (Germany has similar experience with Natura2000 programme). The approach of "Regional Natural Parks" (France and Italy) is a bottom up device encouraging regional initiative and could be considered a good example for participation of diverse stakeholders. Public participation is underlined in all national spatial planning documents as well as in strategic development documents (*Single programming document, Development strategy of Slovenia*). Recommendations for cooperation are also a part of agricultural policies. *Development strategy of Slovenia* also recognizes that the involvement of protected-areas residents is significant for achievement of protection objectives.

3.3.4 Tourism within conservation areas should be carefully planned; better cooperation of the two sectors is required

**Why:** Tourism is usually the most important economic sector within conservation areas, but the relationship is a complex and ambiguous one. The promotion of protected areas, while necessary to gain public support and secure resources for local inhabitants, is also dangerous because it may cause a lot of pressure in sensitive areas. Therefore tourism development and infrastructure have to be carefully planned. This involves the management, control and limitation of the upgrading of tourist infrastructure and increase of capacity. Close attention has to be paid to control of the follow-up activities (hiking and biking on mountain roads, further buildings around the first one established...). The cooperation of the two sectors should be achieved in the planning phase in order to avoid conflicts with granting/refusing permits as well as to manage the activities, which do not require permits. Both nature conservation and tourism sectors seem quite interested in better cooperation. The attitude of the (tourism) developers and local/regional actors changes more in favour of recognising the importance of protecting natural assets if they are to stay a comparative advantage of the area.

**Who:** Tourism and nature conservation policy-makers on national level, nature protection area managers, local authorities, local tourist organisations.

**How:** Formal framework provides for some obligatory ways of cooperation within the spatial planning and permitting procedures (i.e. opinions and consent of conservation sectors on tourism development projects). These required procedures however are too limited and not enough forward-looking. The additional research work is needed to identify relations and predict the impacts. Based on these findings joint measures should be devised, such as discouraging access to most vulnerable areas and redirecting visitors to less vulnerable ones, ensuring adequate infrastructure, educating visitors about nature friendly behaviour.... Clearly, establishment of better cooperation between the nature conservation, tourism and spatial planning sectors is the necessary first step. It seems that lack of knowledge and tradition of cooperation would be the main barriers to overcome.

**References:** There are no contradictory recommendations by the partners. Complementary recommendations regard control over impacts of infrastructure development (Germany, Switzerland). The relation between nature conservation and tourism as well as a rather precautionary principle with tourism development is advocated by *Regional classification of Slovenian landscape types. Spatial development strategy* considers second homes as a possible

strategy for revitalization of declining areas with cultural heritage, whereby certain restrictions have to be observed.

### 3.4 Principle: “spatial planning”

3.4.1 Improve ways of public involvement with the aim to achieve flexibility of the planning decisions, while at the same time provide a fast, simple, transparent process and ensure legal security

**Why:** This recommendation is motivated by much repeated criticism of spatial planning as being too rigid on the one hand while too non-transparent and complicated on the other. Therefore the recommendation itself can be seen as contradictory. The flexibility usually requires more complicated, longer procedures and more discretion on the side of public officers. As a consequence the procedures become less transparent and offer less legal security to clients. It is obvious that this situation is a difficult one to solve, so the recommendation too has limited feasibility. However, with more transparency and public participation these problems could be ameliorated. The effects may be invaluable in terms of improving overall effectiveness and acceptability of planned projects. At present there is some will, but apparently not enough know-how on the national level, and quite diverse situation on local level. In some local communities, advanced approaches are successfully practiced, while elsewhere there is too little know-how as well as innovativeness and will for new approaches, and lack of resources.

**Who:** The recommendation addresses spatial planning policy-makers on national and local levels, administration, practicing planners, NGOs, local groups, individuals.

**How:** Flexibility requires regulation that allows certain level of discretion in specific situations, while ensuring control over crucial public interests. The sensible application of subsidiarity principle can also be effective. The new regulations seem to be quite adequate for improving transparency of the planning process as well as offering more opportunities for flexibility, but the practice needs to formulate the ways of implementation. Since these recommendations have to be implemented on national and on local level, the feasibility may vary according to specific local situation. Limited resources as well as lack of know – how, innovativeness and willingness to change would be the main limiting factors. The national administration should further help local communities with subsidies, which are already available for some specific planning activities (digitalization of plans, workshops, promotion activities...). Pooling of human resources (experienced professionals) on regional level could provide required knowledge for local communities.

**References:** There are no contradicting recommendations from partners. Complementary recommendation would be to make the requirements of the plans (“what is binding for whom?”) very clear (Germany). The needs for better transparency and efficiency for users is evident from Slovenian Spatial policy legislation requiring engagement of broad public in planning procedures and solution-providing as well as conciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all actors of spatial planning on all decision-making levels. *Development strategy of Slovenija* promotes enforcement of “good-householder” principle and transparency in entire public sector; with rational management and users’ content being main criteria.

### 3.4.2 Strategic planning documents should be prepared on regional level

**Why:** The benefits should be rather obvious: if certain decisions are taken on regional level and planning documents are well prepared, then this should clearly work as a joint pool of resources and reduce burden on local communities when preparing their implementation plans. However, if there is not enough conciliation, they may all end-up with double work or even problems with in-compatible plans. The lack of integrated concepts at the level of regions is evident and was confirmed in WP2 interviews as well as WP5 workshops. The co-operation between municipalities in planning tasks should be reinforced. Even supra-regional cooperation is considered indispensable in addressing situations, which affect different types of regions: for instance centre-periphery questions. Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of regional planning, but when it comes to realization it is obvious that they do not always see the benefit of it, but rather as redundant and needless additional complication in planning procedures and financial burden. Additional problem is a lack of tradition and established practice, related with lack of competent personnel, especially as regards management of regional planning.

**Who:** Local policy and decision-makers in spatial and regional planning departments, practicing planners, spatial planning authorities on national level.

**How:** Recommendation partly depends on formal establishment of regional administration. Nevertheless, the planning activities on regional level could still be improved. Spatial planning Act provides legal base for regional plans, which are joint documents of state and (one or more) local communities; as well as common preparation of strategic documents for two or more local communities. The question, whether the regional plans should only address common issues or projects such as industrial parks or shopping malls or whether they should be comprehensive plans for (as yet undefined) planning region, is still open. Other, less formal approaches are also possible with “embedding” supra local co-operation in planning associations and other institutions and procedures.

**References:** Most partners agree that planning on regional level as well as inter-community and inter-regional cooperation need to be strengthened and improved as an ongoing, institutionalized process (Austria, Germany, Italy). *Single programming document* (SPD) includes strengthening the role of spatial planning as a factor of economic development as well as formulating a modern spatial planning policy among the activities aimed at promoting regional development.

### 3.4.3 Development initiatives should be thoroughly assessed in the planning process to avoid adverse impacts

**Why:** Preliminary impact assessment is needed to prevent the unwanted impacts of projects and plans, not only on direct physical environment but also on cultural, social values, human capital and development potentials. There are several existing tools such as EIA, SEIA, forecasting and evaluation of alternative scenarios, which need to be better explored and put into regular practice. While the assessment of development projects is already a prevailing practice (especially EIA on the project level), the impacts of less concrete measures (programmes such

as promotions or financial aids) as well as protection policies are presently not subject to assessment. The implementation of this recommendation would incur direct costs involved in executing the assessment procedures, and indirect costs related to longer and somehow more complicated procedures. There are some “ethical” considerations about who should pay for the assessments. At present, there are clients who pay for EIA, and national administration that is paying for strategic assessments. An independent body (and fund) would make these relations more clear. There are also some reservation as to who should have competence and who should “evaluate” the “evaluators”. The recommendation is also not completely in line with the requirement for short and effective decision making process, since this is not always achievable by introducing additional assessments. On the other hand the benefits do not only accrue in terms of prevention of unwanted impacts but also as new or improved alternatives of projects/programmes.

**Who:** Spatial planning authorities on national level, research and academic institutions

**How:** The concept as well as legislative frameworks are already established. This recommendation therefore involves three levels: (1) the theoretical level including a forward looking perspective, (2) the methodological level: refining and exploring existing tools for assessment of projects/programmes, (3) the implementation level: ensuring that these are really put to good use in planning and decision making practice. The existing methodologies have to be widened by strategic approaches, such as socio-economic assessments, policy evaluation, etc., and assessment of impacts should include aspects such as impacts on urban and regional development, socio and cultural environment and human resources. While the tools and procedures for EIA are well known and established the documents of more strategic and abstract nature have to be addressed with innovative tools, such as scenario development, simulations, visual aids, etc.

**References:** Many teams (Slovenija, France, Austria) agree that the projects and programmes, which may have implications for land-use and cultural landscape, should be assessed within planning procedures. The request for more rigorous use of the proposed tools was also mentioned by Austrian and Swiss teams. The French team underlined the necessity to provide more information about the territorial effect of each policy. Many strategic documents address this issue: *Slovenian Spatial order* requires that sectors prepare guidelines, which contain all relevant environmental protection contents. *Spatial Management policy* proposes preliminary assessments of possible impacts on the urban and regional development before any extensive spatial development activity takes place. *Strategy for economic development of Slovenia* stresses the need for formally ensuring the influence of environmental arguments in designation of development strategies, programmes and measures. Instruments such as EIA and SEIA should be used to integrate issues of territory, biodiversity, surface waters and biomass in sectoral and regional policies.

3.4.4 Sectoral plans should be conciliated within planning procedures and the inputs have to be prepared accordingly

**Why:** This recommendation regards the inputs of different sectors in spatial planning process. They are formally required to prepare guidelines for the spatial documents and give their opinion of spatial documents' proposals but the legislation is in this respect somewhat ambiguous. While spatial planning legislation does require sectoral cooperation and provides the procedural framework, the sectoral legislations each regulate this issue differently. Many force their (un-conciliated) proposals to be automatically a part of the planning documents. As a consequence the quality of this cooperation is not adequate. Inputs of sectors into planning process are presently of too little use for conciliation and problem solving. Rather, they are prepared in a formalistic, unconditional and obligatory manner, which causes the plans to become "dumps" for (often conflicting) sectoral plans. In some cases sectors impose so many binding requirements so there is not much left to be planned. These provisions are often felt as too restrictive for development. The sectors strive to win as much competence over as much space as possible to be able to enforce their rules to others. Since some of the sectors were quite successful with this approach in the past, this attitude, which is sometimes openly admitted, will not be easy to change. The current regulation reflects the prevailing attitude, which may be the main limiting factor with this recommendation. Intensive dialogue between spatial planning and the concerned policy sectors should take place in order to improve the situation. The results should be beneficial for everybody: the performance of sectoral programmes should improve (since they would face less objections later on), so should spatial planning documents, which would be more real and implementable since they would have support from the actors.

**Who:** Spatial planning policy makers on national and local level; national administrations and professional institutions of all related sectors.

**How:** This recommendation can not work if it is only considered within spatial planning: all the sectors need to cooperate. The effort on the side of sectors is related to the preparation of suitable input as well as interactive collaboration; on the side of spatial planning it is related to providing framework and procedures as well as coordinating the process. There may be a lack of knowledge and understanding among personnel of sectoral administration bodies of what planning really is and what it aims to achieve. In some cases lack of people to deal with spatial issues of policies may also be a problem. This problem is pertinent on the local level too, where the subsidiarity principle should also be respected: local needs and specific requirements need to be accounted for.

**References:** There are several recommendations towards improving the cooperation of sectors and spatial planning (Austria, Germany), and no contradicting proposals. Again, the "Regional Natural Parks" (in France and Italy) can be considered a successful case of integrating sectors into coherent strategy. They integrate agriculture policy with the policies of regional development, tourism, nature conservation and landscape protection as well as spatial planning. (The "Regional Natural Parks" concept was originally presented as "project" but seems to be relevant for the spatial planning principle in Slovenian context).

Slovenian *Spatial order* explicitly requires that sectoral guidelines assure quality solutions, supported by transparent and adequate arguments. They should also contain all relevant environmental protection contents. The same document advocates conciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all participators of spatial planning on all decision-making levels.

#### 3.4.5 More emphasis should be given to education and promotion of best practices

**Why:** This recommendation requires a change of the perception of effectiveness and a shift away from administrative and restrictive concept of planning. A serious drawback of spatial planning is namely that the system as a whole relies too much on administrative measures, causing serious deficit in measures such as education, promotion, participation. These measures are needed for acceptance of plans and consequently their implementation. There is no general opposition towards these approaches. However the main strength of these approaches seems also to be their main problem: the less formal nature makes them also somewhat marginal, less important and even redundant, therefore rarely an object of a dedicated, professional, long term effort. Since the administration employees usually consider themselves over-loaded, there may be no one willing to take over these tasks. On the other hand these measures are usually well received by public. The performance differs in short terms (might be very good as well as not so successful) but is in long term absolutely worthwhile.

**Who:** Policy makers, (national and local) administration, academic and professional institutions, practicing planners, NGO and others need to participate.

**How:** The planning initiatives should be from their very beginning accompanied by effort for their introduction to wider public and concerned stakeholders. These activities should include advisory services, courses, workshops field visits as well as materials such as booklets, articles, TV broadcasts... The aim should be to educate, promote best practices in quality, “context sensitive” architecture and building, but also to obtain feed back and to learn from bottom-up. The financial resources should be secured from the budgets of national and local administration. The resources from international funds are also available for this type of activities

**References:** There are no contradicting recommendations from the partners; the proposal to conduct information campaigns in order to raise the level of acceptance of spatial planning (Austria) follows the same idea. In Slovenia, some of the *CRPOV* (agricultural policy Programme for integrated rural development and village renewal) produced results in line with this recommendation (education effects, best practices booklets). Otherwise reviewed documents don't consider the above recommendation.

### 3.4.6 Landscape has to be developed into a convincing concept as a part of spatial development strategies

**Why:** Spatial planning as a cross-sector oriented policy is best suited to address the interrelation between regional development and cultural landscape: knowledge about the interrelation RD/CL has to be integrated in laws and plans. This recommendation may come too late, since the major strategic documents have recently been elaborated. The landscape concept has been given adequate support in legislation and landscape issues are –at least formally – extensively addressed in strategic documents. But the additional efforts are now needed to use this opportunity and to prove the worth and operational value of landscape concept. However one has the impression, that this concept is not clear, and the word is used much too formalistic. Therefore these documents (Spatial development strategy and Spatial order) also show inconsistency: while they advocate integral treatment of space, the same documents do the contrary with the division in three chapters (settlements, infrastructure and landscape), each dealt with separately. Such approach is inoperative to address major issues such as development on urban fringe, urban sprawl; abandonment of marginal areas... There is still a lack of knowledge about CL/RD relations and also a lack of convincing theory of landscape as an explanatory concept as well as a tool providing effective decision making support. It does not always convincingly prove value added in comparison to other concepts. The landscape as a concept is also perceived as a way to promote the landscape profession and therefore causes further reluctance on the side of other professions.

**Who:** Academic, research and professional community, policy makers of spatial development sector on national level

**How:** The awareness of landscape change and the knowledge about driving forces behind it should be emphasized in research and transferred in policy documents. This could be achieved by reviewing the way in which we do diagnoses and foresights. The links between land use and landscape quality need to be defined through integration of criteria for landscape quality.

**References:** This recommendation was adopted from a more general one speaking about cross-sectoral orientation of spatial planning (mentioned by France, Germany, Switzerland and Slovenija) and updated by French proposal on integrating landscape consideration. As already mentioned, the major documents (on national level) that have recently been conceived do explicitly mention landscape issues. However we feel that they stopped short from really incorporating knowledge about the dynamism of landscape change and relation between RD and CL. Therefore they seem to only formally satisfy this recommendation. As mentioned above, the concept is used in a rather awkward way so that it causes isolation of landscape rather than integration with other issues.

### 3.5 Other recommendations:

3.5.1 The coordination and coherence between the various projects and programmes concerning the same territory is needed.

**Why:** The idea of coordination of projects is in general well accepted. The political/administrative framework does not hinder the coordination. The instrument of Regional development programmes is explicitly aimed at devising coordinated common projects on regional level. Regardless their formal merits, these programs turned out to be a very general “wish-lists” with only limited operational value. Despite generally supportive attitude the implementation often fails. When it comes to actual need for coordination, it is often considered (by a project initiator) an unnecessary complication and a cause for the additional costs, related to coordination in the phase of project preparation and delay in the implementation of projects. There are also fears that the projects would have to be changed according to requirements of other actors. But the benefits may well exceed the costs in terms of project winning support from several actors and being easily implemented. The benefits for local community or region hosting the project would also be significantly higher since the coordination could help achieve synergetic effects with other programmes/projects.

**Who:** This recommendation refers to a “project” principle and is therefore primarily addressed to regional policy (in Slovenian context) but also to all other sectoral policies. There is a wide spectrum of targeted public: policy makers of several sectors, in particular regional and spatial development, economic and other stakeholders, regional development agencies and local and regional interest groups...

**How:** Although this is a general recommendation, quite clear procedural / methodological guidelines are needed to make it operational. Generally, projects which involve many actors from different institutions should be encouraged since the projects themselves will create the necessarily links between the institutions. A considerable improvement could be achieved by organising a shared data-base with specific information (on demography, economy, environment...) as well as studies, best-practices, formal documents.... to improve transparency, continuity and information on the actions and foster cooperation between actors. The various studies conducted by the different ministries should be circulated among other ministries in order to make them aware of common problems, to foster mutual knowledge and to envisage common solutions.

**References:** This recommendation was proposed by the partners within the “projects” principle. Since it seems to be particularly relevant for Slovenija, it was adapted from several recommendations proposed by French team and included on the list.

Among the inspected material only *Development strategy of Slovenija* includes related existing recommendations as it stresses the need for coordination of different documents with general, strategic direction and with foreseen public - financial capabilities. They must also be accordant with other documents, intended for reaching same or similar goals.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND COMMENTS

The proposed recommendations are based on achievements and deficits of the policies and the reasons as identified in the course of the whole Regalp project. The three policy principles considered by Slovenian team differ quite a lot in these respects, thus covering a wide spectrum of options for improvement. Agricultural subsidies suffer most from relying too much on European model, without verifying the objectives as well as impacts in the national context. The circumstances in Slovenija may not allow to simultaneously fulfil the set of objectives as divergent as 'restructuring the agriculture and improving competitiveness' and 'conserving cultural landscape and preserving the agriculture in remote areas', unless the measures are fine tuned and better targeted. The major weakness of nature conservation areas is their confinement into nature conservation sector. The conservation sector's mistrust of the other (development) actors leads towards tendencies to win the exclusive competences over territory, which can not be expected to bring positive results. The spatial planning principle is still relying too much on administrative measures, which can not solve the problem of flexible, yet fast, simple and legally safe procedures. This evaluation is also critical to the (way of) recent introduction of the landscape concept into strategic planning documents.

The proposed recommendations built on positive experiences and try to strengthen the weakest points of the principles by improving existing mechanisms of policy implementation or introducing complementary measures. The transversal recommendations either require joint engagement of several policy principles, or are general enough to be applied to any policy principle, or are necessary condition for implementation of policy-specific recommendations. Therefore, certain transversal recommendations are repeated and/or further specified and adapted to the specific context of individual policy principle (strengthening regional level; coordination and participation, requirement for joint measures). Some of the recommendations refer explicitly and exclusively on policy principles in question (e.g. verification of agricultural objectives, changing consumer preferences, tourism in nature conservation areas, etc.). However quite a few have a more general nature and could be applied in almost any other principle (e.g. promotion of best practices, flexible yet fast and secure procedures, public participation, etc.). Although these could be conceived as transversal principles, we decided to address them to those individual principles, where the problem is most acute and where this recommendation would presumably bring significant improvement. Therefore, a certain level of transferability exists between the principles.

The other level of transferability is the one between the regions. Most recommendations are of procedural or methodological nature and do therefore not contain much contents. We consider that the contents have to be determined according to specific objectives and context. Therefore, the recommendations are hardly specific for Alpine space, but could be generalized to other regions. Of course, the scope and the focus of analysed policies and measures clearly show, which are the most relevant for problems and characteristics of the Alps.

Although we didn't expect to come up with revolutionary proposals, we did come across some quite interesting findings: some of the recommendations that seemed quite obvious or even redundant were not even mentioned in the existing texts (e.g. call for future orientation,

strengthening bottom-up approaches, etc.). Most often this is the case with recommendations addressing trans-sectoral and trans-institutional issues and could be explained by the fact that the majority of the existing documents were produced by individual sector or institution. This seems to be a strong justification for the explicitly trans-sectoral/national/institutional approach that was taken by the Regalp project. Another type of recommendations that have not had much reference in existing texts were those referring to the most recent policy measures (verification of agricultural subsidies objectives; introduction of CL into spatial planning, improving public participation in nature conservation areas – case of Natura2000).

