



## **Networking for sustainable spatial development of the European continent**

## **Des réseaux pour le développement territorial durable du continent européen**

Moscow, Russian Federation, 26 September 2005  
Moscou, Fédération de Russie, 26 septembre 2005



## **Networking for sustainable spatial development of the European continent**

## **Des réseaux pour le développement territorial durable du continent européen**

Moscow, Russian Federation, 26 September 2005  
Moscou, Fédération de Russie, 26 septembre 2005

### **proceedings/actes**



COUNCIL OF EUROPE    CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

European spatial planning and landscape, No 79  
Aménagement du territoire européen et paysage, n° 79

Council of Europe Publishing

International Seminar organised by the Council of Europe in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation within the framework of the activities of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning of the member states of the Council of Europe CEMAT-CoE.

Séminaire international CEMAT organisé par le Conseil de l'Europe en coopération avec les autorités de la Fédération de Russie dans le cadre des travaux de la Conférence européenne des ministres responsables de l'Aménagement du territoire des Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe

Statements in their original language as presented at the Seminar. The opinions expressed in this work are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

Interventions dans leur langue originale telles que présentées lors du séminaire. Les vues exprimées dans cet ouvrage sont de la responsabilité des auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement la ligne officielle du Conseil de l'Europe.

Council of Europe  
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex

© Council of Europe, September 2006  
Printed in Belgium

## Contents/Table des matières

	<i>Page</i>
<b>Opening of the Seminar / Ouverture du séminaire .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Vladimir Yakovlev .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Maria-José Festas .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Valeriy V. Sudarenkov .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>First session/Première session</b>	
<b>Networking: basis for modern spatial development policies / Les réseaux, bases pour un développement environnemental durable .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>PART A – Territorial Networks / PARTIE A – Réseaux territoriaux .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Networking Urban as modes for territorial development <i>Robert Kragt .....</i>	<i>19</i>
Integrated studies on cultural landscape in Russia <i>Marina Kuleshova and Tamara Semenova .....</i>	<i>25</i>
Un réseau écologique pour l'Europe <i>Henri Jaffeux .....</i>	<i>33</i>
The European Landscape Convention and transfrontier landscapes <i>Bas Pedroli .....</i>	<i>39</i>
Spatial planning practices in the system of integrated coastal zone management (ICZM): the example of a demonstration project in Geledzhik Resort (Russia) <i>Ekaterina Anatonidze .....</i>	<i>43</i>
<b>PART B – Networking concerning territory/ PARTIE B – Réseaux concernés .....</b>	<b>51</b>
Research for sustainable territorial development: examples and lessons for the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) Programme <i>Thiemo W. Eser .....</i>	<i>53</i>
Patterns of migration in Europe in the 21st Century <i>Irina Molodikova .....</i>	<i>61</i>
Human rights and quality of life: the Eunomia Network of Ombudsman: a project carried out by the Greek Ombudsman under the auspices of the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe <i>Chryssi Hatzl .....</i>	<i>73</i>

Concluding remarks <i>Elena Sadovnikova</i> .....	83
<b>Second session/Deuxième session</b>	
<b>Open round table of regions of innovation, sustainable spatial development/Table ronde des régions d'innovations, développement territorial durable</b> .....	85
The “CEMAT Regions of innovation” <i>Welf Selke</i> .....	87
Spatial planning concepts of CEMAT Regions of innovation <i>André Müller</i> .....	89
<b>PART A – Examples of Russian Regions/ PARTIE A – Exemples de la Russie</b> .....	91
Region of innovation Leningrad Oblast <i>Valery A. Kim, Ekaterina Goloulina</i> .....	93
<b>PART B – Armenia/ PARTIE B – Arménie</b> .....	97
Armenia as an innovative bridge of CEMAT in the European model regions network <i>Ruzan Alaverdyan</i> .....	99
<b>Concluding remarks/Remarques de conclusion</b> .....	105
Border regions as an issue in Russian regional policy <i>Sergey S. Artobolevskiy</i> .....	107
European border regions and networking – The creation of a regional network for sustainable territorial and transfrontier development for the European continent <i>Jens Gabbe</i> .....	111
<b>Final session/Session finale</b>	
<b>General conclusions/Conclusions générales</b> <i>Günter Mudrich</i> .....	118
<b>Closing speech/Discours de clôture</b> <i>Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons</i> .....	129
<b>Programme</b> .....	133
<b>List of participants / Liste des participants</b> .....	141

# **Opening of the seminar/ Ouverture du séminaire**

**Welcome speeches/  
Discours de bienvenue**



Vladimir YAKOVLEV

*Minister of Regional Development of the Russian Federation*

Mr Yakovlev welcomed the participants to the Seminar and expressed the wish for a great success.



Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI

*Director General of DGIV, Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport,  
Council of Europe*

Dear Ministers,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

1. I am particularly pleased to be with you today in Moscow for this International CEMAT Seminar on “Networking for sustainable spatial development of the European Continent”. This Seminar takes place in the framework of the preparation of the 14th Session of the Ministerial Conference which will be organised in 2006 on the following topic: “Networks for sustainable spatial development of the European continent – Building bridges across Europe”. I should like to warmly thank the authorities of the Russian Federation and particularly the Ministry of regional planning for their warm welcome and also for the quality of the work done so far. I am particularly pleased to meet you again Mr Yakovlev.

I should also like to congratulate Mrs Festas, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials for the leading role she is playing in the preparation of the 2006 Ministerial Conference.

2. The Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent, which have now been translated into the languages of most Council of Europe member states and were included in a Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 2002, involved a new philosophy for spatial development that takes account of the four pillars of sustainable development, namely its economic, social, environmental and cultural aspects.

We now need to focus on the current situation, put our thinking into practice and continue to implement these ideas on the ground. We must continue the process of exchanging experience and know-how at pan-European level in order to prevent disparities in economic and social development leading to individual regions leaving others behind. We need to put in place new initiatives, step up training and mobilise funds to boost pan-European co-operation: we really must “build bridges across Europe”.

In this sense, the objective of our Seminar is to start identifying existing networks and to promote networks dealing with the territory. I look forward to a constructive and fruitful exchange between us. We will be able to evaluate the results of our actions at the next Ministerial Conference.

3. The concerns that bring us together today are closely in tune with the Council of Europe’s key objectives of promoting democracy, human rights and social cohesion

and finding solutions to the main challenges facing society. According to the Ljubljana Declaration on sustainable spatial development of the European continent, we wish to continue promoting an integrated approach to territorial cohesion through more balanced social and economic development of regions and improved competitiveness, which respects cultural, landscape diversity and the environment. It is a very profitable investment both for a sustainable development of Europe and also for our continent's future against the background of globalisation.

4. I wish to reiterate my congratulations to all those involved in the preparation of this Seminar and can assure you of the Council of Europe's full support of CEMAT activities as they contribute to create the basis of good governance for Europe. These Ministerial Conferences, which have been organised for thirty-five years now, are an important part of the Council of Europe's activities. They bring together the regional/spatial planning institutions of the wide Europe and provide the opportunity to EU and non-EU countries to meet together in a single forum at Pan-European level to exchange points of view and adopt joint positions on territorial sustainable development issues.

You can be sure of the commitment of our Organisation to the goal of sustainable spatial development as an inescapable development paradigm and as a major element of the pan-European agenda following the Warsaw Declaration adopted last May at the Third Summit of the Council of Europe. The Action Plan adopted at this occasion mention the commitment to improve the quality of life for citizens. On the basis of the existing instruments, the Council of Europe shall develop and support integrated policies in the fields of environment, landscape, spatial planning and prevention and management of natural disasters, in a sustainable development perspective. In this sense, an interdisciplinary reflection group with the task of defining the strategy of sustainable development founded on human rights was set up in order to examine the role of the Council of Europe after the Summit.

Thank you.

**Maria-José FESTAS**

*Chair of committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning (CEMAT) of the member states of the Council of Europe*

Mrs Maria José FESTAS welcomed the participants to the Seminar. She explained that the Seminar will contribute to the preparation of the 14th Session of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning (CEMAT) to be held in Lisbon, Portugal, on 26-27 October 2006 on the theme: “Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent – Building bridges across Europe”, and expressed the wish for a great success for the Seminar.



Valeriy V. SUDARENKOV

*Member of the Federal Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation,  
Head of the Subcommittee for culture at the Committee of the Federal Council for Science,  
Culture, Education, Health and Ecology  
Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe*

Sustainable development is based on a well-balanced interplay between social consumers, economic activity and social environment.

We encourage the organisation of the Seminar which is being prepared by the Council of Europe – by the Spatial Planning and Landscape Division in collaboration with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation in Moscow.

The Seminar is of particular importance, bearing in mind the forthcoming 14th CEMAT Session in Portugal in 2006.

The social and economic requirements imposed on the territories have to correspond to their ecological and cultural functions, which in turn will foster large-scale and well-balanced spatial development.

The Charter of the Mediterranean Landscapes (1994) was the forerunner document of the European Landscape Convention, which has up to now been signed by 30 countries.

One of the shortcomings of the existing approaches to landscape has been the utilitarian approach to resources, where either the economy or the social sector is predominant. The result is that the natural landscapes and biogenes are being destroyed.

I share the opinion that the next step should consist in acknowledging the landscape approach as the most effective means for sustainable development.

This approach contributes to making the natural and socio-natural landscapes the starting point for the management decision-making. The European Natural Landscape Studies is an important event in science.

I would also like to number among them the contemporary German geography of the cultural landscape studies; the British tradition, according to which the landscapes are regarded from the natural and cultural view points; French scenery research and its relationship with the human being; landscape planning in Denmark; the particularities of the landscape preservation in Switzerland and Italy. We have been witnessing in which way the Spanish digested coast landscapes are reconstructed.

The landscapes represent a part of the corporate culture of the local community. They not only encourage the development of the local culture, but also suggest the rights and responsibilities to be assumed by everybody.



# **First session/ Première session**

**Networking, the basis for  
modern spatial development policies/  
Les réseaux, bases pour un développement  
environnemental durable**

## **Session Chair/Président de Session**

Mr Maxim PEROV

*Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe,  
Member of the Committee on Science, Culture, Education, Public Health  
and Ecology, Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation,  
The Council of Federation*



**Part A – Territorial networks/  
Partie A – Réseaux territoriaux**

**Moderators/ Modérateurs**

Mrs Margarita ORTEGA,  
*Representative of Spain to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

Mr Audun MOFLAG,  
*Representative of Norway to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*



# Networking urban as modes for territorial development

Robert KRAGT

*Representative of The Netherlands to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

## 1. Introduction

The Netherlands is generally seen as a highly urbanised country. Being small and having a high population density, this comes as no surprise. There is indeed a long history of urbanisation. Traditionally in the western part of the country, because of natural conditions and because of the “Order on the exterior trade” (1531)<sup>1</sup>. The urbanisation extended later to the whole country because of the growing population and recently because of increasing space demands and smaller households.

For instance, the population has grown from 9 million in 1945 to almost 16 million in 2000. And we still expect a further growth to around 18 million in 2030 (with a stabilisation or a minor decline thereafter). On the other hand the average household size dropped by over 30% in the period 1972-2002.

Furthermore, related activities like working, recreation and sport, and functions like infrastructure, water and nature show ever-growing space demands. And there is a limit to the amount of agricultural land that can be transformed into other activities.

This puts pressure on the limited available space and has asked for (and will continue asking in the future) related policies.

The lower parts of the Netherlands, i.e. the areas below the sea level, have a long history of compact cities. Urban development for a long time focused on renewing existing urban areas. The goal was to meet the autonomous demand for new housing and industrial sites arising from population growth and affluence as concentrated as possible.

Urbanisation policies, as laid down in the governmental policy reports later, were built on these principles and were expressed as a preference for concentrated development. The Second Report on

---

1. The Order on the exterior trade was enacted in 1531 by Emperor Charles V at the request of the “cities of Holland”. It determined that a large number of identified professional activities were not allowed to develop outside the cities. By way of this order the cities tried to concentrate all activities inside their city walls which prevented “spreading” of these activities over the rural areas at an early stage. The order is seen as one of the first examples of regionalised industrialisation policy and one of the first instruments of spatial planning in the Netherlands with a large impact on the spatial pattern and development of the country.

spatial policy from 1966 introduced the concepts of “bundled” or “clustered deconcentration” and “conurbation” and up to the year 2000 these were the leading concepts. New urbanisation, i.e. housing, employment and services, should be realised in the existing area of central place. (And if the available capacity was insufficient, alternative locations bordering the larger municipalities might be investigated, and possibly, urbanisation was conceivable at some distance from that central place i.e. primarily in new towns). As a result approximately 70% of the housing stock is now in the conurbation, a percentage that has remained unchanged for the last ten years. That is quite an achievement given the strong centrifugal forces.

On the other hand however, and this became growingly disappointing and an increasingly serious issue in public and political debate, there was also a continuous growth of the smaller centres.

Together with the fact that a number of conurbations actually burst their seams, that internationalisation made itself more and more felt and the fact that our society was more and more developing into a “network society” and a “network economy”, it became clear that the – simple – concept of conurbation no longer was an option for Dutch urbanisation policy. A new policy had become necessary.

## **2. The National Spatial Strategy (2005)**

This “new” urbanisation policy is laid down in the National Spatial Strategy (NSS), which at the time of writing (August 2005), was still in its “proposal” phase, but is expected to become policy by the end of 2005).

This strategy, the fifth policy report on spatial planning since 1960, is itself of an interesting other character than its predecessors. It integrates spatial policy with the policy of the sectors with the most influence on the use of space. The government delegates more of its powers/responsibilities to the lower administrative levels. In the introductory chapter the government presents this new approach and its philosophy of governance in the following way:

“The National Spatial Strategy contains the government’s views on the spatial development of the Netherlands and the most important objectives associated with that development. In accordance with the government’s coalition agreement, the strategy represents the contribution of national spatial planning to a strong economy, a safe and livable society and an attractive country.”

“The main goal of national spatial policy is to create space for the different functions that demand it, on the limited area that we have available to us in the Netherlands. More specifically, the government focuses on four general objectives:

- strengthening the international competitive position of the Netherlands;
- strong cities and a vibrant, dynamic countryside;
- preserving and developing important national and international spatial values;
- ensuring public safety.”

and:

“In its spatial vision and objectives, the government works on the basis of a dynamic, development-oriented spatial policy and a clear division of responsibilities between the national government and the local and regional governments. In the past, national policy on spatial issues was set out in separate policy documents. This government has chosen to incorporate as much of the national policy as possible into one single strategy. A single National Spatial Strategy will help to reduce the overlap in the different policy fields and the number of separate policy documents, while offering more clarity and ensuring more coherence in the policy and its implementation.

The National Spatial Strategy is a strategic policy document that provides a general outline, distinguishing between the responsibilities of the national government and other parties. The national government is not the sole font of wisdom, nor does it pretend to provide all the solutions to all problems at hand. The national government will be focusing less on looking after others and more on ensuring that others can deal with matters more effectively on their own. It is the responsibility of the national government to provide other tiers of government with an effective toolkit for implementing spatial policy. This brings the national government back to the essential principles of the national spatial policy, which are expressed e.g. in the decentralised planning system where a pivotal role is reserved for local land use plans, shifting the emphasis from planning to development.”

In order to implement all these policy goals the NSS is accompanied by an Implementation Agenda which gives insights into the most important spatial investments and implementation activities. It distinguishes the goals, the instruments, the primary responsible party, the other parties involved and the year in which the activity has to be realised. The Implementation Agenda functions as a multiple year working agenda for the ministries involved and should be updated every two years.

### **3. Urbanisation policy**

The urbanisation policy in the National Spatial Strategy is laid down in chapter two with the title: “Networks and Cities”. In this chapter the main goals of urbanisation policy are described and specific concepts like national urban networks, economic core areas, main ports, brain ports and green ports are presented.

#### *– Main goals of urbanisation*

With its urbanisation policy the government wants to create sufficient space for living, working and mobility and related aspects like public facilities, green areas, recreation, sports and water.

The national government wants to concentrate urbanisation and infrastructure into national urban networks, economic core areas and major transport axes as much as possible.

Concentrating urbanisation and infrastructure and organisation in urban networks is the policy strategy that the national government wishes to employ for the economy, infrastructure and urbanisation. The derivative policy objectives are: developing

national urban networks and urban centers, strengthening the economic core areas, improving accessibility, improving the livability and socio-economic position of cities, maintaining accessible recreational facilities in and around the cities, preserving and strengthening the variation between city and countryside, harmonising urbanisation and the economy with water management, and safe guarding environmental quality and safety.

*– National urban networks and economic core areas*

The Netherlands is developing into a network society and a network economy. On the one hand, individualisation continues to advance; on the other hand, all those individuals are increasingly closely interconnected in numerous networks. This development also has major consequences for spatial planning. There is more and more coherence between the various cities and urban areas. The government welcomes this development towards urban networks. Partnerships between such networks expand the support base of public facilities and services and open up opportunities for optimal use of the scarce spaces. To respond to this trend, the national government has designated 6 national urban networks. The development of these networks is a high priority. The same applies to 13 economic core areas, which are mostly located within the networks.

A national urban network is defined as an entity of larger and smaller cities including the open spaces in between. The cities and centers that comprise these networks complement and reinforce each others' strengths, so that they have more to offer together than they do as individual cities. It is explicitly not the intention that the national urban networks should create a new tier of government. The partnerships between the local and regional governments within the networks are completely voluntary, flexible and pragmatic. The national government expects the municipalities to draw up agreements on how they will shape the concentration policy, in consultation with the provinces and the urban regions.

Within each national urban network, the national government designates a number of areas where urbanisation will be concentrated.

Provinces, urban regions and municipalities will incorporate these concentration areas into their plans and elaborate on the urbanisation policy. It is not the intention that these concentration areas be fully urbanised. Although the emphasis in these areas is on urbanisation, the spatial plans must also leave space for water, nature, landscape, recreation, sport, and agriculture. In the concentration areas, city and country must be developed together, as a coherent, integrated whole. In the national urban networks, the creation of easily accessible, attractive city centers with a variety of functions and public facilities is crucially important. The municipalities bear the primary responsibility for achieving that goal, while the national government adopts a stimulatory role and contributes to the necessary investments. It is particularly important to develop city centers around infrastructure nodes.

*– Main ports, brain ports and green ports*

Next to a policy on urban networks the NSS also presents a policy for main ports, brain ports and green ports. On the one hand this policy is part of the urban networks policy, on the other it is a specially developed policy as another reaction to the global networking developments.

The Netherlands has two main ports, Amsterdam Schiphol airport and the port of Rotterdam. These cover not only the actual airport and port areas, but also the surrounding regions, as a setting for offices of major urban and international businesses. The economic importance and the pressures on space around both main ports require national coordination.

In the area of research and development, the Eindhoven/South east Brabant region is highly prominent both nationally and internationally. The location policy and the policy for creating city centers in the national urban networks support the development of this brain port and other knowledge and innovation clusters.

Besides the two main ports and the brain port, the Strategy distinguishes five green ports in which there is a concentration of knowledge-intensive horticulture and agribusiness. From an international economic perspective, the national government considers it important to preserve and strengthen the international importance of the horticultural function in these locations.

#### **4. Closing remarks**

This article has been written as a contribution to the Council of Europe Seminar on “Networking for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” in Moscow in 2005.

It remains therefore to be judged in how far the National Spatial Strategy policy meets the goals of sustainability. The government presented the NSS explicitly as the Dutch contribution to Lisbon (economy) and Gothenburg (sustainability) goals of the EU.

Formulating policy options in an integrated way and with the goal to integrate several fields of policy (space, economy, mobility, agriculture/rural areas) the chances of implementing a more sustainable policy have grown considerably. Conflicts have to be settled at a very early stage and no longer obstruct desirable developments, or make them very costly and time-consuming when adapting at a later stage.

The concept of urban networks and the policy formulated for developing such networks also is a strong contribution to a network society and at the same time offers enough possibilities to implement the policy in a sustainable way. Such policy where networks share their common strong aspects and not every individual partner strives

after having everything itself shows strong awareness of the necessity to act carefully with limited resources.

The Dutch government is therefore very confident that the “new” urbanisation policy is a contribution to a sustainable development of the Netherlands.

(The author wishes to thank his colleague Arjen van den Burg for giving permission to make use of his article on National Urbanisation Policy of the Netherlands.)

## **Integrated studies on cultural landscape in Russia**

Marina E. KULESHOVA and Tamara Yu. SEMENOVA

*Russian Research Institute for Cultural and Natural Heritage, Moscow*

Heritage as a system of values, accepted, reproduced and protected by a society for the further transfer to next generations, can be natural and cultural, tangible and intangible, movable and immobile. Ability to fix cultural codes in the society is its genuine characteristic, which prerequisites society's sustainability and evolution, similarly to genetic codes of the biological species.

The society always has an own system of values, and it is under constant transformation. What yesterday was not significant could be recognised today as a relict, historical evidence of the passing epoch. For example, the typical pattern of Russian village today becomes a heritage, as tomorrow we might lose it forever. New phenomena enter the sphere of social awareness as well, but society needs time to assess and accept or reject them. For example, for cultural heritage to be nominated as a new site, there has been established, according to the Russian legislation, a minimum age period of 40 years.

Heritage is needed by society for its identity building, and in this sense it is a strategic resource. However, it might be determined as a productive force, and in this case it is an economic resource, which is particularly relevant in the development of various social and economic projects and programs. Many cultural and natural heritage sites in Russia are recognised and function as scientific and cultural centers. In accordance with their nature, specific labor market and relevant infrastructure are being formed, in particular, subsequent tourist business and education activities. From the point of view of a scientist, heritage is information, potentially stored in the matter, in tangible sphere, in the events and processes, ethic, philosophical and religious teachings, folklore, art, literature etc. Demand for heritage resources will grow in due course. Initially, intellectual and later commercial use of the heritage could become the key activity for many regions, while revealing their centers of socio-economic growth based on identified heritage resources.

Heritage is an imperative component of the historic, social and cultural environments. It is crucial for the formation of the specific historic-cultural environment, national and regional identity building. Heritage as a genuine core of national and regional originality reflects the uniqueness and diversity in the natural and socio-cultural environments. Such cores with their integral structures (engineer, ecological, habitat networks) form the natural-cultural framework of the region.

Occasionally, heritage sites might be recognised as spatially localised cultural and natural environments – these are 'cultural landscapes'. Landscape as a site where humans with their life activities are routine actors, requires maintenance and management, and

is regulated by the European Landscape Convention and relevant European spatial planning documents. Recognition of the landscape as a heritage site and human habitat enables comprehensively respond to the challenges of spatial development. Protection of the heritage requires sustenance of certain parameters of the environment. Before adoption of the Convention, in the governmental management practice other concepts were applied that are still in use – the monuments of history and culture (cultural heritage) and strictly protected natural areas (natural heritage). It shall be recalled that state protection of the monuments of nature, history and culture in Russia, as well as establishment of the protected areas (*zapovednik*) were ensured since 1920s, though specific conservation actions have been in practice earlier, and in particular as a private initiative.

The basic forms of heritage protection by state *in situ* today are protected areas. Heritage sites, preserved *ex situ*, are museum collections, botanical and zoological gardens and parks. Sometimes these forms are combined and presented in one establishment (for example, the ‘museum-preserves’). Heritage protection is primarily exercised *in situ*, it is precisely the case when heritage determines the local identity, authenticity of the historic-cultural environment, information potential and distinct image of any land. Heritage *in situ* keeps functioning for support of the diversity, identity, and environment, as well as social, natural and cultural systems within the territorial unit.

In Russia, as in many other countries, different agencies are responsible for national protection of natural and cultural sites, and heritage enhancement is regulated by different state acts. In accordance with the UNESCO Guidelines, natural and cultural heritage have different assessment criteria and separate expert organisations (IUCN – for natural heritage, ICOMOS, ICCROM – for cultural heritage). Nevertheless, practice corrects these regulations. We understand that genuine preservation is needed not for specific individual objects but whole spatial units, as nature and culture cannot be easily separated. By definition, landscape is the integrated geographical unit. Therefore, when the Convention on Natural and Cultural Heritage emerged in 1972, the subgroup for cultural landscape regulations was added in 1992. Cultural landscape is interpreted as a result of co-creative actions of man and the nature, the creative interaction of both agents. In 2004, a new edition of the UNESCO Guidelines has been issued and adopted, where natural and cultural heritage criteria were merged into one joint list. Newly nominated sites are to be assessed now in relation to one or several criteria on this common list, correspondingly not within the separate agencies. It is noteworthy to consider an interesting fact: in the early 20th century in Russia the comprehensive approach to integrated studies of natural and cultural phenomena prevailed, and this has been fixed in the state acts of the 1920s and structure of the governmental agencies. By the mid-century this approach has been displaced by the sectoral approach in the scientific and practical spheres, and only in the 1980s the ideas of integration revived and had reverse movement again.

In modern Russia, in spite of rigid agency barriers, there still exists some forms of territorial protection that enable combining natural and cultural heritage within one complex unit. Moreover, there are conditions for protection of the intangible cultural heritage. The principal forms of comprehensive integrated system of heritage protection – natural and cultural, mental and material, movable objects and property – are national parks and museum-reserves. National parks are managed by the environmental service bodies, the museum-reserves, by the cultural management agencies. Establishment of national parks is regulated by the Federal Law on strictly protected natural areas (1995), and creation of museum-reserves, by individual state acts. In addition to the national parks, the system of strictly protected natural areas includes nature reserves (*zapovednik*), preserves (*zakaznik*), nature parks, monuments of nature, botanical gardens and dendrological parks, spas and health resorts.

