



AlpNaTour – Integration of recreation and tourism concerns to Natura 2000 management planning processes to support sustainability in the alpine area

**DEMOCRATIC DEALING WITH PROBLEMS IN NATURA 2000 PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE ALPINE SPACE AND A CASE STUDY FROM SLOVENIA**

By: Kovac, M., Golob, A., Polansek, B., Skudnik, M.  
Emails: [marko.kovac@gozdis.si](mailto:marko.kovac@gozdis.si); [saso.golob@gozdis.si](mailto:saso.golob@gozdis.si);  
[barbara.polansek@gozdis.si](mailto:barbara.polansek@gozdis.si); [mitja.skudnik@gozdis.si](mailto:mitja.skudnik@gozdis.si)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Aims of this presentation**

- To justify the role of democratic dealing with problems in Natura 2000 planning and management
- To present the state of art in the field of democratic dealing with problems in the countries of the Alpine Space
- To present how the procedure was conducted in Slovenia
- To present the basic guidelines for a potentially successful democratic procedure

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**A) Backgrounds**

Although the idea of Natura 2000 is in concert with the paradigm of sustainable development (wellbeing and healthy environment of this and future generations) its implementation generates a lot of problems. Instead of being a challenge or opportunity, Natura 2000 is generally considered a hindrance.

**Evidences:**

- Considerably slow progress in the implementation of Natura 2000
- Increasing numbers of lawsuits in the EU member states and threats with them
- Fear and disappointment of the local population

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Factors:**

- According to the reports addressing Natura 2000 and to experiences from the field the conflicts are due to:
- Different objectives of landowners and the sectors operating in the environment at one side and nature conservation at the other
  - Unsuitable procedures used at the occasion of designation of Natura 2000 sites and in Natura 2000 planning in general
  - Lack of knowledge of all engaged (authorities, stakeholders)
  - Other

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**B) Democratic dealing with problems (DDP) and Natura 2000 Legislation**

What is DDP:  
An instrument that has been suggested and promoted world-wide to improve communicating, to increase public awareness, to maximize the total benefits of the environment and to enhance the social acceptance of environmental stewardship.

**Objectives of DDP:**

- To improve a conflict situation or
- To come to a reconciled agreement.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**DDP – compound process**

DDP is not a single process but it associates two closely related activities:

- PARTICIPATION addresses the articulation of interests and the creation of such a working environment in which consensus can be achieved
- CONFLICT MANAGEMENT strives to define, to acquaint with, to aggregate interests and finally to get agreements

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



DDP		
COMMUNICATION	CONSULTATION	CONSENSUS
POLL SURVEY INQUIRY PUBLIC HEARING	WORKSHOP ADVISORY GROUP	COLLABORATIVE LEARNING MEDIATION NEGOTIATION ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE
PARTICIPATION		
	CONFLICT MANAGEMENT	

Contrariwise to the environmental acts of the countries of the AlpNatour project (e.g. spatial planning, EIA, SEIA, Water management) the acts, specifically addressing Natura 2000 **DO NOT COMMAND** any form of democratic approach to planning, management, etc.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**C) Slovene approach to Natura 2000 site management**

**Aim of the experiment:**

- To conduct the collaborative planning procedure in the real environment (nature, society, economy)
- To overrule a general hypothesis that collaborative approach to planning and management is a waste of time
- To gain the responses of all engaged in the planning procedure
- To deepen our knowledge and to gain experiences that will assist in improving DDP

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**The procedure:**

1. Defining objectives (acquainting with the development problems, achieving consent on landscape fundamentals plans enlosing the Natura 2000 sites)
2. Defining target groups (stakeholders =Authorities, Sectors operating in the environment e.g. forestry, agricultu-re, hunt, nature conservation, NGO's e.g. representatives of sport associations of alpinism, mountainbiking, snowmobiling,.. Landowners)
3. Sending out official invitations
4. Defining the procedure (equality, objectivity,
5. Organizing 1st. workshop
  - Presenting the aims of the project to all participants

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---







**E) Basic guidelines for unbiased democratic procedure**

- Defining the task force and its leader
- Assuring unbiased democratic procedure (legality, legitimacy, neutrality, objectivity, ....)
- Preparing a complete list of relevant stakeholders (the main developer or investor should not be missing)
- Determining an approach to planning
  - DDP (e.g. collaborative learning, participation+mediation) = **recommended by experts**
  - Solely participation (passive - active)
- Assuring timely informing and reporting in all working phases
- Determining the ways and means of conflict management
- Determining the ways of decision-making (providing alternative solutions to the authorities)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**F) Basic guidelines for encouraging the tourist sector**

- Continuous communicating: exchange of information, knowledge and experiences in the fields of:
  - legislation (in which procedures and how to participate)
  - ecology, geography, history, culture, ethnology, social habits and behavior, local cuisine
  - visitors needs, wants, desires, habits, visitor flows
- Establishment of partnerships
  - exchange of information on development problems, challenges and opportunities
  - investigating possibilities for investments, sponsorships
- Supporting and promoting partnerships

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---