The majority of the proposed recommendations do not require significant financial inputs. Most of them are related to the reassessment of objectives and/or their priorities with consequences of reallocation of resources. These are never easy to implement and they usually require political support. Since the recommendations are addressed (mainly) to the policy makers on national level, their feasibility largely depends on “climate” or understanding and acceptance in these administration bodies. Since there are not many levers to influence policy making process, it is difficult to judge how feasible the proposed recommendations are. It is partly the task of the academic and professional community to find further arguments to make them more convincing and to justify the implementation of changes.

Methodological remarks:

The existing recommendations that we considered as background info as well as a sort of reference system, were of different legal nature (expert studies as well as binding documents) as well as different date and stage of validity (we included documents that are still in procedures, such as Development strategy of Slovenija and Spatial order) as we considered that the newest available information should be included. The short-life of majority of Slovenian legislation, along with the policy documents and measures, proved to be a problem for developing recommendations: since it was very difficult to identify (and prove!) achievements and deficits, it is also difficult to derive recommendations that would really make sense. In this respect, the timing to propose changes is not perfect, since the results might already be out-dated before the new round of policies. Related to this is the lack of the existing resources such as evaluation studies, recommendations etc. The main inputs and reference points for developing the proposed recommendation were based on the results of the WP3 and other work packages (mainly WP5, also WP2 and WP4) and by using background information, collected in the course of the project. Interviews were not conducted at this time, although they would help improve the reliability and completeness of the information. The two rounds of interviews done in WP3 provided a lot of information that could be used for elaboration and verification of hypothesis about reasons for deficits and achievements (step 2) as well as in developing our recommendations. For the feasibility assessment in particular we lacked the resources to give firm argumentation for our deliberations. We had to rely mainly on soft data (material gathered in previous steps, opinions, judgements, workshop results...).

## 5. SOURCES:

### Official documents:

1. Analiza učinkov posameznih subvencij z vidika velikosti kmetijskih zemljišč in kultur za leti 2001 in 2002, (Analysis of the impacts of agricultural subsidies regarding extent of agricultural property and type of culture for 2001-2002), MKGP, Sektor za kmetijske trge v sodelovanju z ARSKTRP 2003
2. CRPOV: program za celovit razvoj podeželja in obnovo vasi, Primeri dobre prakse 1990-2002 (Integrated rural development and village renewal CRPOV 1990-2002, examples of good practice), Ministrstvo za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano, Ljubljana, 2002.
3. Državni razvojni program 2001-2006, (National development programme), Ministrstvo za gospodarstvo, Ljubljana, december 2001
4. Enotni programski dokument 2004-2006, EPD – Programsko dopolnilo, (Single programming document 2004-2006 SPD, Programme complement), Vladni urad za strukturno politiko in regionalni razvoj, 28. Januar 2004.
5. Nacionalni program varstva okolja (Slovenian national programme for environment protection); Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorsko planiranje, Ljubljana, 1999;  
[http://www.sigov.si/cgibin/wpl/mop/podrocja/uradzaokolje\\_sektorokolje/programi/npvo.pdf+program+varstva+okolja](http://www.sigov.si/cgibin/wpl/mop/podrocja/uradzaokolje_sektorokolje/programi/npvo.pdf+program+varstva+okolja)
6. Ocena stanja in teženj v prostoru Slovenije (Assesment of state and tendencies in territory of Slovenia), Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorsko planiranje, 2002
7. Politika urejanja prostora Republike Slovenije (Spatial management policy of the Republic of Slovenia) Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorsko planiranje, Ljubljana, 2001; <http://www.gov.si/upp/Assets/Homepage-Eng/SPSL-DPP/policy.pdf>
8. Porocilo o stanju kmetijstva, gozdarstva in živilstva v letu 2001 (State of the agriculture, forestry and food processing, Report for 2001). Ministrstvo za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano, Ljubljana 2003.
9. Porocilo o stanju kmetijstva, gozdarstva in živilstva v letu 2002 (State of the agriculture, forestry and food processing, Report for 2001). Ministrstvo za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano, Ljubljana 2004.
10. Pregled kmetijske politike – Slovenija (Overview of agricultural policy – Slovenija 2001, OECD – Center za sodebovanje z neclanicami
11. Pregled stanja biotske raznovrstnosti in krajinske pestrosti v Sloveniji (Overview of bio- and landscape diversity in slovenija), Agencija RS za okolje, Ljubljana, 2001
12. Program reforme Slovenske kmetijske politike (Programme for reform of agricultural policy), 1999-2002, Ministrstvo za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano, Ljubljana 1999.
13. Prostorski red Slovenije – predlog osnutka (Spatial order – draft); Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorski razvoj, 2004;
14. Regionalna razdelitev krajinskih tipov v Sloveniji; Krajine alpske regije, Krajine predalpske regije (Regional classification of Slovenian landscape types: Alpine landscapes, Sub-Alpine landscapes), Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorsko planiranje, 1998
15. Slovenija v Evropski Uniji, Strategija gospodarskega razvoja Slovenije, (Strategy for economic development of Slovenija), Urad RS za makroekonomske analize in razvoj, Ljubljana, julij 2001
16. Slovenski kmetijsko-okoljski program 2001-2006 (Slovene agri-environmental programme), Ministrstvo za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano, Ljubljana 2001.

17. Strategija ohranjanja biotske raznovrstnosti v Sloveniji (Strategy for conservation of biodiversity in Slovenia), Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, 2002
18. Strategija prostorskega razvoja Slovenije; (Spatial development strategy) / Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad za prostorski razvoj, Ljubljana, 2004;
19. Strategija razvoja Slovenije (2005-2013) (Development strategy of Slovenia, draft), Osnutek za javno razpravo, Urad Republike Slovenije za makroekonomske analize in razvoj, Junij 2004.
20. Strategija regionalnega razvoja Slovenije (Strategy of regional development), vlada RS, 2001
21. Strategija slovenskega turizma 2002-2006 (Strategy of tourism in Slovenia), Ministrstvo za gospodarstvo, Vlada RS, 2002

#### Legal acts

1. Odlok o višini sredstev za ukrepe kmetijske strukturne politike Programa razvoja podeželja 2000-2006 (SAPARD), Uradni list RS, št. 77/2002
2. Uredba o kriterijih za določitev območij z omejenimi možnostmi za kmetijsko dejavnost - Uradni list RS, št. 18-717/2003
3. Pravilnik o regionalni karti za izvajanje politike regionalnih državnih pomoči v Republiki Sloveniji (Ur.l. RS, št. 58/01)
4. [Uredba o ekološko pomembnih območjih](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 48/2004)
5. [Uredba o habitatnih tipih](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 112/2003)
6. [Uredba o posebnih varstvenih območjih \(območjih Natura 2000\)](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 49/2004)
7. Zakon o gozdovih (Ur. list RS št. 30/93)
8. [Zakon o kmetijstvu /ZKme/](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 54/2000, 16/2004 Odl.US: U-I-211/00-16, 45/2004)
9. Zakon o kmetijstvu, Ur. list RS št. 54/2000
10. [Zakon o kmetijskih zemljiščih - uradno preciščeno besedilo /ZKZ-UPB1/](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 55/2003)
11. [Zakon o ohranjanju narave - uradno preciščeno besedilo /ZON-UPB1/](#), (Ur.l. RS, št. 22/2003)
12. Zakon o pospeševanju turizma, Uradni list RS, 57/98
13. Zakon o spodbujanju skladnega regionalnega razvoja (Ur. list RS št. 60/99)
14. Zakon o urejanju prostora Ur. list RS št. 110/02
15. Zakon o varstvu kulturne dediščine (RS 7/99)
16. [Zakon o varstvu okolja /ZVO-1/](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 41/2004)
17. [Zakon o vodah /ZV-1/](#) (Ur.l. RS, št. 67/2002, 110/2002, 2/2004, 41/2004)
18. Zakon o Triglavskem narodnem parku, (Ur.l. SRS, št. 17 in 18/1981, 42/1986, RS, št. 8/1990, 35/2001, 110/2002)

#### Expert studies:

1. Blaganje D., Šantej B., Študija izvajanja zakonodaje o urejanju prostora, naselij, stavbnih zemljišč in graditve objektov (Study of implementation of spatial legislation), Inštitut za pravo okolja, Republika Slovenija, Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, 2001
2. Dalla Valle S., et.al. 1997, CRPOV KS Dovje - Mojstrana, Urbanistični inštitut RS, Ljubljana

3. Dalla Valle S., et.al. 1998, CRPOV KS Ratece - Planica, Urbanisticni inštitut RS, Ljubljana
4. Hudoklin J. in sod., 2002, Valorizacija in vkljucevanje vrednot krajine v prostorske instrumente (Valorisation and incorporation of landscape values in spatial planning instruments), Acer Novo mesto
5. Kovacic M., 1999, Razvojne tendence v kmetijstvu Slovenije in vpliv na kulturno krajino (Development tendencies of Slovenian agriculturre and their impact on cultural landscape), v: Kultura krajina v dinamiki razvoja in varstva, Zbornik 6. strokovnega srečanja DKAS, DKAS Ljubljana
6. Marušič I., in sod., 2002, Krajina in prostorski razvoj Slovenije SI2020 (Landscape in spatial development plan of Slovenia SI2020), Oddelek za krajinsko arhitekturo BF, Univerza v Ljubljani,
7. Ogrin D. et al., 1996, Strategija varstva krajine v Sloveniji (Landscape protection strategy), Inštitut za krajinsko arhitekturo BF, Univerza v Ljubljani,
8. Prem M., 1999, Kmetijska krajina prihodnosti (Agricultural landscape of the future), v: Kultura krajina v dinamiki razvoja in varstva, Zbornik 6. strokovnega srečanja DKAS, DKAS Ljubljana

## 6. APPENDIX:

### 6.1 Achievements and deficits, further input from other WPs and existing recommendations (steps 1-4)

#### 6.1.1 Maintenance and rd of rural areas and cl by supporting agriculture

##### General description of the principle

**General objective of the principle:** Main aim of the principle is preservation of (agri) cultural landscape by supporting specific agricultural practices. Multifunctionality of agriculture suitable land cultivation and environmentally friendly technologies are explicitly recognized concepts within this policy principle. Multifunctional agriculture includes also the socially important services of agriculture, which can't be directly financially evaluated, such as preservation of traditional settlements, cultural landscape and environment quality. Suitable land cultivation and environmentally friendly technologies aim at preservation of cultivated agricultural land with environmentally friendly agricultural practices, conservation of soil fertility, water resources and biodiversity.

**Administrative character of the principle:** Devices of this principle are almost exclusively within the domain of agricultural policy. Direct (production non-related) payments are the prevailing measure in agricultural policy from the aspect of CL/RD interrelation. Based on *Program for agricultural policy reform (1999-2000)*, the direct payments for landscape and environment protection measures are implemented since 1999. To foster the implementation of these aims, the Government passed Slovenian environmental program for agriculture 2001-2006 (SKOP, 2001). The implementation of certain individual measures from the SKOP program (i.e. support for hand-mowing within nature conservation areas, support for maintenance of green cover above water protection areas...) are related to the legislation in other (mostly environment and nature protection) policy fields. Another approach is represented by the National fund for agricultural land and forests, which acts by active participation on the land market towards an optimal distribution of land to help farmers to obtain and/or retain land for cultivation. Other instruments, such as the advisory service for agriculture support implementation of the objectives.

### Connected devices and their objectives

device	main objectives	administrative level	WP3 evaluat. scale
EKO1: support for agriculture in unfavorable conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National	National /pilot region <sup>3</sup>
EKO 2 & 3: Agrienvironmental measures: support for specific agricultural practices,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> <li>– preservation of natural features, biodiversity and traditional cultural landscape</li> <li>– conservation of soil fertility, water resources and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National	
Support for restructuring of agriculture production,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National	
National fund for agricultural land and forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to assure optimal distribution of land to enable its cultivation</li> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National	
Regional advisory service for agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National / Local	
Support for traditional farming and mountain habitats in Triglav national park,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to protect agricultural land from degradation and overgrowing,</li> <li>– to preserve population and identity of the countryside, traditional cultural landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	National	

### Comparison of principle and devices with the reference system of sustainability

The devices of this principle comply with several of the objectives, defined as a reference system for sustainable development, mainly with those addressing the integration of environmental considerations into sector-based policies (agriculture). Another explicitly addressed aspect of sustainability is to maintain the management of land traditionally cultivated by man. Formally, they also address integrated strategies for the protection or the restoration of cultural heritage, which is endangered or decaying as the strategic areas where measures are to be focused should be determined as a common priorities from the aspects of cultural landscape,

<sup>3</sup> same for all items in the following tables

tourism, preservation of cultural heritage and biodiversity. Another example of integrative approach is the application of agricultural support within TNP, where these are handled within a specific problem context. However, regional planning as an approach is neither considered nor encouraged as an approach to achieve these objectives.

This principle does not comply with diversification strategies and even promote dependency on single economic branch (in this case agriculture). In case of EKO1 and EKO2 support of agriculture also discourage farmers to diversify and search for complementary activities.

There is one more aspect of sustainability, which has not been addressed by this policy: The model of non-related direct payments puts farming in a position of public service, dependent on budget financing. This also questions sustainability of such practice in the long term – how much supported agriculture (public service) can society afford in the long term? The costs of attaining the objectives of agricultural policy have not been openly questioned in public let alone answered.

### Step 1: detecting achievements and deficits

STEP 1: achievements and deficits <sup>4</sup> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE		
	+	-
<b>relevance of devices</b>	Relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• integration of environmental considerations into sector-based policies.</li> <li>• maintenance of the traditional management of land</li> </ul>	Not relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotion of diversified development strategies helping to achieve an indigenous development in rural areas and in cities</li> <li>• ensuring the economic and rational use of land (quality of life, natural hazards, or uncontrolled urban expansion)</li> <li>• integrated spatial development strategies for environmentally sensitive areas and cultural landscape (partly - see step2)</li> <li>• integrated strategies for the protection or the restoration of cultural heritage, which is endangered or decaying (partly-see step2)</li> <li>• ensuring the economic and rational use of land, particular emphasis being placed on the avoidance of overuse and conservation or rehabilitation of natural habitats (partly - see step2)</li> </ul>
<b>coherence of devices with other devices of the principle</b>	generally: devices introducing agricultural subsidies are complementary, but might also be competitive to each other (extensification-intensification) , advisory service and TNP measures are in general in synergy with other measures, administrative and financial instruments could function against measures of active land policy (national fund )	

<sup>4</sup> In the deficit column only those issues were mentioned where the device in question interferes with sustainability objective or where it should be relevant, but is not . The less critical irrelevances were left out for sake of clarity

STEP 1: achievements and deficits <sup>4</sup> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE		
	+	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subsidies (EKO 1 and EKO2?3) complementary</li> <li>agri-advisory service in synergy / complementary with other devices</li> <li>TNP support in synergy / complementary with other devices, competitive only with supports aimed at agriculture intensification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subsidies aimed at traditional and extensive land-use practices (EKO1, EKO 2&amp;3, TNP supports) in competition with supports for intensification of agriculture</li> <li>subsidies in general are competitive with active land policy measures (fund of agro land)</li> </ul>
<b>impacts of devices</b> <i>(source: pilot region case study)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>better knowledge and understanding of environment and ecology</li> <li>better cohabitation of animal husbandry and wildlife</li> <li>improved economical opportunities for permanent crops and pastures, revitalization of agricultural land,</li> <li>preserved typical landscapes and habitats, mountain areas</li> <li>restructuring of the farms, consolidation of agricultural land and improvement of production potential</li> <li>improved educational structure of farmers, improved farm management, higher competitiveness, choice of more suitable and effective technologies,</li> <li>provided economical base for preservation of population, farming and traditional cultural landscape preservation in TNP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impeding the ability of agriculture to consolidate and function as economic activity (EKO1, EKO2&amp;3)</li> <li>increasing “passivity” of farmers (EKO1, EKO2&amp;3)</li> </ul>
<b>impact cross-check</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>complementation or synergy of measures providing economic security for farmers makes it easier for them to stay on the farms and continue (extensive) farming thus preserving population and cultural landscape,</li> <li>synergy of TNP measures (for areas within TNP)</li> <li>synergy of advisory service enabling farmers to make use of opportunities provided by subsidies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impacts of measures aimed at improvement of land fertility (agromeliorations) contradict environmental objectives of EKO2&amp;3</li> <li>impacts of subsidies impede functioning of land market and therefore consolidation of land into bigger, economically viable farms and farmers’ perspectives</li> </ul>
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>program for environmental and landscape assistance for agriculture is at a too early stage of its implementation to assess the effects</li> <li>Fund of agricultural land has only limited impact due to several circumstances</li> <li>TNP measures relatively effective</li> <li>in general impacts correspond with objectives (impacts stated for some devices are only expected, some were already observed, namely for EKO1, agricultural restructuring and national fund)</li> </ul>	
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>integration of environmental considerations into agriculture: practices being more environmentally suitable,</li> <li>maintaining the management of land traditionally cultivated by man.</li> <li>integrative approach (application of agricultural support within TNP, integration of EKO with nature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>question of long-term sustainability of budget supported agriculture</li> <li>regional planning as an approach is neither considered nor encouraged as an approach to achieve the integrated objectives</li> <li>discouraging diversification and promoting dependency on single economic branch (in this case</li> </ul>

STEP 1: achievements and deficits <sup>4</sup> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE		
	+	-
	conservation).	agriculture).
<b>relation to developments and trends (WP2,4)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>revitalization of agricultural land, cultivated mountain areas, preserved typical landscapes and habitats are in accordance with future preservation and use of land for various uses (polifunctional development)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conflicts caused by decline of funds allocated for investments relative to funds allocated for EKO 2 and 3 subsidies, assets in agriculture are decreasing and the farmers have no resources to participate with the obligatory part (minimum 50%) of the investment, majority of the measures are oriented towards supporting unviable forms of farming</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impacts counteract negative trends observed (overgrowing, extensification, mono-functional development)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subsidizing is leading to “passivisation” of farmers instead of helping the sector to reorient towards self-supportiveness in perspective</li> </ul>
<b>relation to WP4 cluster</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>relevance of the principle especially for the areas which could be classified as either with (in sustainable scenario) or without own resources (agriculture being the resource)</li> <li>relevance for the tourist area (cultural landscape as an attraction; farm tourism)</li> <li>high relevance for marginal areas, mainly due to extensive agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not relevant for local centers (Bled and Jesenice)</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>income from agriculture providing one of the local resources for areas surrounding local centers: less cultural landscape changed into “sleeping villages” and retained in agricultural use</li> <li>subsidies can help to keep marginal areas from falling into “decline” category</li> <li>diversified tourist offer – combined with agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>subsidies can impede diversification of activities, thus inhibiting development of multifunctional centers in countryside</li> <li>subsidies stiffen land market thus impeding rational land-use and activation of resources</li> </ul>
<b>relation to local demand (WP5)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high relevance for local inhabitants, agriculture (as economic activity) should remain as basis for preservation of CL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agriculture as economic and self preserving activity is more desirable as agriculture in service for maintaining CL</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improvement of economic situation of the local farmers is regarded positive</li> <li>impacts of agri-advisory service is well received among local population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>expected impacts correspond to local demand, however they are not yet sufficiently visible</li> <li>inflexibility of land-market is not desirable for local development initiatives</li> </ul>
<b>synthesis</b>	Devices of this principle are in their objectives as well as impacts generally relevant for sustainable development, however more in its environmental and cultural landscape aspect and less so in terms of social and economic objectives. Devices of	

<b>STEP 1: achievements and deficits</b> <sup>4</sup> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE		
	+	-
	this principle are mostly coherent and in synergy, there is however a conflict between tendencies for economic strengthening of farms and maintaining agriculture only as service for conservation of CL, dependant more and more on subsidies.	

## Step 2: detecting reasons for deficits and achievements

Methodological remark: We decided to deal with this task only in one step – we basically skipped the verification phase. The reasons are mainly twofold: firstly, the suggestion of German team to derive the hypothetical reasons directly from achievements and deficits identified in step1 doesn't seem to make sense. We don't see the way (and sense?) this could be done without reference to all the information and knowledge we obtained so far. Therefore, verification via results from WP3 and literature review is in a way already included in hypotheses. Also two rounds of interviews were already done in the WP3, therefore this type of verification has been performed, too. The only way of additional verification would be by interviewing the new group of experts. However due to time problems we were not able to conduct the interviews in this stage. Also, the number of experts in specific fields such as individual sector policy is very limited in Slovenia and it is really difficult to find two or three sets of different experts. As expert workshop is planned later in WP6 we postponed this verification until later.