Unlike all other types of strictly protected nature areas, national parks set an objective to preserve and restore both natural and cultural sites and objects. National parks are the most convenient forms for preservation and management of multi-functional spatial complexes with all different heritage components. Various countries have national park establishments, the objectives and activities of which could be very diverse. Russian national parks might be created in a relatively pristine nature and in the transformed environment, with various property owners and land users. In the IUCN Classification of protected areas, they are to be listed under the category V (protected landscape), and not under the category II (national parks). In comparison with the international standards, Russian national parks have other mission. Now there are 35 national parks established in Russia, and 4 of them are listed in the World Heritage List. In addition, the List includes territories of *zapovedniks*, nature parks and *zakazniks*.

Both national parks and museum-reserves have the organisational status of governmental bodies and are regulated territories. Along with the museum-reserves in the sphere of cultural heritage, historic-cultural reserves are proposed as another type of protected territories, but they have not received wide recognition so far. In accordance with the Federal Law “On objects of cultural heritage of the peoples in the Russian Federation”, cultural heritage is subdivided into individual monuments, ensembles and remarkable sites, similar to the World Cultural Heritage. In addition, there are traditionally identified sites of the archaeological heritage and urban construction, historic settlements and other historical objects. Museum-reserves are generally organised in a case when the objects of heritage form a territorial complex, in other words, cultural landscape, where any combinations of sites could be found in their authentic natural or historic-cultural environment.

Some of the museum-reserves do not represent historically valuable territory under protection, but include only architectural ensemble, or group of outstanding buildings. It is worth noting that in the legislation on cultural heritage the cultural and natural landscapes are listed among the remarkable sites. In this way the bureaucratic

apparatus in the sphere of cultural management has either voluntarily or involuntarily expanded the regulated monuments from objects towards territorial units. In the acting museum-reserves of Russia (over 100 nowadays) there are widely represented landscapes of estate, park, manor, feudal domain, historic town, or monastery. There are museum-reserves of archaeological profile, representing paleocultural landscapes, military historic museum-reserves in the battlefields. Many of them include the natural complexes of either ecological or historic-cultural value.

In the World Cultural Heritage list in Russia there are 14 objects, the majority of which are under the museum-reserve protection. Unfortunately, the list comprises predominantly architectural ensembles (cathedrals), which certainly does not recognise the existing cultural variability in Russia and does not reflect its cultural landscape diversity. The notion of cultural landscape has been very widely applied during the last decade. Nevertheless, all those who use it, make their own contribution to this concept, though within the accepted framework. Therefore, let us identify the term in full: cultural landscape is a natural-cultural territorial unit, formed as a result of evolutionary interaction of man and the nature, of human socio-cultural and economic activity; it consists of specific combinations of natural, economic, socio-cultural components observed in sustainable interaction and interrelation. Natural and cultural components in a cultural landscape comprise an integrity, and not only mutual background or impact factor.

It is important to stress that the concept of cultural landscape is not limited by an objective definition. The determinant and leading factor for landscape formation is a system of spiritual, religious, moral and ethic, esthetic, intellectual and other values, which in a multitude of ways channels landscape creative processes. In this scrutiny cultural landscape is in concordance with the methodology elaborated by UNESCO for the World Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites, and represents the result of joint creative work by man and the nature. In cultural landscape evolution there are reflected both the positive side of human-nature collaboration and the conflicting outcomes. Since 2001 the intangible objects of the cultural heritage have become relevant issues for international programs and the UNESCO list was established to fix the outstanding forms of the living traditional culture. In 2003 the International Convention on Intangible Heritage has been adopted. From Russia only one phenomenon has been nominated and adopted as such heritage so far – this is the traditional Orthodox culture of Old Believers in the Baikal region (life style, folklore, crafts, medicine etc.).

Cultural landscape is an exciting object for research. It makes possible to study both isolated monuments and traditional culture, natural biological communities and, most important, their interaction, the laws of the territorial system development. The concept of cultural landscape permits to organise comprehensive assessment of the territory, to optimize parameters of the environment, spatial planning and programming. In

accordance with the UNESCO Guidelines the cultural landscapes are divided into man-made, naturally evolved and associative. This classification reflects the degree of transformation of the natural landscape – from its total cultural absorption to the pure reverence to natural phenomena. According to various types of cultural practices a rich diversity of typical Russian cultural landscapes emerges – they include urban, peasant, industrial, spa, monastery, fishery, grape growing, archaeological landscapes, estates, manors, battlefields, ethno-cultural lands. It is possible to continue this list, but we would like to discuss one of the examples – archaic peasant landscape at the Northern Russia, in the Kenozero National Park.

The rural landscape of the Kenozero has evolved in the molded fluvio-glacial plain with multiple lakes and diversified post-glacial topography. At periphery this territory is abundant in marshy lands. Peasant settlements emerged along the lake coasts the 11th century, and by the 16th century the structure of the settlement was finally formed and did not drastically change since then. Modern rural landscape of the Kenozero is an archaic peasant landscape of the Russian North, an embodiment of millennium traditions of the rural culture. In a system of typological categories, established by UNESCO for World Heritage Sites, such landscape is classified as evolved relic cultural landscape.

One of the important characteristics of such landscape is the incorporation of the interacting static (monuments of culture) and dynamic (living culture) phenomena. Their protection is respectfully determined by existence and continuation of specific traditional land use activities. Consequently, the aboriginal ethno-cultural groups of population shall become the object of special governmental support and policy.

Cultural landscapes of the Kenozero exist as historically formed holistic territorial units. Their stable structural elements are comprised by isolated villages or their cluster groups (kust), system of adjacent and predominantly open rural lands (lakes, fields, meadows), sacred sites and installations (churches, chapels, sacred or vow woods, crosses), hunting forest grounds, road and trail network. These elements are connected via the system of functional, planning and visual factors, providing the integrity of the landscape complex.

The rural landscape of the Kenozero has a polyzonal concentric structure. The village comprises a center limited by the constructed area, which is traditionally fenced. Village, as a rule, has a sacred center – church or chapel, which serve as visual dominants of the settlement and its cluster. Villages have kept the traditional planning, construction, structure and even art decorations (wood carving and painting) of the houses.

Around the village several zones are formed – they differ in land use. It is obvious that aquatic area is in the proximity to the settlement (as we study the ‘settlement along lake’ type). The massive commune fields with small wood patches are divided into

plots of private lands within the social area and each field has had its own name – a toponym. These zones more or less preserve their external features and functions.

It is interesting that crop production and animal breeding (culture of the field) were harmoniously integrated into the hunting, fishing and gathering (culture of the forest). All these activities have an impact on the specific mosaics of the landscape, where open meadow and field lands around the villages are continuously giving way to forests and meadows, further to the forest and lake lands where a rich set of succession biocenoses predetermines the high biological diversity. The mosaic of forests and clearings emerges approximately in one mile from the village. Clearings, in contrast to the forests, were in the private individual use and had their own names, often named after the owner. Toponyms of fields and clearings are exceptionally rich in the Kenozero, and thanks to the still existing system of knowledge it is possible to find out about the abandoned or reforested lands. In relation to the demographic situation the area of the clearings was fluctuating and this pulsation differed in comparison with the stable commune cropland. Clearings are concentrated along the roads leading towards the other settlements or remote lakes, marking primarily the most accessible territories. In this way, the planning of the zone has a ray structure. Until the 1850s the archaic slash-burn clearings were used for crop production. Today the significant portion of the former ploughed lands and hayfields are revolving towards the initial state and are reforested by birch and alder groves. Diverse meadow grass lands are transformed into the monotone plant communities, the mosaic landscape is degraded, clearing or ecotone effect is lost, and as a result, the wildlife, including rare species, becomes extinct. We observe the situation of socio-economic stagnation when it is accompanied by species and cenoses diversity loss, though it is observed that when the nature is relieved from the anthropogenic pressure, it is always a positive effect.

The next zone is a vast peripheral area of forests, marshes and smaller lakes, also the component of a cultural landscape. It is dissected by the remote trails towards the hunting and fishing huts at the smaller lakes in the forests. This zone also fluctuates – the remotest trails, roads and hunting grounds are abandoned. Cultural components of the landscape in this zone often are represented solely in virtual form – in memory of the old local inhabitants, in their folklore. Such inalienable element of the cultural landscape as hunting and fishing grounds – are portions of wilderness with intrinsic diversity of biota and ecosystems. This example well demonstrates that in relation to the methodological approach one or the other plot of land might be seen as a natural ecosystem or a cultural phenomenon.

Aquatic area, near-lake zone of the cultural landscape incorporates different economic and planning lands plots. Here are located both fishing grounds and main ways of transportation, because boats are major transportation means of the Kenozero people. An amazing feature of the water is that it both links and divides space. Visually the aquatic area of the lake have usually connected several clusters of the villages. There

were also acoustic communications – bell tolls in the festive church days, on these days inhabitants of the neighbouring villages had gathered and continue to get together. Within the aquatic area the strictly localised sacred zones are located – the island cemeteries. This type of burial and its archaic forms are rather characteristic for the Kenozero. The traditional farewell processions and archaic burials are preserved: the “floor” under the coffin is laid on, and above it the ‘ceiling’ is constructed. Each village cluster has its own burial grounds.

In general, a unique intensity of the sacred space is observed in the Kenozero region: almost in every settlement there is a church or a chapel, in most cases chapels stand near sacred woods, vow or obey crosses are erected along the roads, sacred trees and stones. Many objects of the ritual architecture are unique monuments. It is very interesting that these objects are peculiarly placed in the landscape. Sacred site frequently serves as a marker at some border, or a transition area. Chapels are located at the end of the village, while the latter extends they occur to be inside the construction area. In many cases chapels standing near sacred woods label the border of the community property and village impact zone. They can be found at the cross-roads, but these are usually highlighted by crosses. Not uncommonly crosses mark the transition zone between different cultural landscapes. Most remarkably, all these sites continue to live and be reproduced thanks to a mental layer of the landscape – common understanding of the universe. The Kenozero is a unique region of various folk traditions – from epic folklore to traditional household habits intimately connected with the environment and locality. In relation to the sacred world vow and obey traditions are widely spread. Crosses are erected on vows, promise of a pilgrimage, for example, to the monastery. There are particular behavior practices and rituals in the sacred places. For example, until 1950s the Kenozero people regularly visited the already abandoned and destroyed St. Makarii hermitage, where they moved on knees along the coast of one of the lakes. The obey tradition is coming to the cross with the presents, usually parts of the clothes, most frequently head scarves, sometimes with the crosses embroidered in the middle of the scarf. This symbol is a present to the particular saint, a request about something. This request and tribute are connected and signify a memorial action. Crosses and chapels with no obeys are dead objects, they are just monuments of the history, abandoned and mortified. But the majority of the Kenozero chapels and crosses still have tributes. In the land use, in particular, in the animal breeding and hunting practices, the habits, spells and charms are also common. The texts of charms are preserved in the family and inherited from the previous generations. If a family shares such text with the folklore scientist, this is the sign that it has abandoned such ritual and does not use it anymore: the science acquires a new monument while the traditional culture loses it – this is one of the paradoxes of the heritage protection.

For better representation of the cultural landscape it is important to know how its essential elements are constructed. For example, the functional structure of the

peasant house determines its exterior and location in the landscape. In Kenozero villages the traditional internal planning of the houses is still applied. The yard is connected to the house via a common space under one roof. The house consists of two wooden huts – summer and winter (*zimnik*) parts. The summer part has larger size and is usually oriented to the south. The winter hut is located “normally” or perpendicularly to the summer one. Houses, where all constructions are aligned, look like ships. The vertical structure of the house is rather complex: the yard has 2-3 height levels, summer and winter huts are often located at the different levels and are connected by corridors and staircases. Most important detail of the house is a stove, where all fragments have proper destination, connected to the peasant household. Here even a for a cat is intended. Traditional character and coloring of the house add particular significance to the old wooden furniture, clay utensils, decorated towels at the icons in the red corner (which is a special place in the Russian hut), woven hand-made rugs.

It is precisely the rural landscape with cultural monuments that determines the attractiveness of the Kenozero region and enhances its values. At the same time the value of the landscape is to be only supported via participation of the local community, as cultural attributes of the landscape are the products of local peasant life. However, local community is too small numbered and grows old quickly. Furthermore, younger generations prefer to promote urban lifestyle, so there could be no connection to the traditional values and existing environmental microcosm in the future. It is highly advisable to fix main features and components of the historical-cultural space today, in particular, in addition to the physical environment, to assess the spiritual culture, which is expressed via semantics and semiotics of the landscape. The complete knowledge about the object serves as a tool for the landscape management, and in our case for its support and preservation.

The studies by Heritage Institute in the Kenozero National Park have built up a basis for elaborating management plan for this territory and compiling programs and other documents aimed at the heritage protection and sustainable spatial development at the local level.

## Un réseau écologique pour l'Europe

Henri JAFFEUX

*Président du Comité d'experts pour la constitution du Réseau écologique paneuropéen du Conseil de l'Europe*

A l'instar de Mme Marina Kuleskova qui vient de parler en faveur des paysages culturels dans le développement territorial européen, je vais plaider, pour ma part, pour la prise en compte des considérations écologiques. Je crois pouvoir dire que mon intervention est complémentaire à la sienne.

Comme l'a fait la directrice générale, Mme Gabriella Battaini-Dragnoni, je voudrais me référer aussi aux «Principes directeurs pour le développement territorial durable du continent européen». Ces principes, les ministres des Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe, responsables de l'aménagement du territoire, les ont adoptés à leur Conférence de Hanovre, en septembre 2000. Ils visent en particulier à mettre en cohérence les attentes économiques et sociales par rapport au territoire avec ses fonctions écologiques et culturelles.

Ces fonctions écologiques, le Réseau écologique paneuropéen est destiné à les préserver.

Avant de vous en présenter les principales caractéristiques, je voudrais vous donner les raisons qui ont justifié et qui justifient toujours le besoin de le mettre en place. Je vais vous parler de fragmentation des écosystèmes.

La fragmentation des milieux naturels par l'urbanisation, l'industrialisation et les réseaux de transport est un fait avéré à travers toute l'Europe. Le développement des réseaux de transport, en particulier, connaît un essor important à travers tout le continent européen. Dans l'Union européenne à Quinze, plus de 12 000 km de nouvelles routes étaient prévues jusqu'en 2010. Avec l'extension des réseaux dans le cadre de l'Union élargie et au-delà, et ici même à travers la Russie, les derniers grands espaces restés peu morcelés jusqu'à présent risquent d'être fragmentés à leur tour et ceux qui l'ont déjà été, de disparaître.

Pourquoi cette question est-elle donc devenue prioritaire pour la conservation de la diversité biologique et paysagère du continent européen? Quels sont donc les effets de cette fragmentation?

La fragmentation a d'ores et déjà des incidences significatives sur la survie de différentes populations animales à travers l'Europe, sur leur état de conservation et sur leurs capacités de migration.

Aux problèmes de mortalité directe de la faune par collision, qui met aussi en danger les automobilistes, s'ajoute la diminution progressive du nombre d'individus formant une population animale viable pouvant conduire celle-ci à la disparition.

Dans d'autres cas, on constate une sédentarisation des populations dans les espaces fortement fragmentés par les infrastructures de transport augmentant leurs pressions sur le milieu, provoquant des dégâts aux cultures ou aux forêts.

D'une façon générale, une catégorie d'animaux paie un lourd tribut aux routes, ce sont les amphibiens. Ce facteur, s'ajoutant à d'autres causes, a conduit à la disparition de populations entières.

D'autres espèces liées aux cours d'eau, comme la loutre, le castor ou le vison, sont particulièrement touchées. En effet, les intersections du réseau routier secondaire avec le réseau hydrographique constituent des sites dont les caractéristiques techniques les rendent souvent mortelles.

D'autre part, toutes les espèces qui ont besoin de grands espaces vitaux ou qui effectuent des migrations saisonnières, sont particulièrement sensibles à la fragmentation et à la perte de leurs corridors écologiques naturels.

Mais, si je peux dire, il y a plus inquiétant encore. Une récente étude de l'ONU, réalisée dans le cadre des Objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement, a révélé que 60% des services fournis par les écosystèmes et qui permettent, non moins que cela, la vie humaine sur terre, sont dégradés ou surexploités. Les experts affirment que la dégradation observée de 15 des 24 services fournis par les écosystèmes accroît la probabilité de changements brusques qui pourront affecter sérieusement le bien-être des humains. Nous avons modifié les écosystèmes plus rapidement au cours des 50 dernières années qu'à tout autre moment de notre histoire. La conséquence en est une perte substantielle et largement irréversible de la diversité de la vie sur la terre où, désormais, 10 à 30% des espèces de mammifères, d'oiseaux et d'amphibiens sont menacées d'extinction.

Mais, me direz-vous, des politiques de préservation des espèces et des espaces ont été conduites depuis plus d'un siècle, et plus intensément depuis une quarantaine d'années, sur tous les continents, dont le nôtre et à tous les niveaux, local, national, international. On peut d'ailleurs honorer le Conseil de l'Europe qui, parmi les organisations intergouvernementales, a été pionnier en la matière dès les années soixante.

Aujourd'hui, près de 12% de la superficie terrestre mondiale est concernée par des aires protégées. N'ont-elles pas été créées, justement, pour protéger les espèces et les écosystèmes des pressions anthropiques?

Oui, certes, mais les aires protégées ont longtemps été et sont encore parfois aujourd'hui, l'expression de la protection de la nature du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle. Identifier et isoler

des portions de territoire pour préserver des espèces sauvages remarquables ou des «monuments naturels» apparaissait alors comme une stratégie de protection de la nature simple, évidente et nécessairement efficace. Or cette stratégie n'a pas été gagnante dans le contexte du développement économique de ces cinquante dernières années et des aspirations de nos sociétés, avides de progrès techniques et d'élévation du niveau de vie qu'elles ont obtenus à un prix de plus en plus élevé en termes de dégradation des autres services comme le montre l'étude que j'ai déjà citée.

Aujourd'hui, les aires protégées et les écosystèmes qu'elles ont pour mission de protéger sont soumises, à l'instar de la nature ordinaire, à la «globalisation écologique». Je veux dire par cette expression que leurs frontières sont perméables aux pollutions diffuses et à certains événements extérieurs sans que leur réglementation puisse les en protéger.

Deux autres faiblesses les caractérisent. La première est le fait de leur périmètre qui a souvent été le fruit de compromis peu favorables aux exigences écologiques des espèces et des écosystèmes qu'elles sont censées protéger. Le second provient de leur planification qui n'a que trop rarement pris en compte la connectivité écologique qui devrait être assurée, lorsque cela est approprié, entre les aires protégées elles mêmes ou entre celles-ci et les zones dont dépendent les espèces qu'elles abritent.

Dans nos pays, l'absence de prise en compte de cette connectivité dans l'établissement des aires protégées, conçues comme des éléments trop souvent déconnectés les uns des autres n'a pas permis d'enrayer la destruction du maillage écologique du territoire avec toutes les conséquences que j'ai déjà signalées. Le changement climatique désormais à l'œuvre fait craindre que la fragmentation du territoire européen qui isole déjà trop souvent les aires protégées les unes des autres, les fragilise encore plus dans l'avenir.

Alors, me direz-vous qu'apportera donc de plus le Réseau écologique paneuropéen? La réponse est contenue dans l'idée directrice suivante: la diversité biologique du continent européen ne sera préservée durablement que si l'on réussit à maintenir ou à restaurer les facteurs environnementaux qui conditionnent la viabilité des écosystèmes.

A cette fin trois grands principes directeurs sont à appliquer :

- les types d'habitats naturels, dans toute leur diversité, d'importance nationale et européenne, doivent être conservés dans des zones aussi vastes et nombreuses que possible;
- lorsque la seule possibilité consiste à sauvegarder les habitats au travers d'un grand nombre de zones plus petites et dispersées, celles-ci doivent être aussi proches que possible et reliées entre elles par des structures paysagères;

- si nécessaire, on doit veiller à ce que la qualité de l'environnement à l'intérieur d'une zone soit protégée des effets dommageables provenant de l'extérieur de la zone.

C'est ce que s'efforce de réaliser le Réseau écologique paneuropéen en associant quatre types de zones:

- les «zones noyaux» sont des foyers de diversité biologique. En leur sein sont conservés les éléments majeurs d'écosystèmes, d'habitats naturels et de populations d'espèces. Leur préservation est assurée en faisant appel aux instruments classiques à la disposition des gouvernements allant des systèmes conventionnels aux statuts réglementaires d'aires protégées;
- les «couloirs ou corridors écologiques», en reliant certaines zones noyaux entre elles permettent la dispersion et la migration des espèces et les échanges génétiques entre des populations locales différentes;
- les «zones tampons», lorsqu'elles sont nécessaires, protègent les zones noyaux, voire les couloirs, des impacts dommageables que peuvent occasionner à distance certaines activités humaines;
- enfin, en raison de l'importance des dommages déjà causés à la diversité biologique et aux fonctions écologiques vitales des écosystèmes qui en conditionnent son expression, le réseau a aussi un objectif de reconquête de ces qualités perdues dans des «zones de restauration» quand cela est réalisable techniquement et à un coût raisonnable.

En 1995, année où fut décidée à Sofia la création de ce Réseau par les ministres de l'environnement dans le cadre de l'adoption de la Stratégie paneuropéenne de la diversité biologique et paysagère, il s'agissait encore d'un projet quelque peu théorique. Aujourd'hui, le réseau se tisse à partir des nombreuses initiatives visant l'établissement de réseaux écologiques nationaux, régionaux et transrégionaux. A ce titre le réseau «Natura 2000» mis en place au sein de l'Union européenne et le réseau «Emeraude» édifié selon les mêmes principes, dans le cadre de la convention de Berne sous l'égide du Conseil de l'Europe, sont une contribution à son édification. 15% du territoire de l'Union Européenne est actuellement couvert par Natura 2000.

La Fédération de Russie participe à cette réalisation. Elle a adopté une stratégie nationale pour la création de réseaux écologiques en 2002. Elle apporte d'ores et déjà une contribution importante à la réalisation du réseau paneuropéen avec plus de 140 millions d'hectares d'aires naturelles spécialement protégées soit 7,6% de la superficie de son territoire.

Le Réseau écologique paneuropéen est le premier réseau écologique établi à l'échelle d'un continent entier. A ce titre, il répond au Plan d'application du sommet mondial pour le développement durable et aux Objectifs de développement pour le Millénaire.

Pareillement, il s'inscrit dans le programme de travail sur les aires protégées de la convention sur la diversité biologique qui doit concourir à réduire fortement le rythme actuel de perte de la diversité biologique à l'horizon 2010.

Sous l'autorité du Conseil intergouvernemental de la Stratégie paneuropéenne de la diversité biologique et paysagère, le Comité d'experts pour la constitution du Réseau écologique paneuropéen assure la réflexion, l'échange d'expériences et le suivi de sa mise en place.

La prochaine étape cruciale pour le conseil de la Stratégie et son comité d'experts sera la Conférence des ministres européens de l'environnement qui se tiendra en 2007 à Belgrade. En effet, selon la résolution prise lors de leur précédente conférence, à Kiev, en 2003, les principaux éléments constitutifs du Réseau écologique paneuropéen devront être identifiés et cartographiés. Dans ce but, un rapport est en préparation et des cartes sont en cours de réalisation.

J'ai commencé mon intervention en me référant aux Principes de Hanovre pour le développement territorial durable du continent européen. Je voudrais y revenir un instant en appelant votre attention sur l'un des passages de ces Principes qui souligne qu' «il est important d'accélérer le développement et la mise en œuvre du réseau paneuropéen des transports (notamment les dix corridors paneuropéens de transport) qui constituent une condition indispensable à la réalisation de conditions d'accès satisfaisantes sur l'ensemble du territoire».

Si le vocabulaire employé est le même pour les deux types de réseaux, il traduit cependant des demandes économiques et sociales différentes qui, si on n'y prend pas garde, pourraient se trouver en opposition sur le terrain, le moment venu.

Ce Séminaire est l'occasion d'aborder sans ambages les deux facettes de cette réalité et de proposer des solutions concrètes à présenter à la prochaine conférence ministérielle de l'aménagement du territoire qui se tiendra au Portugal l'an prochain. Le slogan donné à cette conférence n'est-il pas «construire des ponts à travers l'Europe»? Il doit s'entendre au propre et au figuré. Dans cette perspective, je voudrais vous proposer très concrètement que votre Séminaire prenne en considération les conclusions du rapport de synthèse de l'action COST 341 lancée en 1998 par l'Union européenne. Cette initiative avait pour objet de promouvoir une approche pluridisciplinaire et de réunir des méthodologies et des outils pour une planification de réseaux de transport tenant compte des nécessités d'interconnexions pour la faune sauvage et minimisant les nouvelles coupures de ses espaces vitaux. Les recommandations qui en sont issues seront, j'en suis sûr, très utiles à vos réflexions. Elles vont justement dans le sens de cette conciliation souhaitée entre les exigences économiques, sociales, culturelles et écologiques.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.



# The European Landscape Convention and transfrontier landscapes

Bas PEDROLI

*Alterra Wageningen UR*

One of the assets of Europe is its diversity of landscapes. That is one of the reasons why the European Landscape Convention states that

“every landscape is worth to be taken care of”.

Aims of the Landscape Convention are (Article 3) to base proper landscape protection, management and planning on sound knowledge of the landscapes throughout Europe and to organise European co-operation on landscape issues. However, a multitude of landscape classifications exist in the different countries. This is logical since the landscapes in the different regions of Europe are so different, but it sometimes hampers international cooperation in landscape matters, especially where transfrontier landscapes are at stake.