<b>STEP 2a: reasons for deficits</b> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE			
	<b>reason hypothetical / verified</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons</b>
<b>relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of coordination among sectors (spatial planning, environment and nature protection, economy); lack of verification in domestic public – direct transcription of the EU policy</li> </ul>		
<b>coherence of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• different orientation of financial devices: market-oriented payments are diminishing, subsidies are prevailing</li> <li>• lack of coordination and different orientation among sectors (protection vs. development)</li> </ul>		
<b>impacts of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of coordination among sectors</li> <li>• lack of verification of objectives and assessment of possible negative impacts</li> <li>• agricultural production (efforts and diligence) is not stimulated due to option of subsidies (direct payments)</li> <li>• presently financial incentives are too low to reach considerable changes in agricultural practice</li> </ul>		
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• late introduction of majority of devices</li> <li>• competitiveness of certain devices (subsidies vs. land fund)</li> </ul>		

<b>STEP 2a: reasons for deficits</b> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE			
	<b>reason hypothetical / verified</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons</b>
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of intersectoral and integrative approaches</li> <li>• difficulties to satisfy both developmental and protective objectives</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP2,4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further orientation to market not related subsidies (supporting unviable forms of farming )</li> <li>• objectives don't include satisfactory prevention from negative impacts</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP4 cluster</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of communication and reconciliation between actors and natural protection sector</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• financial incentive too low to reach considerable changes in agricultural practice</li> </ul>		

<b>STEP 2b: reasons for achievements</b> / MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE			
	<b>reason hypothetical</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons verified</b>
<b>reasons for achievements / good practice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• implementation of devices is adapted to specific context and coordinated by one responsible institution (TNP), contradicting effect can be avoided</li> <li>• functioning of support service on local / regional level (agri-advisory service)</li> <li>• devices reach best results if they stimulate activities and tendency to develop (no stagnation)</li> <li>• diverse objectives (and connected devices) do not crosswise in the same area</li> <li>• the existence (and growth) of demand for environmentally grown products functions synergetically with supports for environmentally friendly agricultural practices (S, possibly all?)</li> <li>• accompanying education (compulsory 15 hours course) of involved farmers about ecological aspects of agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

### Step 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5

<b>STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5</b> MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE		
	<b>input concerning principle</b>	<b>conclusion for principle/devices</b>
<b>WP2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• trend towards increase of larger agricultural business, share of smaller a.b. is decreasing... (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.13)</li> <li>• share of arable land has decreased....</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the processes within agriculture are not homogeneous or one-way, but diverse: agriculture is changing, not (only) declining, also abandonment of farming has complex background. it has to do</li> </ul>

**STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5 MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE**

	<b>input concerning principle</b>	<b>conclusion for principle/devices</b>
	<p>permanent crops increased...rise in share of intense grasslands..., extensive grasslands decreased. (...13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• low educational level of farmers is a problem, after joining EU farmers will need more functional knowledge, educated youth finds employment in other sectors, low educated young people continue with farming (...13)</li> <li>• migration of young people from remote villages is closely related with the decline of farming; which results in reforestation of remote arable land (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.33)</li> <li>• the municipalities have big influence on the region trough investments in sewer and road infrastructure (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.36)</li> <li>• farmland or even whole farms being sold to buyers not interested in farming, using this to build secondary homes; even though this is legally not permitted (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.37)</li> </ul>	<p>with life-styles, education and cultural issues, not only with revenue. Therefore, the instruments, directly supplementing income, may have only limited success. However they are a signal to farmers that their activity is valuable for the society in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More care should be taken that the applied instruments really help steer development of rural areas and CL in the desired direction , whereby the desired direction still needs to be determined.</li> <li>• Important influence on countryside is by improvement of infrastructure (transport, telecommunication etc.)</li> <li>• strong pressure of non-farmers on countryside reveals an existing and growing trend and needs to be taken into account.</li> <li>• the emphasis on tourism as a solution for CL preservation is a controversial concept, because it could lead to conflicts with interests of locals</li> </ul>
<b>WP 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further slow reorientation from production related subsidies to payments for ecological services (WP4, Task 4.4, Pilot region scenarios SLO, Final report, p.10, INS)</li> <li>• agriculture will be a part time or supplementary activity and mostly extensive (in peripheral areas), organic agriculture will become more widely practiced (...21, INS)</li> <li>• in peripheral areas some processes, such as overgrowth on agricultural land, decrease of arable land and extensive grassland, will continue, but their intensity will be rather low (...22, INS)</li> <li>• agritourism could be increasing in some places (in peripheral areas) (...23, INS)</li> <li>• energy policy with reference to use of local renewable resources... (...10, INS)</li> <li>• measures to promote farming as full-time activity, in connection with supplementary activities on farms, traditional crafts...(40, TSS)</li> <li>• measures to increase special forms of animal husbandry (horse and sheep breeding, bee-keeping,) (52, INS, TSS)</li> <li>• balanced development and revitalization of rural areas will be supported by decentralization of national public services (...30, TSS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the differences between inertial and sustainable scenario do not seem to be major as far as the changes in agriculture are concerned, therefore it is questionable, whether agricultural supports can have any significant impact? Or to put it differently: do the expected outcomes / effects justify inputs?</li> <li>• other types of measures may have significant effects; such as decentralization of public services, which can provide jobs, improve accessibility of services for locals as well as move decision making closer to users.</li> <li>• co-ordination and pooling of instruments of various sectors, such as forestry, agriculture, nature protection, need to be integrated to help achieve better results.</li> </ul>
<b>WP 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overgrowth on agricultural land, changed land use – to building land (WP5, Zapis poteka in rez. 1. delavnice, p.5)</li> <li>• changed agricultural practice, new ways and processes are being enforced., traditional patterns and practices are disappearing (mineral fertilizers, untimely mowing, silage rolls) (...5)</li> <li>• decay of farm buildings (...6)</li> <li>• maintenance of CI. in reachable extent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is questionable whether agricultural subsidies can prevent the agricultural land to be built up due too high differences in land price.</li> <li>• the extent of landscape that could be maintained in traditional way should be limited – need to determine criteria!</li> <li>• the existing instruments do not solve adequately the problem of dislocation of farms (transformation of former</li> </ul>

**STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5** MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE

	<b>input concerning principle</b>	<b>conclusion for principle/devices</b>
	quality before quantity (...7) • removal of farms from village centres (...9) • possible transformation from farm buildings to residential buildings in order to prevent decaying...allowing transformation	agricultural objects into new uses, building of new farms in locations outside village core) • development of supplementary activities on farms is an important factor for survival of agricultural holdings

**Step 4: reviewing existing recommendations**

**STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations** MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE

<b>existing technical recommend.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>operationalisation of political aims, laws and regulations and introduction of monitoring processes and evaluation (CH, 5,6)</li> <li>Guarantee and improvement of education as an essential basic prerequisite for future development, maintenance of local knowledge (D,3,7)</li> <li>Diminution of bureaucratic proceedings within administration (Ch,5.5) - administration should be as simple and transparent as possible, co-ordination in controlling should be improved (p.62)</li> <li>Implementation of adequate policies for mountain areas in diverse sectors necessary (I,8.5)</li> <li>All political measures focusing on the development of rural regions have to be intersectoral, specifically supported by integrated economic and territorial planning tools, consistent with the general planning strategy of the entire regional territories. The strict sectoral focus of agricultural policy neglects the strong interdependence of the agricultural sector with other economic sectors..(p.53)</li> <li>Given the diversity of the Union's rural areas, rural development policy must follow the principle of subsidiarity. It must be as decentralised as possible and based on partnership and co-operation between all levels concerned (local, regional, national and European). The emphasis must be on participation and a 'bottom up' approach, which harnesses the creativity and solidarity of rural communities. Rural development must be local and community-driven within a coherent European framework.(p.27)</li> </ul>
<b>existing thematic recommend.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>diverging opinions regarding the extent of CL maintenance: maintain at least the "valuable" landscapes i.e mountain pastures and solitary farms (what are the criteria: ecology, natural and cultural heritage, economy, aesthetics?), or the whole alpine landscape area-wide (D,3.14; SLO,6.1(3) (p.70)</li> <li>Promotion and establishment of a bigger market for high quality and organic agricultural products, also by developing special action programmes for organic husbandry and strengthening cooperation of tourism, local trade and handicraft, establishment of links between rural areas and consumers (p.78) (D,3.10) (CH,5.3; F,7.3 (2))</li> <li>Promotion of multifunctional agriculture, providing additional sources of income for farmers in the tourism and trade sector (D,3.16; D,3.10)</li> <li>Rising awareness of CL and environmental issues with the farmers, but also rising public awareness of the benefits of agriculture and forestry (D,3.2; D,3.11; D,3.16)</li> <li>Orientation towards niche production: specific high-quality products like fruit, grappa, chestnuts, flax, cheese, etc., at local level could be a challenge for farmers to improve their agricultural income. (p.12)</li> <li>Orientation to influencing consumers' behaviour, which can influence the development of cultural landscape (p.37)</li> <li>Agriculture is not able to maintain permanent settlement in rural areas on its own. as it</li> </ul>

**STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations** MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE

is dependent on a milieu offering supply, education and alternative working places. Therefore, public investment in non-agricultural structures is necessary (p.59)

- Development programmes for the demographically endangered areas must be based on the local characteristics and their comparative advantages. (p.71)
- Agricultural land should be preserved from two perspectives: to protect a natural resource for food production, and to maintain a multifunctional countryside and consequently preserve the cultural landscape. More effective farmland management should be achieved through property structure improvement, changed and improved technologies, and other structural measures of agricultural policy in accordance with the spatial potentials. Unavoidable processes of rural landscape transformation due to the abandonment of agricultural land use and forestation should thus be controlled by means of cultural landscape conservation, particularly in the areas with cultural landscapes of outstanding value (p.71)
- In order to raise alpine agriculture, it is necessary that regional development projects focus on the increase of businesses profitability, exploiting excellence and typicality of local products. (p.86)
- Care of cultural landscape always have to be area-wide and not only concentrated on agricultural areas.(p.14)

*recommendations in favour of maintaining financial support / devices:*

- To be successful, financial incentives must be transparent and must be set above a certain threshold (subsidies have to be more than ca. 800 €/ha in order to influence the choice of a farm strategy).
- Subsidisation should be structured so that a farmer who manages his operation according to a clear strategy receives payments from at most 2 – 3 subsidies. At the same time such commitment to a clear farm strategy result in the highest possible grants.
- A commitment to “profitability” in the classical sense is an extremely counter-productive approach for farms located in disfavoured areas where a high degree of ecological responsibility is called for. The model for such zones must rather be a sufficient income (satisfaction strategy) in exchange for environmentally responsible farming.
- Criteria of natural disasters prevention should be used in subsidies allocation (p. 21)
- Subsidies for the cultural landscape should not come alone from the agriculture, but also from other sectors like tourism who depend on cultural landscape (p.31)
- Investment aid should occur indirectly, i.e. via money market (p. 58)
- Direct payment measures have to be more clearly target-orientated (p. 62)
- It has to be examined whether part of direct payments should be decentralized for specific regional purposes (p. 62)
- In agriculture, sustainable extensive land-use is labour-intensive and can not be realized without considerable financial support. It has to be examined whether part of direct payments should be related to the number of labour forces (p. 62) (p. 68)
- Efficiency of today’s direct payments is insufficient. Grading with regard to the region’s structural and topographical characteristics is necessary
- Negative ecological effects on extensification can be reduced with direct payments for location-specific production methods (p. 68)

*recommendations against maintaining financial support / devices:*

- Reduction of regional subsidies in order to diminish dependencies and to rise responsibility; ( D,3.10 (2); D,3.12; CH,5.2; SLO,6.3)
- structural change should be reinforced in order to keep enterprises competitive (D,3.12)
- Agriculture policy has to support the high - class production of all food – in the mountains and in the valleys. But financial support must not have the function of a live-safer. Long term the farmers should be able to operate independent of financial

**STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations** MAINTENANCE AND RD OF RURAL AREAS AND CL BY SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE

	<p>support (p. 20).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The use of local financial resources must be encouraged to promote local rural development projects. More encouragement must be given to using financial engineering in rural credit techniques in order to mobilise better the synergies between public and private funding, reduce financial constraints on small and medium size enterprises, promote productive investment, and diversify rural economies. Greater participation by the banking sector (public and private) and other fiscal intermediaries must be encouraged.(p.28)</li><li>• Support for diversification of economic and social activity must focus on providing the framework for self-sustaining private and community-based initiatives: investment, technical assistance, business services, adequate infrastructure, education, training, integrating advances in information technology, strengthening the role of small towns as integral parts of rural areas and key development factors, and promoting the development of viable rural communities and renewal of villages.(p.27)</li><li>• Direct payments for very small areas and favourable conditions to acquire real estate seem to be incentives to maintain part-time or hobby farming. Thus structural change can slow down (p. 68)</li><li>• Existing structural change is insufficient to compensate decrease in product prices and income. Thus active structural policy has to become an essential part of agriculture policy</li><li>• Direct payments are in a long-term view insufficient for the maintenance of area-covering land-use. Without increase of direct payments, maintenance of land-use can only be secured with reinforced structural change</li></ul>
synthesis	

## 6.1.2 Conciliation of RD with ENV or CL aims by planning

### General description of the principle

#### General objective of the principle

This principle contains the objectives of rational and suitable land use. Spatial planning is meant to provide the conceptual framework, the objectives therefore contain little “contents” (the most often stated objective is »implementation of spatial plans«) as the contents should be determined by the needs of sectors and adjusted to spatial potentials.

#### Administrative character of the principle

Spatial planning devices prevail, but some sectorial policies embedded their objectives directly into spatial planning, using spatial planning instruments for implementation. The instruments are mostly administrative such as the designation of exclusive zones in plans. Agriculture compensation is the only financial device. The majority of instruments function in hierarchical order, and have most direct influence on the level of local land-use plans. The requirement for public participation has also been imbedded in planning legislation in the form of compulsory public displays and hearings for all local land use plans and detailed plans.

#### Connected devices and their objectives

device	main objectives	administrative level	WP3 evaluat. scale
Landscape plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to ensure spatially suitable and compatible arrangement of uses in space (SPA)</li> <li>– preservation of regional landscape and architectural characteristics (SSP)</li> </ul>	Local	
Local and national spatial order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to assure sufficient and adequate areas for production activities</li> </ul>	National/Local	
Site plan (national and local level)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to assure sufficient and adequate areas for production activities</li> </ul>	National/Local	
cooperation of sectors in planning process (guidelines, opinions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– rational and suitable land use, accordant with physical characteristics of space</li> <li>– environmental protection: nature conservation (indigenous species, habitats, ecological balance, natural biodiversity)</li> <li>– protection of cultural heritage</li> <li>– sustainable use of natural resources</li> <li>– protection of living and natural environment</li> <li>– conservation of variety and cultural and esthetic value of landscape</li> </ul>	National/Local	

device	main objectives	administrative level	WP3 evaluat. scale
	(SPA)		
Protection zones designated in local plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– preservation of agricultural land, protective forests, forests with special purpose, nature protection areas, cultural monuments and cultural landscape from uncontrolled urbanization</li> </ul>	National/Local	
Strategic Environmental impacts assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– sustainable use of natural resources</li> <li>– protection of living and natural environment</li> <li>– rational and suitable land use, accordant with physical characteristics of space</li> </ul>	National	
Environmental impacts assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– environmental protection: nature conservation (indigenous species, habitats, ecological balance, natural biodiversity)</li> </ul>	National	
Protected agricultural land and agricultural compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– slowing down loss of (agri) cultural landscape</li> <li>– rational and suitable land use, accordant with physical characteristics of space</li> </ul>	National	

### **Comparison of principle and devices with the reference system of sustainability**

Principle of planning shows a very high level of compliance with sustainability reference system. It basically complies with all the issues except with explicitly aimed at economic development (diversification strategies). This can be understood, as it is inherently deals with aspects of development as well as conservation, thus addressing the major issues of sustainable development. The indifference of spatial planning towards economic issues however often shows as relatively strong draw back in practice.

## Step 1: detecting achievements and deficits

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STEP 1: achievements and deficits</li> </ul> CONCILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING		
	+	-
<b>relevance of devices</b>	Relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>including integrated spatial development strategies for environmentally sensitive areas and CL</li> <li>ensuring the economic and rational use of land, particular emphasis being placed on quality of life, natural hazards, or uncontrolled urban expansion</li> <li>integrating landscape into regional and town planning policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape</li> <li>co-coordinated and integrated infrastructure planning and management for avoiding inefficient investments and impact on landscapes</li> <li>Integrated spatial development strategies for environmentally sensitive areas and cultural landscape</li> <li>Integrated strategies for the protection or the restoration of cultural heritage, which is endangered or decaying</li> <li>ensuring the economic and rational use of land, particular emphasis being placed on the avoidance of overuse and conservation or rehabilitation of natural habitats</li> </ul>	Not relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>promotion of diversified development strategies helping to achieve an indigenous development in rural areas and in cities, which are too dependent on a single economic branch</li> </ul>
<b>coherence of devices with other devices of the principle</b>	devices of this principle are complementary to each other and form a complex, interrelated and hierarchical regulatory structure.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in the case of hierarchical structure of planning documents, where higher one's are necessary condition for the others, it is difficult to say whether there is synergy or competition, so it could be defined as complementarity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>impacts of devices<sup>5</sup></b> <i>(source: pilot region case study)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>compliance of new building with requirements concerning spatial regulations</li> <li>land use accordant with physical characteristics of space and proposed land use</li> <li>preserved agricultural land, cultural landscape and natural heritage</li> <li>cultural landscape protected from uncontrolled urbanization</li> <li>change of agricultural land slowed down</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impacts of devices are not equally satisfying, in some areas the loss of cultivated land is constant and rapid (e.g. flat areas close to urban centres with high attractiveness for development)</li> <li>increased pressures and concentrating land uses at borders of protected areas</li> <li>restrictions are sometimes causing more damage by individuals evading the regulations or inhibiting rational land-use (e.g. moving farmers outside village centers to expand their farms)</li> </ul>
<b>impact cross-check</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>due to hierarchy of the documents, only the lower lever devices have direct impacts. in general, these are not contradictory to higher level documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sometimes, lower level documents can interpret higher level provisions in a way that leads to impacts which are not in compliance with the higher level document (true for protection as</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Judgement on impact is difficult for this principle, as the regulation on spatial planning has been recently changed. The opinions given here refer to impacts of those devices, which don't change significantly with the new regulation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STEP 1: achievements and deficits</li> </ul> CONCILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING		
	+	-
		well as development issues)
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>efficiency of EIA and SEIA is satisfactory</li> <li>some negative and not expected impacts (contrary to objectives) appear, consequence of too strict / rigid measures</li> <li>low efficiency of plans is also due to insufficient participation of public in planning processes and resulting opposition from locals</li> </ul>	
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned development in general reduces impacts on environmentally sensitive areas, landscape as well as natural hazards and urban expansion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>rigid land use zoning and protection areas inhibits diversification of activities</li> <li>length of planning procedures and restriction it imposes on developer affects efficiency of investment</li> <li>impacts do not always contribute to maintenance of cultural landscape, heritage etc, which require active use</li> </ul>
<b>relation to developments and trends (WP2,4)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high relevance of principle, because it is applied in entire space</li> <li>high relevance since the cluster area confronts colliding interests, NP areas vs. developmental zones</li> <li>compulsory measures</li> <li>principle relevant for major processes in the pilot region (suburbanization and transformation of industry to services and tourism) and their spatial distribution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>most devices are not yet implemented</li> <li>trends that need active involvement (agriculture transformation) do not profit as much from this principle;</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>positive impacts for major processes in the pilot region (suburbanization and transformation of industry to services and tourism) and their spatial distribution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>positive impacts are not achieved to expected degree</li> <li>obstacle to diversify activities (e.g. start business on (agricultural) property or expand farm)</li> </ul>
<b>relation to WP4 cluster</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high relevance especially for expanding suburban areas and tourist area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not as relevant for those areas, whose status depends on the level of activation of own resources</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>directing extent and quality of suburban development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hindering activation of local resources</li> </ul>
<b>relation to local demand (WP5)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planning documents generally do (should) contain common (locally defined) objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>documents on higher (national) level do not always contain objectives relevant for or corresponding to local demand</li> <li>planning documents usually lag behind initiatives</li> <li>long and complicated procedures even for simple improvements of people's living conditions</li> </ul>
	impacts:	

• <b>STEP 1: achievements and deficits</b> CONCIILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING		
	+	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>by now, planning has relatively successfully limited negative impacts of increasing development pressure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planning documents can not always satisfy local demand - usually they are too restrictive</li> <li>in some cases, evading the rigid planning restriction resulted in inappropriate development (illegal housing, expansion of activities...)</li> </ul>
<b>synthesis</b>	The planning principle is a hierarchy of devices, providing a framework for implementation of objectives which are defined on several levels. This is on the one hand opportunity to achieve synergistic and integrative action, but can also prove to be inefficient (too rigid, complicated, irrelevant) or yield unwanted side effects.	

## Step 2: detecting reasons for deficits and achievements

<b>STEP 2a: reasons for deficits</b> CONCIILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING			
	<b>reason hypothetical</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons verified</b>
<b>relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nature of document (administrative), lack of coordination with other types of measures</li> </ul>		
<b>coherence of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>long hierarchical chains can contribute to misinterpretations between documents</li> </ul>	•	
<b>impacts of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planning objectives and provisions are not adequately assessed in terms of their impacts</li> <li>some restrictions are too rigid</li> <li>different (sectoral) interests are not appropriately conciliated before they are transcribed as a requirement in plans</li> </ul>		
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>too rigid devices</li> <li>long and complicated procedures</li> <li>insufficient participation of public in planning process</li> <li>compensation fee (for agricultural land) is too low to have impact on developers</li> </ul>		
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lack of coordination (input) of development opportunities and initiatives, also problem of different time-scales (spatial plans: long term vs. development plans short and medium term)</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP2,4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>most devices are not yet implemented</li> <li>trends that need active involvement (agriculture transformation) do not profit as much from this principle;</li> <li>most of the devices are restrictive in nature</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP4 cluster</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>administrative nature of majority of the documents (not suitable to support activation of resources)</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hierarchical structure (imposing “higher” objectives)</li> <li>long time span and complicatedness of planning process</li> </ul>		

## **STEP 2b: reasons for achievements** CONCIILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING

	reason hypothetical	verification options	reasons verified
reasons for achievements / good practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• hierarchical structure of the devices</li> <li>• planning process as such allows incorporation of objectives from different levels and sectors as well as identifying possible negative impacts in advance</li> <li>• binding nature of most measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

### Step 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5

STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5 CONCILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING		
	input concerning principle	conclusion for principle/devices
WP2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diverse and rather unspoiled nature and transition – emphasis on tourism, experience conflicting interests (development/protection, development directions, pressure on land for secondary homes, small business other than tourism (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.15)</li> <li>• lack of cooperation and coordination among the municipalities, RD became more partial when municipalities began to work on their own projects without cooperation with bordering m. (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.33, p. 36)</li> <li>• interests of landowners who plan to sell their land and therefore change its status from farm land to building landing order to get much better price – this causes conflict with CL preservation policies (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.37)</li> <li>• industry often facing problems when seeking locations, conflicts between economic development and nature/env. preservation (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.37)</li> <li>• prepared regional development program seem to be too general (more list of desires and needs of the municipalities than a realistic development plan) interests are included in the plan, but not coordinated and thus hardly implementable (...38)</li> <li>• development of tourism should be a subject of common, well thought-out plan...(...38)</li> <li>• plans should determine sensible interrelation between economy (specifically tourism) and ecology...(...38)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transparent planning processes with active involvement of public would reduce land speculation</li> <li>• land use designation and regulation should better take into account local needs and specific requirements; conservation authorities should be “forced” to negotiate, not to automatically veto developmental initiatives: this may prevent breaking and evading the regulations.</li> <li>• development initiatives should be thoroughly assessed in the planning process, instruments such as SEIA and EIA should be applied as well as more innovative approaches; i.e. study of alternative scenarios,</li> </ul>
WP 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spatial development will continue to be informed by daily politics rather than guided by long-term development and planning documents, this will result in wasteful use of space, loss of landscape amenities and problems in spatial organization (WP4, Task 4.4, Pilot region scenarios SLO, Final report, p.11, INS)</li> <li>• legal provisions will continue to hinder introduction of supplementary activities on farms, which could help slow down the decrease in number of agricultural holdings (...10, INS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transparent, flexible and effective planning documents should be timely prepared on regional / strategic level, as well as on local / concrete level to prevent speculations and optimise spatial development processes, specially to accommodate increasing housing demand in a way, which will bring economic and cultural benefits and reduce environmental damage and risks for natural disasters.</li> <li>• there is a coherence problem: diversification of activities (including</li> </ul>

<b>STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5 CONCIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING</b>		
	<b>input concerning principle</b>	<b>conclusion for principle/devices</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>suburban residential areas will grow considerably..., pressure for new residential areas, due to people leaving local centres or moving from Ljubljana urban region (...11, INS)</li> <li>quality of env. is expected to remain rather stable..., air quality will probably deteriorate, there will be more noise due to increased traffic volumes (...17, INS)</li> <li>high risk of torrential streams and landslides (...22, INS)</li> <li>a higher degree of coordination and co-operation in the planning process, which will be open to stakeholders willing to participate (...30, TSS)</li> </ul>	<p>use of local resources) is not always consistent with several provisions for protection of agricultural land / planning regulations</p>
<b>WP 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>costs connected to preparation of spatial planning acts are too high for small municipalities (...8)</li> <li>tendencies to prepare acts conciliatory with market aspirations (...8)</li> <li>disappearing distinctions between towns and villages/countryside (...9)</li> <li>development of villages considering functional and formative aspects (WP5, Zapis...2. delavnice, p.4)</li> <li>new buildings not adjusted to location and traditional patterns (WP5, Zapis poteka in rez. 1. delavnice, p.5)</li> <li>preservation of village identity (WP5, Zapis...2. delavnice, p.9)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strategic planning documents should be prepared on regional level, addressing common issues – to reduce burdens on local communities in preparations of own plans, to improve coordination and integration, to reduce possibility of developers to influence plans to the costs of public interests</li> <li>the planning system should be more flexible and inclusive than presently</li> <li>education and promotion of (courses, advisory services, booklets...) on quality, “context sensitive” architecture and building should be organized to improve knowledge and responsibility of everybody intending to build or renovate.</li> </ul>

#### Step 4: reviewing existing recommendations

<b>STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations CONCIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING</b>	
<b>existing technical recommend.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear definition of political aims, laws and regulations, precise, differentiated and comprehensible formulation (D,3.1 (2); F,7.6)</li> <li>Operationalisation of political aims, laws and regulations and introduction of monitoring processes and evaluation (CH,5.6)</li> <li>Integration of strategies and measures into all concerned political and administrative levels from EU, national, regional to local level; improvement of consistency/coherence of aims and measures as well as of cooperation of all levels (D,3.9; D,3.11 (2); D,3.16)</li> <li>Promotion of “new governance” processes: more democracy, more participation (D,3.2), extension and improvement of participative processes (D,3.6; A,4.1)</li> <li>Extension of decision making authority on regional level (regional planning and development) (D,3.4; D,3.16; Ch,5.6; F,7.1)</li> <li>Planning standards have to be checked successively and have to experience a change of paradigm, orientated on the motives of the directly affected people (p.14)</li> <li>Communities and rural districts should have more decision-making authority (p. 22)</li> <li>Reconsideration and better integration of NGOs on international, national and local levels (p.35)</li> </ul>

**STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations** CONCILIATION OF RD WITH ENV OR CL AIMS BY PLANNING

<p><b>existing thematic recommend.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out-commuting regions: reinforcement of centres, creation of decentral structures, avoidance of suburbanisation (D,3.12)</li> <li>• Avoidance of urban sprawl, preference of multi-storey houses, multi-family houses, concentration and densification of settlements (A,4.2, SLO,6.1)</li> <li>• Concentration of tourism in existing touristic centres, qualitative improvement of existing structures, establishment of new activities and alternatives facing future (climatic) changes, avoidance of expansion and prevention of establishment of new touristic infrastructure (D,3.11 (2), SLO,6.1)</li> <li>• Measures concerning custodial aspects of cultural landscape in rural areas only will be successful if they could be integrated in existing planning systems. Informal instruments, connecting public and private actors in terms of a rural “Public-Private-Partnership” have to be added”.(p.13)</li> <li>• policy has to shift more competences from the central- to the regional- and local level.(p. 14) to achieve an active co-operation in regional planning and a common responsibility for the own living space and economic area. (p.17)</li> <li>• The Alps only can remain a multifunctional living space and economical area. That means that the urban areas have to become more urban and the rural areas more rural (p. 23 – 24).</li> <li>• Co-ordination of planning, development and compensation measures (p.41)</li> <li>• Building up networks within the regions for dealing with thematical issues (p.47)</li> <li>• A two-step permission requests procedure should be introduced. Submitting only a project sketch as first step helps to discern difficulties in an early project phase (p.63)</li> <li>• Dispersed development of settlement and holiday dwellings outside existing settlements should be prevented. Transformation of existing Alpine farms (“planine”) into holiday dwellings should be avoided (p.69)</li> <li>• Natural and cultural heritage as well as other particularly valuable landscape units should be protected and conserved (p.70)</li> <li>• Spatial (land-use) proportions – between woods, agricultural land, settlements, infrastructure should be maintained (p.70)</li> <li>• Timely and high-quality planning of settlements to prevent insufficiently considered or forced spatial development activities based on partial solutions from location to location. Preliminary assessments of possible impacts on the urban and regional development should be provided before any extensive spatial development activity takes place (p.70)</li> <li>• The development of rural areas should be guided so as to preserve the landscape and urban heritage and to ensure the reconciliation of primary and other land uses. Particular attention should also be devoted to the degraded landscapes resulting from various intensive land uses. (p.70)</li> <li>• Reinforce the network of services to the population, habitat quality and accommodation supply</li> <li>• Fight against the demise of forest and agriculture while maintaining open spaces (p.77)</li> <li>• Catch up the delay on transport and communication infrastructures (p.77)</li> <li>• Many alpine areas are affected by stressed hydrogeological hazard, due to uncontrolled regional development and to intensive urbanization and industrialization. It is necessary to promote the re-naturalisation of the most risk-prone areas and the economic activities that exploit environmental resources. (p.86)</li> <li>• Land use has to be conservative concerning the way of utilization (sort, intensity and rhythm of use) but innovative in looking for techniques which facilitate the continuation of the specific land use (p. 19)</li> </ul>
<p><b>synthesis</b></p>	

### 6.1.3 Nature and CL conservation through protected areas

#### General description of the principle

**General objective of the principle:** Main objective is nature conservation and preservation of CL including environment protection. The consideration of cultural landscape and regional development is usually implicit and can be assessed via indirect impacts.

**Administrative character of the principle:** In distinction to most of the European countries, a large proportion of Slovenian territory can be considered as rather unspoiled “natural” habitat. 8% of the Slovenian territory is at the moment under some nature protection measure (most of it is represented by Triglav national park, which covers a large proportion of Slovenian Alps). Nature conservation is here the prevailing sector, implementing majority of it’s objectives through establishment and management of protected areas. This policy is lately gaining influence by the EU legislation (Natura 2000). All other sectors are targeted by the restrictions, and individuals as well as (public and private) organizations are most often addressed; be it by the restrictions, which are the strongest lever of action or by incentives and projects for promotion and information of environment protection.

#### Connected devices and their objectives

device	main objectives	administrative level	WP3 evaluat. scale
Protection (and temporary protection) by nature protection decrees (EPA, NCA) with definition of adequate protective measures	– to conserve nature: conservation of biodiversity and protection of natural values	National	
Management plan for protected areas (defined conservation goals, guidelines and measures for nature protection):	– to conserve nature: conservation of biodiversity and protection of natural values	Regional	
Promotion of nature protection	– to conserve nature: conservation of biodiversity and protection of natural values	National Local	
Forest reserves,	– maintenance of ecologically important forest according to their ecological function – conservation and improvement of biodiversity	National	

### Comparison of principle and devices with the reference system of sustainability

Clearly, this principle complies with the most parts of the reference system, most notably with the conservation requirements. The objectives themselves are complying (i.e. addressing environmentally sensitive areas and cultural landscapes, avoidance of overuse, rehabilitation of natural areas etc...). Due to its protective nature, it also contradicts the sustainability framework in parts, addressing development. Some of the objectives are on the other hand not addressed or even contradicting (e.g. the impact of nature conservation areas on the diversification of activities and rational land use can often be negative). Also, the strategies, which are considered viable in sustainability framework, are not adequately used or even hampered by this principle, specifically integrative approach and regional planning. However, it must be noted, that this deficits do not always appear. In some contexts they may well be irrelevant.

### Step 1: detecting achievements and deficits

STEP 1: achievements and deficits NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS		
	+	-
<b>relevance of devices</b>	Relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• integration of environmental considerations into sector-based policies</li> <li>• maintenance of the traditional management of land</li> <li>• integrated spatial development strategies for environmentally sensitive areas and cultural landscape</li> <li>• Territorial impact assessment as an instrument for spatial assessment of large infrastructure projects</li> <li>• ensuring the economic and rational use of land, particular emphasis being placed on the avoidance of overuse and conservation or rehabilitation of natural habitats</li> </ul>	Not relevant for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring the economic and rational use of land, particular emphasis being placed on quality of life, natural hazards, or uncontrolled urban expansion</li> <li>• integrating landscape into regional and town planning policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape</li> <li>• Co-ordinated and integrated infrastructure planning and management for avoiding inefficient investments and impact on landscapes</li> </ul>
<b>coherence of devices with other devices of the principle</b>	generally: Devices from this group function in synergy, as they are in fact parts of the same complex device “nature conservation areas”. Forest reserves are one narrower part of this approach, which falls well into the scope of wider protection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conservation areas are in synergy with promotion and management plans</li> <li>• forest reserves are complementary to conservation areas and promotion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inspite of high synergy /complementarity of devices problems arise mainly due to lack of management plans and documents, weak organization and low effectiveness of inspection and control and inadequate communication with local communities and involved public</li> </ul>
<b>impacts of devices</b> <i>(source: pilot area case study, expert interviews)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• landscape and biodiversity is conserved and developed, natural structures within habitats as well as ecological connections are preserved and/or established, suitable living condition for species are maintained, populations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conflicts over use of space due to restrictive measures,</li> <li>• impeded RD and rational land use</li> <li>• increased development pressures on the bordering areas</li> <li>• rule violations and evasions - illegal development</li> </ul>

STEP 1: achievements and deficits NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS		
	+	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for species are maintained, populations of endangered species are maintained<sup>6</sup></li> <li>land uses and activities in parks are conciliated with protection considerations, pressures on endangered species are reduced in critical periods</li> <li>raised awareness among inhabitants, visitors, general public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development,</li> <li>passivization of local development initiative</li> <li>attracting secondary housing to area, conflicts with residents</li> </ul>
<b>impact cross-check</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>positive impacts complement each other (activities with environmental impacts are not allowed in sensitive areas, conservation of habitats supports maintenance of endangered species as well as biodiversity...)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>restrictions narrow opportunities for economic viability of activities for local residents</li> <li>restrictions concentrate development on park borders, causing pressures in border as well as back to protected area</li> <li>promotion of parks attracts visitors, secondary housing ...contradicting protection aims</li> <li>strict and rigid restriction cause evasions, which can have even worse impacts</li> </ul>
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>legislation for environment (1993) and nature protection (1999) is very recent, so achievement can't be reliably evaluated</li> <li>the objective to protect more than 30% of Slovenian territory was set very ambitiously, but is far from achieved (and feasible)</li> <li>Management plans are only prepared and confirmed in few cases, for TNP there is still no formal management plan.</li> <li>implementation of restrictions (e.g. limiting construction within the TNP) not entirely successful</li> </ul>	
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>achievements in protection of natural habitats and processes do comply with RSS, so does preservation and/or introduction of traditional land-uses to preserve cultural landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>most contradictory are conflicts with other sectors and local inhabitants, which hinder integrative strategies and planning efforts for commonly agreed objectives</li> <li>rational land-use as well as activation of local resources is sometimes hampered due to rigid sectorial views</li> </ul>
<b>relation to developments and trends (WP2,4)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high relevance for valuable natural areas, which are subject to increasing developmental pressures</li> <li>relevant also for valuable CL areas subject to overgrowing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>less relevant where development needs to be directed, initialised, ... as a part of the problem (i.e. activation of local resources in suburban areas, restructuring agriculture and tourism...)</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TNP helped preserve nature as major (national and) local asset</li> <li>TNP image attracts consumers in the area, providing market for local resources</li> <li>TNP supports development of ecological agriculture and preservation of traditional crafts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>economic growth impeded by strict measures</li> <li>negative impacts such as secondary homes building are not prevented</li> <li>increased pressure for development in specific areas</li> </ul>
<b>relation to WP4</b>	relevance:	

<sup>6</sup> These impacts are difficult to measure and empirically proved. However, according to some expert opinions, they are sufficiently achieved at least within TNP as well as natural and forest reserves.

STEP 1: achievements and deficits NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS		
	+	-
<b>cluster</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high relevance for peripheral areas and touristic areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not relevant for areas where active development is under way or is desired (local centers, suburban areas, some tourist areas)</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>positive impacts by protecting nature as a local resource as well as supporting sustainable ways of development and providing market</li> <li>limiting suburban development into most valuable areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attracting suburbanization in bordering areas</li> <li>impeding activation of certain local resources</li> </ul>
<b>relation to local demand (WP5)</b>	relevance:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TNP objectives correspond to local perception of preserved nature as their primary local asset</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conflicting interests with development initiatives;</li> </ul>
	impacts:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>restrictions of TNP generally prevented the process of urbanization within TNP</li> <li>some measures like restriction of building secondary homes correspond to their pretensions)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>preserved nature attracts newcomers (permanent as well as weekend residents), which is not always accepted by locals</li> <li>too strict measures impede local development</li> </ul>
<b>synthesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim to protect 30% of Slovenian territory is far from achieved, feasibility is questionable, mostly due to lack of trans-sectoral cooperation and integrating protection objectives into spatial and developmental planning and programming, NC sector is considered as too restrictive for RD and very rigid, leading to conflicts over use of space, negative public opinion and opposition to enlargement or establishment of new NC areas. This principle is successful in protecting nature, but much less successful in dealing with issues where active approach is needed to maintain and/or develop valuable cultural assets or conciliate development and protection requirements. Principle is much more successful if there is a holistic approach and good cooperation with locals (TNP)</li> </ul>	

## Step 2: detecting reasons for deficits and achievements

STEP 2a: reasons for deficits NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS			
	reason hypothetical	verification options	reasons verified
<b>relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principle is applied on large area with complex problems, while being under competence of only one sector (nature conservation), which does not have other issues, such as protection and development of CL as a priority</li> <li>Competition between nature conservation areas and spatial planning</li> <li>Lack of trans- sectoral cooperation and integrative approaches</li> <li>lack of public participation</li> </ul>		
<b>coherence of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of trans- sectoral cooperation and integrative approaches</li> <li>lack of management plans and documents, weak organization,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
<b>impacts of devices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of trans- sectoral cooperation and integrative approaches</li> <li>Lack of evaluation of impacts (presumably not needed)</li> </ul>		

<b>STEP 2a: reasons for deficits</b> NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS			
	<b>reason hypothetical</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons verified</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for protection measures)</li> <li>• rigid restrictions, not tuned to local needs</li> <li>• violations and evasions of legislation</li> </ul>		
<b>achievement of objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• placement of the principle under Nature protection sector, which lacks several important instruments</li> <li>• restrictive measures for development impede achievement of objectives targeted to maintaining settlement and CL</li> <li>• lack of adequate supportive instruments /subsidies, incentives)</li> <li>• lack of measures to conciliate with other sectors</li> <li>• lack of trust for the NC sector and its negative image in public opinion as being too restrictive for regional development and non cooperative with local interest groups.</li> <li>• low effectiveness of inspection and control</li> </ul>		
<b>consistence impacts – RSS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• placement of the principle under Nature protection sector, lack of coordination with other sectors, lack of implementation</li> <li>• lack of management plans and documents, weak organization,</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP2,4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of trans- sectoral cooperation and integrative approaches</li> <li>• rigid restrictions, not tuned to local needs</li> <li>• low effectiveness of inspection and control</li> </ul>		
<b>relation to WP4 cluster</b>			
<b>relation to WP5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inadequate communication with local communities and involved public</li> <li>• no appropriate means for compensations in case of limitations</li> <li>• discontent and opposition for establishment of new protected areas due to conservative and authoritative approach of the sector</li> </ul>		