The development of a knowledge basis is thus needed, for which we can refer to three approaches:

- landscape typology (ELCAI),
- SWOT analysis of transfrontier landscapes, and
- provision of education and training (ATLAS).

The objective of the European Landscape Character Assessment Initiative (EU FP5 Accompanying Measure ELCAI [www.elcai.org](http://www.elcai.org)) was to demonstrate the use of landscape character assessment as tool for linking regional and national bottom-up approaches with European top-down processes in support of future policy implementation. After an inventory of national approaches we also attempted a European landscape map (LANMAP2) on the basis of:

- Topography (Digital Elevation model GTOPO30, 1 km resolution, USGS),
- Parent material (ESDB, vector, 1:1M, European Soil Bureau) and
- Land cover (CORINE land cover database, vector, 1:100 000, EEA).

With the help of pattern analysis (eCognition) we arrived at a general outline for landscape mapping in Europe: LANMAP2. This map is used as a basis for further detail depending on local specificities.

Conclusions of the ELCAI project are:

---

1. Pérez-Soba, M. & D.M. Wascher (eds. 2005): *Landscape Character Areas. Places for building a sustainable Europe*. Policy Brochure ELCAI. Landscape Europe, Wageningen.

- Landscape characterisation is not the solution for all problems related to the development of a European landscape policy, especially not when taking into consideration the values to be attributed to the landscape (which may be possible on the local level only), but:
- European typology may enhance the notion that landscape is something real, with a clear identity that can be defined in objective terms, and can further be detailed according to local perception,
- it can help identify changes in time in landscape types, related to a well-defined European typology,
- it can well be used in combination with national or regional typologies to cover transboundary issues (cf. Article 9 of the European Landscape Convention).

The second approach is a study of European transfrontier landscapes. This project was commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality in support of the European Landscape Convention, and was carried out by members of the Landscape Europe network ([www.landscape-europe.net](http://www.landscape-europe.net)). 14 Case studies distributed over Mediterranean landscapes (4), Continental landscapes (4) and Atlantic landscapes (6) were described, most of them crossing national boundaries, some regional boundaries within states.

A SWOT analysis in 14 case studies was carried out regarding the following items<sup>2</sup>:

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– What are the advantages intrinsic to the landscape, e.g. environmental, geographical, reputation in the country, uses?</li> <li>– What makes it special for the surroundings?</li> <li>– What is well organised? What is doing well?</li> <li>– What are the good characteristics?</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– What can be improved?</li> <li>– What is done poorly or inconsistently?</li> <li>– What should be avoided?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– What are the interesting trends, good chances?</li> <li>– Changes in government policy related to the landscape described</li> <li>– Changes in cultural and social trends (lifestyle trends, population demographics, education, recreation)</li> <li>– Changes in markets (agribusiness, tourism, commercialisation of regional products)</li> <li>– Local events</li> </ul> <p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Environment: pollution</li> <li>– Land/building: insufficient job perspectives, land use conflicts, uncontrolled countryside urbanisation</li> <li>– Transport/communication infrastructure</li> <li>– General infrastructure (water, health care, social and cultural facilities)</li> </ul>
--	--

2. Wascher D. & Perez-Soba M. (eds.. 2004): *Learning from European Transfrontier Landscapes – a project in support of the European Landscape Convention*. Alterra report 964, Landscape Europe, Wageningen.

The landscape crossing the border between Spain and Portugal, the Arribes del Duero/do Douro may be given as an example:

- Strengths: agricultural and forest mosaic,
- Weakness: problems in maintaining the traditional agricultural infrastructures (terracing, irrigation),
- Opportunities: valuable landscape resources,
- Threats: non-regulated housing development close to present-day settlements.

In most cases the answers to the challenges posed to the comparable landscapes in the separate countries or regions are different, which may not always be detrimental, but should be taken into due consideration.

The third approach is an Action for Training in Land use And Sustainability (EU FP6 Co-ordination Action ATLAS [www.atlas-eu.org](http://www.atlas-eu.org)), a Landscape Europe initiative with the objective to:

- evaluate the impact of land use and landscape policies with regard to:
  - assessment of educational and training provision in the area of land use change, and
  - development of a tool (on-line data base) for the training possibilities;
- analyse the sustainability impact assessment process and the obstacles to successful implementation of the land use and landscape policy in Europe, and make recommendations aimed at finding solutions for improvement; and
- develop a ‘road-map’ as an interactive web-based training tool for sustainability impact assessment in the landscape area, primarily aimed at policy makers.

The deliverables of ATLAS will be:

- a baseline description (on-line data base) of the status of landscape educational provision at practitioner’s, professional, undergraduate and Master’s levels, within Europe;
- a SWOT-analysis of the extent to which this provision meets current needs, with clear recommendations for improvement; and,
- a ‘road-map’ for training in land use sustainability assessment providing better European organisation of the educational provision leading to appropriate professional qualifications.

In this way the knowledge base of the European landscape community can be improved, to allow for better protection, planning and management of Europe’s diverse landscapes. Let us be aware that landscapes do not stop at regional or national boundaries.



## **Methodology on spatial planning in system of integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) by example of demonstration project for Geledzhik Resort (Russia)**

Ekaterina ANATONIDZE

*Chairman of ICZM, Advisory Group of the Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution*

The Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution (Bucharest Convention) was signed by representatives of 6 riparian countries – Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russia, Turkey and Ukraine – in 1992. The Convention aims at the co-operation in the sphere of protection of the Black sea marine environment and its living resources. In 1993 GEF initiated realisation of the Black Sea Environmental Program (BSEP). Within this Program, Black Sea countries were supported in Convention implementation. Countries also receive permanent support from European Union.

The Activity Center on Development of Common Methodologies for ICZM (ICZM-center) was established in Russia (Krasnodar) in 1994. Its main purpose is the “exchange of information and experience on ensuring sustainable resource use, including recreational use by tourists in the coastal zones of Black Sea countries, and develop methodologies for coastal zone management, with particular reference to threats to the environment arising from the transition to market economies”.

ICZM is defined as:

### **European Commission:**

“ICZM is a continuous process of administration the general aim of which is to put into practice sustainable development and conservation in coastal zones and to maintain their biodiversity. To this end, ICZM seeks, through more efficient management, to establish and maintain the best use and sustainable levels of development and activity (use) in the coastal zone, and, over time, to improve the physical status of the coastal environment in accordance with certain commonly held and agreed norms.”

### **World Bank:**

“Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) is a governmental process and consists of the legal and institutional framework necessary to ensure that development and management plans for coastal zones are integrated with environmental (including social) goals and are made with the participation of those affected.”

During the last decade the ICZM-center has dealt in its activities with the study of international experience in the sphere of ICZM and the preparation of documents for ICZM implementation in the Black Sea region. In recent years, the ICZM-center has been supported by the European Union through the TACIS Program. The ICZM-center is responsible for the implementation of Projects which include development and implementation of ICZM methodologies in Black Sea coastal zones.

According to Guiding Principles for Sustainable Development of the European Continent:

“58. Europe’s coastal regions are not only sensitive natural heritage areas but also important focuses of economic and commercial activities, prime locations for industry and energy conversion, a starting point for the exploitation of maritime and underwater resources and particularly attractive areas for tourism.

59. Since such a range of activities in coastal strips can generate numerous conflicts, an integrated and sustainable spatial development policy, covering not only the coastal strip but also the hinterland, is essential for such regions. The concept of the integrated management of coastal areas is intended to take into account the interaction between economic activities and social and environmental requirements when making use of natural resources in coastal areas and hence facilitate the decision-making process in assessing investments. Integrated coastal management should be a systematic component of regional planning at the various levels concerned. Cross-border and transnational co-operation beyond the sea are of particular importance in this respect.”

### The Black Sea Basin



A key component in the ICZM system implementation is spatial planning. The methodology of spatial planning in the ICZM System was developed by the ICZM-center and based on it a demonstration project was implemented within the EuropeAid Project “Technical Assistance to the Black Sea Environmental Programme in Russia, Georgia, Ukraine” (2002-2004).

The Spatial Planning procedure is based on prior functional zoning of the area. Functional zoning is basic for the preparation of investment programs and it considerably facilitates the search of optimal alternatives for coastal zones development.

The basic Stages in functional zoning are:

*1. Baseline survey and identification of interpretation methods*

The first step of functional zoning procedure is the baseline survey. The baseline survey aims to present a general overview of land-use related situations, eg social-economic and environmental, which are then discussed between experts, authorities and the public. The survey forms the basis for the planning and identification of adequate options for future development. The survey consists of the following issues:

- geographical survey of the area;
- social-demographic situation;
- economic situation in the area;
- ecological situation.

All aspects of the survey are then compiled into an ecological and anthropogenic inventory and the sectoral perspectives developments.

*2. Mapping and digitalisation of theme maps*

Ecological assessment is a major instrument in Spatial Planning, especially while aiming at sustainable development. Its aim is to get an overview of:

- the natural resources;
- their use;
- their importance;
- their vulnerability.


The importance and vulnerability are assessed for the following natural components and classified from one to three:

- soil;
- water resources;
- flora;
- fauna;
- sea.

*Natural Component Importance* – Combined properties of the natural component identifying its importance to preserve the qualities and features aimed at being used in accordance with its target function. Scale: 1 – low, 2 – average, 3 – high.

*Natural Component Target Function* – Main function of the natural component in the general natural system.

*Natural Component Vulnerability* – Changeability of natural component features and qualities under the influence of external factors. Scale: 1 – low, 2 – average, 3 – high.



Stages within Functional zoning

3. Matrix tabulation of sectoral interaction
4. Development of information integral estimate programme in GIS format to define possibilities of optimal land use by different sectors. This programme will ensure:
  - the introduction of sectoral interference levels indication for individual theme maps on the basis of matrix tables into the GIS programme;
  - the introduction of sectoral interaction indication;
  - the possibility of integral theme maps analysis and new theme mapping in accordance with the specified algorithm.
5. Mapping and digitalisation of actual area use map

Mapping of the present nature management is an essential step toward Spatial Planning. Since all land has already a use, either natural or economic, every change in nature management will result in an increase of the one and a decrease of another territory for the other sector. This information is used for identification of sectors and analysis of development opportunities. On the practical nature management map the areas used by main sectors are marked out:

- agriculture;
- tourism, resort;
- transport;
- industry;
- urban-planning.
- forestry;
- fishery;
- nature conservation;
- water industry.

6. Matrix tabulation of levels and types of sectoral impact.
7. Matrix tabulation of intervention levels (accepted sectoral levels) for the areas specified by theme maps.
8. Identification of the land use alternative considering natural factors for individual sector based on the integral estimation of all theme maps and sectoral land use mapping.
9. Actual land use analysis with an allowance for the natural factor, identification of ecological conflicts, analysis of causes, search for acceptable solutions.

Functional zoning sets for each zone a set of interventions into the present land use to reduce or to prevent conflict level and stimulate the most socio-economically and ecologically profitable sectors.



The economic and environmental situations around the Black Sea are foreseeing possibilities for development. The point is to save natural resources – the basis for the resort welfare – for present and future use. This can only be done in a sustainable approach and co-operation with all stakeholders. Integrated Coastal Zone Management and Spatial Planning are instruments which can help with sustainable development.

Spatial Planning will help reduce conflicts of interest, slowing down development, and stimulating the desired development taking future demands into account.

Administrative authorities, public and business have to be further prepared for this co-operated process, to experience the mutual advantages.

The actual implementation has to take place through the adoption of legislation documents including the Spatial Planning Law and instruments for its enforcement. Besides, the implementation process can be supported by environmental, economic and sanitary regulations.

Having a functional zoning plan and the will to enforce it for the long-term perspective, it is possible to stimulate development and attract necessary investments for the social-economic development and make the investment process more stable.



**Part B – Networking concerning territory/  
Partie B – Réseaux concernés**

**Moderator/Modérateur**

Mrs Danica PAVLOVSKA

*Representative of “the Former Republic of Macedonia  
to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials”*



# Research for sustainable territorial development: examples and lessons for the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) Programme

Thiemo W. ESER

*Representative of Luxembourg to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

## 1. The ESPON Programme

Objectives of the ESPON 2006 Programme “Spatial development of an enlarging European Union”

- Support spatial dimension of the territorial cohesion policy and other EU policies,
- Better coordination of territorial decisions,
- Bridging between policy makers administrators and scientists,
- Scientific networking and platform for applied European territorial research,
- New knowledge on European territorial trends and impact of EU policies,
- Integrated territorial analysis, tools and scenarios.
- 30 applied research projects on trends, policy impact and integrated analysis,
- 15 Final Reports, so far.

(See in detail Annex 1: Facts about the ESPON 2006 Programme)

## 2. Some questions and findings

### 2.1 Elements of an ESPON approach to sustainable territorial development

- Dimensions of sustainability: economic, ecological, social (cultural),
- identifying the territorial dimension with regard to:
  - development potentials of the territory,
  - territorial trends,
  - impacts of policies,
  - cross thematic effects.
- References of political documents such as:
  - the ESDP,
  - scoping document on the territorial state and perspectives of the European Union,
  - Lisbon Strategy and Gothenburg/Sustainable Development Strategy.

## *2.2 Key questions for research on consequences of sustainable territorial development*

- Do we (be)li(e)ve in a bipolar world?
  - economic growth vs environmental sustainability,
  - competitiveness vs cohesion,
  - Lisbon vs non Lisbon regions,
  - concentration vs polycentricism,
  - diversity vs homogeneity of territories,
  - global vs local integration,
  - urban vs rural.

## *2.3 Selection of midterm results*

### Overview

- signs of Europe moving towards better territorial balance and cohesion,
- signs of increasing competition of regions,
- confirmation that Europe entails a rich regional diversity and specialisation,
- every region offers a unique combination of territorial potentials for development,
- every region faces as well individual challenges,
- substantial possibilities for exploiting potentials and improving regional competitiveness, in particular through territorial cooperation.

### Urban structure and economic development

- Pentagon (14% surface -32% population - 46% GDP),
- increasing importance of Metropolitan regions outside the Pentagon,
- growth in GDP higher in areas with relatively lower GDP level (% 1995-2002).

### Components of population development

- ageing and population decline,
- population becomes more geographically concentrated,
- competition between regions for human resources,
- major urban areas and pleasant retirement areas.

### Accessibility, multimodal

- core-periphery pattern,
- air transport more territorially balanced,
- Pentagon and eastwards as well as major urban agglomerations in better situation,
- ICT access depends on national preferences,
- favours urban areas.

#### Research and development importance

- highest expenditure in regions close to the Pentagon and few areas to the North and South,
- at national level often concentration around the capital
- knowledge production such as higher education rather territorially balanced in Europe.

#### Regionalised economic Lisbon performance

- some regions have better potentials for a knowledge based economy than others,
- 5 out of 14 Lisbon indicators show particular Pentagon and selected areas in Northern Europe,
- Eastern Europe faces the greatest challenge,
- high potential is not linked to urbanisation.

#### Areas assigned to Potential Urban Strategic Horizons (PUSH)

- cities with overlapping travel to work areas have the best potential for developing synergies,
- areas assigned to PUSH area (in red) – municipalities of which at least 10% of the area is within 45 minutes from the nearest FUA centres.

#### 2.4 *Some answers for research on sustainable territorial development*

- the word is not bipolar:
- economic growth can be combined to environmental sustainability,
- competitiveness and cohesion by activating potentials,
- non Lisbon regions – not necessarily without chances,
- polycentricism as a source for sustainable development – 3 dimensions,
- diversity of territories as an asset,
- global and local integration – a multilayer approach,
- urban and rural – the question of complementarity, connection and exchange,
- territorial approach allows to consider simultaneously several dimensions,
- territorial potentials and sustainable development,
- multi-factorial view,
- multi-level view,
- building on relations,
- perception of research by policy-makers – importance of information and communication.

### **3. Considerations on ESPON II, 2007-2013 - Five key elements**

- service/client orientation with targeted deliveries,
- continued knowledge production on territorial development and impacts,
- networking of a wider group of contributors,
- scientific platform and monitoring,
- technical and analytical support.

## **Annex 1:**

(Version 10 August 2005)

### **Facts about the Espon 2006 Programme**

- (1) The European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) is set up under the Interreg III programme as a networking activity. All EU Member States have agreed to contribute to carrying through the programme with Luxembourg as taking the lead. The programme started its activities early in 2002.
- (2) The aims of the programme are (a) to support policy development with new knowledge on territorial trends and impacts of policies that affects the regions and territories within Europe and (b) to build a European scientific network in applied research relating to European territorial development.
- (3) The budget for the ESPON programme is in total approximately 17 Million?, of which the European Commission via the ERDF provides 7 Million? The 25 EU Member States match the EU finding, Norway and Switzerland have joined the programme as full members and contribute extra funding as well as Luxembourg which contributes in order to ensure sufficient resources for hosting the Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.
- (4) The ESPON programme is steered and managed by a Monitoring Committee with the Commission (DG Regio) and the EU Member States as well as Norway and Switzerland as full members.
- (5) The roles of Managing and Paying Authorities are handled by the Ministry of the Interior and Spatial Planning in Luxembourg.
- (6) The applied research is undertaken by transnational project groups including researchers from at least 3 EU countries. More than 130 institutions from all over Europe have up until now been involved in the networking around ESPON projects.
- (7) The applied research undertaken covers the territory of the 25 EU Member States plus Bulgaria, Romania, Norway and Switzerland. The applied research opts for European wide regional information at as detailed a level as the statistics allow for. The main source of statistical information is Eurostat.

- (8) The themes for the applied research are partly defined in the Community Initiative Programme for ESPON, partly selected by the ESPON Monitoring Committee as the budget was extended following the enlargement of the EU.
- (9) The themes of the applied research falls in three groups: (a) Territorial trends, (b) Territorial impact of EU policies and (c) Integrated territorial analysis and tools. The following table provides an overview of the themes of ESPON projects undertaken or ongoing as well as their titles:

**ESPON project themes:**

(a) Territorial trends:

- the role, specific situation and potentials of urban areas as nodes in a polycentric development
- urban-Rural relations in Europe
- enlargement of the European Union and the wider European perspective as regards its polycentric spatial structure
- the spatial effects of demographic trends and migration
- transport Services and networks: Territorial trends and basic supply of infrastructure for territorial cohesion
- telecommunication services and networks: Territorial trends and basic supply of infrastructure for territorial cohesion
- identification of spatially relevant aspects of the information society
- the spatial effects and management of natural and technological hazards (in general and in relation to climate change)
- territorial trends of the management of natural heritage
- impact of cultural heritage and identity
- the role of small and medium sized towns
- the territorial dimension of social developments in Europe

(b) Territorial impact of EU policies:

- territorial impacts of EU transport and TEN polices
- territorial impacts of EU research and development policy
- the territorial impact of CAP and rural development policy
- territorial trends of energy services and networks and territorial impact of EU Energy Policy
- territorial impacts of European fisheries policy
- territorial impacts of structural funds

- territorial impacts of the “Aquis communautaire”, pre-accession aid and PHARE/TACIS/MEDA programmes
  - territorial impacts of structural funds in urban areas
  - territorial impacts of EU environment policy
  - application and effects of the ESDP in member states
  - governance of urban and territorial policies from EU to local level
  - territorial impacts of EU economic policies and location of economic activities
- (c) Integrated territorial analysis and tools
- integrated analysis of transnational and national territories based on ESPON results
  - integrated tools for European spatial development
  - spatial scenarios and orientations in relation to the ESDP and EU cohesion policy
  - territorial dimension of the Lisbon/Gothenburg process
  - Europe in the world
  - the modifiable areas unit problem (mixing Nuts 2 and Nuts 3 in analyses)

- (10) The ESPON programme will altogether carry through 30 projects before the end of the programme by end 2006. This is 11 projects more than envisaged at the start.
- (11) With the 30 project themes the ESPON programme has taken the first step in delivering new European knowledge that can nourish the discussion related to territorial cohesion at European level as well as within regions and transnational and national territories. The findings are heavily supported with European maps showing different aspects of the regional diversity within the theme in question.
- (12) Further development of the scientific findings and networking will take place within the current ESPON programme in order to progress as far as possible towards excellence in applied European Territorial Research. However, the thematic coverage can be further deepened and widened in order to reflect the territorial dynamics of Europe and more progress on methodologies and tools can be done in order to understand territorial potentials and develop tools for territorial impact assessment. In particular, progress on regionalised European dataset will be necessary.
- (13) At the moment 15 ESPON projects have delivered their final findings and European maps. This means that ESPON programme has currently reached a midterm milestone.

- (14) A particular challenge for the remaining 19 months of the programme is the communication of the new European knowledge produced in order to make it operational, at European scale as well as at transnational, national and regional level.
- (15) The ESPON takes part in the Interact programme in order to feed in ESPON results into all Interreg programmes strands A, B, and C and to establish the link between main European territorial trends and the effects of territorially relevant sector policies with activities carried through in the programmes under Interreg.
- (16) The ESPON programme has decided a communication strategy including a dialogue with regional policy makers and practitioners at several transnational seminars as well as cooperation with the Interact programme resulting in three seminars with representatives from other Interreg III programmes.
- (17) The wider dissemination of results is ensured by a transparent website, where all interim and final results are made available, as well as through printed material. A folder, a synthesis report (2003), a briefing (2004) has been published until now. A ESPON synthesis report II was presented just before the Informal Ministerial meeting on 20-21 May 2005 in Luxembourg.
- (18) At the end of the programme it is envisaged to produce a Final Report synthesising the findings of all 30 project as well as a report documenting the progress made on a scientific platform for applied European Territorial Research including issues such as methodologies for integrated territorial analysis, core indicators and typologies, mapping tools, progress on tools for territorial impact assessment and an ESPON database.



# Patterns of migration in Europe in the 21st Century

Irina MOLODIKOVA

*Director of migration, Central European University Budapest*

## Introduction

Nowadays migration has become one of the most important forces shaping today's life across Europe. Scenarios of European development in UN replacement migration report indicate that Europe's population will shrink at least to 100 million between 2000 and 2050. Population ageing is another inevitable outcome of current demographic trends. In order to support ageing population in the future at the current level of benefits Europe would need at least 370 000 additional working people per year according to the medium variant for economic development and up to 4,7 million per year to maintain a constant ratio of active working group. From 1995 to 2003 the inflow of migrants to Europe was about 5,6 million, or approximately 0,6 million per year (UN, 2001). But the problem is not only the share volume of migration. Understanding the main patterns of directions and destinations of the migration flows are equally important for the purposes of spatial planning.

In order to analyse these migration patterns we need to disclose the main migration flows among European countries. It is evident that the migration flows are changing in time, and the level of generalisation should be different for different purposes. Migrants mostly come to certain cities and regions (despite mass flows in cases of extreme emergency like wars or natural disasters). Therefore in different countries there are regions experiencing various migration pressures. The main reasons for the choice of a destination country by prospective migrants are: existence of historical links with the territory (links from colonial times, for example); communities of compatriots; existing migration network which enables migration; knowledge of the language; choice of middleperson or smugglers.

The paper covers mainly migration models for the last years<sup>1</sup>. The main focus of this study is the general dynamics and directions of international migration flows, labour migration (including irregular), flows of refugees and asylum-seekers.

There are several so-called "global migration systems" (International Migration Systems, 1992), each of them usually includes destination countries, which shape migration flows from neighboring countries. Europe with its historic, political and

---

1. Discussing international migration we operate with official data on foreigners and foreign-born population in EU and Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Comparable statistics on foreigners in CIS countries, especially those who originated from former Soviet Republics), is limited by peculiarities of counting procedures.

economic links is one of these world systems. But there are two big subsystems within European System which serve as major driving forces of the whole process, namely the Western European sub-system (WESS) (with its core in EU 15 countries) and the CIS countries sub-system (CISS) with center in Russia. Both subsystems have high level of cohesion (interstate migration in systems consists about 60-70% of the total). There is no comparative data on WESS and CISS on foreign migrants stock, but for EU 15 the total stock of foreign migrants by 2001 was estimated as 23,4 million, while for CISS there is a figure of approximately 20 million people involved in migration flows between CIS countries in 1991-2001 (Ivakhnuk I., 2005).

The Western European migration subsystem<sup>2</sup> is formed by several determining factors: historical links of countries and their former colonies<sup>3</sup>, cultural and historic links of European countries between themselves through their ethnic minorities, involvement into “guest workers” policy. An important factor is the European tradition of humanitarian assistance for asylum-seekers in the 20th century. One more factor is the long list of numerous border changes in the 20th century (only 9 out of 36 countries preserved their borders in the same shape)<sup>4</sup>.

As for as the CIS migration subsystem is concerned, we also should take into account that the CIS region remains a common area for most of the population of the former USSR even if that countries have become independent. With some exceptions, crossing internal CIS borders does not require a visa yet. The principal migration flows are within the CIS region. The intra-regional character of this migration is largely due to family and cultural ties among CIS populations, as well as common transportation and communication systems, a common language of communication (Russian), similar educational systems, complementary labor markets, and similar mentalities and behavior patterns. Although the new states are integrating independently into the world system, they are also displaying certain commonalities. (Tishkov V. 2004, p. 4, cited).

There are two main vectors of migration flows in Europe: South – to – North and East – to – West. Both subsystems have both vectors of migration.

South – to – North migration for WESS is a reminder of European colonial history and rapid post-World War II economic development (West European countries recruited labor force from Southern Europe (Spain, Italy, Greece, Portugal)<sup>5</sup> and also attracted non-European labor migration (from African countries, Turkey, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”). The main ethnic groups currently are Moroccans and Turks.

---

2. EU15 +EFTA, enlarged and candidates countries included into the W. European Subsystem.

3. 6,5 million (4,6 citizens and 1,6 non-citizens) returned from Colonies during the 50-60s (Basik, 2000).

4. The Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland and Denmark Luxembourg, San Marino, Monaco.

5. For example United Kingdom mainly recruited migrants from colonies.

The Southern flow has its established migrants' networks, process of families' reunification, and appearance of the phenomenon of new minorities. For CISS, the main reasons of the South-North vector was the repatriation of Russian speaking population, which started in the end of 70s. The full scale of this process was reached after the collapse of the SU. Still nowadays 70% of migrants are ethnic Russians and Russian speaking population. (Tishkov V., 2004; Trends, 2002).

Both sub-systems have experienced asylum and refugees inflows during the last 15 years: for WeSS because of wars in FSU and in the Balkans in 1992 (695 800), 2000-2002 (420 000). In total in WeSS there were 325 600 asylum-seeking applications in 2003 (UNHCR. 2005, Salt J. 2005). The main destination countries for asylum seekers are the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Austria. For CISS because of wars on the territory of FSU (the peak of refugees was 3,6 million in 1997) main recipient of refugees was Russia<sup>6</sup> (Tishkov V.2004; SOPEMI, 2004).

East-West migration vector existed in the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, but during the "iron curtain" epoch all migration processes were artificially frozen. Only Jews and Germans were allowed to emigrate to the West. After the fall of socialism migration to the West renewed, but fears in the West about "invasion from the East" were exaggerated. During the last 15 years migrants from former USSR to the Western Europe compose about 30.8% of the total number of migrants during that period, the number of migrants from fSU is about 1,5 million people (excluding asylum-seekers). From 1998 to 2001 there were 164,400 asylum applications in the West Europe from CIS countries (table 3). For Russia this "eastern" vector also exists, by the way, in the form of Chinese migration, which is characterised by the rise of the Chinese community, especially in the Far East. The same tendency (with Chinese migrants) is also evident in WESS.

It is impossible to compare the share of foreigners between two subsystems, because of the lack of comprehensive statistics<sup>7</sup>, nevertheless some figures may give the feeling of the main trends (table 5, Salt, 2005).

Total stock of foreigners WESS indicated about 23,49 million migrants (for EU 15 & EFTA). Despite the fact that the largest proportion of foreigners exists in Luxembourg (38,95%), Switzerland (20,1%) and Austria (9,4%), Germany is still the main target country of WESS. Germany holds 29,0 % of all total foreign population of EU & EFTA countries followed by France (18,7%) and the United Kingdom (11,35%) (Salt, 2005).

---

6. For Russia 352,000 force migrants, including 61,400 – internally displaced in 2003 (UNHCR, 2004).

7. For example Russia before 2000 gave the opportunity for citizens of the former Soviet Union to emigrate and live with a former Soviet Union passport without a change of citizenship. Registration in place of residence was enough for access to social benefits. There were about 3 million people who lived in Russia before 2000 with old passports and were out of migration statistical data.5. For example United Kingdom mainly recruited migrants from colonies.

These three countries concentrate more than half of all foreign population in West Europe.

CISS total stock of foreigners is characterised by high population exchanges between CIS countries themselves. From 1991 to 2004 more than 20 million people participated in the migration movements inside CIS countries. After the dissolution of the USSR, Russia remains the main target country for CIS migrants (Ivakhnuk I., 2005).

The main migration flows go from neighbouring CIS countries to several directions: 1. Moscow and Moscow region; 2. Big cities of Russian administrative units – regional capitals; 3. Border regions (prevailing inflows also determined by geographical location of border regions<sup>8</sup>; 4. oil-producing regions of Siberia and Russian North. Inside the Russian federation migrants from the former Soviet Republic are going to the areas settled predominantly by Russians and not to the national autonomies inside Russia<sup>9</sup>. Thus mostly Russian regions within Russia are gradually becoming more and more poly-ethnic, while national autonomies are becoming more and more mono-ethnic (Molodikova I, Nozdrina N. 1998). Out-going migration from Russia is about 100 000 thousand/year and the main destinations are Germany (550 000 in 1992-2002), Israel (200 000) and USA (more than 50 000). These people are mostly urban dwellers (Ivakhnyk I., 2005). The total number of foreigners from European countries outside CIS living in Russia was 18 284.<sup>10</sup>

National composition of migrants. Every country of WESS has a unique national composition of its migrant populations. It depends on the colonial past and “the guest workers” policy and the existence of own ethnic groups in other states. For example, the majority of migrants in France are Africans, in Spain and Portugal – Africans and Latin Americans, in United Kingdom – Indians and Pakistanis, in Italy – Africans, people from CEE countries and Asians (SOPEMI, 2004, Salt J., 2005). Talking about CISS we should mention only ethnic composition inflow to Russia as a destination country (66,8% Russians, 10% South Caucasians, 6% Ukrainians, 1,5% Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tajiks and Uzbeks, 15% others) (tabl.2).

Labour migration. In WESS in 2003, the number of registered foreign labour forces was more than 17 million (Ivakhnuk I., 2005). With inclusion of 10 new member-states (75 million) it enlarged, but new member-states still will have some limitations on work permits. It is difficult to compare number of labor migrants between EU countries because of regularisation programs of some of them. Labour migrants regularisation program was offered in Greece, France, Spain, Italy, Belgium and Portugal. Germany,

---

8. The Siberian border regions attract migrants mainly from Kazakhstan and Central Asia; Western – from Ukrainian, Moldova and Belarus, North Caucasus – from South Caucasus and Ukraine. Far East and Border Siberian regions -Chinese migrants.

9. With the exception of ethnic autonomous regions with gas and oil resources.

10. Without Turkey (20 915 issued work permissions), Poland: 2 600, Finland: 1 800, Germany: 1 600, United Kingdom: 1 700, France: 1 200 (Source: Federal migration Service RF Ministry of Internal Affairs (2002).

Luxembourg and the United Kingdom organised it on lesser scale. For 1995-2002 2,5 million people were regularised (Munz R., 2004), most of them were irregular migrants.

In CISS, as far as labour migration is concerned, Russia is the main target country. More than 30 of Russian factories are short of labor force. And they try to attract labour migrants. Labour migrants' national composition is different from ethnic composition of total migration because of influence of Russian repatriation flow. The interstate labour migration in the CIS region is estimated at approximately 6,5-7 million.<sup>11</sup> Out of them some 1,5-2 million are from Russia searching work outside the CIS, 3 million go to Russia from the CIS states and about 2 million migrate to other CIS countries and to outside the CISS. The main countries for labour migrants from outside the CIS are China, Vietnam, North and South Korea, and Turkey (estimated figure – 1 million. people) (Irregular., 2005; Trends, 2005, Zaionchkovskaya Z., 2003).

Over 2 million Ukrainians work abroad, half of them is in Russia and another half is in Poland (300 000), in Italy (200 000), in the Czech Republic (100 000-200 000), in Portugal (150 000), in Spain (100 000), and in Turkey (35 000)<sup>12</sup>. The total number of Moldavian labour migrants out-flow is estimated at 600 000, half of them left for Russia, and others mainly to Israel, Italy, Portugal, Turkey, etc. For Azerbaijan and Armenia, Russia is the main destination country (1,5-2 million). Labour migrants from Central Asia are estimated at an approximately 1 to 1,5 million<sup>13</sup>. The share of out-flow to Russia is extremely high (Tajikistan: 97%, Uzbekistan: 70%, Kyrgyzstan: over 50%)<sup>14</sup>.

---

11. Estimates without indication of the source have been received on the basis of sociological surveys on labour migration done by the Centre for Migration Studies in 2001-2002 in Russia and other CIS countries. They are likely to be reliable as they are based on information from countries-exporters and importers of labour migrants. In this report the data of the sociological survey was used that included a poll among more than 3,000 irregular migrants in Russia. The IOM Moscow Migration Research Program conducted the survey in 2002.

12. *Naseleniye Ukraini. 2002. Ezhegodniy Demographicheskiy Doklad* (Population of Ukraine. 2002. Annual demographic review). Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences. Institute for Demographic and Sociological Studies of the UNAS. Ukrainian State Committee on Statistics. Kiev. 2002. pp. 128, 129.

13. Estimates on Central Asian countries are given by: Labour Migration from Tajikistan. International Organisation for Migration in cooperation with the Sociological Service Center Shark. 2003.

14. Kazakhstan supplies its labour force predominantly to Russia and receives labour force from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan as well as from China. Over 200,000 labour migrants from Central Asia work in Kazakhstan. Kyrgyzstan exports about 300000 migrants mainly to Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation. Kyrgyzstan also receives labour migrants from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and a small number from Turkey and other countries. Uzbekistan sends abroad between 500 000 and 1 million labour migrants who work predominantly in Russia, Kazakhstan, South Korea; it also receives a small number of migrants from Tajikistan, few from Afghanistan and highly skilled labour force from countries outside the CIS. In Tajikistan over 500,000 labour migrants go to Russia. Turkmenistan is participating poorly in interstate migration processes (Tishkov, 2005).

Irregular migration is even more difficult to estimate because of the difficulty to conduct data collection. The number of irregular migrants for WESS countries is fluctuated from 100 000 to 400 000. The share of the informal economy in GDP is sufficient and estimated as 9,4 % for Switzerland, between 22 -28% for Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain (Biffi G., 2005). The highest number of apprehensions in 2003 occurred at the border of Turkey, Armenia, Hungary, Czech and Slovak and Ukraine. Three groups of countries produce irregular migrants for WE: 1. From former SU Russia (especially Chechens); 2. Middle East, Central Asia, China and India sub-continent; 3. Romania (Moldova), FY. (Salt, 2005)<sup>15</sup>.

CISS countries. The number of irregular migrants in Russia varies from several thousands to 10-15 million. Official data is about 250 000, but in reality, it is 4-5 million people (Zaionchkovskaia, 2002). 90 % of irregular migrants entered Russia from CIS countries. Irregular migrants are not forced but rather economic migrants. The main countries of resources of irregular migrants are Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Byelorussia, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan. 15-20% are from "far abroad", mainly from China. The region of destination of Chinese in Russia is the Far East of Russia<sup>16</sup>. It is estimated that in the border regions of RF irregular migrants consist of about 3% of Russian population, in deep regions – about 0,3%, and in Moscow is about 10%. Irregular migrants enter CISS countries through Central Asia and Far East of Russia and leave through the Western border of CESS countries. They use Russia as a transit country. (Irregular migration, 2005).

Role of cities in concentration of foreigners is sufficient. For WESS countries only 11,5% of native-born Dutch live in 4 large cities: Amsterdam<sup>17</sup>, Rotterdam, The Hague, Utrecht. In The United Kingdom Asian migrants concentrated in Great London, Birmingham with area, Yorkshire (the Bradford, often called "Little Pakistan"), and Great Manchester. There are at least 10 million citizens in France who have at least one foreign parent or grandparent. They mainly live in Greater Paris (38,3%) Rhône-Alpes (with center in Lyon – 12 %), Provence Alpes-Côte d'Azur (between Marseilles and Nice - 8.4 %) (Bade, 2002, p. 278). The largest absolute figure of migrants in Germany is also in big cities (Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Frankfurt-am-Main, Cologne, Stuttgart). For last three mentioned and Offenbach, the share of foreigners reached 20 % of city population. Big cities are also centers for concentration of illegal migrants (40,000 work in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, Utrecht)<sup>18</sup> (Bade K.J.,2003; European Migration,1994).

---

15. Italy - 569 000 illegal migrants, 90 000 in Belgium, 70 000 - 180 000 in Switzerland.

16. Illegal entrance, illegal residence, illegal occupation.

17. About 20 % of the Netherlands Surinamese community of live in city.

18. There is a metropolitan area in the core of WeSS: N-W - Randstad, Rhine – Ruhr, begin from the United Kingdom and pass several Western Europe countries, consisting of cities such as London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Randstad (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague) and Ruhr – Main (Germany). It includes more then 60 million people (Dieman F. & Faludi A.,1998).

In CISS countries we can observe similar processes of formation of new minorities communities (mainly in big cities). The main flow of migrants comes to Russia also from big cities and capitals of CIS countries (about 60%). Small cities and rural areas out-flow constitute 20% and 15% respectively. (Tishkov, 2004; Trends, 2002).

There are evidences of transformation of some districts into areas, which accumulate social insecurity and social problems in Moscow. There are mainly dwellings of workers in South, South-East, East and North periphery of Moscow (Vendina O., 2005). The Chinese communities (about 400 000) are located mainly in Moscow, Irkutsk, Khabarovsk and Vladivostok. Koreans (about 50 000) in Moscow (10 000), and Far East (35 000 - 40 000 - Vladivostok, Ussuriysk). The community of Vietnamese consists of 80 - 100,000 people and is concentrated in Moscow, St. Petersburg, far east cities and old Russian textile industry cities (Ivanovo). Moldavians (50 000 - 100 000) are concentrated mainly in Moscow and Moscow region, Afghan nationals – (100 - 150,000) – 2/3 are in Moscow and 1/3 in St. Petersburg. Main routes for irregular migration go through big regional cities such as Moscow, St. Petersburg, Murmansk, Astrakhan, Krasnodar, Stavropol, Bishkek, Almati, Aktubinsk, Uralsk, Saratov, Samara, Kiev (Iregular, 2005).

The structural peculiarities of European migration subsystems would be incomplete without a short analysis of migration systems structure, which also shapes migration patterns of Europe (Geddes A., 2000). For the last 25 years, WESS has created priorities system according to their migration policy, the so-called “zones of different types of neighbourhood” for EU. WESS migration systems structure constitutes “EU core receiving countries” (France, UK, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, and EFTA), which have established international migration policy on neighbouring countries. There are some internal relations in the «core» of WESS<sup>19</sup>. The “Periphery of core countries” (Mediterranean South Europe) has been for a long time (since 80s) a source of “guest workers” for the “core” zone. It is maintaining this tradition to supply labour resources for the “core”. For other external countries, they work as destination countries and also play the role of transit countries.

“Enlarged not full members” (Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Czech republic, Slovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia). These countries are in the process of harmonisation of their political and economical structure for EU inclusion. They are sending countries for the “Core” zone. For the zone of “candidate countries” they are countries of destination. They became attractive for neighbouring candidate countries and non – EU candidate states for the time of economic development. They play also role of transit countries for the migrants from candidate state and other periphery. The flows inside the CEE countries are “self-containment”. (SOPEMI, Salt, 2005).

---

20. North Europe created its regional migration system with own focus of gravities based on common market agreement (from 1954) and free movement and residence of members (from 1982). (Salt 2005).

“Candidates countries” (Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia). The zone of neighbourhood with EU expectation is in the starting point for their legal norms harmonisation with EU policy. They are sending countries and they are used by migrants from other world as transit countries.

The most complicated group is the “Countries of systems overlapping” (Serbia, Macedonia, Moldova, Ukraine, Montenegro & Serbia, Ukraine, Belarus). They are located in the regions where the vectors of migration of WESS and CISS overlap. These countries are characterised by unfavourable socio-demographic and political situation. Some of them are even physically divided. They are major source of illegal migrants for both sub-systems. In comparison with enlarged and candidate countries migrants from these countries are much more oriented towards emigration without returning (Migration Potential, 1998). The behaviour of migration flows in these countries is determined by the policy of WeSS and CISS (Russia). These countries might be the source of unexpected events and force migrants for both systems.

### **Conclusions**

- Every country in Europe has its own peculiarities of development of migration processes. Nevertheless, two major migration schemes exist, which are sub-systems of the major pan-European migration system and which determine major migration flows within Europe (Western European sub-System and CIS Sub-system).
- Despite the fact that both sub-systems have the same major migration vectors (South- North and East-West), certain countries are located in the regions where the vectors of these two sub-systems overlap. These countries are characterised by unfavourable socio-demographic and political situation, they are often divided. They are major suppliers of illegal migrants to both sub-systems.
- The EU 15 created some sort of neighbourhood zones around it, if each zone has its own migration regulation policy. Migrants from each zone tend to migrate to the better well-off zones or directly to the EU 15.
- Concentration of migrants takes places in the specific regions (border zones, big cities and their suburbs), and underestimation of this fact in planning may have negative effects for sustainable development perspectives of those regions.
- Cities, and first of all the largest cities, play the most important role in concentration of migration, especially illegal. There are established routes for illegal migration.

### **Sources**

- 1 Bade Klaus: J.(2003) History of European Migration. Blackwell, US.
- 2 Biffi G. Economic aspects of labour migration in countries and areas of destination. 13th OSCE Economic Forum: Migration from an economic, environmental and security perspective, Almaty, Kazakhstan, 24-25 Jan. 2005.

- 3 Geddes A., (2000) Immigration and European Integration. Toward fortress of Europe. Manchester University Press, p. 175.
- 4 Dieman F. & Faludi A., (1998) Randsrad, Rhein-Rhur and Flemish diamond as one polynucleated macroregion? Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie 89(3)320-7.
- 5 European Migration. In the Late Twentieth Century. (1994). Ed.by Fassmann H. Munz R.IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria.
- 6 Irregular migration in Russia, (2005) ed. By Vitkovskaya, Moscow, IOM, Russia.
- 7 Ivakhnuk I. (2005) International labor migration, Moscow , TEIS.
- 8 Labour Migration from Tajikistan. International Organisation for Migration in cooperation with the Sociological Service Center Shark. 2003.
- 9 Labour Migration in countries of Central Asia, Russia Federation, Afghanistan and Pakistan, Aslmati, 2005, IOM.
- 10 Migration patterns in Central and Eastern Europe.(1998), IOM, Geneva.
- 11 Molodikova I. Nozdrina N. Migration Flows to Russia in 1990s and their Impact on Territorial Re-distribution of Population (with N. Nozdrina). In “Problems of Forecasting” N6, 1998, Moscow.
- 12 Munz R., (2004) Migrants, labor markets and integration in Europe: a comparative analysis. Regional Report for the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), Working paper, Regional Hearing on Europe. Budapest, December, 2004.
- 13 SOPEMI, (2004) Trends of International Migration. OECD, Paris.
- 14 Salt J. (2005) Current Trends in International Migration in Europe, Council of Europe. Working paper, CDMG(2005)2.
- 15 Tishkov V., (2004) Migration in the Countries of Former USSR. Regional Report for the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), working paper, Regional Hearing on Europe. Budapest, December, 2004.
- 16 Vendina O. (2005) Migrants in Moscow: is Moscow beading forward ethnic segregation? Center of migration studies. Moscow.
- 17 Labour Migration in CIS countries (social and economic effect (2003), Ed. by Zaionchkovskaia Z. Institute of economic forecasting RAS. Moscow.
- 18 UN Displacement migration (2991), UN, N-Y.

Table 5  
Foreign population in EU and EFTA countries, as of 1 January 2000 (or latest year available)

Annexed figures	B	DK	D	EL	E	FR	GR	I	IRL	IT	NL	P	FIN	UK	IS	SE	CH	N	LI	BE	LU	EU 15	EFTA	EU & EFTA
	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Total	613269	56276	243091	191148	801329	820186	126533	1276553	117700	65352	753226	190806	87650	187176	229784	7071	13114	178260	146600	1892345	192250	1187560	137449	253550
Europe	661258	157203	293031	197432	352974	556579	62209	498170	333380	474728	567170	60171	139763	105720	7071	11414	116354	125400	165825	1377449	165225	137449	1791699	1303570
EU 15 & EFTA	570051	72473	950432	49789	245268	1287956	161024	200987	200987	54253	173333	747257	52417	86239	83355	81052	566994	89480	807328	5704486	88431	27820579	6588911	6588911
EU 15	562358	53190	838972	455209	31282	1195296	132506	111410	153866	200987	54253	103238	177138	59138	28177	5012	78485	807328	807328	5704486	88431	27820579	6588911	6588911
EU 15	562358	53190	838972	455209	31282	1195296	132506	111410	153866	200987	54253	103238	177138	59138	28177	5012	78485	807328	807328	5704486	88431	27820579	6588911	6588911
Central and Eastern Europe	21544	46628	169760	47264	29733	118849	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144	329144
Other Europe	61983	38104	1055119	33776	653	210075	6502	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764	449764
Africa	153256	23871	300851	132237	219012	1419758	411492	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899	208899
Americas	18744	8808	20037	19962	160709	81293	8044	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484	36484
Asia	10645	1152	10033	1542	1013	3024	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164
Oceania	648	1152	10033	1542	1013	3024	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164	3164
Other (3)	316	8760	74171	699	470	65369	278500	278	17651	10561	23846	5	34	417	274	46027	461	46544	461	46544	461	46544	461	46544

Proportion of total foreign population of receiving country (per cent)

Year	B	DK	D	EL	E	FR	GR	I	IRL	IT	NL	P	FIN	UK	IS	SE	CH	N	LI	BE	LU	EU 15	EFTA	EU & EFTA
	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Europe	77.5	81.3	80.8	66.5	44.0	47.7	72.9	39.2	51.2	30.7	29.6	67.9	48.0	70.1	97.4	69.2	89.1	62.4	86.5	62.4	64.3	30.5	32.4	30.5
EU 15 & EFTA	66.9	28.3	25.9	40.0	37.6	71.9	11.1	35.8	8.0	1.5	1.1	3.7	0.5	38.4	32.7	2.1	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8
EU 15	66.9	28.3	25.9	40.0	37.6	71.9	11.1	35.8	8.0	1.5	1.1	3.7	0.5	38.4	32.7	2.1	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8
EU 15	66.9	28.3	25.9	40.0	37.6	71.9	11.1	35.8	8.0	1.5	1.1	3.7	0.5	38.4	32.7	2.1	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8	30.1	50.8
Central and Eastern Europe	2.5	18.2	26.8	29.3	3.2	3.7	25.6	15.5	5.0	45.2	1.2	46.8	20.4	5.2	29.5	17.1	24.9	17.1	24.9	17.1	24.9	17.1	24.9	17.1
Other Europe	8.1	14.9	28.0	2.1	0.1	6.4	0.7	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5	15.5
Africa	15.0	9.3	4.1	8.2	26.6	43.5	32.4	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0	23.0
Americas	3.0	5.2	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Asia	2.2	21.7	11.3	17.3	8.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6	6.4	18.6
Oceania	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Other (3)	0.0	3.4	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Proportion of total foreign population in EU and EFTA countries (per cent)

Year	B	DK	D	EL	E	FR	GR	I	IRL	IT	NL	P	FIN	UK	IS	SE	CH	N	LI	BE	LU	EU 15	EFTA	EU & EFTA
	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Total	4.2	1.3	36.2	0.8	4.0	16.1	0.6	3.7	0.7	3.2	3.7	0.3	0.4	2.4	11.3	0.0	0.1	0.9	6.9	92.1	7.9	93.1	100.0	100.0
Europe	5.1	1.2	48.5	0.7	2.7	11.9	0.7	3.8	0.7	2.6	3.6	0.5	0.5	2.5	8.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	9.6	89.4	10.6	90.4	100.0	100.0
EU 15 & EFTA	4.6	1.1	48.5	0.7	2.7	11.9	0.7	3.8	0.7	2.6	3.6	0.5	0.5	2.5	8.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	9.6	89.4	10.6	90.4	100.0	100.0
EU 15	4.6	1.1	48.5	0.7	2.7	11.9	0.7	3.8	0.7	2.6	3.6	0.5	0.5	2.5	8.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	9.6	89.4	10.6	90.4	100.0	100.0
EU 15	4.6	1.1	48.5	0.7	2.7	11.9	0.7	3.8	0.7	2.6	3.6	0.5	0.5	2.5	8.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	9.6	89.4	10.6	90.4	100.0	100.0
Central and Eastern Europe	0.6	1.3	54.9	1.3	0.7	3.3	0.1	0.9	9.6	0.1	1.1	2.8	3.3	0.1	0.0	0.9	10.1	89.9	11.0	89.9	11.0	89.9	100.0	100.0
Other Europe	2.6	1.4	77.4	0.1	0.0	7.6	0.3	3.8	0.0	0.1	0.6	2.4	0.0	0.1	3.0	96.8	3.2	97.0	96.8	3.2	97.0	96.8	100.0	100.0
Africa	1.3	0.8	11.1	0.8	4.1	15.8	0.2	2.6	0.2	0.9	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	95.5	1.5	95.5	1.5	95.5	1.5	95.5	100.0	100.0
Americas	0.8	2.5	16.4	1.5	15.8	4.2	0.8	11.1	0.8	2.6	3.7	24.7	0.0	1.5	3.0	96.5	4.3	96.5	4.3	96.5	4.3	96.5	100.0	100.0
Asia	0.8	2.5	16.4	1.5	15.8	4.2	0.8	11.1	0.8	2.6	3.7	24.7	0.0	1.5	3.0	96.5	4.3	96.5	4.3	96.5	4.3	96.5	100.0	100.0
Oceania	0.5	0.9	7.8	1.0	0.8	2.4	0.2	2.5	0.4	1.7	76.7	0.0	0.6	2.0	0.7	99.4	2.6	99.4	2.6	99.4	2.6	99.4	100.0	100.0
Other (3)	0.1	1.9	15.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

Source: Eurostat

- Notes:
1. "\*" refers to data which are unavailable.
  2. These sub-totals have been constructed by summing relevant figures where available in the preceding columns. Therefore, owing to unavailable figures and data from different years, some of these figures are (border) estimates. Non-eligible to EU not included in other categories, statistics and unknown.
  3. "\*" refers to data which are unavailable.
  4. For UK, CE, Europe includes F. Since Union and Other Europe does not.
  5. These sub-totals have been constructed by summing relevant figures where available in the preceding columns. Therefore, owing to unavailable figures and data from different years, some of these figures are (border) estimates. Includes those not included in other categories, statistics and unknown.