<b>STEP 2b: reasons for achievements</b> NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS			
	<b>reason hypothetical</b>	<b>verification options</b>	<b>reasons verified</b>
<b>reasons for achievements / good practice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TNP can be considered a successful achievement, mainly due to its long tradition and relatively independent status with rather trans-sectoral attitude (in distinction with most protected areas)</li> <li>• TNP is welcomed by locals as it provides jobs, attracts tourists to the area</li> <li>• local residents have high opinion and consciousness of protected area ad CL values</li> <li>• carefully planned and implemented promotional activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

### Step 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5

STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5 NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS		
	input concerning principle	conclusion for principle/devices
WP2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expansion of tourism could also be seen as a threat to TNP as tourists penetrate to small remote places, cars are left outside parking places and other pollution is also present (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.34)</li> <li>• TNP representatives mentioned that the municipalities just charge for parking without reinvesting the income into nature conservation (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.36)</li> <li>• restrictions if they are to be efficient must not be too strict – this applies for TNP, regulations are prohibiting almost any kind of intervention (problem for people living in TNP area) – conflicts between CL preservation interests and needs of locals (Annex 5.7 WP2 Task 2.5, 2.6 Regional report SLO, p.37)</li> <li>• setting the line between tourism as means of income and tourism as a source of harm for the env...(37)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the set of measures, used to achieve nature / environment protection should be more complex and sensitive; i.e. restrictions should be complemented with incentives, alternative options should be offered, (i.e. free parking and organized transport should complement traffic restrictions...),</li> <li>• tourism should be carefully planned – the promotion of protected areas, while necessary to gain public support, is also dangerous because it may attract a lot of people to sensitive areas</li> <li>• income generated because of natural values (within as well as on the borders of the parks) should be reinvested in nature conservation</li> <li>• this type of device seems to be, in spite of many reservations, rather attractive and possibly more effective in terms of RD (living in a park, possibility to market products under park labels, special types of tourism offer etc.) than nature conservation</li> </ul>
WP 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• due to vulnerability of designated nature areas, development of tourism should be limited and oriented to non mass tourism, the so-called soft tourism – biking and hiking has spread already; due to high demand for holiday dwellings and parking land use conflicts appear (WP4, Task 4.4, Pilot region scenarios SLO, Final report, p.8, introduction)</li> <li>• strict nature conservation policy implementation in TNP will lead to aggravation of the existing , as well as to emergence of new conflicts (...10, INS)</li> <li>• in Alpine valleys area conflicts between nature conservation and economic uses by residential population, as well as between residential population, owners of holiday dwellings and tourists will aggravate / emerge (...22, INS)</li> <li>• forest overgrowth and loss of valuable Narcissus flower meadows will result in a diminished biodiversity of the SP areas (...22, INS)</li> <li>• there are possibilities for further development and improvement from tourism, but limitations need to be set and enforced (WP4, Task 4.4, Pilot region scenarios SLO, Final report, p.8)</li> <li>• instruments to protect nature outside protected areas will be introduced and implemented (...10)</li> <li>• better implementation of conservation objectives, better acceptance among inhabitants and users will be achieved by applying supportive means (i.e. fees, licenses.... measures will be planned with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tourism should be carefully planned – the promotion of protected areas, while necessary to gain public support, is also dangerous because it may attract a lot of people to sensitive areas</li> <li>• restrictions and management of TNP should be discussed with locals as well as representatives of other users</li> <li>• because the Park boundaries are always arbitrary, the nature conservation efforts should not all be concentrated within the boundaries, but should be presented in the whole area. more effective cooperation should be achieved in spatial planning as well as planning and programming of other sectors.</li> <li>• the set of measures, used to achieve nature / environment protection should be more complex and sensitive; i.e. restrictions should be complemented with incentives, alternative options should be offered, (i.e. free parking and organized transport should complement traffic restrictions...),</li> </ul>

STEP 3: further input WP 2, 4, 5 NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS		
	input concerning principle	conclusion for principle/devices
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cooperation of involved actors (...31)</li> <li>more effective reconciliation between protection and (tourism) development (...49)</li> </ul>	
WP 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>need for aggravation of restrictions for exploitation of natural sources (...9)</li> <li>assuring participation of inhabitants in decision making and management of TNP, mutual cooperation of inhabitants (...12)</li> <li>more flexible managing of TNP, limitations (connected with payment of entrance fees...registration of users or providers of different services) instead of severe restrictions (...11)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the set of measures, used to achieve nature / environment protection should be more complex; i.e. restrictions should be complemented with incentives, alternative options should be offered (i.e. free parking and organized transport should complement traffic restrictions...)</li> <li>restrictions and management of TNP should be discussed with locals as well as representatives of other users</li> </ul>

#### STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations

STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS	
existing technical recommend.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operationalisation of political aims, laws and regulations and introduction of monitoring processes and evaluation (CH,5.6)</li> <li>Promotion of “new governance” processes: more democracy, more participation (D,3.2)</li> <li>Reduction of conflicts and enhancement of synergies between economy, tourism, agriculture, forestry, cultural landscape and environment (D,3.13)</li> <li>Avoidance of strictly sectoral considerations and actions, preference of cross-sector approaches integrating all relevant issues (D,3.16; F,7.2)</li> <li>improvement of formulation and implementation of laws and binding instruments, increase of subsidies, establishment of informal instruments (integrated regional concepts, participation of locals, voluntary actions) (D,3.4 (4); A,4.1; Ch,5.7; F,7.2)</li> </ul>
existing thematic recommend.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Consensus is that nature, environment and biodiversity have to be protected within the alpine space, but there are diverging opinions about how to reach this aim – by more restrictive authoritarian intervention (establishing more restrictive laws and nature protection areas) or by “new” instruments like regional or local development concepts (adapted to the specific situation), voluntary cooperation, participation processes etc. (D,3.11)</i></li> <li>more emphasis on landscape development than only on conservation: a positive sustainable and flexible development should be strengthened instead of introducing new restrictions (p. 22) (D,3.4)</li> <li>Reduction of negative impacts of all kinds of land-use on nature and environment, improvement of cooperation between the different types of land-use, enhancement of synergies; particular attention and efforts in areas with high pressure on nature and environment (D, 3.6)</li> <li>better results could be reached in protecting cultural landscape if the protection would be not based on legal norms but on voluntarily accepted contracts (p. 61).</li> <li>Preservation of environmental qualities based on endogenous incentives (p.16)</li> <li>Because of increasing demands for security in alpine space (concerning natural hazards) by inhabitants and tourists, a comprehensive policy of area protection (“<i>Flächenschutzpolitik</i>”) is more and more important. To reach this goal, agriculture and forestry have to be more included than actually (p.19).</li> <li>Ecologically compatible tourism can only be enforced if it gets directed benefits, if the local population is informed and if there are made “pacts” (between the government.</li> </ul>

**STEP 4: reviewing existing recommendations** NATURE AND CL CONSERVATION THROUGH PROTECTED AREAS

	<p>associations and unions) (p. 22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological awareness concerning tourism in mountain areas is important for the contractor and the consumer. Measures to enforce ecological awareness should cover people of all ages and should be advanced by policy and scientists (p. 22).</li><li>• Adverse environmental protection behaviour has to be punished; but it would be more effective to bunch the controls (whereof also the farmers would benefit) (p.36)</li><li>• It is recommended that consideration be given to increase funding for a more vigorous policy in regard to protected areas; increase the surface area devoted to biotope protection; establish an ecological network; set realistic quantitative targets for biotope and species preservation; improve monitoring and assessment of results; strengthen the partnership between actors; (p.64)</li><li>• Greater weight should be given to the integration of environmental concerns in economic and social policies. Problems also persist in regard to balancing nature conservation, tourism and land use objectives (p.64)</li><li>• Particular attention should be devoted to nature conservation in areas with increasing density of settlements and accelerated development of economic activities, while at the same time providing sufficiently large areas for leisure and recreation as part of high-quality living environment (p.71)</li><li>• The possibilities for enlargement and consolidation of protected areas should be studied, taking into consideration nature protection, scientific and tourist requirements, as well as the potential of rural areas for living and the development of environmentally-friendly economic activities. (p.71)</li><li>• The guiding of spatial development in the landscape should ensure the integration of naturally preserved areas into a network and their eventual linking to the system of European natural corridors (eco corridors). (p.72)</li><li>• Protected areas could be a suitable mean to contribute to an improved income situation in agriculture and forestry (p.59)</li></ul>
<b>synthesis</b>	

## 6.2 List of draft recommendations

### 6.2.1 Transverzal recommendations

(1) Adaptation to future perspectives, especially the centre/ periphery dilemma.

This option seems particularly relevant in the case of Slovenija. Although the majority of the legislation and policy documents are brand new, there seems to be a considerable lack of future perspective, i.e. there is too much orientation into solving existing problems instead of anticipation of problems in the future. For example, the emerging lifestyles which will not any more fit into the traditional urban-rural classification countryside are not sufficiently taken into account. Countryside is therefore still almost exclusively treated as agricultural – productive landscape. The measures to regulate possible landscapes, resulting from mentioned trends are missing. The efficiency objective as alternative option to balanced development raises some questions regarding social fairness and equity.

### 6.2.2 Principle: “Supporting agriculture”

(1) The (public interest) objectives of agriculture need to be verified and /or re-evaluated in an open public debate, where the benefits have to be clearly defined and faced with the costs. Such clarification would help to determine the criteria for allocation of resources as well as preferred results.

(2) The vitality of countryside decisively depends on the level of infrastructure and services. The resources might be better invested in providing these services as well as jobs. (Example: subsidizing grocery store in Škocjan regional park). These subsidies should be provided from resources other than agriculture (regional funds?) (workshop)

(3) At least certain share of agricultural income should be left to the (tourist) market, which is the most rapidly growing economy. This would have several beneficial effects: It would keep farming in the market as a vital and competitive activity, it would relieve public budget and assure that services provided by farmers are really in demand, and not something conceived by experts and bureaucrats in their offices. In this case, initial incentives should be directed in education of farmers in basic touristic skills (languages, bookkeeping, marketing,...) Clearly, not all problems of agriculture can be solved in this way (workshop).

(4) In cases where the objectives are overlapping joint measures of agriculture and other sectors should be conceived (example: Slovenian agri-environmental program – measures in Triglav national park, measures in Special protected areas are joint measures of agriculture and nature conservation towards maintenance of biodiversity). Similar principle could be applied with cultural heritage and other policies (workshop)

(5) Decentralization of measures: local communities should have some competence over where to allocate the subsidies

(6) Individualized approach and active involvement of farmers. The subsidies could be introduced through active cooperation of farmer with advisory services and experts (biologists,

tourism developers etc). The future for each farm could be individually discussed and strategy chosen accordingly. Such individualized approach would require a lot more input on the side of administration (in terms of money, time and personnel) but would result in much better targeting of spent resources and higher commitment of farmers (workshop).

(8) The circulation of agricultural land should be enabled. The system of subsidies seriously hinders the land market, therefore blocking active use of farm land even in those cases, where there are opportunities and potential users. The fund of agricultural land need to become a more active player and should be able to function as a “broker” for agricultural land and foster the cultivation wherever there is some initiative.

### 6.2.3 Principle: “Protected areas”

(1) The set of nature conservation measures should be more complex and sensitive; i.e. restrictions should be complemented with incentives, alternative options should be offered, (i.e. free parking and organized transport should complement traffic restrictions...), (WP2,4,5)

(2) Tourism within conservation areas should be carefully planned – the promotion of protected areas, while necessary to gain public support, is also dangerous because it may attract a lot of people to sensitive areas. The cooperation of the two sectors should be achieved in order to avoid conflicts in the phase of granting/refusing permits and to manage the tourist activities which do not require permits. There are several options, such as redirecting visitors to less vulnerable areas, discouraging access... (WP2,4,5, workshop)

(3) The question of resources for paying for conservation (EU/State subsidies or other financial contributions) is at present not a very pertinent one. However, if the planned 38% of national territory will become Natura 2000 areas they may require a lot of resources for maintenance. Therefore the question of obtaining this money will become critical. Income generated because of natural values (within as well as on the borders of the area) should be reinvested in nature conservation. Visitors of the area are the most obvious target group that could contribute. But the question of equity (i.e. nature should be free for all to enjoy) can be raised. The “land-users” and developers on the borders of protected areas are less obvious, but sometimes most “rewarded” by declaring protected areas. Therefore they should in some way contribute money for nature conservation.

(4) Improving public participation. Restrictions and management of conservation areas should be discussed with locals as well as representatives of other users (WP2,4,5)

(5) The nature conservation efforts should not all be concentrated within the boundaries of conservation areas, but should be present in the whole area. If all the resources are focussed into protected areas there is the danger to neglect the nature outside protection areas (as is the case with Natura 2000 in Slovenija at the time). There are several effective measures that only need to be applied (landscape / environmental planning approaches, EIA and SEIA, planning and programming of other sectors etc).

#### 6.2.4 Principle: “Spatial planning”

(1) Improved transparency of the planning processes with active involvement of public. This is a way to ensure timely documents, responsive to the needs and problems in society, to provide legal security, reduce land speculation and optimise spatial development. The “flexibility” could be achieved without reducing legal security and speed of the process (WP2,4,5)

(2) Planning documents should be prepared on regional / strategic level, as well as on local / concrete level. The strategic planning documents on regional level should address common issues – to reduce burdens on local communities in preparations of own plans, to improve coordination and integration, to reduce possibility of developers to influence plans to the costs of public interests. (WP2,4,5, workshop)

(3) Local needs and specific requirements need to be accounted for. Therefore, the conservation authorities should be “forced” to negotiate, and not given automatically right to veto developmental initiatives. This may prevent breaking and evading the regulations. (WP2,4,5). They should also improve their inputs (they are required to prepare sectorial guidelines for development) for spatial local plans (workshop).

(4) Development initiatives should be thoroughly assessed in the planning process to avoid adverse impacts. Besides established instruments such as SEIA and EIA, other approaches should be applied as well; i.e. study of alternative scenarios (WP2,4,5). These procedures, especially if implemented by active involvement of all actors would have beneficial effects in terms of improved cooperation between conservation, planning and local authorities (workshop).

(5) The coherence problem between the aim of diversification of activities (including use of local resources) and several provisions for protection of agricultural land / planning regulations needs to be resolved on case by case basis (WP2,4,5). All the sectorial provision, which have implications for land use should be conciliated within planning procedures. The problem of different time-dynamic needs to be resolved (workshop)

(6) Education and promotion (courses, advisory services, booklets...) of best practices in quality, “context sensitive” architecture and building should be organized to improve knowledge and responsibility of everybody intending to build or renovate. People should not only be told what (not) to do, but also explained why (WP2,4,5, workshop).

### **6.3 Cross check results: transferability, existing recommendations, feasibility**

#### 6.3.1 Transverzal recommendations

Proposed (draft) recommendations:

- (1) CL / RD issues require future perspectives
- (2) The regional level needs to gain more administrative power.
- (3) The measures should take into account their adaptation to the specific regional situations

#### Overall transferability cross-check:

There are no contradictions on trans-national level. Especially the proposals (2) and (3) were proposed and/or supported by several partners' recommendations (Germany, Italy, Austria).

One complementary recommendation was added to the list:

- (4) Bottom-up approaches have to be strengthened (proposed by Austria, Germany and France)

#### Transferability, existing recommendations and feasibility analysis for individual recommendations:

## Balancing economic, landscape and environmental issues requires future perspectives

### Transferability cross-check:

There was no significant contradiction among partners' proposals. However not many partners mentioned similar recommendations.

### Existing recommendations cross-check:

On general more documents address existing and most crucial problems (dispersed settlement, forest overgrowing and abandonment of farm land...), some strategic documents are as presumed more future oriented, but on the other hand too principled and general.

PRO: For instance: Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia states that special attention should be devoted to the development of regional centres in border areas, with promotion of the development generators in these areas. Also a very general statement in Spatial order aiming at preservation of spatial capacity for present and future generations.

CONTRA/OPPOSITE: There are many statements concerning existing problems, such as: restoring degraded landscapes resulting from various intensive land uses (Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia), preservation of agricultural land, to control unavoidable processes of rural landscape transformation due to the abandonment of agricultural land use and forest overgrowing. Similar more concrete prepositions, for instance: development and maintenance of a multifunctional countryside, its diversified activities connected with agriculture and forestry and consequently preservation of the cultural landscape. Stimulation and diversification of employment possibilities in order to lessen migrations (Spatial development strategy).

Future oriented statements are somehow more protection rather than development oriented, for instance (Spatial order): development should contribute to preserving national identity by preservation of the landscape and urban and cultural heritage, areas of outstanding natural value and biodiversity, reaching basic goals of spatial planning and towards reconciliation and linked economical, social and environmental politics and to diminishing distinctions in regional development.

### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	rather "qualitative" recommendation, difficult to implement normatively	low
overall effort required	not so much effort once the "critical mass" of involved actors accept the concept	medium
"price-performance ratio"	Since no additional costs are involved, the ratio is favourable	high
Political / administrative situation	There is no formal barrier to implement forward oriented perspective, however many (recent) official documents were prepared on existing scientific base with more conservative assumptions. Therefore, there may be difficulties to bring about	medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	change	
financial resources	There are no specific additional costs involved, resources from EU research projects (ESPON, 6 <sup>th</sup> framework) could be used to finance development of the new methodological and theoretical framework. Also, the new Development strategy of Slovenia proposes significant share of public expenditure for R&D	high
human resources	There are no specific requirement for additional personnel, however having new people on certain positions might help	medium
attitude of relevant target groups	generally, the discussion of CL reflects a prevalingly conservative attitude of policy makers as well as NGOs and some experts, which is slow to change	Low-medium
synthesis	It is a specific recommendation that can not be formally or normatively put into force, but requires recognition and acceptance of different actors. The experts and academics in concerned fields should promote new approaches and stimulate future oriented perspectives. The recommendation seems an inevitable one to implement sooner or later, but it may take some time.	

**The regional level is a necessary, although lacking level to address RD/CL issues: it needs consolidation as well as more administrative power**

Transferability cross-check:

There was no significant contradiction among partners' proposals. Similar and/or supporting proposals were developed by several partners (Germany, Italy, Austria).

Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: In existing documents regional level is explicitly mentioned in Single programming document, stating that "enhancing the role of endogenous potential in regional development calls for decentralisation. Activities aimed at promoting regional development involve a wide range of policy measures, including introducing local self-governance and establishing regions.

Strategy for development of Slovenia is critical to past polycentric development that has spurred the development of many new municipalities, but at the same time weakened their competencies as well as neglected regional level. At present, regions without distinctive functional centers don't have the ability to transform into provinces (formal regions).

Spatial order claims for conciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all participators of spatial planning on all decision-making levels.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	Recommendation largely depends on formal (administrative) framework, however the cooperation on regional level could still be improved despite formal barriers	medium
overall effort required	Politically sensitive question, needs a lot of conciliation and favourable distribution of political powers	medium
"price-performance ratio"	Difficult to assess: the redistribution of competences requires redistribution of resources, and usually introduction of new administrative bodies requires higher amount of resources. On the other hand, the outputs are difficult to measure but should in general help to bring about faster and more efficient action, especially in shorter - terms	Medium-high
Political / administrative situation	There is at present still a formal barrier since the regional level of administration is not yet established, but is in process	medium
financial resources	The financial resources would have to be transferred from state and local administrations according to transferred competencies	medium
human resources	There would be need for additional personnel, however regions could provide shared human resources for local communities and thus ameliorate the lack of personnel that the local communities experience right now.	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of regions, but when it comes to realization it is obvious that they are not really willing to hand over their competences	low-medium
synthesis	There is at present still a formal barrier since the regional level of administration is not yet established. This may take some time since it is a politically sensitive question, which needs a lot of conciliation and favourable distribution of political powers. On the other hand, some level of regional action already takes place on the basis of voluntarily cooperation between local communities and/or between local communities and the state. This experience could be a good base to build upon	

**The measures should take into account and be sensitive to the specific regional situations**

Transferability cross-check:

This recommendation is supported by several partners' recommendations (Austria, Italy, Switzerland), mainly proposed under the policy principle "investments in infrastructure, enterprises and business initiatives including tourism".

Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: Spatial development strategy contains recommendations aiming at adapting to local/regional conditions, which are mostly of protective nature even if they concern development (tendencies for preserving typical architecture, identity of different areas, especially valuable rural areas and landscape. Planning and designing of rural settlements should consider contemporary development trends and simultaneously preserve traditional

structures; spatial development must preserve integral identity of landscape areas important for national identity).

Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia contains more direct connection with adopting legislation to specific space and condition: Development programmes for the demographically endangered areas must be based on the local characteristics and their comparative advantages.