Table 1 Migration exchange in CIS countries 1998-2000 (1000 persons)

	1998				1999				2000			
	In-migration from CIS countries	Out-migration to CIS countries	Net migration	In-migration from CIS countries	Out-migration to CIS countries	Net migration	In-migration from CIS countries	Out-migration to CIS countries	Net migration	In-migration from CIS countries	Out-migration to CIS countries	Net migration
<i>Western region</i>												
Belarus	30,4	16,4	14,0	28,4	13,9	14,5	23,5	12,8	10,7			
Moldova	9,9	15,2	-5,3	6,8	13,0	-6,2	4,0	16,6	-12,6			
Russia	488,1	117,8	370,3	362,7	112,1	250,6	346,8	82,6	264,2			
Ukraine	66,0	125,2	-59,2	61,1	91,0	-29,9	49,3	82,0	-32,7			
<i>Transcaucasia</i>												
Armenia	1,6	18,0	-16,4	1,2	15,6	-14,4	1,0	17,1	-16,1			
Azerbaijan	4,5	24,4	-19,9	4,2	17,7	-13,5	3,9	16,4	-12,5			
Georgia	3,7	22,8	-19,1	3,2	21,2	-18,0	2,3	21,5	-19,2			
<i>Central Asia</i>												
Kazakhstan	38,3	221,3	-183,0	35,4	148,2	-112,8	31,6	133,4	-101,8			
Kyrgyzstan	10,1	13,1	-3,0	7,8	12,7	-4,9	5,3	18,1	-12,8			
Tajikistan	2,5	21,3	-18,8	2,7	16,0	-13,3	2,0	13,1	-11,1			
Turkmenia	4,0	13,6	-9,6	3,7	10,5	-6,8	1,2	9,9	-8,7			
Uzbekistan	4,9	54,9	-50,0	8,3	53,6	-45,3	5,0	52,4	-47,4			
<b>C.I.S.</b>	<b>664,0</b>	<b>664,0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>525,5</b>	<b>525,5</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>475,9</b>	<b>475,9</b>	<b>-</b>			


Based on arrival registration in recipient countries. Migration Trends in Eastern Europe and Central Asia

Table 2. Ethnic composition of migrants, migration flows between CIS countries 1998-2000

	1000 persons			%		
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000
Azerbaijani	18,8	15,6	15,0	2,8	3,0	3,1
Armenian	25,9	22,5	22,8	3,9	4,3	4,8
Belarusian	25,1	20,8	16,4	3,8	4,0	3,4
Georgian	6,5	5,8	5,5	1,0	1,1	1,2
Kazakh	19,4	16,1	16,2	2,9	3,1	3,4
Kyrgyz	2,5	2,3	2,1	0,4	0,4	0,4
Moldavian	6,8	5,4	4,9	1,0	1,0	1,0
Russian	358,4	266,4	238,8	54,0	50,7	50,2
Tajik	6,1	4,8	4,6	0,9	0,9	1,0
Turkmen	2,2	2,1	1,0	0,3	0,4	0,2
Uzbek	7,3	7,5	6,3	1,1	1,4	1,3
Ukrainian	103,2	79,9	69,0	15,6	15,2	14,5
Other	81,8	76,3	73,3	12,3	14,5	15,5
<b>Total</b>	<b>664,0</b>	<b>525,5</b>	<b>475,9</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>

Based on arrival registration in recipient countries: Migration Trends in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. 2001-2002 Review. 2002 International Organisation for Migration

Figure 1. Emigration from the CIS states to outside the CIS region, 1992-2002 (1000 persons)



# **Human rights and quality of life: the Enomia Network of Ombudsman: a project carried out under the auspices of the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe**

Chryssi HATZI

*Greek Deputy Ombudsman, Quality of Life Department*

## **Introduction**

Ombudsman<sup>1</sup> institutions, sometimes under the title of Mediators (France) or People's Defenders (Spain, Greece), are independent mediation mechanisms between people (citizens and non-citizens) and the State (including public law entities and sometimes utility companies) aiming at providing out-of-court settlement of disputes. The usual wording, combating maladministration and safeguarding the respect for legality and people's rights and legitimate expectations, reveals an ambitious goal: to promote good governance acting as a -complementary to the Courts -mechanism of safeguarding the Rule of Law. Operational independence from the Government, the administration of which they have the mission to monitor, is considered a necessary feature of the Ombudsman institutions, which are accountable only to the Parliament. The persons appointed as Ombudsmen are often elected by an enhanced majority vote, adding thus a personal independence guarantee to their operation. Greece was one of the last countries in the EU to establish an Ombudsman office in 1997<sup>2</sup> ([www.synigoros.gr](http://www.synigoros.gr)) which acquired constitutional status in the 2001 constitutional amendment. The present Ombudsman, assistant Law professor Yorgos Kaminis, was elected by a unanimous vote by the Presidium of parliamentary parties and his predecessor, Professor Nikiforos Diamandouros is currently the European Ombudsman ([www.euro-ombudsman.eu.int](http://www.euro-ombudsman.eu.int)), elected by the European Parliament to investigate complaints about maladministration by EU institutions and bodies. The Ombudsman was included in the draft Constitution-some call it Convention- of the European Union by way of Article 43 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU that perceives the application to the Ombudsman as a right of the citizens and residents alike<sup>3</sup>.

---

1. The word as well as the institution of "ombudsman" has a 19th century Swedish origin.

2. Law 2477/97, now amended by Law 3094/03.

3. The Charter adopts the wording of art. 195 of the Treaty establishing the EC (unified version, Official Gazette C 325/33/24.12.02) on the European Ombudsman's jurisdiction as non extending to the Court of Justice and the Court of First Instance acting in their judicial role.

## **1. The Greek Ombudsman's Office and the activities of the Eunomia programme**

Profiting from the experience of its European counterparts and devoting hard work to the mission of securing the respect for legality including human rights as well as combating maladministration, in a state that suffers from bureaucracy and poor level of quality service to the citizens, the Ombudsman institution in Greece earned gradually the confidence of the public, receiving annually an average of 10-11.000 complaints, a number quite impressive bearing in mind the population (10 million) of Greece.

Rising up to the expectations of a constitutionally entrenched mission of consolidating the rule of law and at the same time undertaking a Council of Europe's programme of building similar institutions in the southeastern European geographical region was a quite ambitious pledge for the Greek Ombudsman.

Setting up an institution-building process is not an easy task. You have to specify your goal, your methods and your supporting group.

As prerequisites of an institution-building process one may identify:<sup>4</sup>

- the approval of the hosting state,
- the compatibility with international regulations,
- the impartial and multilateral character,
- the coordination of activities,
- the understanding and taking into account of local institutions.

The object: the promotion of Rule of Law and human rights, which is the very scope of ombudsman type institutions, proved an ideal ground for working with the Council of Europe.

In 1999, the Office of the Greek Ombudsman began cooperating with the Directorate of Human Rights of the Council of Europe, in the framework of the First Working Table of the Stability Pact, in an action plan for the building of civic institutions in South-Eastern Europe, with emphasis given to the establishment of Ombudsman-type mediation institutions. The project was named EUNOMIA<sup>5</sup>, a title referring to the Rule of Law. The plan comprised a series of activities aiming to contribute to the shaping process and medium-term support for the 'young' mediation institutions in the countries of South-Eastern Europe. Furthermore, they aimed to provide training for the ombudsmen personnel and the creation of informal international networks and their long-term support. During 2000 successive meetings took place in Strasbourg and in Athens on procedural and substantial issues and funding commenced at the

---

4. See the Eunomia Project leaflet by the Greek Ombudsman.

5. The sole funding source of the EUNOMIA project "*Contribution to the creation of mediator institutions focusing on Southeast European countries and their respective networking*" is the Greek Foreign Ministry.

beginning of 2001. In the beginning of 2004 the new steering group of the Eunomia Project convened in Strasbourg. Apart from the Greek Ombudsman, the new steering group includes the EU Ombudsman, while the Human Rights Commissioner of the Council of Europe (CoE) has filled in the position occupied so far by the Human Rights Directorate of the Council of Europe. The purpose of the meeting was to review the activities of the first phase of the project (period 2001-2003) and to plan the next phase of its evolution. Having secured sufficient funding from the Greek Government the activities of the Eunomia Project will be prolonged well into 2006.

The activities under the Eunomia project and some selected publications can be found in the Greek Ombudsman site, under [www.synigoros.gr/eunomia](http://www.synigoros.gr/eunomia). The Eunomia project has implemented over 50 activities, mainly in South-Eastern Europe, since 2001.

All this could not have been achieved without having expert personnel, with the qualifications, knowledge and will to work on the project. Around 30 members of the expert staff of the Ombudsman's office, (lawyers, engineers, political scientists, archaeologists and others) participate in the Eunomia project which relies a great deal on the interdisciplinary character of the pool of experts and their fresh ideas, initiative, various professional and communication skills.

Throughout the past 5 years, the Ombudsman as well as members of the Ombudsman expert staff have taken part in training seminars and short-term missions. They have visited Southeast European states (as well as hosted visits from representatives of): Albania (2000, 2001, 2005), Kosovo (2000, 2001), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2002), Republic of Serbia (RS) entity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2002), Montenegro (2001, 2004), Voivodina (2004).

Training seminars aim to familiarise the respective Ombudsman staff with the experiences of the Greek Ombudsman on day-to-day practices and functions, to explore matters of common interest and to establish mutual understanding of the different role that the Ombudsman undertakes within the constitutional system of societies of rule of law and those in transitory phase (i.e. Kosovo, Vojvodina). The contacts also promoted the bilateral solution of issues.

The issue of Albanian immigration to Greece in 2001-2002 can be taken as an example: the ombudsmen reached a common decision to establish a permanent link (hot-line) between the two institutions in order to meet with efficiency the Albanian immigrants needs for rights protection.

The Ombudsman experts have also been discussing legislative proposals with the agencies involved and producing legal expertise, commissioned by the Council of Europe, on draft bills on Ombudsman institutions: Bulgaria 2000, Slovakia 2001, Montenegro (draft bills of 2002 and 2003); Republic of Serbia (RS) 2004 (following a request from the OSCE mission in Serbia).

The Greek Ombudsman's involvement in the introduction of an Ombudsman's office in Turkey has to be noted. The Turkish Parliament chose the Greek-Austrian partnership of Ombudsmen as twinning partners in a EU programme to the building of this institution.

In 2004 at Nevsehir of Cappadokia (Turkey), a seminar devoted to "The Role of the Ombudsman in a State Governed by the Rule of Law" was jointly organised by the Turkish Parliament, the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights and the Greek Ombudsman's "Eunomia" Project. The seminar – which was attended by the European Ombudsman, Ombudsmen from several European countries, numerous Turkish parliamentarians, administration officials and civil society representatives – aimed to further develop the ongoing discussions in Turkey on the possible introduction of an Ombudsman's office. Also in December 2004, a conference entitled "Setting up an Ombudsman Institution" was held in the premises of Dolmabahce Palace and of Bilgi University in Istanbul, Turkey. The event, which was instigated by the upcoming adoption of a bill establishing an Ombudsman institution in Turkey, was a product of the collaboration between the Greek Ombudsman, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and Law Faculty of Bilgi University of Istanbul. Participants included high-level delegations from Ombudsman institutions in the EU and international organisations, as well as Turkish officials, academics and representatives of the civil society. The sessions covered a wide range of important issues encountered in the Ombudsman's daily work, through experience sharing, reflection, and in-depth discussions among all participants.

As it is apparent from the aforementioned activities, bilateral collaboration was the key in the beginning of the Eunomia project, in order to promote the establishment of ombudsman type institutions in Southeastern Europe. The second phase of the programme focuses on multilateral collaboration<sup>6</sup>. As our relations, contacts and exchange of ideas progressed, the Eunomia project has moved from networking of institutions to networking on common issues, targets and methods applied by the Ombudsmen in the region of Southeastern Europe.

## **2. Environment as a field of Ombudsman networking under the auspices of the CoE**

More than 1/4 of the annual complaints to the Greek Ombudsman (3113 for the year 2004) relate to environment protection, infrastructure works and urban planning and they are processed by the Quality of Life Department of the Ombudsman's Office.

---

6. The shift from bilateral to multilateral method of collaboration was stressed by the Eunomia project officer Dimitris Hormovitis, in *D. Christopoulos-D. Hormovitis (eds) The Ombudsman in South Eastern Europe*, Ant. N. Sakkoulas, Athens-Bruylant, Bruxelles, 2005, Introduction, p.11s.

*Main subjects of the complaints handled by the Quality of Life Department of the Greek Ombudsman's Office in 2004*

Urban environment	32,10 %
Natural environment	25,37 %
Encumbrances on property	11,84 %
Licencing of industrial and handicraft enterprises	7,47 %
Public works	4,71 %
Utilities infrastructure	3,36 %
Damage recovery	3,23 %
Transport infrastructure	3,16 %
Cultural environment	2,49 %
Various	6,26 %

In the last 2 years of the Eunomia project, networking by objective has fostered environment as a key issue of the work of the ombudsman institutions. Environment has thus emerged as both an important field of work and a right to be effectively protected by the ombudsman institutions. This was not an easy development. The initial difficulty we faced was the preconception shared by some international or state organisations that traditional human rights, perceived in a narrow sense, was the sole object of the ombudsman institutions in countries of Southeastern Europe going through the process of transition to democracy. The answer of the Greek Ombudsman, in line with the Council of Europe, was that the Ombudsman has a broader mission related to the Rule of Law<sup>7</sup>, that is substantial enjoyment of entrenched rights, legal rules being fully complied with by all state organs and applied with fairness and reasonableness. Liberal democracies have to justify their title in their everyday approach to people and raising the standards of the service, in a rights-minded manner, to the citizens is a key contribution of the ombudsman to the Rule of law. In this analysis, the protection of environment emerges as a right of the people to safeguard and raise the standards of their quality of life.

The Ombudsman receives numerous complaints by people (individuals, informal groups and NGOs) stressing, and stressed by, the deterioration of their natural environment, the problems in infrastructure providing for the basic needs (water, electricity, waste disposal) of an urban society and many others. Whenever we meet people suffering from the air pollution of industries in proximity, parents concerned about the radiation emissions from antennas close to schools, etc. we do not adopt an academic

7. See the analysis of the transition phases of new democracies towards consolidating the actual exercise of rights in D. Cristopoulos, N. Diamandouros: Traditional Rights Protection Mechanism and the Rising Role of Mediation in South Eastern Europe, in D. Christopoulos-D. Hormovitis (eds) *The Ombudsman in South Eastern Europe*, *ibid.*, p.30.

attitude of analysing whether or not a so called third generation right is involved. The protection of the environment, which entrenched in the constitution<sup>8</sup>, was initially perceived as a limitation to property, introducing public interest concerns to a crucial for liberal democracies right. It has in the Greek courts rulings gradually acquired an autonomous status as a separate constitutional value<sup>9</sup>. This is an indication that legal theory is shifting from the abstract consideration of individuals to act in liberty to a more holistic consideration of people in their active role as members of the society with the right to have their basic needs secured and their full potential realised as to how they want to live a life of quality. I must note here the analysis of Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons who brings light into the conception of environment as no less than a human right<sup>10</sup>. The Ombudsman's role in that is crucial, contributing to raising awareness, and developing an environment-minded administration, not only adopting high environmental standards but also willing to fully comply with them and proceeding to economic development in a proportionate manner, adopting policies after having conducted the appropriate environmental impact assessments, and after consultations with the people and all the grass root organisations concerned. The participatory element of a liberal democracy is further safeguarded by the Ombudsman who monitors the respect of the individual's right to environmental information and by definition seeks for a common understanding between the citizen and the administration.

The Ombudsman institution's advantages in this field are:

The experience to identify systemic problems in administration and to seek in a broad minded manner reasonable short term measures and long term effective solutions. The need for both short term protective measures and a more global long term perspective, is very apparent in approaching environmental issues: – the method of solutions to be worked out and reached by way of mediation which brings into contact the administration and the people, an interaction crucial to the Rule of Law.

Exploring environment as well as other matters of common interest came as a natural outcome of strengthening contacts in Eunomia by way of multilateral conferences and two-party training visits.

Between 20-22 November 2002, the Greek Ombudsman, in the framework of Eunomia project, invited to Athens a delegation from the Ombudsman institutions of the two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), the Republika Srepska of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to attende the

---

8. Article 24, 18 of the Greek constitution.

9. For this gradual development in Courts' decisions see i.e. the Greek Conseil d'Etat, cases 695/1986, 3135/1993, 261/1997.

10. Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons and Marc Pallemarts, *Droits de l'Homme et environnement*, Council of Europe publishing, 2002.

meeting of the Athens Ombudsman Network for the Protection of the Environment (ANPE), which is a project supported by the EU.

In 2003, the Greek Ombudsman started introducing thematic workshops in its contacts and training seminars with representatives of respective Ombudsman offices and that included issues of protection of the environment and urban planning and respective case handling:

Albanian Ombudsman delegation in Athens, 2003, Kosovo Ombudsman delegation in Athens 2003, Vojvodina Ombudsman delegation in Athens, 2004, Montenegro Ombudsman delegation in Athens, 2004, FYROM Ombudsman delegation in Athens, 2005.

The protection of environment appeared also as an important issue that the Greek Ombudsman's Office introduced in the international workshops it organised under the Eunomia project:

In May 2003 the Greek Ombudsman organised a 2-day International Workshop in Athens on the "Ombudsman's role in South-Eastern Europe – strengthening the rule of law as a step towards European integration". During the course of the Workshop senior officials from the Ombudsman institutions of Albania, the entities of Bosnia – Herzegovina, Croatia, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Kosovo as well as representatives from the Ombudsman law drafting committees of Montenegro and Bulgaria, presented the historical framework of the establishment and functioning of the Ombudsman in their respective countries. In addition they exchanged views with experts from the Greek Ombudsman, the Council of Europe and the OSCE on thematic sessions. The Greek Ombudsman experts presented inter alia the policy networks for developing international co-operation on the example of environment, with emphasis given to the relation of networking with the openness and effectiveness principles of democratic government<sup>11</sup>. In November of the same year, the Greek Ombudsman organised a Conference in Sofia entitled "The role of the Ombudsman in South-Eastern Europe (SEE)". The event was held on the premises of the Bulgarian National Assembly with co-hosting of the Bulgarian Ministry of Justice, the Presidency of the Bulgarian Assembly and the Center for the Study of Democracy. The Conference aimed to promote the Ombudsman institution, especially in view of the introduction of this institution in Bulgaria in the beginning of 2004. The proceedings were followed by representations from practically all the Ombudsman institutions in Southeastern Europe as well as Ombudsmen of other European States and international institutions striving towards the establishment of democratic institutions

---

11. A paper by Emilia Liaska, senior investigator in the Quality of Life Department of the Greek Ombudsman, focusing on a networking programme for the protection of the environment initiated by the Greek Ombudsman and funded by the EU Commission, in D. Christopoulos-D. Hormovitis (eds), *The Ombudsman in South Eastern Europe*, op.cit., note 6, p. 168.

in SEE. The environmental protection was again introduced by the Greek Ombudsman's experts as a common aspect of the institution building process and the establishment of the rule of law in South-Eastern Europe, namely under the title of the contribution of the Ombudsman to the implementation and enforcement of the EU *acquis de droit* in environmental legislation, a major challenge also for EU candidate and accession countries<sup>12</sup>.

The most ambitious environment related activity we engaged in so far within the Enomia network of Southeast European (SEE) Ombudsman institutions, was a capacity building seminar we organised in a small village in the Prespa Lakes' district in the Northwest of Greece, in June this year.

It was a training seminar aiming to enhance the environmental case handling capacity of SEE Ombudsman institutions staff members, capitalising on the experience and knowledge of the Greek and other EU Ombudsmen on such issues. The seminar hosted Ombudsman representatives from Albania, Austria, Bosnia – Herzegovina, Spain, Serbia – Montenegro (Kosovo, Montenegro, Vojvodina) and the FYR of Macedonia.

The Prespa seminar first presented the normative framework for environmental protection and sustainable development, including the European Union<sup>13</sup> and Council of Europe's achievements<sup>14</sup>. Then we moved to the actual implementation of the legal framework, the drawbacks and delays in the transposition of EU directives into Greek national legislation<sup>15</sup> and the application of international and national laws in the Transboundary Prespa Park. This last presentation was made by a representative<sup>16</sup> of the Society for the Protection of Prespa, an NGO, in co-operation with whom this seminar took place. A useful cooperation in terms of learning the actual environmental problems of this area of special protection, which were further illustrated by a visit to the lake area, and also keeping the link with the civil society in discussing the effective application of the normative framework of protection. The seminar proceeded with the Ombudsman's respective work. First the participating Ombudsman institutions mandates were presented<sup>17</sup> and compared and the question of raising public awareness was discussed. Then the works focused on case handling, presentations on five topics (Wildlife Habitats protection<sup>18</sup>, Water Resources Management<sup>19</sup>, Municipal

12. A paper by Ioanna Koufaki, senior investigator in the Quality of Life Department of the Greek Ombudsman, analysing the importance of the *acquis communautaire* in the field, *ibid.* p.164.

13. A paper by Dr. Juris Ch. Petrou.

14. Presented by Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons, Council of Europe-DG IV.

15. Presentation prepared by the Greek Ombudsman's experts A. Salamaliki and Ch.Tsaitouridis.

16. Vassiliki Roumeliotou.

17. By a representative of each Ombudsman, in the case of Greece by the expert Mr A. Bosdoyanni.

18. By the Greek Ombudsman's expert N. Vittis.

19. By the Catalan Ombudsman's expert S. Vernia.

Waste Management<sup>20</sup>, Illegal Constructions<sup>21</sup>, Industrial Air Pollution<sup>22</sup>) by representatives of the Greek, the Austrian and the Catalan Ombudsmen were made. Finally, 3 moot cases proposed by the Society for the Protection of Prespa were discussed in a workgroup exercise.

Evidently, the workgroup cases were useful for identifying the similarities in the systemic problems of the participating countries in the public administration's environment agenda and working out the best practices and methods of ombudsman intervention. But what made this seminar a pledge for further deepening our co-operation with our neighbour countries' Ombudsman institutions, was that the moot cases we addressed in the workshops were actually submitted as formal complaints by the Society for the Protection of Prespa to the three Ombudsman institutions of Albania, FYROM and Greece<sup>23</sup>. And in the seminar we had the chance to work together our steps of investigation and mediation to the relevant 3 countries public authorities. This investigation is pending and we are about to proceed in the coordination of our actions, which entails trans-national co-operation in our functions as Ombudsmen. That is an ambitious pilot project, inaugurating trans-national communication and coordination of activities of the three respective ombudsman offices of Albania, FYROM and Greece, in order to address in a coordinated way the converging environmental problems arising in one biotope, the area of Prespa Lake, and it holds a significant symbolic meaning, since the Prespa Lake (the bigger of the two of the Prespa lakes) has a tripartite national frontier into the water surface, separating the 3 sovereign states of "the Former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia", Albania and Greece, the neighbouring past of which has not been without clouds.

## **Conclusions**

While we held this multinational conference in Prespa, an old lady in black in the village nearby asked us one day who we were and the reason we visited her village. We tried to explain and then she said that she was very happy to see us because not many young people were around in the village, her own son migrated to Australia! I think this incident illustrates the problem of working on making sustainable development possible while the people of the region directly concerned are absent, unaware of the process, have even emigrated to try their luck elsewhere. The CEMAT Principles<sup>24</sup>

---

20. By the Greek Ombudsman's expert C. Antoniadis.

21. By M. Mauerer, Director, the Austrian Ombudsman Board.

22. By the Greek Ombudsman's expert K. Fliatoura.

23. The Greek case concerned the boundaries of area to be expropriated for the National Park of Prespa, while preserving the human factor in the sustainable development of the lake. The Albanian case concerned the measures against depletion of water resources endangering wildlife and protected species. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia case concerned the pollution of water of the lake and the problem in enforcing the protection of the lake as a natural reserve.

24. Recommendation Rec (2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent.

putting into perspective social cohesion<sup>25</sup>, include the need for effective participation of the society in the process of spatial development<sup>26</sup>. That observation brings a burden upon the shoulders of all key factors concerned, international organisations, governments, academics, ombudsman institutions, to build bridges with the civil society and raise the local people's awareness, degree of information and actual participation in all stages of discussing, planning and taking initiatives on regional development.

Social cohesion in Europe as one of the objectives of territorial development policy brings solidarity into the game, solidarity being a forgotten word, a principle of co-operation to be revalorised. The idea that co-operation is indispensable because there are common challenges for the countries beyond national boundaries, was the idea underlying the Prespa programme of the Eunomia project and a key concept for the whole Eunomia project of Ombudsmen networking. I kept for the end the principal asset of our networking: confidence building through introspection.

As Dr. Dimitris Christopoulos, Eunomia Project manager and lecturer in State theory, remarks:

“Our familiarisation with the institutions of another political community functions in a demystifying way...The long term challenge which institution building presents, along with its pre-occupation with the improvement of institutional performances, is a process of deconstruction of the nationally stereotypical discourse about the “other” – whoever this might be”<sup>27</sup>.

“Institution building can be regarded as an introspection: by examining the institutions of others, we come to know better our own institutional juncture, our vested interests and inadequacies. In this manner, institution building is not a one-way action. It becomes an interactive process, rewarding from all sides. From others, we learn about ourselves; with their knowledge and experience we enhance our own potential. Yet the most important aspect is that institution building may function as a confidence building measure among States carrying a heavy historical legacy of distrust and national rivalry. In the final analysis, this becomes the most important contribution of institution building. The Ombudsman's role in this procedure is both factually and symbolically crucial. If we agree that confidence building aspires to achieving a rapprochement between states, institutions and individuals, through the lifting of mutually negative stereotypes, then it seems hard to consider a better means of achieving this than through the goal that the Ombudsman institution is designated to serve: the promotion of rule of law and human rights. This is the heritage and conclusion of the first five years of implementing the Eunomia project in Southeastern Europe, but also the guideline for its forthcoming activities in a broader geographical context.”<sup>28</sup>

---

25. «Les Principes directeurs[...]visent en particulier à mettre en cohérence les attentes économiques et sociales par rapport au territoire avec ses fonctions écologiques et culturelles, et ainsi à contribuer à un développement territorial à grande échelle, durable et équilibré», *ibid*, para. 8. 26. *Ibid*, para. 82.

27. In D. Christopoulos-D, Hormovitis (eds) *The Ombudsman in South Eastern Europe*, *op.cit.*, note 6, p. 18: “From Institution Building to Confidence Building in the Balkans”.

28. Dimitri Christopoulos, a summary in the Eunomia leaflet, *o.c.* note 4.

## Conclusive remarks

Elena SADOVNIKOVA

*Representative of the Russian Federation to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

Dear Colleagues,

Let me make a brief conclusion of our session.

Mr Thiemo Eser, the representative of Luxembourg in the CEMAT, Committee Senior Officials (CSO) and representative of the Ministry of Territorial Planning of Luxembourg, presented very important analysis of the territorial's potentials aiming the support of the spartial development on the territory of as European Union in general as the coordination of common activity on the local territories. The project attracted scientists from many countries and the Ministry became a center of coordination of 2004-2006 program. This deep and broad cooperation leads to the structure of transnational net, and synergy of common work looks perfect. Website of the project is a good informational support of their work. The ESPON sustainable development strategy based on the principle of the territorial potential development is very concrete and certain strategy. Looking forward for period 2007-2013, and keeping in mind the neighbour program of European Union, it is important to involve into ESPON program the neighbour countries and in particulars, the scientists from this countries.

Mrs Irina Molodikova from Budapest, presented extremely actual item – the detailed analysis and the model of the migratory process in the Europe of the 21st century. She expressed the concern about negative trends in European demography. The prognosis for 2050 is very inauspicious: Europe can lose about 100 mln as now it is losing 2 mln per year. Where Europe can find the reserves? For now we can see that the German immigration mainly goes from Turkey, French one – from Morocco and Algeria, English one – from Asia as India and Pakistan. The involvement of the government authorities is definitely not enough. All these global trends should be in the sphere of very intent attention of European countries otherwise we can one day suddenly meet and face unpredictable and unpleasant consequences.

Mrs Chrysi Hatzi, the Greek Deputy Ombudsman, Quality of Life Department, presented us few projects of the Ombudsman Office (created in 1997), which main target is to develop the channel of communication between government and people. The main mission of the Office is to provide the legitimate rights of people to upgrade their quality of life. Office really did a very important job: among others there are such a projects as “elimination of bureaucratic obstacles”, “bringing in correspondence of the national and international legislations”, “how people have to stand up for their rights”. The Department of Life created very broad sphere of connection: from individual people, social organisations to the governmental structures and international

organisations. It is very important to bring such a rich experience to the international stage and to create possibility for information exchange in this regards.

Mr Boris Peril, Member of ENTO Bureau, Mr Vyacheslav Tolkovanov, Administrator, ENTO, Council of Europe, presented the European network of training for local and regional authorities (ENTO), which was created to help local authorities. They think that cooperation with CEMAT is very important and offer to include some issues of ENTO into the program of Ministerial conference of CEMAT in Lisbon in 2006. Mr Peril also presented the work of the Academy of Government Service he leads: migratory regulation, cross-boarder cooperation, training courses for regions, courses for spatial planning and offered the cooperation.

# **Second session/ Deuxième session**

**Open round table of Regions of innovation:  
sustainable spatial development/  
Table ronde des Régions d'innovation:  
développement territorial durable**

## **Session Chairs/Présidents de Session**

Mrs Maria-José FESTAS

*Chair of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials, Portugal*

Mr Maxim PEROV

*Vice-Chair of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials, Russian Federation*

## **Moderator/Modérateur**

Mr Welf SELKE

*Representative of Germany to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*



## The “CEMAT Regions of innovation”

Welf SELKE

*Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Housing*

*Federal Republic of Germany*

The “CEMAT Regions of Innovation” project runs alongside the implementation of the Russian Federation law that came into effect on 6 October 2003 entitled “On the General Principles governing the Organisation of Local Government in the Russian Federation”. This law also governs the forms of territorial organisation of local (civil) self-government.

Democracy and an active local community are the cornerstone of sustainable development in Europe. This particularly applies to the new member states of the Council of Europe. Through the project, Germany is providing strong support for this process in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia and is helping to make the Ljubljana Declaration a reality. In this Declaration, which was signed at the 13th Conference of Ministers responsible for regional planning of Council of Europe member states in Ljubljana, the course was set for expansion of the network of CEMAT pan-European regions of innovation as a platform for modern municipal and regional management that matches up to European standards.

The aim of the numerous measures adopted as part of the project has been to discuss the political dimension of modern municipal and regional management and its role in the development of the Russian Federation in the light of new legislation. It also aimed to establish a dialogue between senior representatives of the regions involved in the project and the newly-created Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation and the Council of Europe (the Parliamentary Assembly, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe and – something to which we always pay particular attention – with the “real sector” of the economy, and to give people in Russia and Armenia a sense of ownership of the process. Representatives of Russian regions, and of the Republic of Armenia, which came into this later, have shared the initial results of their work in their local areas and have reported on their experience in getting to grips with the instruments of modern municipal and regional management and the interlinked development of the transport sector, the economy and local communities.

The Conference held in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, on 7-8 April 2005, in which the Minister for Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia, Mr Arutyunyan, and his Deputy, Mrs Alaverdyan, took part, generated a lot of interest. The participants at the Conference were mainly focused on the competition between 12 municipalities

(Marz in Armenian) to find the best concept for the spatial and socio-economic development of their territory.

The final conference in the “CEMAT Regions of Innovation” project is planned for 27-28 October this year, in Moscow, to be held jointly with the new RF Ministry of Regional Development. One important feature of the conference will be the round table on “the municipal economy”, at which there will be a discussion of the potential for small and medium-sized businesses to participate in the development of their own municipalities. Mr A. Müller (Federal Authority for Construction and Spatial Organisation) will report on the results of individual pilot regions, and then, to conclude, there will be reports from representatives of the regions themselves.

What lies ahead for the project? Germany has pledged to finance the network of regions of innovation until 2007, and now is the time to expand this network by bringing in more countries. We see this process as being linked to the Black Sea region, in other words with countries such as Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova and Bulgaria. Now and in the future, though, we would like to hear what our colleagues have to say about this. We consider it a success that, by establishing the network, we have made a contribution to the development of a trans-border Euro-region. The question is whether we should take a more active view of Euro-regions as an engine for European cooperation in our activities to develop the network.

We are currently faced with a major task – that of directing our efforts towards developing the CEMAT network of regions of innovation in such a way that this work ties in with the preparations for the next CEMAT conference in Portugal. We are also giving some thought to how our co-operation in the Council of Europe could be taken up during the forthcoming German presidency of the EU in the first half of 2007.

Thank you for your attention.

## **Introduction: Spatial planning concepts of CEMAT regions of innovations**

André MÜLLER

*Senior Project Coordinator,*

*Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR), Germany*

CEMAT Regions of innovation project is a project which has been implemented so far in the framework of the German Action Programme “Demonstration Projects of Spatial Development” on behalf of the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (BMVBS) and the German Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR) under the umbrella of the Council of Europe.

The purpose of the project is to exemplarily implement in European regions the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial development of the European Continent” (CEMAT Guiding Principles), thus designing spatial planning concepts and creating a “Pan-European Network of CEMAT Regions of Innovation” which constitutes examples for other European regions (cf. Resolution No 2 on “Training of Authorities Responsible for Sustainable Spatial Development”).

Lessons learned so far:

- formal planning instruments and informal planning instruments are necessary.
- strategic key projects for regional / local development should be identified;
- strengthening local self-government is an indispensable planning issue;
- public participation should be enhanced and creative milieus should be supported;
- the focus – if possible – should be given to cross-border regions (Eurogios);
- thematic co-operation of CEMAT Regions of Innovation (economy, culture etc) is necessary.

The working principle is: More actions and concrete projects in addition to programmes and plan.

Working focuses in regions involved:

- Oblast Leningrad:  
Competition amongst Volosti in Pilot Rayon Gatschina (implementation of the new Russian communal law in terms of practice).
- Oblast Moscow:  
Elaboration of a development concept for the Pan-European Transport Corridor II (Berlin – Moscow – Nizhny Novgorod) combining transport and urban settlement planning for the benefit of all communes (support from an expert council).

- Oblast Kaliningrad:  
Local development planning in communes of the Pilot Rayon Pravdinsk as preparatory phase to further implement the new Russian communal law (support from an expert of Volosti Prigorod – Oblast Leningrad – as competition winner on the spot).
- Oblast Pskov:  
Establishment of the Eurogio Pskov-Livonia in border regions between Estonia, Latvia and the Russian Federation and the integration of the work there in the New Neighbourhood Programme of the European Union (support from the Association of European Border Regions – [www.aebr.net](http://www.aebr.net)).
- Armenia:  
National level = Implementation of the CEMAT Guiding Principles and preparation of a spatial development strategy for the Republic of Armenia.  
Regional and local level = Regional and local development concepts (coordinated competition amongst municipalities) + lighthouse projects for regional and local development.

The following conclusions can be drawn so far:

- Multi-step approach in elaborating spatial planning concepts is indispensable.
- Bridges to e.g. EU Programmes – wherever possible – are to be built.
- Network seminars and conferences are to be conducted to secure a constant exchange of information.
- In a short-term perspective personal networking (i.e. through creative milieus) is necessary, in a long-term perspective institutional networking is to be achieved.

Further information are available at [www.cemat-region.net](http://www.cemat-region.net)

**Part A – Example of Russian Regions/  
Partie A – Exemples de Russie**



## Region of innovation Leningrad Oblast

Valery A. KIM

*Chief Architect and Chairman of Leningrad Oblast and*

Ekaterina GOLOULINA

*Member of the delegation of the Russian Federation*

*to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

Russia's transition from state monopolism to market economy was accompanied not only by the change of proprietor of a huge part of the state property, but also by the loss of some the centralised institutes of the government, including institute of state planning.

Interrelations between tools of spatial planning (with reference to St.-Petersburg – the General Plan for development of city) and financial and economic planning (the program of social and economic development, the perspective financial plan, etc.) have been completely lost.

However, the practice of the last years has shown that without a precisely built hierarchical system of the purposes and problems of the development of a region on the one hand, and the rigidly regulated system of decision-making, as well as criteria of an estimation of their efficiency, the balanced development of a region in a combination to the improvement of the quality of life of the population is impossible. In connection to this, the Government of St.-Petersburg has decided to prepare a system of statutory acts, making a basis of state planning. The development of bases of system of state planning was carried out by the Committee of Economic Development, Industrial Policy and Trade.

The European model of spatial planning has been chosen as a reference point. It is based on the principles of zoning of territories (the master-plan of city) and the maintenance of a certain degree of quality of life characterised by a quantitatively measurable set of parameters (natural parameters of standards of residing). Thus, the purpose on realisation of problems of territorial development on the basis of financial and economic opportunities of region has been reached.

So, for today the system of state planning of St.-Petersburg represents the set of following documents:

- The Concept of social and economic development – forecast for long-term (20 years) according to the Government, forms a basis for the creation of the General Plan for development.

- The General Plan for development – the spatial decision of town-planning and planning of territories development, with a view realisation of policies, the Law of St. Petersburg (validity of 20 years).
- The register of state functions – the list of functions of executive agencies of the government providing performance of established standards of residing (validity of 10 years).
- Politicians – the list of directions of a state activity in corresponding spheres of social and economic development of St.-Petersburg, by means of the establishment of standards of residing and their specifications, and also resource maintenance of achievement of specifications of standards of residing (validity of 10 years).
- Standards of residing – the complex of requirements to quality of residing of the population, which list affirms the Government and forms a basis for development of the Program of Social and Economic Development.
- Specifications of standards – the quantitative (natural) parameters of standards having base, guaranteed and target value, are developed for a period of 5 years.
- The Program of Social and Economic Development – the forecast of social and economic development, the summary list of standards of residing and set values of specifications of standards of residing established in it, and also planned ways and means of achievement of the indicated reference points, the Law of St. Petersburg (validity of 5 years).
- The perspective financial plan (validity 3 years).
- The annual message of the Governor to Legislative Assembly – specification of the purposes and problems of the next year, a basis for updating documents of intermediate term planning and preparation of the budget, is developed annually by the Government.
- The budget of St. Petersburg – the structured planning of incomes and charges, the Law of St. Petersburg (annually).

The given system allows to provide a continuity in the documents of long and intermediate-term planning, to react operatively to the changes of social and economic character, to receive a quantitatively-measured estimation of authority activity (activity of government bodies).

The budget of the subject in the given system becomes the form of formation and an expenditure of the money resources intended for financial maintenance of improvement of quality of life of the population by change of parameters of specifications of standards of residing from base (minimally admissible) up to target. Besides there is a transparent process of a choice of priorities.

First of all, the norms of budgetary security of emergency and minimal parameters of standards, and also the priority directions certain (definite) in the annual message of the Governor are financed.

So, a basis of achievement of the set purposes and problems are politicians. Realisation of the purposes and the problems declared in documents of spatial planning is impossible without the achievement of equation of resources.

Let's consider what kind of resources are a subject to a planned distribution, and what tooling are necessary for a fair distribution of resources.

Thus, the system generated allows treat the social and economic development of region, as it progresses from lower parameters of quality of life of the population to higher ones, through the change of parameters of specifications of standards of residing.

Considering that target values of standards of residing are generated proceeding from data about analytical parameters in the countries of the East Europe (Poland, Germany) can be ascertained, that their achievement will promote finishing of a consumption level of material benefits, services, satisfactions of the spiritual needs of the population, availability of an infrastructure up to Central European parameters. The adaptation of an estimation of the quality of life to accepted in the countries of the European Union to methodological approaches will allow to make Petersburg is more information opened and attractive for investment.

The system of state planning was accepted by the Government of St.-Petersburg in March 2004.

Between March 2004 and August 2005 the Concept of social and economic development on long-term prospect was developed and approved by the Government, as well as the General Plan for Development, the Program of social and economic development for the period till 2008. These documents now pass the statement in the form of laws in Legislative assembly of St. Petersburg.

The plan schedule of stage-by-stage introduction of system of state planning during till 2007 is established.

By way of preparation of elements of system development of resource balances is conducted, the concept of the automated information-analytical system of monitoring of standards of residing is prepared. The purpose of monitoring – creation of effective system of supervision over a level of change of parameters of standards in a regular (quarterly) mode, revealing disbalance and deviations territorial (regional) parameters from averages on city, formation of the unified accounting data.

Data of monitoring are a core element for revealing depressive territories, where parameters of standards of the residing lie below the minimally admissible level, or values averages on city on one or several politicians; revealing of the least developed

branches (also by criterion of affinity of sizes of parameters of standards to minimally admissible).

To overcome negative tendencies revealed during the monitoring the tool of target programs will be used.

The package of documents regulating the order of development and the statement intermediate-and long-term target programs, as mechanism of realisation of principles of state planning, algorithm of distribution of resources and formation of the budget focused on result now prepares. Acceptance of a package of documents, including the city Law on target programs is planned to carry out in 2006.

All the documents described above at statement of a problem are initially synchronised in the format of data, principles of formation, and calendar terms with bases of budgetary process.

It mean that a combination of territorial principles of development and financial opportunities of all sectors of region will be reached.

We meet certainly serious difficulties in the realisation of even local subsystems. For example, in the formation of the methodological approach to monitoring standards of residing greater discrepancies of data at regional level have been revealed.

If you allow me, I should like to mention here my assistant, who was engaged in preparation of the standardised forms of gathering of primary data at regional level.

Certainly plans which are put by us today are too ambitious. However, we consider that no other way except this one for integrating European space at us is not present (exist). And a uniform space assumes a uniform language, uniform principles, uniform standards. I would like to thank colleagues from other countries, employees of the Council of Europe who have given us the opportunities over the last years to exchange experience and rational offers on realisation of various projects.

**Part B – Armenia/  
Partie B – Arménie**



## **Armenia as an Innovative Bridge of CEMAT in the European Model Regions Network**

Ruzan ALAVERDYAN

*Deputy Minister for Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia,  
Armenian representative on CSO-CEMAT*

Ladies and gentlemen.

A little over a year ago work began the project “Armenia as a New Bridge of CEMAT in the European Model Regions Network”. The project is being implemented under the auspices of the Council of Europe, as part of the co-operation between the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Housing and the Ministry of Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia, through the Ost-Euro organisation.

The main aim of the project is to support sustainable and balanced spatial development in the Republic of Armenia and to help our country achieve a harmonious integration into the European Community through practical implementation of the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”, which, as stated by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, sets out the spatial aspects of human rights and democratic principles.

The first thing we should point out is that we attach particular importance to and are pinning considerable hopes on successful completion of the Model Project, bearing in mind the following: spatial planning, as an effective way of identifying universally valid preconditions for the economic, environmental, social and cultural development of countries, regions and municipalities, plays a fundamental role in supporting the latter’s transition to sustainable development. Ineluctably linked as it is to so many spheres of human activity, the task of spatial planning is essentially to balance out the mutual acceptability of state, social and private interests in the creation of a harmonious living environment for present and future generations, thus acquiring major significance in the qualitative evaluation of people’s lives.

Allow me to outline for you the priority tasks of the project and the progress made in putting them into effect.

The “Guiding Principles” are being implemented as follows in the Republic of Armenia:

- step by step, the role and significance of each guiding principle in the particular context of Armenia are being analysed and assimilated;

- then, through analysis of the best experience of European countries, the priorities and the specific features of their application in Armenia will be presented, along with the relevant implementation mechanisms;
- in parallel with this process, consideration will be given to spatial planning documents currently being drafted in the Republic, both in terms of classical methods, and in terms of non-traditional methods of implementing spatial development strategies – through the introduction of programmes based on a “bottom-up” approach.

The next stage in the project involves devising conceptual principles for the spatial development of the Republic of Armenia.

In recent years, work has been steadily proceeding in Armenia to put together a database of legal and planning documentation in the sphere of spatial development which will match the political and economic realities facing our country.

The past and current reforms – decentralisation of government, market mechanisms regulating relations between those involved in the planning and construction process, and a gradual increase in the public’s role in decision-making – are throwing up new challenges, which often translate into urgent calls for action.

The drafting of spatial development programmes is naturally being considered in the context of the Council of Europe’s principles. To achieve a synergistic result, which is one of the most characteristic and inalienable features of this area of work, it is extremely important to always bear in mind that the “Guiding Principles” mentioned above, the Ljubljana Declaration on the territorial dimension of sustainable development, the European Landscape Convention, which was ratified by the Republic of Armenia, and other documents adopted by the Council of Europe, consider the economic, social, environmental, town planning and cultural aspects of spatial development to be inextricably linked. It is only through their systemic assimilation that the main strategic aim – creating a conducive living environment (in the broad sense of the term) – may be achieved.

The foundations for the work in hand are accepted sustainable development criteria based on universally acknowledged pillars of sustainability, and on an integral network principle of analysis and mutual understanding between the stakeholders in spatial planning. The fourth sustainability criterion – culture – which is embodied in the Guiding Principles and the Ljubljana Declaration, is of particular importance for Armenia, as the oldest Christian country in the world, whose cultural heritage is an indisputable and invaluable asset.

Recognition of the value of cultural heritage as a development factor is a central principle which must be applied as a direct tool in achieving sustainable spatial development. This is not just the objective result of theoretical conclusions, but one of the

basic principles of spatial development. The emphatic inclusion of the cultural dimension in the new planning philosophy will thus become a cornerstone for future ventures and investments, and especially for creating employment in the service sphere, notably through the development of a network of small and medium-sized businesses. By becoming an engine for endogenous development, culture is thus one of the main aims of the territorial management of Armenia, for which protecting heritage and using it as a resource to improve people's wellbeing is a firm priority.

Besides the above founding principle, the following very important areas for sustainable spatial development in the Republic of Armenia have also been identified:

- polycentric spatial development model, strengthening of the partnership between town and village;
- overcoming disparities in the development of regions and municipalities and making them more competitive;
- redevelopment of former industrial zones;
- interlinked application of landscape and spatial planning policy;
- support for high-quality sustainable tourism;
- reducing the impact of natural disasters, etc.

As part of the project, Prof. Meyer of Bayreuth University presented the best European practice, while Armenian specialists presented the preconditions for and experience and specific features of the implementation of the guiding principles in the context of Armenia.

It is extremely important to put together documentation on spatial planning at local level. This, together with the other factors mentioned above, will greatly contribute to the development of local government, bearing in mind, too, that under Armenian law, all licensing procedures related to urban development are handled by municipal leaders.

The drafting and ratification of planning documentation is also of primary importance in attracting investment, as a sort of “Constitution” for the spatial development of the municipality concerned.

The creation of a system of requisite guarantees for the implementation of long-term investment programmes and the establishment of a fully-fledged legal and planning framework – these are the main tasks for spatial development.

In a situation where there are no established rules for urban development, many investors prefer to dictate the terms themselves, according to their own personal taste and, of course, their own personal agenda, without any regard for the surrounding environment.

The tasks outlined above need to be addressed through the application of clearly formulated urban development conditions that are transparent and accessible to any investor. It is important to establish urban development rules that are as flexible as possible yet, at the same time, fully defined and applicable to everyone. This will minimise the potential for subjective decision-making, and all the bureaucracy and corruption that goes with it.

Although it is a legally established competence of municipalities, in the present environment, with the institution of local government still not fully formed and finance limited, drafting planning documentation is not an easy task. In many communities, unregulated building is continuing, posing a potential threat to the future development of these communities.

In view of the above, for the second year substantial sums are now being allocated from the state budget to allow spatial planning documentation to be drafted at local level.

As part of the Model Project, general plans for municipalities, which are at various stages and have been drafted using money provided by the state, have become the focus of joint discussions both at the Ministry of Urban Development (with the participation of the relevant municipal leaders and specialists), and at outreach meetings with local councils.

When drafting local planning documentation, considerable emphasis is given to public consultation. Involving all sectors of society in talks is becoming standard practice in Armenia: from the shaping of the planning task right through to ratification of the project, “public participation in decision-making” plays a dominant role in the drafting of these documents.

Indeed, much of the conference “Pan-European Network of CEMAT Regions of Innovation. Sustainable Spatial Development at National, Regional and Local Level in Armenia”, which was held in Yerevan in early April 2005, was given over to discussing spatial development issues at municipal level. The conference was organised by the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Housing and the Ministry of Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia, under the auspices of the Council of Europe.

A German delegation led by Ms Iris Gleicke, Parliamentary State Secretary at the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Housing, took part in the conference, along with representatives of the Council of Europe and other international organisations, other relevant Armenian ministries, regions and municipalities, and also the private sector.

In her paper “Spatial Development Policy and Active Municipalities as Engines in the Transformation Process”, Ms Gleicke examined the role of spatial development policy in the reform process, and described the experience of East Germany. The

conference concluded with a presentation of certificates and prizes to four of the 12 Armenian municipalities taking part in the conference (Goris, Dzhermuk, Ararat and Arzni) which had demonstrated the best results in a competition to find local spatial development concepts.

To conclude my presentation, I would like to stress once more that the programme “Armenia as a New Bridge of CEMAT in the European Model Regions Network”, which is being implemented in our country, reflects the need to harmonise the entire system of spatial planning at national, regional and local level.

It may be regarded as a pilot model in the application of the general Council of Europe methodology for framing and implementing spatial planning policy, to be put into effect not just in selected regions of the country, but nationwide, and the main aim of which is to sustain and develop both our own unique identity and the principles and ideals that are the common heritage of Council of Europe member states.

In recalling the words of the great Goethe, that

“faith is a bridge between heaven and earth that is a joy to all”,

I hope you will permit me to express my confident belief that the success of this project will go a long way towards strengthening international co-operation on spatial development and, as the name of the project itself suggests, will serve as a kind of bridge between Armenia, countries in the region and other countries of Europe.



**Concluding remarks/  
Remarques conclusives**



## **Border regions of Russia as aim for regional policy**

Sergey S.ARTOBOLEVSKIY

*Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow*

Historically the location near the state boundary constrained economic development of the majority of Russia/USSR adjacent areas. Boundary line was regarded as a barrier protecting from something unfriendly. Military-political factors in 1920s – 1960s compelled to locate economical objects far from state boundary. The latter was practically closed for people, including residents of border areas. Access to these areas was limited for all other population of the country. So, in reality, only transborder cooperation existed, but not border one. The main “border pass” in the country was Moscow. Besides, the large part of boundary perimeter passes through underdeveloped sparsely populated spaces of the Russian North and East. In general, the level of infrastructure (including boundary one) and the economic development were low in many border areas.