Strategy for development of Slovenia brings forward that decisions should be taken as close as possible to people and thus adapted to particular needs of that area.

Single programming document adopts “spatial targeting approach”, whereby the way of implementation should be adopted to specific development policy in a way that it won’t affect overall national productiveness.

CONTRA In some documents also tendencies of common, basic policy appear such as statement (Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia): Timely and high-quality planning of settlements is needed to prevent insufficiently considered or forced spatial development activities based on partial solutions from location to location. Here adaptation of planning is not meant as good but as partial.

#### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	rather “qualitative” recommendation, the normative implementation would differ from sector to sector	medium
overall effort required	considerable effort is required: the arguments need to be presented, the changes of legislation for some measures need to be adopted, the criteria for regional differentiation and the indicators for monitoring need to be established...	low
“price-performance ratio”	No need for an overall rise of the financial input is involved . On the other hand, the expenditure for measures could be much more directed, therefore achieving much better results	high
Political / administrative situation	For some programmes there is no formal barrier to implement regional/geographical differentiations. However, with some measures, certain hesitations regarding equity could be involved. Also if a measure requires back-up of a formal document, this should be elaborated and passed, which may be a complicated and lengthy procedure.	low-medium
financial resources	As with the efforts, there would be some additional costs involved in setting up the procedures, but these would (presumably) not exceed existing budgets.	high
human resources	There is no specific requirement for additional personnel, however such approaches would require knowledge in the fields of spatial planning/landscape architecture/geography...	medium
attitude of relevant target groups	There is no a-priori refusal of regional-specific approach. However in implementation phases it might cause some conflicts and opposition. The administration suffers from rigidity so there might be refusal to change existing procedures.	medium
synthesis	Considerable effort is required to apply this recommendation, especially in policy programmes with existing firm procedural rules and criteria. Considering the proverbial rigidity of the administration no radical change can be expected. On the other hand, this approach can be taken gradually and for individual measures where it can bring about significant results and improve the effectiveness of	

**STEP 6: assessment of feasibility**

indicator	features	feasibility
	certain measures.	

**Bottom-up approaches have to be strengthened and supported by formal procedures as well as innovative approaches**

Transferability cross-check:

The recommendation was transferred and adapted from proposals of Austria, Germany and France.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

In favour of this recommendation are statements concerning:

- Conciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all participators of spatial planning on all decision-making levels (Spatial order) and
- including broad public in (legislative) procedure of search for solution (according to different criteria and minimal environmental impacts).
- Improvement of efficacy and participation in political decision-making, invigoration of dialogue between institutions and civil public (Development strategy of Slovenia).

Also in agricultural policy documents the cooperation between levels (state and farming community) is explicitly mentioned (CRPOV, Integrated rural development and village renewal), agricultural policy emphasizes adaptation to local conditions, small projects, education and promotion (Slovene agri-environmental programme, EKO IV).

Feasibility cross-check:

<b>STEP 6: assessment of feasibility</b>		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This is a well known and often mentioned recommendation, for which formal framework is only rarely established.	medium
overall effort required	There is quite a lot of effort involved to motivate and coordinate the actors: on the side of policy-makers as well as on the side of public (NGOs, local groups, individuals). In many cases the procedures still have to be established and there is still a prevailing (often justified) opinion that participation makes processes longer and more complicated.	medium
“price-performance ratio”	Difficult to assess. A general assessment holds that the bottom-up approaches are more expensive due to larger number of involved actors and longer procedures. There is no data however on how much in comparison with more traditional top-down approaches. On the other hand, the outputs are also difficult to measure: a somewhat more expensive and longer process could still be worthwhile if the results are better and the plan/project is implemented.	medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers to implement more bottom-up approaches. However they are only seldom formally required (.e. in spatial planning) more often the decision is left over to authorities	medium
financial resources	At present there is no organized way (for example special funds) to finance bottom-up approaches. The financing of NGOs is somewhat regulated, and some forms of cooperative approaches (workshops, round-tables, promotion materials) can compete for funding from national budget (Ministry for spatial planning). EU funds also support participation projects	medium
human resources	There is certain lack of properly trained professionals to facilitate as well as conceive the bottom-up processes, but is not considered critical.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of bottom-up approaches, but when it comes to realization it is obvious that there is not enough will neither know-how on the side of local /national administrations as well as certain reluctance and fear of losing competence. There is also a sort of over-saturation with bottom-up events (workshops, round-tables, meetings etc...), often extremely time-consuming and with only limited effects so people are sometimes overloaded and not motivated to participate. Especially in smaller communities this could be a problem because there are only few individuals that 'have to' participate in every bottom-up event.	low-medium
synthesis	This is a well known and officially recognized concept, but only seldom formally required (i.e. in spatial planning) and regulated and therefore not so often implemented. The implementation is left over to responsible authorities who lack the know-how as well as show certain reluctance and fear of losing competence. This can be therefore considered the main barrier. On the other hand the problems of missing methodologies and lack of trained facilitators should not be too difficult to overcome.	

### 6.3.2 Principle: “Supporting agriculture”

#### Proposed (draft) recommendations:

- (1) The objectives of agriculture need to be verified and /or re-evaluated
- (2) Reallocation of resources towards providing basic services as well as jobs in the countryside
- (3) Leaving certain share of agricultural income to the (tourist) market, with initial incentives directed in education of farmers.
- (4) Joint (or at least not contradicting) measures of agriculture and other sectors in cases of overlapping objectives i.e. diversification of farms.
- (5) Decentralization of measures: local communities should have some competence over allocation of the subsidies
- (6) Individualized approach and active involvement of farmers.
- (7) Enabling the circulation of agricultural land (activation of the fund of agricultural land).

#### Overall transferability cross-check:

Our set of recommendations does not entirely comply with the statement that “Agriculture policy has the potential to be the most advanced policy with regard to sustainability and to combine the main objectives of all dimensions (economical, social, and ecological), as it comprises investments in the scopes of agriculture, natural space, and population” (Swiss team; see transferability check list, Chapter 7.2; p. 13). With the changing role of agriculture in the countryside we do not feel that agricultural policy is the most powerful and competent to solve problems of CL/RD neither that it could or should be given exclusive responsibility for countryside. On the other hand we do agree that “Besides agriculture, new ways of financing outstanding CL have to be found; especially in areas where agriculture is less efficient, or because one believes that the agriculture sector shouldn’t assume the whole costs of CL” (Swiss team; see transferability check list, Chapter 7.2; p. 16) and that “In the future, rural development should not be fostered through agricultural policy alone or through measures, which exist mainly to support agriculture, as is being planned at the EU level (Austrian team, see transferability check list, Chapter 7.6; p.22). We feel that there is some inconsistency between the two attitudes.

Similarly, the recommendation that alpine agriculture needs to be maintained (ibid; item 2) has to be taken with certain reservations. Not unconditionally, not everywhere, not at any price. There are however complying findings (by German and Swiss team), stating that “Area-wide agriculture isn’t a must, but the abandonment of large areas should be avoided” and that “A strategy towards coping with some level of abandonment should be outlined” (Austrian team) (see transferability check list, Chapter 7.2; p. 16).

One complementary measure was added to the list:

- (8) Acting on consumers’ attitude may bring considerable benefits (proposed by German partners).

---

Transferability, existing recommendations and feasibility analysis for individual recommendations:

**The objectives of agriculture need to be verified and /or re -evaluated**

Transferability cross-check:

There are several recommendations that address this issue, especially as regards definition of multifunctionality (Austria), the role of CL, the criteria of eligibility for subsidies etc. However not many recommendations explicitly require re-assessment. This may be due to the recent adoption of EU agri-policy by Slovenian policy and lack of verification in national context.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: Slovene agri-environmental programme assigns multifunctional role of agriculture, since measures are not associated exclusively with production, but observe environmental, social, spatial and demographic aspects of countryside. Programme also supports preservation of nature, biodiversity, soil fertility and traditional cultural landscape (mountain pastures, steep slopes mowing, humpy meadows mowing, meadow orchards, rearing of traditional and rare regionally agricultural plants, sustainable animal breeding (EKO II)

There are some claims of adjusting agriculture to spatial potentials (i.e. modern farm methods on flatlands, sparing crops on water deficit areas) – probably attempting to lessen expenses of farming and claims to repay damage in case of droughts... (Spatial development strategy). Other possibility mentioned is combining agriculture with other activities - including also different financial sources, for instance: Unavoidable processes of rural landscape transformation due to the abandonment of agricultural land use and forestation should be controlled by means of cultural landscape conservation and with reconciliation with recreational and other activities (Spatial development strategy).

CONTRA: Some reviewed documents do not mention reduction of payments but encourage use and introduce direct payments (per hectare), and support of market neutrality, support of environmentally friendly agriculture (BAT-best accessible technology for harvesting and increasing of cattle). Payments (EKO) have different purposes, can be combined/summed with other funds and also (co-financed) with SAPARD (Slovene agri-environmental programme).

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This is a rather radical recommendation, especially considering that agriculture policy has been recently shaped according to EU -standards and is deemed up-to date and relevant	low
overall effort required	There is quite a lot of effort involved: initiating and steering (meaningful) public debate is always a demanding task	low
"price-performance ratio"	The price involved is difficult to assess in monetary terms. On the "performance" side, the assumption is that re-evaluation of policy objectives is needed exactly because the money spent is not solving the "right" problems. The reshaping of the policy should cause reallocation of money so that it would bring much better (and socially relevant) results.	medium-high
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers for reshaping the policy objective. It is dependent on the attitude of responsible policy makers (see below)	medium
financial resources	The recommendation does not require raising the budget, the idea is that existing money should be reallocated	high
human resources	In agriculture policy makers there are only few experts with insight into CL/RD issues, cooperation between spatial planning (as well as other) sectors is also traditionally weak.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	Involved actors do not seem to have the need to open these questions at present. Agriculture authorities do not feel any need of verifying agricultural policy since the fact that it complies with EU is considered a satisfactory justification. There is at present also no pressure from other groups: farmers seem rather satisfied with promising subsidies,... other sectors do not have problems with agricultural measures either.	low
synthesis	An extensive legislative apparatus has recently been established to support the system of subsidies, comparable to EU. It is therefore difficult to expect much change at least in short terms. The feasibility of this measure is therefore assessed as low, also due to the political support that present policy enjoys. Since the present distribution was not verified in public it is not illegitimate to ask for changes, but at present there is no real need or pressure from actors to verify or re-shape the existing policy	

**Resources should be allocated to provide basic services as well as jobs in the countryside**

Transferability cross-check:

Many of proposals were in line with this recommendation, Austrian & Swiss teams proposed similar under the Principle "investments in infrastructure, enterprises and business initiatives including tourism".

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Spatial Development Strategy mentions following strategies: strengthening of towns and settlements in border areas, improvement of accessibility and connections with central parts of Slovenia and assurance of service and supply adjusted to defined level of urban centre. Better traffic connections for marginal regions are specially stressed as basis for their social, economic

and spatial cohesion and development. Development and maintenance of a multifunctional countryside, with diversified activities connected with agriculture and forestry and stimulation and diversification of employment possibilities in order to lessen migrations are core strategies for preservation of the cultural landscape. Development of secondary homes areas, tourism and other free time activities is mentioned as a possible strategy to support development in marginal, declining areas with valuable objects of cultural heritage (vernacular architecture). Population in areas with specific potentials and problems (coastal, hilly, mountainous, border, areas with exceptional cultural or natural values) should be retained through proper location of public services, assurance of building plots and provision of adequate infrastructure (traffic connections) and specific development programs that can exploit (particular regional) potentials (ecological agriculture, sustainable tourism, etc.).

Agricultural policy promotes this approach through Integrated rural development and village renewal (CRPOV) programmes meant to assure equal opportunities for the development of countryside and multifunctional role of agriculture. These programs focus on support for developing supplementary activities on the farm, job creation, sustainable use of renewable resources, preservation of natural, historical and cultural heritage.

Strategy for development of Slovenia states that traffic isolation amplifies developmental lag and emigration and increases weakness of regional and sub-regional centers. Goal is to improve accessibility of peripheral parts from main traffic axis and to improve inter-regional connections by improvement of public roads.

National development programme in the chapter on countryside development lists following measures: development of complementary activities and related jobs, improvement of infrastructure in the countryside, renewal and development of villages, protection of cultural heritage, diversification of agricultural as well as non-agricultural activities to ensure alternative income sources.

SAPARD sources are available for countryside development measures such as: infrastructure development and diversification of activities.

#### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This is a rather straightforward recommendation, but requires some rearrangements of priorities and policy objectives as well as cooperation and conciliation of activities between sectors	Medium
overall effort required	There is some effort involved, especially regarding cooperation and conciliation between sectors	medium
“price-performance ratio”	The price of investments in infrastructure (transport, public transport, social infrastructure, services) could be rather high. On the “performance” side, the assumption is that it should bring better results than the same amount of money invested in subsidies for agriculture.	medium-high
Political / administrative situation	The main barrier is lack of established links and cooperation between agriculture and other relevant sector (regional development, infrastructure, social services, education...)	low
financial resources	It is not expected that there would be additional sources	medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	required. The idea is that existing money should be reallocated and better targeted and that sources from different Ministries should be joined.	
human resources	There are no additional requirements for personnel, only some coordination skills and wider views are required.	medium
attitude of relevant target groups	Officially there is no refusal of inter-sectoral cooperation, however in practice it barely works. Still, the prevailing attitude that the countryside is exclusively the competence of agriculture, further hinders joint efforts	medium
synthesis	There is general agreement that basic services are needed to prevent depopulation. But this does not reflect accordingly in the devised measures. The main barrier is lack of established links and cooperation between agriculture and other relevant sector (regional development, infrastructure, social services, education...), connected to the prevailing attitude that the countryside is exclusively the competence of agriculture.	

### **Initial incentives are needed to help farmers earn a share of their income on the (tourist) market**

#### Transferability cross-check:

There is a general agreement that agriculture should be more oriented towards the market. Different options for diversification of income sources for farmers were proposed by several partners. Recommendations that were proposed by German and Austrian team could be considered complementary:

“A set of subsidies should continue to support the infrastructure and market structure which permit the commercial success of a farm (investments, new strategy towards quality production, pluriactivity etc...)”.

“One basic prerequisite for the maintenance of agriculture is the provision of capable and efficient education and formation possibilities which have to be guaranteed by the State. This is also a basis for future innovation”.

#### Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: Agricultural policy contains modernization of agriculture (competitive farms – young farm-owners, competitive food-processing industry, effective cooperation (societies) of production and market, support for restructuring of agriculture and progressive liberalization of market, supporting preparation of goods for export, transitional compensatory payments (Programme for reform of agricultural policy, 1999-2002). There are also measures (EKO IV, Slovene agri-environmental programme) to support education and promotion (education of farmers, state administration and public institute staff; informing on the significance of AE

Measures, of quality of agricultural products and foodstuffs obtained through sustainable agricultural practices).

Development strategy of Slovenia argues for redirection to more competitive agriculture (although recognizing eco-farming is an important niche as well). According to this document competitiveness could be improved by: increasing mobility of production factors, supporting capital investments, supporting management with human sources/potentials, transferring of knowledge and infrastructural support of the development.

National development programme mentions 'connecting farmers in new networks for marketing their products' as a countryside development measure.

Single programming document includes measures for diversification of activities on farms. Financial support is provided for investment in buildings, equipment, including computer software, costs of professional consultancy, feasibility studies, obtaining licences etc. Same document provides measures for marketing of quality (certified) food products, according to the quality improvement strategy, which aims at stimulating farmers to produce high quality food to achieve higher price and satisfy the consumers demand for authentic and high quality products. Support is intended for: increasing the number of certified products, improving competitiveness and consolidation of producers' associations, establishment of connected chains from producer to user, introduction of product tracking programs.

#### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This is a rather straightforward recommendation, but requires some rearrangements of priorities and policy objectives as well as cooperation and conciliation of activities between sectors	Medium
overall effort required	There is some effort involved, especially regarding devising new measures to initiate and stimulate market	medium
"price-performance ratio"	The recommendation does not incur (public) costs – on the contrary, it argues for less subsidies or at least reallocation of a part of it into initial capacity building and establishing market networks. It is expected that these short term-costs should bring higher medium and long-term benefits.	high
Political / administrative situation	There are no important political-administrative barriers, the only problem being lack of established links and cooperation between agriculture and tourism sectors	medium
financial resources	It is not expected that there would be additional sources required. The required resources should come from reallocations in budgets of agriculture as well as tourism, education, information society...	medium
human resources	There are quite demanding requirements for skills that are especially lacking in lagging areas. Also, young and flexible population would better accept this more pro-active and dynamic approach.	Low- medium
attitude of relevant target groups	Since this approach requires more active involvement of actors (farmers) compared to subsidies; as well as efforts in terms of additional education and changing life-styles, reluctance can be expected, especially among older population. Officially there is no refusal of such approach among the policy makers, but some reluctance could be expected due to lack of experience.	Low-medium

**STEP 6: assessment of feasibility**

indicator	features	feasibility
synthesis	The measure should be well accepted and easily implemented, however there are some barriers that would be especially relevant in remote, declining areas, where there is lack of human resources and reluctance to change existing attitudes and lifestyles. Lack of existing cooperation between tourism and agriculture could also hinder feasibility of this recommendation	

**Joint measures are needed; existing contradictions need to be removed**Transferability cross-check:

The case of multifunctionality was often mentioned as problematic due to restrictive provisions from different sectors (spatial planning, protection of cultural heritage, nature conservation...) and the need for cooperation was stressed as a general recommendation.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: Reviewed documents do not explicitly mention or propose measures that would contain cooperation of different policy sectors, but one reviewed programme (CRPOV, Integrated rural development and village renewal) actually works through cooperation and adjustment of different activities and contents: sustainable development of rural areas may be ensured only by joint efforts of state and farming community and support for the restructuring of agriculture and introduction of supplementary activities on the farm (creation of jobs, sustainable use of renewable resources, preservation of natural, historical and cultural heritage).

Spatial development strategy also contains the following objective: development and maintenance of a multifunctional countryside, its diversified activities connected with agriculture and forestry and consequently preservation of the cultural landscape. Stimulation and diversification of employment possibilities in order to reduce migrations. More effective farmland management should be achieved through property structure improvement, changed and improved technologies, and other structural measures of agricultural policy in accordance with the spatial potentials (i.e. modern farm methods on flatlands, sparing crops on water deficit areas).

Strategy for the development of Slovenia presents Natura 2000 as an opportunity to develop joint measures. The preparation of management plans for land use will be required to preserve or improve living conditions for protected habitats. Appropriate agricultural and forestry usage should be determined – this gives possibilities to establish well organized and financially supported mode that would profile Slovene agriculture as eco- and would support development of other connected activities.

Same document calls for integral spatial planning system for rural areas to be developed, including systematical and financial possibilities for managing building plots.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This recommendation is a part of a more general request for better cooperation between the sectors. Specifically, it addresses spatial planning regulations regarding land-use and renovation of buildings. The implementation is connected to more individualized, context sensitive and flexible approach towards permitting changes.	medium
overall effort required	There is some effort involved especially on the side of local planners, who devise planning regulations. If the innovative solutions have to be searched, as would be the case here, this inevitably causes some creative effort and responsibility.	medium
"price-performance ratio"	There are no direct costs involved. The outputs, on the other hand, might prove valuable in terms of keeping farms economically viable; enabling renovation and reuse of existing buildings etc.	high
Political / administrative situation	The new regulation on national level "spatial order" provides for several solutions concerning diversification of activities and solving spatial problems of farms. So it is mainly the task for agricultural advisory services and local planners to find the common solutions with individual farmers and promote these solutions in plans. In some cases there could be difficulties to reach a political consensus for certain solutions in local councils. The present framework already provides some sort of joint measures (mainly in terms of "lending" the agricultural financial instruments for achieving intersectoral objectives), which could be further explored without requirement for much adaptation of legislation.	high
financial resources	There are no direct costs involved.	high
human resources	There are no special requirements for personnel or specific skills. Practicing spatial planners, agricultural advisors, local officers, etc. should join forces to improve the regulations.	medium
attitude of relevant target groups	There seem to be certain lack of awareness of this particular problem on the side of agricultural as well as spatial planning authorities. All the involved actors should theoretically support the solutions, since they would solve the problems of farmers as well as their neighbours. There might be some local opposition due to particular conflicting interests.	high
synthesis	This recommendation is one of the most feasible ones. However the feasibility may differ from one local community to another. In some cases, the cooperation as well as political consent for certain solutions might be more difficult to achieve. On the other hand agricultural financial instruments could be better explored for achieving intersectoral objectives without requirement for much adaptation of legislation.	