During the USSR period, areas along internal boundaries between Russia and other republics were also mainly underdeveloped. As a result new country borders, arisen as a result of the disintegration of USSR, pass in majority through not very well-developed areas, located rather far from capitals or/and main centres of new states. All republics “follow” the centre – periphery model as well as their regions (oblasts or/and small administrative regions). So mentioned areas were in double periphery. In post-USSR period when these administrative areas became national ones, a crisis of adjacent areas was increased by disruption of traditional economic ties.

The EU enlargements in 1994 (Finland) and ten years later (Baltic States, Finland, Poland) created and increase length of Union – RF direct boundary. As a boundary with the “third country” it increased barrier functions. The phenomenon of Kaliningrad exclave/enclave was created. All new members became more oriented towards Brussels.

As a result of this heritage and current situation many border areas can be regarded as underdeveloped or depressed. They create economic problems for the country and social problems for own population.

Under conditions of liberalisation of foreign trade activities and people contacts, the significance of border areas, as zones of contact with the external world, has sharply increased. During the last 15 years, the number of boundary passes, marine and river ports, airports open for the international trade and people was increased sharply. However, it occurred under conditions when transport ways to boundary passes, other elements of infrastructure, government control capacity were inadequately developed and this situation created significant problems for border areas.

A large part of the Russia territory is strongly removed from external markets. Time and additional costs at crossing by the freights and passengers of the state border result in essential material losses at the expense of downturn of foreign trade activities income and competitiveness of the export goods, and, naturally, losses, of different territorial levels budgets. Experience of West European country shows that border areas can be best places for economic development, especially export oriented (or highly dependent from import), but not without state help.

In many border areas Russia is interested in the creation of a wide network of boundary infrastructure (including passes) of modern level, and wide range of services. This makes possible. To minimise the costs of foreign trade operations on own territory on the account of transportation costs inside country and acceleration of border crossing. It also permits to expand export of services, to create thanks to this new working places, and, to increase on place export production and foreign investments. Finally, well-equipped border areas improve the prestige of state.

It is necessary to note that border areas have limited export potential, and this, under market conditions, contradicts their transport-geographical location. Expansion in these regions of export goods and services production will have strategic significance, taking into account, that the basis of Russian export make raw and semi-raw materials and fuel, produced, basically, in remote inner regions of the country. The development of export industries of manufacture sector in boundary regions would solve at once two major, for Russia, problems, movement of export production to the external markets and diversification of export manufacture structure.

Thus, in a economic sphere, measures of state support to border areas should mainly concern questions of development of infrastructure and export potential.

But border areas also have socio-political problems. They execute the duties, connected with their status of “gates of the country”, practically not receiving from the federal authorities adequate compensation for additional load on social infrastructure, housing, environment, etc. Border areas have whole spectrum of social and even political problems, connected with inflow of migrants and increased concentration of military functions.

Problems of border areas and problems for the country created by situation in mentioned territory need state intervention. In the EU, development of border areas is among the main aims of regional policy (and an important recipient of Structural Funds money). The development of the Russian border regions needs laws, institutions, money and tools.

The attempt to legalise special position of Russian border areas has its own history. The draft of the law “On state support for the development of border areas in Russian Federation” was initiated ten years ago by the Council of Federation, upper chamber

of Parliament. Although reactions from regions were positive, the document was rejected at federal level (by executive authorities), which did not want to provide additional money, nor additional rights to border areas. The same position of Government blocked the realisation of the “Conception of border cooperation in RF” (officially approved in 2001), the draft law “On border co-operation in Russian Federation (proposed by Council of Federation and even transferred to State Duma in 2004), and the development of law “On state support of socio-economic development of border areas”.

The “movement” of the laws were (and are) hindered by several circumstances. First, by the large variety of specified territories. It is possible to classify them by geographical position, degree of development, density of population and structure of economy, by type of the customs and visa mode with adjacent country, role in foreign economic relations of Russia. For example, the variants of the boundary mode vary from cancellation of boundary control and application of maximally soft customs control on the boundary between Russia and Byelorussia, to full visa mode and not granting one another most favoured nation status in trade by Russia and Estonia. Large differentiations hinder the search of the universal norms of support, suitable and effective for various types of boundary territories.

Under such conditions subjects of RF (Pskov, Murmansk, Amur, Orenburg oblasts...) developed and approved their own laws and other legal acts on border cooperation and the development of border regions. But this is rather hard task in the current period of centralisation.

Second, not of laws are hindered by the fact that several acting laws and official documents “touch” border areas, and this makes co-ordination of the above mentioned documents with the developing laws necessary. Among the mentioned documents it is necessary to point the laws “On state regulation of external economic activities in RF”, “On the bases of state regulation of socio-economic development of the Russian Federation North”, “On free economic zone in Kaliningrad oblast”, Federal programs on socio-economic development of Kaliningrad oblast and Kuril islands, which was approved only in 2005, after more than 10 years of discussions, worth noting is also the federal law “On special economic zones” (i.e. free economic zones).

Subjects of Federation are too big to be regarded as border areas. Only municipal units should receive official status of border areas (of both levels), which have a direct exit to the state border. Added to this, the municipal unit has to have boundary or custom pass on its territory (to exclude sparsely populated areas of the North and East). All territory of mentioned units has to be included into border areas and completely included into law sphere of action. Such approach should exclude subjective factors in the process of border areas delimitation.

Among the norms of border areas support could be the following:

- direct state investments into infrastructure and own control institutions;
- financial support of regional and municipal authorities (mainly grants and loans). Compensation of additional expenses;
- financial support of private business. Special attention to development of local export production;
- liberalisation of border and custom regimes;
- practical support of subsidiarity principle;
- stimulation of international cooperation on municipal level.

Federal authorities have 2 possibilities to help border areas. The first one is to incorporate them into country regional policy (either as independent direction or as depressed or underdeveloped areas). This way seems more logical, but more time-consuming. The second possibility is to develop an independent policy for border areas. The latter will solve problems of these areas as well as the tasks of federal authorities. The situation seems more favourable for the second option.

But in all cases this policy has to be concentrated in one federal institute – the Ministry of regional development. The long-term priority of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade in solving of regional problems was harmful for the country. It is possible to regret that “special economic zones” are the responsibility of the latter ministry.

# **European Border regions and networking – The creation of a regional network for sustainable territorial and transfrontier development for the European continent**

Jens GABBE

*Secretary General of the Association of European Border Regions, Germany*

## **1. Experiences**

- Network is the widely used, more generic term. Partnerships, sponsorships and strategic alliances are concrete forms of cooperation within networks.
- Networks are made up of three or more border or cross-border regions in several countries or the whole of Europe, depending on whether the issues in question are of general European relevance or more specific. The existence of these networks does not say anything about the actual usage of potential lines of communication by the border regions involved.
- Partnerships are a clearly defined form of cooperation between border or cross-border regions in different countries (as opposed to neighbouring regions along one side of a national border). Here, co-operation covers selected themes (e.g. the economy, agriculture, research, the labour market, culture, the media. etc.) or involves selected establishments or institutions (e.g. ports, universities, chambers of industry and commerce, small or medium-sized enterprises, etc.).
- Sponsorships entail one border or cross-border region attending to all the needs of another (e.g. a well-developed cross-border region in Central Europe might become a sponsor for a cross-border region in an associated country).
- Strategic alliances involve cooperation between regions with a view to attaining a specific (sub)goal. Once that goal has been reached - which often happens very quickly - the cooperation ends.
- Networks of border regions are particularly useful for exchanging information and sharing experiences.

This exchange of information and experiences can either involve all border regions or deliberately be aimed at specific types of border regions (on a subject-related or geographical basis).

- Networks benefit not only regional local authorities, the social partners and similar organisations, but also national bodies.

- All border and cross-border regions within and outside the EU have a substantial and complex need for exchanges or transfers of expertise regarding knowledge and experiences of cross-border cooperation, for instance with regard to:
- Real cross-border programmes (their design, management and analysis);
  - actual cross-border projects;
  - mutual agreements regarding the management of finances, eligibility for sponsorship, joint decision-making structures, etc.;
  - the development of sustainable cross-border structures;
  - co-operation on economic and social development.
- Experience gathered in the course of the “Association of European Border Regions” (AEBR) “LACE observatory” project identified a wide range of issues and obstacles for the different types of border and cross-border regions (see annex).
- If good practices and know-how are to be exchanged efficiently and consultations are both to last and be efficient, then networks need both financial support from the EU and its member states, and also AEBR’s Europe-wide knowledge.

## **2. Prerequisites**

- Networks should include border regions within and outside the EU, with border regions in the EU probably having to provide the necessary financial resources to begin with.
- Networks need to be designed for the long term and not simply geared towards EU programmes.
- Networks (Europe-wide, multilateral or bilateral) of border and cross-border regions have to be interlinked by establishing:
  - partnerships between individual border or cross-border regions in one or more specialist areas;
  - sponsorships between border or cross-border regions (most likely between East and West, North and South, etc.);
  - strategic alliances for dealing with special issues, so that with AEBR’s help the respective politicians and specialists can put up a united front.
- Regional profiles will have to be drawn up (if necessary by AEBR) so that suitable partners can be identified for the various networks as easily as possible.
- Border and cross-border regions need to be clear about whether they regard co-operation in networks as a general necessity when dealing with all kinds of regional issues, or merely wish to establish them to deal with certain topics.

- When networks are established, the focus needs to shift away from an administrative, agreement-based outlook towards an approach in which often very different partners exchange experiences, share know-how and learn to develop fresh ideas. Consequently, border and cross-border regions have a responsibility to mobilise the social partners and any other potential players on both sides of the region's border to participate in such networks, partnerships or sponsoring.
- AEBR acts as a helpdesk for networks and offers the following assistance:
  - website and databank;
  - newsletter/information sheets;
  - practical aids such as manuals, guides, input to conferences, workshops, etc.;
  - information about cross-border structures, programmes and projects;
  - examples of good practice and know-how;
  - specialist guidance for networks.

### 3. Conclusions

- AEBR, as the umbrella organisation for all border and cross-border regions, is the Europe-wide network for sharing experiences in relation to all areas of cross-border co-operation.
- In the long term, exchanges of experience between border and cross-border regions remain absolutely essential for all aspects of cross-border co-operation and in particular for the development and implementation of EU programmes.
- Working in networks helps to simplify exchanges of experiences, to identify, condense and always disseminate good practices, and also learn from the experiences of all border areas.
- Special thematic networks should be set up, for instance for border and cross-border regions:
  - comprising rural areas;
  - containing mountainous terrain;
  - including present and future external EU borders;
  - adjoining internal borders;
  - encompassing maritime areas;
  - containing large border towns.
- The activities of networks could include the following:
  - sharing experiences in practical projects;
  - co-operation in selected areas (e.g. tourism, innovation, universities, small and medium-sized enterprises, and so forth);

- exchanges for trainees and specialists;
- training programmes implemented by EU specialists in border regions outside the EU;
- cultural exchange programmes.
- Each network should be run by one region which initiates activities and chairs all proceedings (backed by AEBR).
- Network members should mainly be regional and local authorities or other organisations in the border and cross-border regions concerned; representatives of national authorities or EU institutions may participate in networking activities at their own cost.
- The members of networks play a key role in all the activities in which they engage in the following contexts:
  - “multilateral” work: e.g. through conferences and/or workshops and over the Internet;
  - “vertical” work: centralised secretariat/info point/border regions (for instance collecting information about the regions, preparing publications and distributing them amongst regions);
  - “horizontal” work: exchanges between regions via working groups which form a kind of mini-network (with AEBR acting as a kind of help desk).
- Joint conferences for all border regions (general sharing of information between all border regions, bilateral and multilateral contact between groups), thematic workshops linked to the topics covered by networks and special workshops (to cover other network needs) are appropriate activities.
- From a regional and local point of view there is a definite need to learn from one another, not only as regards issues to do with EU aid programmes, but also in all other cross-border activities.
- The various local and regional players who generally deal with cross-border co-operation and especially with the implementation of EU aid programmes need to be given feedback and support.
- Networks of border and cross-border regions should also tackle the following issues:
  - border regions with less well-developed structures for cross-border co-operation and fewer financial resources need special support, and sharing experiences can lay the basis for the region-specific management of joint programmes and projects;
  - the still considerable need for advice and exchanges of experience at internal borders extends beyond purely economic aspects; there is also a need to share experiences regarding actual cross-border projects and programmes;

- Present and future external EU borders have particular difficulties to overcome if they are to work closely together (e.g. major economic differences and different EU aid programmes).
- Networks throughout Europe are important tools for border and cross-border regions that wish to help themselves.
- All possible types of border regions have common problems to overcome, but also have a great many experiences in common; therefore there is a considerable need for them to learn from one another via networks.
- Some border regions are better developed than others in the area of cross-border co-operation (this will depend on their history, experiences and cross-border strategies and structures); consequently, there is leeway for the formation (on a topical or geographical basis) of bilateral and multilateral networks comprising different types of European border and cross-border regions.



**Final session:  
general conclusions/  
Session finale:  
conclusions générales**

**Session Chair/Président de Session**

Mr Gheorghe PATRASCU  
*Representative of Romania to the  
CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials*

## General conclusions

Günter MUDRICH

*First Secretary of the Chamber of Regions of the Council of Europe Congress of Local and regional Authorities of the Council of Europe*

Spatial/Regional planning at national as at European level has to be considered as a political activity which influences and defines directly the future development of our society. The planning and management of our natural and constructed environment, the political decisions on organisation, transportation, infrastructures, environmental project, as well as decisions on the future of rural and urban regions, determine directly and indirectly the way of life of people living in the areas concerned. The decision to build a parking place or to plant a tree instead has an impact on the environment and on the living conditions of the citizen of which the politicians and the administrations concerned must be aware. Regional planning is thus an important part of the socio-economic development of our societies and has a long-term development dimension.

In this sense, the opening statements of Mr Vladimir Yakovlev, Russian Minister of Regional Development and Mrs Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni General Director of DGIV, Council of Europe, were presented.

The Russian Minister welcomed this Seminar as a first experience of international character being organised by his Ministry.

He underlined that regional development policies must reply to the needs of the citizens, that thus have to assure public and community services for them, contribute to social cohesion, assure a healthy environment and appropriate living and employment conditions. He pointed out the need to define guiding principles for sustainable development policies, especially for the national territorial planning concept of the Russian Federation. Mrs Battaini-Dragoni stressed the importance of exchange of experiences and training as driving forces to boost pan-European co-operation and network building especially with the new Council of Europe member countries. It is important to build bridges across Europe by network structures based on the concepts and value systems of the Council of Europe.

A certain number of values has to be applied when defining and implementing planning policies. The European Charter for Spatial/Regional Planning adopted in 1983 in Torremolinos defines in this respect that regional planning should be democratic, comprehensive, functional and long term oriented. As regional planning has to take into consideration the existence of a multitude of individual and institutional decision-makers which influence the organisation of space, it has to work with networks existing at different levels in a horizontal as in a vertical dimension. The European

## Conclusions générales

Günter MUDRICH

*Premier Secrétaire de la Chambre des régions du Congrès des pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe*

L'aménagement du territoire au niveau national et européen doit être considéré comme une activité politique qui conditionne et définit directement le développement futur de notre société. L'aménagement et la gestion de l'environnement naturel et bâti, les décisions politiques sur l'organisation, le transport, les infrastructures, les projets environnementaux, les décisions sur l'avenir des régions rurales et urbaines ont une influence, directe ou indirecte, sur le mode de vie des habitants des zones concernées. Ainsi, la décision d'aménager une aire de stationnement plutôt que de planter un arbre aura une incidence sur l'environnement et les conditions de vie du citoyen, incidence dont les hommes politiques et les administrations concernées doivent être conscients. L'aménagement régional est donc une partie importante du développement socio-économique de nos sociétés, qui s'inscrit dans le long terme.

C'est en ce sens que M. Vladimir Yakovlev, Ministre russe du développement régional et Mme Gabriella Battaini-Dracconi, Directrice Générale de la DGIV du Conseil de l'Europe, ont présenté leurs allocutions d'ouverture.

M. Yakovlev s'est félicité de la tenue de ce Séminaire, premier événement de nature internationale à être organisé par son ministère.

Il a souligné que les politiques de développement régional doivent répondre aux besoins des citoyens, c'est-à-dire leur assurer des services publics collectifs, contribuer à la cohésion sociale, assurer un environnement sain et des conditions de vie et de travail adéquates. Il a également rappelé la nécessité de définir des principes directeurs pour les politiques de développement durable, en particulier pour le concept national d'aménagement du territoire en Fédération de Russie. Mme Battaini-Dracconi a insisté sur l'importance de l'échange d'expériences et de la formation, qui sont les éléments moteurs de la coopération paneuropéenne, et de la création de réseaux, notamment avec les nouveaux Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe. Il importe de construire des ponts à travers toute l'Europe, par le biais de structures en réseaux fondées sur les concepts et valeurs du Conseil de l'Europe.

Un certain nombre de principes doivent être appliqués lors de la définition et de la mise en œuvre des politiques d'aménagement du territoire. La Charte européenne de l'aménagement du territoire, adoptée en 1983 à Torremolinos, énonce que l'aménagement du territoire doit être démocratique, global, fonctionnel et prospectif. Etant donné qu'il doit prendre en considération l'existence d'une multitude de décideurs individuels et institutionnels qui influencent l'organisation territoriale, il doit tenir

Regional/Spatial Planning Charter defines the following fundamental planning objectives:

- balanced socio-economic development of the regions;
- improvement of the quality of life;
- responsible management of natural resources and protection of the environment with a view for sustainable development;
- rational use of land.

These principles have to be applied in all sector policies, especially in urban areas, rural, frontier or mountain regions.

In the light of the Charter which represents the theoretical basis and the common political will of the Council of Europe member countries in the field of regional planning, it is important to support network building and identify the possible obstacles which hinder the creation of operational and efficient networks.

Regional planning is an administrative technique and a political activity and is – as defined by Eugène Claudius-Petit, the father of French spatial territorial planning – the planning of our society by orienting the living and working conditions of the citizens in urban and rural life.

In the pluralistic, democratic society large numbers of different types of networks are active; they can have a political, administrative, technical, general or specific character. They can be built for special purposes or are created with long term objectives. They are abolished when their objectives are reached or they are created as soon as a new need is being felt.

During the seminar, a certain number of examples of network building and network functioning was presented by the delegates from different countries. When trying to structure these contributions it was possible to identify five types of networks with European or transnational character.

### **1. Geographic – territorial networks**

- urban networks: examples were presented by Robert Kragt who referred to the Netherlands national planning strategy. Also mentioned were trans-European transport, communications, and infrastructure networks assuring mobility of goods, ideas and information in north-south and west-east directions. Strong urban networks are for example Maastricht (NL) – Liege (B) – Aachen (D) as well as Basel (CH) – Freiburg (D) – Mulhouse (F);
- protected areas: networks exists especially for national parks and nature parks which can be interrelated to allow protection of national natural habitats;

compte des réseaux existant aux différents niveaux, dans une double dimension, horizontale et verticale. En outre, la Charte définit les objectifs fondamentaux suivants :

- le développement socio-économique équilibré des régions ;
- l'amélioration de la qualité de la vie ;
- la gestion responsable des ressources naturelles et la protection de l'environnement en favorisant le développement durable ;
- l'utilisation rationnelle du territoire.

Ces principes doivent être appliqués dans toutes les politiques sectorielles, en particulier dans les régions urbaines, rurales, frontalières et de montagne.

Dans l'esprit de la Charte, qui représente le fondement théorique et la volonté politique commune des Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe dans le domaine de l'aménagement du territoire, il importe de soutenir la création de réseaux opérationnels et efficaces et d'identifier les obstacles éventuels à leur bon fonctionnement.

L'aménagement du territoire est à la fois une technique administrative, une activité politique et – selon la définition d'Eugène Claudius-Petit, le père de l'aménagement du territoire en France – l'organisation de la société en orientant les conditions de vie et de travail des citoyens en milieu urbain et rural.

Dans une société pluraliste et démocratique, il existe un grand nombre de réseaux de différents types, pouvant avoir un caractère politique, administratif, technique, général ou spécifique. Ils peuvent être créés à des fins précises ou avec des objectifs à long terme, être supprimés lorsque leurs objectifs sont atteints, ou créés dès qu'un nouveau besoin se fait sentir.

Au cours du Séminaire, les délégués de différents pays ont présenté plusieurs exemples de création et de fonctionnement de réseaux. Cinq types de réseaux à caractère européen ou transnational peuvent être identifiés à partir de ces contributions.

### **1. Réseaux géographiques – territoriaux**

- réseaux urbains: des exemples ont été présentés par Robert Kragt, qui a évoqué la stratégie nationale d'aménagement du territoire aux Pays-Bas. Ont également été mentionnés les réseaux transeuropéens de transport, de communications et d'infrastructures assurant la mobilité des biens, des idées et de l'information sur les axes nord-sud et ouest-est. Parmi les réseaux urbains bien développés, on trouve par exemple les réseaux Maastricht (NL) – Liège (B) – Aix-la-Chapelle (D) ou Bâle (CH) – Fribourg (D) – Mulhouse (F);
- zones protégées: de tels réseaux existent notamment pour les parcs nationaux et naturels, qui peuvent être liés entre eux pour assurer la protection des habitats naturels nationaux;

- area networks: here the Alpen-Adria-Working Community, the Pyrenean and the Alps-Regions Community should be mentioned here, as well as the co-operation structures of the Carpathian and the recently created Adriatic region, or the Black Sea Euroregion.

## **2. Territorial political network**

Transnational regional co-operation and transborder co-operation structures should be mentioned here. Jans Gabbe explained the European transfrontier co-operation networks acting in the Association of European Border Regions. Sergey S. Artobolevskiy described Russian border regions and Karoly Misley presented the case of the Tisza/Tisa river Basin.

## **3. Social - political networks**

The European Network of training Organisations for local and regional authorities (ENTO) was presented as well as the Network of Ombudsman described Chryssi Hatzi as an example. The problems and management of recent populations migration developments reads also European wide social network publishing as presented out by Irina Molodikova.

## **4. Sector Networks**

Henri Jaffeux presented the Pan-European Ecological Network, a network of protected areas and ecological corridors. The Landscape European Network as well as the European Landscape Convention were presented by Bas Pedroli, who also spoke about the European Landscape Map and the European Landscape Characteristic Assessment Initiative. There are also university co-operation networks which are established at European, transborder and worldwide level.

In the field of spatial planning a European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) exists, described by Thiemo Eser. This network, however, is limited to the countries of the enlarged European Union. Examples from the Russian Cultural Landscape protection work were also presented.

## **5. Special project – and ad hoc-networks**

Co-operation structures set up by CEMAT and its Committee of Senior Officials are an operative example of this type of network as well as the special innovation projects for sustainable planning of St Petersburg, the Leningrad, Kaliningrad and Moscow Oblats. Armenia as an innovating land bridge of CEMAT was also presented by Mrs Alaverdyan.

Since the enlargement of the number of Council of Europe member countries covering today all of Europe and parts of the Asian continent, a new dimension had to be

- réseaux de zones: il convient de mentionner ici la communauté de travail Alpe-Adria, les communautés des régions pyrénéennes et alpines ainsi que les structures de coopération dans les Carpates, l'Eurorégion Adriatique récemment créée ou encore l'Eurorégion de la mer Noire.

## **2. Réseau politique territorial**

Font partie de cette catégorie les structures de coopération transfrontalière et de coopération régionale transnationale. Jans Gabbe a présenté les réseaux européens de coopération transfrontalière actifs au sein de l'Association des régions frontalières européennes. Sergey S. Artobolevskiy a décrit les régions frontalières russes et Karoly Misléy a présenté le cas du bassin de la rivière Tisza/Tizza.

## **3. Réseaux sociaux – politiques**

Le Réseau européen des organismes de formation des collectivités territoriales (ENTO) a été cité en exemple, de même que le Réseau des médiateurs présenté par Chryssi Hatzi. Les problèmes et la gestion de l'évolution récente en matière de migrations de population ont fait l'objet de publications à l'échelle européenne, comme l'a présenté Irina Molodikova.

## **4. Réseaux sectoriels**

Henri Jaffeux a présenté le Réseau écologique paneuropéen, qui rassemble des zones protégées et des corridors écologiques. Le réseau européen du paysage et la Convention européenne du paysage ont été présentés par Bas Pedrolí, qui a également évoqué la Carte des paysages européens et la European Landscape Character Assessment Initiative (Initiative d'évaluation du paysage européen). Il existe également des réseaux de coopération universitaires au niveau européen, transfrontalier et international.

Thiemo Eser a présenté l'Observatoire en réseau de l'aménagement du territoire européen (ORATE), qui reste toutefois limité aux pays de l'Union européenne élargie. Des exemples d'activités de protection du paysage culturel russe ont également été présentés.

## **5. Projets spécifiques et réseaux ad hoc**

Les structures de coopération créées par le CEMAT et son comité des hauts fonctionnaires sont un exemple opérationnel de ce type de réseaux, tout comme les projets innovants spéciaux pour l'aménagement durable des Oblasts de St Pétersbourg, Leningrad, Kaliningrad et Moscou. Ruzan Alaverdyan a également présenté l'exemple de l'Arménie en tant que pays «passerelle» du CEMAT.