**Decentralization of measures: regions as well as local communities should have some competence over allocation of the subsidies**

Transferability cross-check:

There were no contradicting proposals. Especially regions were mentioned as most suitable level of dealing with CL/RD issues.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

In reviewed documents there were no contents explicitly linked with this recommendation. However increased application of subsidiarity principle and a need to decentralize certain competencies is mentioned in Development Strategy of Slovenia.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	Recommendation partly depends on formal (administrative) framework, especially as regards regional level	Low-medium
overall effort required	Politically sensitive question, probably would require considerable efforts in argumentation for redistribution the competences	Low-medium
“price-performance ratio”	Difficult to assess: the redistribution of competences requires redistribution of resources, and usually additional money is needed for functioning of each administrative body. On the other hand, the outputs are difficult to measure, but could be more efficient if allocated according to local needs	medium
Political / administrative situation	There is at present still a formal barrier since the regional level of administration is not yet established. There are also at present no formal provisions for redistribution of agricultural money to local communities	low
financial resources	The available financial resources would have to be transferred from state to regional and local administrations.	high
human resources	There might be need for additional personnel, dealing with criteria and distribution of subsidies on regional/local level	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	At present all the competences are concentrated on national level and reluctance to hand them over can be expected. On the other hand, local communities would welcome the opportunity to take care of certain part of agricultural budget	low
synthesis	There are major formal barriers, limiting the redistribution of resources to regional/local level. Especially the regional level, which is not yet operational. Therefore, this recommendation is not considered very feasible at least in short term.	

**Individualized approach and active involvement of farmers**

Transferability cross-check:

There were no contradicting proposals. Many recommendations were aimed at finding “tailor-made” economic and social viable strategies for farms, which include education and capacity – building of farmers.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Agricultural policy programmes (CRPOV, Integrated rural development and village renewal) are based on cooperation and joint efforts of state and farming community and individual, adapted approach.

According to Strategy for the development of Slovenia, management with human sources/potentials and transferring of knowledge could contribute to improved competitiveness of agriculture.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendations requires some adaptation of existing measures (agricultural subsidies)	Medium - high
overall effort required	There is not so much effort involved in conceiving different measures, however, more effort would be required on the side of implementation: for advisors-professionals that would need to be involved as well as farmers	medium
“price-performance ratio”	The financial input per farm would probably have to be slightly higher. On the other hand the results from other countries (Austria, Great Britain) show that such approach may bring significantly better results. Therefore it is expected the ratio to be favourable.	medium
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers to implement such approach.	high
financial resources	The financial resources that are presently available for agricultural programs (limited conditions, agri-environmental measures, agromeliorations) would be used.	high
human resources	Certain number of trained professionals from different fields would be required (agronomists, economists, biologists, ecologists...) to participate in this scheme. They might prove difficult to find, since additional skills, such as experience with agriculture as well as readiness for field work and cooperation with farmers would also be required. There are some resources on regional level in agri-advisory services, which could be activated.	Low-medium
attitude of relevant target groups	It may be difficult to find enough professionals willing to cooperate. On the side of farmers, not everyone would be willing to participate too. Especially in most deprived areas with older populations such arrangements might be difficult to implement	medium
synthesis	The feasibility of this recommendation mainly depends on attitudes of target groups (readiness of policy makers to rearrange measures; willingness of farmers to cooperate and availability of professionals ready to be engaged in this type of work)	

**Circulation of agricultural land needs stimulation to enable formation of competitive vital farms**

Transferability cross-check:

There were no explicitly contradicting proposals. However the concept of subsidies (which was generally supported by all partners) can in itself be considered contradictory to proper functioning of land-market.

### Existing recommendations cross-check:

Development strategy of Slovenia calls for integral spatial planning system for rural areas to be developed, including systematical and financial possibilities for managing building plots. Prevention of » I build where I own land« principle and enable alternation and achievable prices for building plots acquisition. Also more intensive managing of abandoned residential and farm-buildings fund is necessary.

### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation requires harmonization as well as strengthening of role of existing measures	medium
overall effort required	The required effort is related to the assessment of existing provisions and proposing their changes in terms of better coherence	medium
“price-performance ratio”	In general, functioning of land market should relieve public budget. In long term, this ratio should be favourable. In shorter term, the measure may require (public) investments in buying land.	medium
Political / administrative situation	There have been some steps made in the direction of implementing this recommendation; the registration of property is soon to be finished, which is a necessary base for tax reforms. The fund for agricultural land is already established but not quite effective, due to several reasons such as denationalization. On the other hand, there were no steps made towards assessment of impact on subsidies on land market to-date.	medium
financial resources	The appropriate taxation system should bring in financial benefits which may be used for investments of agri-land fund.	medium
human resources	There is no direct requirement on human resources	high
attitude of relevant target groups	The popularity of subsidies at present makes it difficult to propose any changes in terms of their reduction. Tax reforms are usually not met with much enthusiasm either. However, there is a theoretical agreement among policy makers, that the land market should be revived. Farmers’s conservativeness and attachment to land is a strong limiting factor in functioning of the agricultural land market. With the generation change however, this is expected to change.	low-medium
synthesis	The feasibility of this recommendation depends on several conditions: the ability of policy makers to avoid the hindering effects of subsidies on land-market, the taxing reform and role of the fund of agricultural land. The overall feasibility is considered medium to high (in long term)	

### **Increase competitiveness of mountain farmers by acting on consumers’ preferences**

#### Transferability cross-check:

This recommendation was transferred and adapted from German proposal, and is supported by several others.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Slovene agri-environmental programme, EKO IV pillar is meant to support education and promotion (education of farmers, state administration and public institute staff; informing on the significance of AE Measures, of quality of agricultural products and foodstuffs obtained through sustainable agricultural practices)

Development strategy of Slovenija considers present integration of environmental-protection demands in consumer patterns only moderate. Development of new groups and institutions that would include all dimensions of sustainable development is too slow and hinders consistent sustainable development.

Single programming document provides measures for marketing of quality (certified) products as well as programs to raise demand for these products by informing consumers about importance of food quality.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation seems obvious but has been largely underused.	Medium-high
overall effort required	There would be some effort involved first to introduce the idea and then to devise suitable measures	medium
“price-performance ratio”	There would be direct financial cost involved in marketing campaigns as well as organizing product labels, distribution networks etc... But the long-term result should be that the consumers would contribute to “subsidies” by paying higher price for labelled products, therefore relieving public budgets as well as contribute to healthier market conditions	medium
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers to implement this recommendation.	Medium- high
financial resources	At present there are no resources allocated specifically for these activities. The resources for initial campaigns, organizing product labels, distribution networks, education, etc. would have to be obtained or re-allocated.	Low-medium
human resources	A certain number of properly trained personnel would be needed. This would probably require employing additional people or hiring suitable companies.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	There should be no problem on the side of target groups since the approach would only bring benefits to all involved (consumers, producers, policy –makers), there might be some reluctance on the side of authorities due to lack of flexibility and know-how	Medium-high
synthesis	This recommendation has been largely underused but has in our opinion high potential for efficiency since there is latent demand for healthy, local products among consumers, but has been largely unexplored. The effort and investment in organizing campaigns, distribution networks, labelling... should return many fold by transferring a part of costs of agriculture maintenance to consumers and providing healthier market conditions	

### 6.3.3 Principle: “Protected areas”

#### Proposed (draft) recommendations:

- (1) The set of nature conservation measures should be more complex and sensitive;
- (2) Tourism within conservation areas should be carefully planned; better cooperation of the two sectors is required
- (3) Income generated because of natural values should be reinvested in nature conservation.
- (4) Improving public participation and involvement of other stakeholders
- (5) Nature conservation efforts should go beyond sectoral and geographical borders of conservation areas

#### Overall transferability cross-check

The list of draft recommendation was not changed – there was no additional relevant recommendation found neither was there any significant contradiction among partners’ proposals.

#### Transferability, existing recommendations and feasibility cross-check results for individual recommendations:

#### **The set of nature conservation measures should be more complex and sensitive**

##### Transferability cross-check:

There are no contradictory recommendations. A case of a successful complex approach to protection areas are "Regional Natural Parks" (in France and Italy). They promote regional potentials and regional awareness, and keep working places in the region. They would further integrate agriculture policy with the policies of regional development, tourism, nature conservation and landscape protection as well as spatial planning. Measures such as the marketing of regional products and landscaping services can help to maintain cultural landscapes for the future. The PNR seem to be the most suitable instruments to balance the socio-economic aims of regional development and the ecological aims of landscape protection. (This presentation of “best practice” from French, Italian and Swiss partners was originally presented as “project” but seems to be relevant for the nature conservation principle in Slovenian context).

##### Existing recommendations cross-check:

Some documents mention different approaches (or special concerns) of natural conservation, for instance (Spatial Management policy of the Republic of Slovenia): particular attention should be devoted to nature conservation in areas with increasing density of settlements and accelerated

development of economic activities, while at the same time providing sufficiently large areas for leisure and recreation as part of high-quality living environment.

Reconciliation of developmental needs with claims of protection, aim toward economical and suitable handling with space, reaching sustainable use of renewable and non-renewable resources and defining land use according to quality of spatial potentials for individual activities (Spatial order).

The possibility to protect nationally important areas if protection improves managing was also mentioned. In this way areas are treated as integrities; spatial development must preserve their integral identity (Regional classification of Slovenian landscape types).

In reviewed documents there were not explicitly mentioned any alternative measures or options to lessen strictness of protection even if it would be beneficial for the development.

Spatial development strategy of Slovenija expresses concern that high share of protected areas could also mean restrictions for development. To avoid this, suitable compromises should be searched to enable development (and employment for local residents) in areas with less strict regime while at the same time achieve nature conservation goals. Same document requires the environmental protection mechanisms to be as flexible as possible, while the inspection over execution of environmental laws, regulation and standards should be more effective. Development of NGO-s for motivation, informing and advising to public should be supported to enable them equal cooperation in legislative procedures. Involvement of protected-areas residents is needed to achieve the aims of protection. Protection regime should enable integrative development by adjusted managing, residence and visiting.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	The recommendation does not apply to specific measure but to policy as a whole, requiring more sensitive and comprehensive approach. As such, it is not an easy one to achieve	Low-medium
overall effort required	There would be significant effort involved due to requirement of new measures as well as modification of existing ones. However in some cases quite a lot could be achieved with small adaptations	Low-medium
“price-performance ratio”	The price involved would depend on chosen set of complementary measures. Since the synergetic effects are expected, the ratio should turn out to be positive. However it would be in any case difficult to present clear input-output relations	Low-medium
Political / administrative situation	The administrative barriers that could hinder implementation of this recommendation are those related to lack of intersectoral cooperation, which is indispensable condition for integrated application of several measures. The cooperation between national and local authorities, which is often weak at present would also help to improve the results	Medium
financial resources	Some of the complementary measures would require additional financial inputs. The problem of resources in nature conservation sector is already quite acute and will have to be solved also for the implementation of Natura2000. There is a danger that all available resources would be allocated for	Low-medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	research work (monitoring, reporting) and administration (assessments, permitting) in Natura2000 sites.	
human resources	A certain number of people should work on devising the possibilities of complementary measures. Implementation of these measures in the field would also require additional personnel (rangers, advisors, guides...). This might have additional positive effects in opening jobs for local population in remote areas	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	The nature conservation sector as a target group may react with some reluctance due to its tradition of functioning mainly through prohibitive measures. More pro-active and cooperational attitude might therefore prove somewhat problematic. It is expected on the other hand, that local inhabitants and visitors of nature protection areas would accept most of the measures well, especially if they are devised in a participative manner.	Medium-high
synthesis	This is a complex recommendation, requiring some effort on the side of policy makers as well as efforts to promote the implementation of several measures. With participative approach the success and cost-benefit ratio would improve significantly. Natura2000 may even reduce the willingness to go on with more creative approaches, since it will focus efforts and resources in scientific and administrative tasks and further into strictly prohibitive approaches	

**Tourism within conservation areas should be carefully planned; better cooperation of the two sectors is required**

Transferability cross-check:

There are no contradictory recommendations. Complementary recommendations regard control over impacts of infrastructure development (Germany, Switzerland).

Existing recommendations cross-check:

PRO: Many spatial planning policy documents also concerns tourism:

Tourism development should be directed to existing tourist areas, further tourism development should follow previous sanitation of existing degraded areas and comply with spatial carrying capacities and environmental restrictions (**Regional classification of Slo. landscape types**).

Tourism, as one of the fastest growing and most significant activities, requires special attention - directly by way of prudent placement and construction of necessary structures, and indirectly through the concern for the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, which are the main resources of the Slovenian tourist economy. (**Regional classification of Slo. landscape types**).

In declining areas with valuable objects of cultural heritage (vernacular architecture) purpose of area and buildings can be changed to secondary homes. Changes must be made accordant with directions of competent authorities, and development of broader area, tourism and free-time activities development and preservation of agricultural heritage. Areas of secondary homes (weekends) are positioned in attractive environments as united, rationally organized and

parcelled areas, accordant with regional and local architecture, settlement and landscape typics and conservation aims/directions. These areas should support development in marginal, remote areas, especially development of tourism and other free time activities. Secondary homes differ from other residential buildings and cannot be changed into permanent residence.

The possibilities for enlargement and consolidation of protected areas should be studied, taking into consideration nature protection, scientific and tourist requirements, as well as the potential of rural areas for living and the development of environmentally-friendly economic activities (Spatial development strategy).

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	The recommendation on the one hand draws attention to often neglected aspect of protected areas/tourism interrelations; and (again) underlines the need for better inter-sectoral cooperation	Medium-high
overall effort required	The required effort is related to additional research work as well as establishment of cooperation between the nature conservation, tourism and spatial planning sectors	medium
“price-performance ratio”	The price as well as performance is difficult to assess directly	medium
Political / administrative situation	Formal framework provides for some obligatory ways of cooperation within the spatial planning and permitting procedures (i.e. opinions and consent of conservation sectors on tourism development projects). These required procedures however are too limited and not enough forward-looking. Other ways of cooperation need to be established for which there are no formal administrative barriers.	high
financial resources	The financial resources should not exceed the amount of resources devoted to normal functioning of related sectors.	high
human resources	A certain number of people within administration and research/academic institutions should work on devising the methodologies of assessments and proposing measures.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	The nature conservation as well as tourism sector seem quite interested in better cooperation. If the findings would lead towards restrictions for tourism development, this might reduce the enthusiasm. The local/regional actors are also very interested in exploring natural resources in a sustainable way, since they are usually quite aware of the importance to keep their natural assets “intact”	Medium-high
synthesis	This recommendation requires joint efforts in research of possible interactions as well as in devising joint measures. The mentality of the development (tourism) interest groups changes more in favour of recognising the importance of protecting natural assets if they are to stay a comparative advantage. It seems that lack of knowledge and tradition of cooperation would be the main barriers to overcome.	

**Income generated because of natural values should be reinvested in nature conservation.**

Transferability cross-check:

There are no contradictory recommendations.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

In reviewed materials there are no recommendations linked to this subject.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This is a rather straightforward recommendation, however it is not as clear in proposing how to achieve this	medium
overall effort required	The required effort is related to devising measures (probably nature conservation sector) and conciliating them with others (users' interest groups, financial sector, legal restrictions...)	medium
"price-performance ratio"	The price would incur on the side of users and income generated would be used for nature conservation activities. Since these are chronically under-financed, the effect of this income should prove very efficient. In terms of public benefits, the ratio is favourable	high
Political / administrative situation	There may be problems because of legal provisions. There is at present no legal base to explicitly tax the benefits of natural assets and guarantee the purposeful spending of this money. Imposing new financial burdens is always a difficult decision to gain political support for.	low
financial resources	The financial resources needed to implement the measure should not exceed the normal operation of competent authorities. The implementation should also use existing mechanisms of money transfers. The measure itself should generate income.	high
human resources	A certain number of people within administration and should work on devising the possible ways of implementation	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	The nature conservation sector would support the idea. There may be opposition on other side(s), since the idea that natural assets should be free for all could be used as an argument against such measure. There may also be powerful interest groups (in some local situations) in opposition of proposal. There would also be difficulties in defining who really benefits from preserved nature i.e. who is obliged to contribute and whether the principle of equity is respected	Low-medium
synthesis	The main problem and the reason for low feasibility here would be the requirement to adopt legal base for such measure as well as gaining political and public support. The attitude in general public is probably still not quite in favour of imposing taxes on something so elusive as "natural values". So maybe more refined instruments to achieve similar effects would have to be devised.	

## Improving public participation and involvement of other stakeholders

### Transferability cross-check:

There are several recommendations in line with this one regarding almost all policy principles. The transversal recommendation regarding strengthening of bottom-up approach could also be applied here. Since we feel that there is the most acute lack of participation in nature conservation policy, the issue is specifically underlined.

Recommendations regarding dissemination of knowledge on nature and landscape preservation among the decision makers (Germany, France) as well as improvement of image of protected areas as instruments to protect assets, not prohibit development (Germany) could be considered complementary. The approach of "Regional Natural Parks" (France and Italy), as a bottom up device that encourage regional initiative could be considered a good example of intersectoral approach with participation of diverse stakeholders.

### Existing recommendations cross-check:

In spatial planning policy participation and public interest are mentioned in Spatial order as necessity in legislative proceedings. Recommendations for cooperation are also a part of agricultural policies (Sustainable development of rural areas may be ensured only by joint efforts of state and farming community).

Development strategy of Slovenija calls for improvement of efficacy and participation in political decision-making and invigoration of dialogue between institutions and civil public. It also recognizes that involvement of protected-areas residents is significant for achievement of protection objectives. Protection regime should enable integrative development with adjusted managing, residence and visiting.

### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This is a well known and often mentioned recommendation, but still not well implemented. It seems rather acute in the case of nature conservation; therefore it is explicitly mentioned here.	medium
overall effort required	There is quite a lot of effort involved: on the side of policy-makers as well as on the side of public (NGOs, local groups, individuals).	medium
"price-performance ratio"	Difficult to assess. There are not so much direct costs involved, but the processes may take longer and more people have to be engaged. On the other hand, the effects may be invaluable if they in terms of achieving results that may not be achieved at all otherwise.	medium
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers to implement participative approaches. However they are also not formally required.	medium
financial resources	Participative actions would have to be financed from regular nature conservation budget. Although the costs are not so high, they are usually difficult to justify. There are also funds	medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	available from international programs (Interreg, Phare...)	
human resources	There is certain lack of properly trained professionals to facilitate as well as conceive the bottom-up processes.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	It is more and more clear, that prohibitive measures can only partly achieve their aims if they are not accepted and supported by local population and/or users. Especially with measures, requiring certain types of land-use, cooperation with users in inevitable. Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of participation, but when it comes to realization it usually takes the form of PR or persuasion. It is obvious that there is not enough will neither know-how on the side of authorities as well as certain reluctance and fear of losing competence.	low-medium
synthesis	This is a well known and officially recognized concept, but often reduced to some form of PR. The responsible authorities lack the know-how as well as show certain reluctance and fear of losing competence. This can be therefore considered the main barrier. On the other hand there is a growing awareness that benevolent and pro-active attitude of users is required to achieve majority of nature conservation objectives.	

### **Nature conservation efforts should go beyond sectoral and geographical borders of conservation areas**

#### Transferability cross-check:

There are some supporting recommendations advocating area-wide environmentally sound practices (from German and Swiss teams). German “Alpenplan” is given as an example of a relatively successful case of a coherent strategy combining protected areas and environmentally sound land-use activities. It succeeded to make it very clear for whom it is binding and it generally has a good image.

#### Existing recommendations cross-check:

There were no explicit recommendations/statements concerning (pro/contra) this recommendation, however Slovene Agri-environmental programme, EKO III supports maintenance of protected areas (maintenance of cultural landscape and protected areas, restructuring of animal husbandry in the central areas of appearance of large carnivores, preservation of habitats of endangered bird species, permanent green cover in underground water protected areas, grassing and green fallow).

Spatial development strategy states following: Landscape areas important for national identity are defined on national and lower importance. Preserving of nationally important areas is assured through proper planning and programmes, they can also be protected if protection improves managing. Areas are treated as integrities; spatial development must preserve their integral identity.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This recommendation may seem redundant since officially there is no such confinement. But in practice and in prospect this recommendation does make sense.	medium
overall effort required	There is a lot of effort involved: the instruments and the inputs have to be well prepared and adjusted to be useful also in cases where the sector does not have exclusive decision making power, but has to bring convincing arguments in conciliation process with several other interests. However, there is already a lot of tradition and experience as well as existing methodologies that need to be better explored and put into practice	Medium-high
"price-performance ratio"	Difficult to assess. There is no direct costs involved and the effects can only be measured in long terms and through improvement of decisions in other (development) sectors.	Low-medium
Political / administrative situation	Generally there are no administrative barriers to implement the recommendation. The ways of integration are sometimes even formally required (i.e. EIA, SEIA, assessment of alternatives), in other cases the ways of integration require less formal and innovative approaches	high
financial resources	The financing of required activities could be financed from regular budgets for administrative work, research projects, assessments...	medium
human resources	We assess that there are available professionals to facilitate as well as implement scientific studies. There may be some lack of skills in transferring these into practice through cross-sectoral studies and integration in development documents	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of integration. On the other hand, it is easier for the sectoral authorities to stay safely within their "yard" where they can execute exclusive power. Therefore they aim at widening this area as much as possible. There is some reluctance in venturing beyond these borders, partly due to bad experience with development interest groups who enforced their will at the cost of nature conservation, but also due to lack of convincing tools and arguments.	low-medium
synthesis	This recommendation requires a shift in way of operation of nature conservation sector: instead of securing as much competence over as wide territory as possible, they should try to develop ways of cooperation and integration their interests in as many parts of development decision making forums as possible. At present, the situation shows exactly the opposite tendencies.	

#### 6.3.4 Principle: “Spatial planning”

##### Proposed (draft) recommendations:

- (1) Improved transparency of the planning processes with active involvement of public: “flexibility” without reducing legal security and speed of the process.
- (2) Planning documents prepared on regional / strategic level, as well as on local / concrete level.
- (3) Local needs and specific requirements need to be accounted for
- (4) Development initiatives should be thoroughly assessed in the planning process to avoid adverse impacts (SEIA, EIA, study of alternative scenarios).
- (5) Sectorial provisions, which have implications for land use, should be conciliated within planning procedures.
- (6) Education and promotion (courses, advisory services, booklets...) of best practices in quality, “context sensitive” architecture and building.

##### Overall transferability cross-check:

There were no significant divergences. One general idea prevailed within this policy principle: majority of recommendations focussed on improvement of the implementation of spatial planning documents. One recommendation (3) was dropped, since it was adequately mentioned in other contexts and a part of it was joined with recommendations (2) and (5). There was one complementary measure identified, which was not explicitly proposed earlier, but seems relevant:

- (6) Landscape considerations have to be a part of this (spatial development) strategy (proposed by French team).

##### Transferability, existing recommendations and feasibility cross-check results for individual recommendations:

**Improved transparency of the planning processes with active involvement of public: “flexibility” without reducing legal security and speed of the process.**

##### Transferability cross-check:

There are no contradicting recommendations. Complementary recommendation would be to make the requirements of the plans (“what is binding for whom?”) very clear (Germany).

##### Existing recommendations cross-check:

Spatial policy documents contains necessity for engagement of broad public in (legislative) procedures and solution-providing (according to different criteria and minimal environmental

impacts). And reconciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all participators of spatial planning on all decision-making levels

Development strategy of Slovenija promotes enforcement of “good-householder” principle and transparency in entire public sector; with rational management and users’ content being main criteria.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation is motivated by often cited criticism of spatial planning as being too rigid on one hand while too non-transparent and complicated on the other. It is obvious that this situation is a difficult one to solve, so the recommendation too has limited feasibility. Since it would have to be implemented on national and on local level, there may be quite diverse levels of feasibility – depending on specific local situation.	Low-medium
overall effort required	There is quite a lot of effort involved: on the side of policy-makers, administration, practicing planners as well as on the side of public (NGOs, local groups, individuals).	medium
“price-performance ratio”	Difficult to assess. There are not so much direct costs involved, but the processes may take longer and more people have to be engaged, which raises the costs. On the other hand, the effects may be invaluable in terms of improving overall effectiveness and acceptability of planned projects	medium
Political / administrative situation	There are quite adequate formal provisions for improving transparency of the planning process. However, the practice has not (yet?) achieved it. There are some more problems with flexibility – this needs suitable regulation which allows certain level of discretion in specific situations, while ensuring control over crucial public interests. There was not so much opportunity in past system neither was the subsidiarity principle adequately implemented. The present regulations may improve this, but it is yet to be seen.	medium
financial resources	The situation regarding budget for spatial planning rather differs among municipalities – the small ones have big problems and therefore do only the most necessary and reduced planning tasks. The market works so as to do as little as possible for available money. The national administration should help with subsidies, which are already available for some specific planning activities (digitalization of plans, workshops, promotion activities...)	medium
human resources	There is similar problem with human resources: small municipality lack people who could help implement more sophisticated planning procedures. Therefore the lack is evident on the side of local planning administrations as well as practicing planners,	medium
attitude of relevant target groups	The situation rather differs: there is some will, but apparently not enough know-how on national level, and quite diverse situation on local level. In some local communities, advanced approaches are successfully practiced, while elsewhere there is too little know-how as well as innovativeness and will for different approaches. This does not necessarily correspond with the extent of the community.	medium
synthesis	The problems of rigidity, non-transparency and complicatedness of spatial planning are obviously difficult to solve, The feasibility of this recommendation also largely depends on specific local situation, which may differ significantly. In general, the limited resources as well as lack of know – how, innovativeness and	

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	willingness to change, would be the main limiting factors	

**Planning documents have to be prepared on regional / strategic level, as well as on local / concrete level.**

Transferability cross-check:

Most partners agree that the planning on regional level need to be strengthened significantly (Austria, Germany, Italy). Several recommendations address improvement of inter-community as well as inter-regional cooperation, for which an ongoing, institutionalized process is needed (Austria and Germany). There is another complementary recommendation regarding the need for a better coordination of spatial planning goals and instruments on the different political and administrative levels starting from the EU (ESDP) via national to the regional and communal level (Germany).

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Single programming document (SPD) includes strengthening the role of spatial planning as a factor of economic development as well as formulating a modern spatial planning policy among the activities aimed at promoting regional development.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	Recommendation partly depends on formal (administrative) framework, however the planning activities on regional level could still be improved.	medium
overall effort required	There is a lot of effort involved, since the planning on regional level has no tradition so there is no established practice	Low-medium
“price-performance ratio”	The positive ratio should be rather obvious: if certain decisions are taken on regional level and planning documents are well prepared, then this should clearly work as a joint pool of resources and reduce burden on local communities when preparing plans for implementation. However, if there is not enough conciliation, they may all end-up with double work or even problems with in-compatible plans.	Medium-high
Political / administrative situation	There is at present still a formal barrier since the regional level of administration is not yet established. However, the Spatial planning Act provides for regional plans, which are joint documents of state and (one or more) local communities; as well as common preparation of strategic documents for two or more local communities. Other, less formal approaches are also possible and may yield significant results.	medium

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
financial resources	The financial resources of national and local (or several local) budgets have to be joined but in general, there should be no additional costs, rather economization. However, some local communities may view regional projects as redundant and needless additional financial burden.	medium
human resources	This problem is related to relatively low level of experience with supra-local planning. There are few practicing planners and / or administrators, with such experience. There is a bigger problem on the side of management of regional planning which is a rather demanding task, then on professional (planning) level.	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	Officially, all the involved actors support the idea of regional planning, but when it comes to realization it is obvious that they do not always see the benefit of it, but rather as redundant and needless additional complication in planning procedures and financial burden.	low-medium
synthesis	The formal lack of regional level administration should not impose a too important barrier, since the Planning act does provide for different ways of supra-local planning. All the involved actors officially support the idea of regional planning, but when it comes to realization it is obvious that they do not always see the benefit of it, but rather as redundant and needless additional complication in planning procedures and financial burden. Additional problem is a lack of tradition and established practice, related with lack of competent personnel, especially as regards management of regional planning.	

**Development initiatives should be thoroughly assessed in the planning process to avoid adverse impacts**

Transferability cross-check:

Many teams (Slovenija, France, Austria) agree that all the sectoral provisions, which have implications for land-use and cultural landscape, should be conciliated as well as assessed within planning procedures. The request for more rigorous use of the proposed tools was also mentioned by Austrian and Swiss teams. The French team underlined the necessity to provide more information about the territorial effect of each policy. All necessary tools have to be used to achieve this intersectoral dialogue: the use of visual aids, such as maps and photographs to visualize the juxtaposition of policies between them on a territory, is deemed especially effective.

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Spatial order contains most explicit statement concerning the above recommendation: If spatial act requires environmental opinion or acceptability opinion sectoral guidelines should contain all relevant environmental protection contents.

Otherwise reviewed documents content only some general statements (Spatial Management policy): timely and high-quality planning of settlements is needed to prevent insufficiently considered or forced spatial development activities based on partial solutions from location to

location. Preliminary assessments of possible impacts on the urban and regional development should be provided before any extensive spatial development activity takes place.

Strategy for economic development of Slovenia in the chapter regarding environment calls for the implementation of formally ensured influence of environmental arguments in designation of development strategies, programmes and measures; specifically for the issues of: territory, biodiversity, surface waters and biomass. Environment protection should be integrated with sectoral and regional policies with development of integrative measures (EIA, SEIA).

#### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation refers to theoretical aspect (forward looking perspective) as well as methodological one (refining and exploring existing tools for assessment of development projects/programmes).	medium
overall effort required	Since the concept as well as legislative frameworks are already established, the implementation should not require extraordinary efforts. It does however require some refinement and development of existing tools and possibly developing new ones, and effort in making sure that they are really put to good use in planning and decision making practice	Medium-high
“price-performance ratio”	There are direct costs involved in executing the assessment procedures, which may also make the procedures longer and somehow more complicated. The benefits do not only accrue in terms of prevention of unwanted impacts but also in new or improved alternatives of projects/programmes. The ratio is course difficult to assess	medium
Political / administrative situation	Some of the proposed procedures are already formally required (i.e. EIA, SEIA, assessment of alternatives), in other cases the ways of assessment require less formal and innovative approaches, but there are no formal barriers to implement them	high
financial resources	There are additional costs involved and there are “ethical” considerations about who should pay for them. At present, there are clients who pay for EIA, and national administration that is paying for strategic assessments. An independent body (and fund) would make these relations more clear.	medium
human resources	There is already a rich bulk of knowledge and experience related to EIA as well as comparative assessment of alternatives. Other types of assessments require innovative approaches. Strategic approaches, such as socio-economic assessments, policy evaluation etc., are less well known. But we assess that there are available professionals to implement scientific studies as well as integrate findings in development documents.	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	There is no general opposition towards these approaches. However the problems arise when they complicate and prolongate the decision-making and consent-giving procedures. There are also some reservation as to who should have competence and who should “evaluate” the “evaluators”.	low-medium
synthesis	This recommendation builds on existing practice and knowledge and further develops the tools that already proved effective. The concept as well as legislative frameworks are already established, the main barriers are related to the questions of who has the competence, where does the money come from, ... The recommendation is also not completely in line with the requirement for short and effective decision making process which is not always achieved by introducing additional assessments on several levels.	

**Sectoral provisions, which have implications for land use, should be conciliated within planning procedures.**

Transferability cross-check:

There are several recommendations towards improving the cooperation of sectors and spatial planning (Austria, Germany), and no contradicting proposals. Again, the "Regional Natural Parks" (in France and Italy) can be considered a successful case of integrating sectors into coherent strategy. They integrate agriculture policy with the policies of regional development, tourism, nature conservation and landscape protection as well as spatial planning. (The "Regional Natural Parks" concept was originally presented as "project" but seems to be relevant for the spatial planning principle in Slovenian context).

Existing recommendations cross-check:

Most explicit statements concerning above recommendation are (spatial order):

Sectoral provisions/guidelines of specific contents/fields are integrant part of spatial acts on national, regional and local level. They should assure quality, transparent and argument solutions in frame of defined policy act.

If spatial act requires environmental opinion or acceptability opinion sectoral guidelines should contain all relevant environmental protection contents.

Other linked contents concern:

- conciliation and linked economical, social and environmental politics,
- integral treating of population/settlements, infrastructure and landscape; spatial regulations/arrangements must assure effective and reliable activity and mutual supplementing,
- reconciliated and connected vertical and horizontal activities of all participators of spatial planning on all decision-making levels.

Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
"quality" of rec.	This recommendation can not work if it is only considered within spatial planning: all the sectors need to cooperate. However, spatial planning has to provide framework and conditions and develop procedures	medium
overall effort required	The effort is required on all sides - on the side of sectors this is related to the preparation of suitable input as well as interactive collaboration; on the side of spatial planning it is related to providing framework and procedures as well as coordinating the process	Low-medium
"price-performance ratio"	There not much additional costs, there are already requirements for sectors to cooperate in spatial planning, so it is more the matter of quality of their cooperation. The performance on the other hand should be much better: of their sectoral programmes (since they would face less objections later on) as well as in	high

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	spatial planning document, which would be more real and implementable since they would have support from the actors.	
Political / administrative situation	The administrative framework is somewhat ambiguous. While spatial planning legislation does provide for sectoral cooperation and involvement, the sectoral legislation each regulates this issue differently .many of them try to force their (un-conciliated) proposals to be automatically a part of the planning documents.	high
financial resources	The costs are within regular workload and budgets of national administration	high
human resources	There may be a problem of not enough knowledge and understanding of what planning really is and what it aims to achieve among personnel of sectoral administration bodies. In some cases may also be a problem of not having people to explicitly deal with spatial issues of policies.	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	The attitude may be the most problematic item here. There is still the prevailing idea of winning as much competence over as much space as possible and then let other sectors play according to our rules. This of course is far away from the idea of coordination. Since some of the sectors were quite successful with this approach in the past, this attitude, which is sometimes openly admitted, will not be easy to change	low
synthesis	This recommendation can not work if it is only considered within spatial planning: The effort is required on all sides- on the side of sectors this is related to the preparation of suitable input as well as interactive collaboration; on the side of spatial planning it is related to providing framework and procedures as well as coordinating the process. There are two main and related barriers: among sectors the idea of competition still prevails over coordination. Since some of the sectors were quite successful with this approach in the past, this attitude was transferred to other sectors and confirmed in legislation. Therefore the situation will be difficult to change	

## Education and promotion (courses, advisory services, booklets...) of best practices in quality, “context sensitive” architecture and building.

### Transferability cross-check:

There are no contradicting recommendations; the proposal to conduct information campaigns in order to raise the level of acceptance of spatial planning (Austria) follows the same idea.

### Existing recommendations cross-check:

A part of agricultural policy document CRPOV, Integrated rural development and village renewal – is renovation of old buildings and establishing new uses (often of broader public interest). There was also best practices booklet published. Otherwise reviewed documents don't consider the above recommendation.

### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation refers to the change of the perception of effectiveness and a shift away from administrative and restrictive concept of planning.	medium
overall effort required	There is some effort required to conceive the new approaches, to produce the programs, materials and of course to implement them, The policy makers, (national and local) administration, academia, practicing planners, NGO and others need to participate.	Medium
“price-performance ratio”	The price of less formal approaches may be significant, but does generally not represent a large share of overall budgets. The performance differs in short terms (might be very good as well as not so successful) but is in long term absolutely worthwhile.	medium
Political / administrative situation	There are no political and/or administrative barriers. However, if these procedures were more firmly supported by legislation and/or included in administrative procedures, they may be more regularly and successfully implemented	Medium-high
financial resources	The financial resources should be secured from the budgets of national and local administration. The resources from international funds are also available for this type of activities	Medium-high
human resources	There is certain lack of properly trained and experienced practitioners but is not considered critical. It is also difficult for the employees in administration to find time and energy to deal with “less urgent” tasks.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	There is no general opposition towards these approaches. However there is an attitude that these type of activities as being less formal, non-obligatory are also somewhat redundant and marginal. Since the administration employees usually consider themselves over-loaded, there may be no one willing to take over the tasks. On the other hand they are usually well received by public.	medium
synthesis	The main strength of these approaches seems also to be their main problem: the less formal nature makes them also somewhat marginal and less important, therefore never an object of a dedicated, professional, long term effort.	

## Landscape considerations have to be a part of spatial development strategies

### Transferability cross-check:

This recommendation was adopted from a more general one speaking about cross-sectoral orientation of spatial planning (mentioned by France, Germany, Switzerland and Slovenija) and updated by French proposal on integrating landscape consideration.

### Existing recommendations cross-check:

Spatial development strategy mentions guiding of spatial development in the landscape, that should ensure the integration of naturally preserved areas into a network and their eventual linking to the system of European natural corridors (ecocorridors).

In reviewed documents there were no explicit statements about consideration of landscape as a crucial part of spatial development strategies. There was frequently mentioned the role of landscape for national identity, as basis for development (of rural areas...).

### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation may come too late, since the major documents have recently been made. The landscape issue is also –at least formally– extensively addressed	high
overall effort required	The first step of introducing landscape in strategic documents is already achieved with quite a lot of efforts. But additional efforts are now needed to not use this opportunity and to prove the worth and operational value of landscape concepts	Low-Medium
“price-performance ratio”	There are no clear indicators on either side, but the performance is of course expected to improve in the long terms	medium
Political / administrative situation	The political-administrative situation is not a barrier in implementing the recommendation. The landscape concept has been given adequate support in legislation, but needs further elaboration to achieve its operational value	high
financial resources	There are no significant financial resources required.	high
human resources	There are suitably educated professionals in national administration but a lack of them on lower levels. But there is still a general lack of knowledge about CL/RD relations and also a lack of convincing theory of landscape as an explanatory concept as well as a tool providing effective decision making support.	Medium - high
attitude of relevant target groups	There is some reluctance to accept the landscape as a concept since it does not always convincingly prove added value in comparison to other concepts. It is also perceived as a way to promote the landscape profession and therefore causes further reservation on the side of other professions.	medium
synthesis	This recommendation was included although in may seem redundant. The major documents (on national level) that have recently been conceived do explicitly mention landscape issues. However we feel that they stopped short from really incorporating knowledge about the dynamism of landscape change and relation between RD and CL. Therefore they seem to only formally satisfy this	



STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
	recommendation.	

### 6.3.5 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following recommendation, proposed by partners within the “projects” principle, seems to be particularly relevant:

**The coordination and coherence between the various projects (as well as programmes) concerning the same territory is needed. Generally, projects which involve many actors from different institutions should be encouraged since the project themselves will create the necessarily links between the institutions.**

#### Existing recommendations cross-check:

Development strategy of Slovenija stresses the need for coordination of different documents with general, strategic direction and with foreseen public - financial capabilities. They must also be accordant with other documents, intended for reaching same or similar goals.

#### Feasibility cross-check:

STEP 6: assessment of feasibility		
indicator	features	feasibility
“quality” of rec.	This recommendation refers to a “project” principle and is therefore primarily addressed to regional policy (in Slovenian context) but also to all other sectoral policies. It is a general one, but quite clear procedural / methodological guidelines are needed to make it operational	low
overall effort required	The effort is required on all sides - on the side of sectors this is related to the preparation of suitable input as well as interactive collaboration; on the side of regional development it is related to providing framework and procedures as well as coordinating the process	Low-medium
“price-performance ratio”	There are some additional costs, related to coordination in the phase of project preparation. But the benefits may well exceed the costs in terms of project winning support from several actors and being easily implemented. The benefits for local community or region hosting the project would also be significantly higher.	high
Political / administrative situation	The political/administrative framework does not hinder the coordination. On the contrary, the instrument of Regional development programmes is aimed at devising coordinated common projects on regional level. Regardless their formal merits, these programs turned out to be a very general “wish-lists” with only limited operational value.	medium
financial resources	The costs should be calculated in the preparation of project documentation. The functioning of regional development agencies also requires financial resources, which partly come from national budget, partly from projects and partly from international funds and programmes	medium
human resources	The institutions such as regional development agencies should take active role and provide framework and procedures for coordination. At present, there is still a certain lack of people, skilled and trained in coordination of project.	Medium
attitude of relevant target groups	The general attitude seems supportive. But when it comes to actual need for coordination, it is often considered (by a project initiator) an unnecessary complication and a cause for the delay	Low-medium

**STEP 6: assessment of feasibility**

indicator	features	feasibility
	in the implementation of projects. There are also fears that the projects would have to be changed according to requirements of other actors.	
synthesis	This recommendation can not work if it is only considered within spatial planning: The effort is required on all sides - on the side of sectors this is related to the preparation of suitable input as well as interactive collaboration; on the side of spatial planning it is related to providing framework and procedures as well as coordinating the process. There are two main and related barriers: among sectors the idea of competition still prevails over coordination. Since some of the sectors were quite successful with this approach in the past, this attitude was transferred to other sectors and confirmed in legislation. Therefore the situation will be difficult to change	