Avec l'élargissement du Conseil de l'Europe, qui s'étend aujourd'hui à l'ensemble de l'Europe et à des parties du continent asiatique, il convenait d'ajouter une nouvelle

introduced into our work in this field. Strategic territorial planning is necessary to go above the balanced regional development with a view to achieve a balanced continental and transcontinental balance. Two instruments could be developed for successful network building. The first is the elaboration of a “Transcontinental territorial development concept”. This project could define guidelines and territorial projections for closer interrelating territories of Eastern and Central Russia to the industrial and urban centres of Western and Central Europe. Such a transcontinental development concept should be based on a network of transport and communication axes, development corridors and energy networks showing medium and long term prospects for development of human habitats, urban centres and industrial investments.

Such a concept needs new working instruments. Beside the classical methods of regional planning, the recently developed outer space equipments and satellite technologies are at the disposal of governments and should be used. Especially remote sensing which has been developed in the last 15 years as an important tool for surveying ecological and industrial developments at continental and global scale should be further exploited.

It is true that the member countries of the European Union started work on a territorial development concept. However, this approach seems to be much limited to central and parts of Eastern Europe and will not be able to respond to the geopolitical dimension created by the enlargement of the Council of Europe. The “common European house” needs also a new regional planning strategy for being built in a successful way and has to take into consideration the urban and industrial dynamics of the Russian Federation, Ukraine and neighbouring countries for bringing appropriate new tools and objectives into European regional planning.

However, their new geographical constellation brings in a new category of disadvantaged regions. These are the ultraperipheral areas situated at the outer borders of our continent. It is important to integrate these regions into the existing regional development networks and, if possible, to create new ones between them for better representation at governmental and European level.

The recent ecological catastrophes show the need for closer co-operation networks also in specific areas, such as combating the large forest fires in the Mediterranean countries or the water and flood disasters which accored in Central Europe. Regional planning can indicate means to reduce these ecological disasters and accidents which become in recent years stronger and more dangerous. Pan-European co-operation networks should be setup for developing preventive policies and mutual assistance programmes.

Network building is therefore of utmost importance in our society and the Council of Europe has been supporting this for many years. Network building and working with

dimension aux travaux de l'Organisation dans le domaine de l'aménagement du territoire. L'aménagement stratégique du territoire est nécessaire pour passer du développement équilibré des régions à un équilibre continental et transcontinental. Deux instruments pourraient être mis au point pour la création de réseaux. Par exemple, un «concept de développement territorial transcontinental» pourrait définir des lignes directrices et des projections territoriales afin de renforcer les liens entre les territoires de Russie orientale et centrale et les centres industriels et urbains d'Europe centrale et occidentale. Ce concept devrait être basé sur un ensemble d'axes de communication et de transport, de couloirs de développement et de réseaux énergétiques apportant des perspectives à moyen et à long terme pour le développement de l'habitat, des centres urbains et des investissements industriels.

Un tel concept nécessite de nouveaux instruments de travail. Outre les méthodes traditionnelles d'aménagement du territoire, les gouvernements ont à leur disposition des technologies spatiales, et notamment satellitaires. En particulier, il conviendrait de faire un meilleur usage de la télédétection, qui a été développée ces quinze dernières années en tant qu'instrument d'étude de l'évolution écologique et industrielle à l'échelle continentale et globale.

S'il est vrai que les Etats membres de l'Union européenne ont commencé à travailler sur un concept d'aménagement du territoire, cette approche semble être limitée à l'Europe centrale et à certaines parties de l'Europe orientale ; elle ne permettra donc pas de répondre à la dimension géopolitique résultant de l'élargissement du Conseil de l'Europe. La «maison européenne commune» a également besoin d'une nouvelle stratégie d'aménagement du territoire, qui tienne compte de la dynamique urbaine et industrielle de la Fédération de Russie, de l'Ukraine et des pays voisins pour apporter de nouveaux instruments et des objectifs adaptés en matière d'aménagement du territoire européen.

Toutefois, cette nouvelle constellation géographique crée une nouvelle catégorie de régions défavorisées, à savoir les régions ultrapériphériques situées aux frontières extérieures de notre continent. Il importe que ces régions s'intègrent aux réseaux d'aménagement régional existants et, si possible, qu'elles créent leurs propres réseaux nouveaux pour renforcer leur visibilité au niveau national et européen.

Les catastrophes écologiques récentes ont mis en évidence la nécessité d'une coopération étroite dans d'autres domaines tels que la lutte contre les incendies de forêt dans les pays méditerranéens ou les grandes crues en Europe centrale. L'aménagement régional peut aider à mieux faire face à ces catastrophes et accidents écologiques, dont l'intensité et la dangerosité ont augmenté ces dernières années. Il conviendrait de créer des réseaux de coopération paneuropéens pour élaborer des politiques de prévention et des programmes d'entraide.

En conclusion, les réseaux revêtent une importance capitale dans notre société: cela fait de nombreuses années que le Conseil de l'Europe défend cette idée. Ils sont essentiels

and in networks are important for the creation of synergies and for better working with institutions at national and European level.

Much substantial work has been done in regional/spatial European planning. Studies, research, evaluations, analytical work, exchange of experiences and pilot projects exist. This work has now to be integrated into effective spatial planning work and has to become available to planners charged with the drawing up of development plans. From this level information, knowledge and experiences have to be transmitted to the politicians for use in decision-making and policy guidelines. CEMAT has an important role to play here and to further strengthen work for this transfer of information and of knowledge. It has done so over the past 25 years, but has to continue also in future.

Protection of our environment, sustainable local and regional, national and European territorial development, rational use of land and integration of cultural values and policies for social cohesion should be the guiding orientations for the future of territorial planning of the enlarged European landscape. The Council of Europe offers a large number of legal and technical tools and value systems which should help to assure that all citizens in our enlarged Europe have living and working conditions which correspond to the values of the Council of Europe.

pour la création de synergies et l'amélioration du travail avec les institutions, au niveau national et européen.

De nombreux travaux de fond ont été réalisés en matière d'aménagement du territoire en Europe : études, recherches, évaluations, travaux analytiques, échange d'expériences et projets pilotes. Il reste maintenant à les intégrer dans des activités d'aménagement du territoire et à les rendre accessibles aux planificateurs chargés d'élaborer des plans d'aménagement. De là, les informations, connaissances et expériences devront être transmis à la classe politique pour la prise de décisions et la définition des grandes orientations. La CEMAT a un rôle important à jouer sur ce plan, ainsi que dans le renforcement des activités de transfert d'informations et de connaissances. C'est ce qu'elle fait depuis 25 ans et qu'elle doit continuer à faire.

La protection de l'environnement, le développement durable du territoire local, régional, national et européen, l'utilisation rationnelle du territoire et l'harmonisation des valeurs culturelles et des politiques de cohésion sociale doivent être les orientations majeures pour l'avenir de l'aménagement territorial du paysage européen élargi. Le Conseil de l'Europe a élaboré des grands principes, mais aussi des instruments juridiques et techniques qui devraient permettre de faire en sorte que tous les citoyens de l'Europe élargie bénéficient de conditions de vie et de travail conformes aux valeurs de l'Organisation.



## **Closing speech/ Discours de clôture**

Maguelonne DEJEANT-PONS

*Head of the Spatial Planning and Landscape Division*

I should like, at the close of this CEMAT international Seminar on the theme of “Networking for sustainable spatial development of the European continent”, to express my warmest thanks again on behalf of the Council of Europe to the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation for hosting the Seminar in Moscow and, in so doing, choosing to organise its first international meeting since it was set up a year ago with the Council of Europe.

I should also like to thank all the speakers for presenting such interesting papers and the participants for sharing their experience.

The various aspects and challenges of spatial planning have been discussed and we have seen that there are numerous networks – landscape, ecological, environmental, cultural, social and economic networks – which are expanding, interacting and sometimes clashing with one another. Other transnational and cross-border co-operation networks are developing.

The idea was also to present other types of networks that are fundamental, in particular cultural routes, road, rail and sea transport networks, energy networks and information networks.

It is now necessary to ensure that these networks are co-ordinated as efficiently as possible, with the regional dimension as the common denominator.

That was the purpose of the seminar: to start identifying the various types of networks. The objective of the CEMAT’s work will be to help these various networks to pool their efforts and complement one another – to set up networks of expertise – in order to make for better governance, sustainable, balanced regional development and the well-being of the population.

I should like to end by extending my special thanks to Mr Günter Mudrich, who was Secretary to the CEMAT’s first Session in Bonn in 1970, for being kind enough, 35 years later, to present the conclusions of this Seminar, which has prepared the ground for the CEMAT’s 14th Session.

Thank you.

Maguelonne DÉJEANT-PONS

*Chef de la Division de l'aménagement du territoire et du paysage*

Je souhaiterais, au terme de ce Séminaire international de la CEMAT consacré aux «Réseaux pour le développement territorial durable du Continent européen» remercier à nouveau bien vivement au nom du Conseil de l'Europe le Ministère du développement régional de la Fédération de Russie, de nous avoir accueillis à Moscou et d'avoir ainsi organisé avec le Conseil de l'Europe la première rencontre internationale depuis sa création, il y a un an.

Je remercie également l'ensemble des orateurs et les participants, qui ont bien voulu présenter des communications d'un grand intérêt et faire part de leur expérience.

Les diverses facettes et enjeux du territoire ont été examinées et nous avons pu voir que des multiples réseaux – paysagers, écologiques, environnementaux, culturels, sociaux et économiques – qui existent, se développent, s'entrecroisent et parfois s'entrechoquent. D'autres réseaux de coopération, transnationaux et transfrontaliers, se développent.

Il était prévu de présenter également d'autres types de réseaux fondamentaux: les routes culturelles, les réseaux de transport – routiers, ferroviaires, maritimes –, les réseaux énergétiques et les réseaux de l'information, notamment.

Il convient à présent de veiller à ce que ces réseaux soient cordonnés de manière optimale, le territoire étant le commun dénominateur.

Tel a été l'objet de ce Séminaire: commencer à identifier ces différents types de réseaux. Tel sera l'objet des travaux de la CEMAT, de créer des synergies, des complémentarités entre ces différents réseaux – de mettre en place des réseaux de l'intelligence – pour une meilleure gouvernance, un développement durable et équilibré du territoire et le bien-être des populations.

Je souhaiterais terminer mon intervention en remerciant tout particulièrement M. Günter Mudrich, qui était le Secrétaire de la 1<sup>ère</sup> Session de la CEMAT qui s'est tenue à Bonn en 1970 et qui a bien voulu trente cinq ans après, nous présenter les conclusions de ce Séminaire, qui prépare à présent la 14<sup>e</sup> Session de la CEMAT.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.



# Programme



## **Monday 26 September 2005**

**8.30 - 9.00**

**Welcome to participants and registration**

**9.00 - 9.30**

**Opening of the Conference:** Welcoming speeches

- **Mr Vladimir YAKOVLEV**, Minister of Regional Development of the Russian Federation
- **Mrs Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI**, Director General of DGIV, Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe
- **Mrs Maria José FESTAS**, Chair of committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning (CEMAT) of the member states of the Council of Europe
- **Mr Valeriy V. SUDARENKOV**, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Member of the Committee on Science, Culture, Education, Public Health and Ecology, Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, The Council of Federation

## **FIRST SESSION**

### **Networking: basis for modern spatial development policies**

Session Chair:

**Mr MAXIM PEROV** Deputy Director, Department of Economic Development and Spatial Planning, Ministry of Regional Development (Russian Federation), Vice-Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning (CEMAT) of the member states of the Council of Europe

## **PART A – TERRITORIAL NETWORKS**

**9.30 - 10.30**

**Presentations and debate**

**Moderators:** **Mrs Margarita ORTEGA**, representative of Spain to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials and **Mr Audun MOFLAG**, Representative of Norway to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

- Networking Urban as modes for territorial development  
**Mr Rob KRAGT**, Representative of the Netherlands to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials
- Integrated Studies on Cultural Landscape in Russia  
**Mrs Marina KULESHOVA**, Head of the Cultural Landscape Department and  
**Mrs Tamara SEMENOVA**, Senior Researcher, Russian Research Institute for Cultural and Natural Heritage
- The Pan-European Ecological Network  
**Mr Henri JAFFEUX**, Chair of the Committee of experts for the development of the Pan-European Ecological Network of the Council of Europe
- The European Landscape Convention and Transfrontier landscapes  
**Mr Bas PEDROLLI**, Senior Landscape Researcher, Alterra Green World Research, The Netherlands

#### **10.45 - 11.00**

Coffee break

### **PART B – NETWORKING CONCERNING TERRITORY**

#### **11.00 - 12.15**

##### **Presentations and debate**

**Moderator: Mrs Danica PAVLOVSKA**, Representative of “the Former Republic of Macedonia to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials”

- Research for sustainable territorial development: examples and lessons for the ESPON Programme  
**Mr Thiemo W. ESER**, Representative of Luxembourg to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials
- Patterns of migration in Europe in the 21st century  
**Ms Irina MOLODIKOVA**, Director of migration, Central European University, Budapest
- Human Rights and Quality of Life: the Eunomia network of Ombudsman: a project carried out by the Greek Ombudsman under the auspices of the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe  
**Mrs Chryssi HATZI**, Greek Deputy Ombudsman, Quality of Life Department
- The European Network of Training Organisations for Local Authorities (ENTO)  
**Mr Boris PERIL**, Member of the Bureau of the European Network of Training Organisations for Local and Regional Authorities and

**Mr Vyacheslav TOLKOVANOV**, Coordinator of the European Network of Training Organisations for Local and Regional Authorities

**Conclusive remarks**

**Mrs Elena SADOVNIKOVA**, Representative of the Russian Federation to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

**12.15 - 12.30**

Press Conference

**12.30 - 14.00**

Lunch

**SECOND SESSION**

**Open round table on Regions of innovation, a paneuropean network for sustainable spatial development**

Session Chairs:

**Mrs Maria José FESTAS**, Chair of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials, Portugal

**Mr Maxim PEROV**, Vice-Chair of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials, Russian Federation

**14.00 - 14.30**

**Moderator: Mr Welf SELKE**, Representative of Germany to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

**Introduction: Spatial planning concepts of CEMAT Regions of Innovation**

**Mr André MÜLLER**, Senior Project Coordinator, Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR), Germany

**14.30 - 15.30**

Presentation of Project results and discussion

**PART A – EXAMPLES OF RUSSIAN REGIONS**

– Region of Innovation Moscow Oblast

**Mr Alexander FROLOV**, Chief Architect of Moscow Oblast and Member of the delegation of the Russian Federation to the CEMAT Committee of Senior

Officials and **Mr Konstantin ANANITCHEV**, Member of the delegation of the Russian Federation to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

- Region of Innovation Leningrad Oblast  
**Mr Valery A. KIM**, Chief Architect and Chairman of Leningrad Oblast and  
**Mrs Ekaterina GOLOULINA**, Member of the delegation of the Russian Federation to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials
- Region of Innovation Kaliningrad Oblast  
**Mr TE**, Representative of Governor of Kaliningrad Oblast

## **PART B – ARMENIA**

- Armenia as an Innovative Bridge of CEMAT in the European Model Regions Network  
**Mrs Ruzan ALAVERDYAN**, Representative of Armenia to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

### **15.30 - 16.00**

Coffee break

### **16.00 - 17.00**

Presentations of the Project results and discussion

## **PART C – TISZA/TISA REGION**

- The Tisza/Tisa Region as a CEMAT Innovative Region of transfrontier character: co-operation between Hungary, Slovak Republic, Serbia-Montenegro, Romania and Ukraine  
**Mr Karoly MISLEY**, Representative of Hungary to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials, Chair of the Initiative on the Sustainable Spatial Development of the Tisza/Tisa River Basin

## **PART D – ALPE-ADRIA REGION**

- Alpe-Adria Region: progress made since 2003  
**Mrs Margarita JANČIČ**, Representative of Slovenia to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

### **17.00 - 17.30**

**Conclusive remarks**

- Border regions of Russia as aim for regional policy  
**Mr Sergey S. ARTOBOLVSKIY**, Head of Department, Institute of Geography of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russian Federation
- European Border regions and networking – The creation of a regional Network for sustainable territorial and transfrontier development for the European continent  
**Mr Jens GABBE**, Secretary General of the Association of European Border Regions, Germany

## **FINAL SESSION**

### **General conclusions and resolutions**

**17.30 - 18.00**

Session Chair:

**Mr Gheorghe PATRASCU**, Representative of Romania to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

**General conclusions:** synthesis and recommendations for future work to be submitted to the 14th CEMAT Session

- **Mr Gunter MUDRICH**, Secretary of the Chamber of Regions of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe

**Closing speeches by:**

- **Mrs Maguelonne DÉJEANT-PONS**, Head of the Spatial and Landscape Division, Council of Europe
- **Mrs Maria José FESTAS**, Chair of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials
- **Mr Vladimir YAKOVLEV**, Minister of Regional Development of the Russian Federation

## **Tuesday 27 September 2005**

**9.00 - 17.30**

Meeting of the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO-CEMAT) (restricted)

## **Wednesday 28 September 2005**

**9.00 - 12.00**

Consultation on the Initiative on the Sustainable Development of the Tisza/Tisa River Basin (restricted)



**List of participants/  
Liste des participants**



## **ALBANIA / ALBANIE**

Mrs Ruzan ALAVERDYAN, Deputy Minister of Urban Development,  
3 Government House, Republic Square, AR - YEREVAN 375010  
Tel. +3741 52 43 37 – Fax +3741 52 32 00  
E-mail: urban@infocom.am; ruzan\_a@yahoo.com

## **AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE**

Mr Michael ROTH, Expert, Federal Chancellery, Ballhausplatz 2, A-1014 VIENNE  
Tel. +43-(0)153115 2936 – Fax +43-(0)1-53115 2180  
E-mail: michael.roth@bka.gv.at; www.bka.gv.at/regionalpolitik

## **CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

Mr Petr KALIVODA, Deputy Director, Ministry for Regional Development,  
Staromestske nam. 6, CZ - 110 15 PRAGUE 1  
Tel. +420 224 862 240 – Fax +420 224 862 284 – E-mail: kalpet@mmr.cz

Mrs Martina PASKOVA, Ph.D., Head of Settlements' and Human Ecology  
Department, Ministry of Environment, Vršovická 65, CZ - 100 10 PRAGUE  
Tel./Fax: +420 2 67 312 486 (Apologised/Excusée)  
E-mail: martina\_paskova@env.cz

Mrs Martina VACLAVKOVA, Lawyer in the international Relations Department,  
Ministry of Culture, Maltezske Namesti 1, CZ - 118 11 PRAGUE 1,  
Tel. +420 257 085 371 – Fax +420 224 324 282  
E-mail: martina.vaclavkova@mkcr.cz

## **FRANCE**

Mr Henri JAFFEUX, Chair of the Committee of experts for the development of the  
Pan-European Ecological Network of the Council of Europe, Chargé de Mission,  
Ministère de l'Ecologie et du développement durable, 20, Avenue de Ségur,  
75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel. + 33 (0)1 42 19 19 14 – Fax +33 (0)1 42 19 19 98  
E-mail: henri.jaffeux@ecologie.gouv.fr

M. Claude ROUGEAU, Représentant permanent de la FIHUAT et représentant de la  
Commission de liaison des ONG , 39, boulevard de la Liberté , F - 59800 LILLE  
Tel./Fax +33 (0)3 20 54 49 01/ 6 60 74 70 92  
E-mail: info@cofhuat.org; clauderou@aol.com

## **GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Mr Gert FIEGUTH, President of ENTO, Kinzigallee, 1, D - 77694 KEHL  
Tel. +49 (7851) 89 41 84 – Fax +49 (7851) 89 45 184  
E-mail: fieguth@fh-kehl.de

Mr Jens GABBE, Secretary General, Association of European Border Regions,  
Enscheder Str. 362, 48599 GRONAU  
Tel.+49 2562 702 55 Mob. 49171694966 – Fax +49 2562 702 59  
E-mail: a.winkler@aebr.net

Mr André MUELLER, Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, Federal Office  
for Building and Regional Planning, Deichmanns Aue 31-37, P.O. Box 210150,  
D - 53177 BONN  
Tel. +49 18 88 401 23 04 – Fax +49 18 88 401 22 60  
E-mail: andre.mueller@bbr.bund.de; www.bbr.bund.de

Mr Welf SELKE, Head of Division “European Spatial Development and  
EU-Enlargement” (AR22), Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing,  
Invalidenstr. 44, D - 10115 BERLIN  
Tel. +49 (0)30 20 08 28 30 – Fax +49 (0)30 20 08 32 59  
E-mail: welf.selke@bmvbw.bund.de

## **GREECE / GRECE**

Mr Evangelos GOUNTANIS, Délégué Urbaniste-aménagiste, Ministère de  
l’environnement et de l’aménagement du territoire et des travaux publics,  
17 rue Amaliados, 17, Rue Amaliados GR -15.23 ATHÈNES  
Tel. +.30 210 644 29 17 – Fax: +.30 210 645 86 90  
E-mail: e.goutanis@dxor.minenv.gr

Mrs Chrysi HATZI, The Greek Deputy Ombudsman, Deputy Ombudsman,  
Quality of Life Department, 5, Hadjiyanni Mexi street, GR – 11528 ATHENES  
Tel. +30-210-7289664 – Fax +30-210-7289665 – E-mail: Hatzi@synigoros.gr

## **HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

Mr Károly MISLEY, Adviser, Office for Territorial and Regional Development,  
Hattyú u. 14, H - 1015 BUDAPEST  
Tel. +36 1 441 7179 – Fax: +36 1 441 7182 – E-mail: karoly.misley@meh.hu

Ms Irina MOLODIKOVA, Director of migration, Central European University,  
Budapest – E-mail: Molodiko@ceu.hu

Mrs Erzsébet VAJDOVICH-VISY, Director of International relations, VÁTY,  
Gellérthegy u.30-32, H - 1016 BUDAPEST  
Tel. +36 1 224 3162 – Fax: +36 1 224 3105 – E-mail: evisy@vati.hu

## **LATVIA / LETTONIE**

Mr Juris ANNUSKANS, Director of the EUREGIO PSKOV-LIVONIA – Section Latvia, 1a Berzpils str., LV - BALVI 450  
Tel. +371 (45) 22 399 – Fax: +371 45 21109  
E-mail: juris@balvi.gov.lv

Ms Ilze KJAHJARE, Director of Spatial Planning Department, Ministry of Regional Development and Local Governments of Latvia, Smil%ou street 1, LV - 1919 RIGA  
Tel. +371 770 427 – Fax +371 75 07 280  
E-mail: ilze.kjahjare@raplm.gov.lv

## **LUXEMBOURG**

M. Thiemo W. ESER, Ministère de l'Intérieur, Direction de l'Aménagement du Territoire, 1, rue du Plébiscite, L - 2341 LUXEMBOURG  
Tel. 352 (478) 6934 – Fax +352 408970  
E-mail: thiemo.eser@mat.etat.lu

## **THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Mr Robert KRAGT, Project Manager International, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, DG Spatial Policy, Cluster International Affairs (IPC 305), Rijnstraat 8, NL - 2515 GX THE HAGUE  
Tel. +31 70 339 32 43 - Fax: +31 70 339 11 80 – E-mail: rob.kragt@minvrom.nl

Dr G.B.M. PEDROLI, Landscape Europe Coordinating manager, ALTERRA Green World Research, P.O. Box 47, NL - 6700 AA WAGENINGEN  
Tel. +31 317 477 833 – Fax: +31 317 424 988  
E-mail: bas.pedroli@wur.nl

## **NORWAY / NORVEGE**

Mr Audun MOFLAG, Senior Adviser, Ministry of the Environment, Department for Regional Planning, PO Box 8013 Dep., Myntgt. 2, N – 0030 OSLO  
Tel. +47 22 24 59 52 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59 – E-mail: amo@md.dep.no

## **PORTUGAL**

Mme Maria José FESTAS, Présidente du CHF-CEMAT/ Chair of the CSO-CEMAT, Senior Adviser, Direction Générale de l'Aménagement du territoire et du Développement urbain, Ministère des Villes, de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, Campo Grande 50, P - 1749 014 LISBOA  
Tel. +351 21 782 50 11 – Fax +351 21 782 50 03  
E-mail: gabdg@dgotdu.pt

## **ROMANIA / ROUMANIE**

Mr Gheorghe PATRASCU, General Manager, Ministry of Transports, Construction and Tourism, General Division for Urban and Territorial Planning, Bd Dinicu Golescu 38, Sector 1, RO – BUCHAREST 010873  
Tel. +40 (0)21 31 96 102 – Fax +40 (0)21 31 961022 – E-mail: patrascu@mt.ro

## **RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

Mr Konstantin ANANITCHEV, Expert, Government of Moscow Region, Stoleshnikov Lane 7, RU - 103031 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7095 3690548 – Fax: +7 095 229 2393 – E-mail: glavvarh@mosreg.ru

Mrs Ekaterina ANTONIDZE, Chairman of the Advisory Group on Integrated Coastal Zone Management, Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution, Bryanskaya str. 5 ap. 48, RU - Krasnodar, 350020  
Tel. +7 (861) 253-52-67, (918) 495 82 56 – Fax +7 (861) 225 38 66  
E-mail: iczm@mail.ru

Mr Sergey S. ARTOBOLEVSKIY, Institute of Geography/Russian Academy of Sciences, 29 Staromonetniy per, RU - 109017 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7095 959 99 25 – Fax: +7095 959 00 33  
E-mail: artob@aha.ru

Mr Vladimir BASHKIN, Head of Department, Institute of Ecology, 8 Brestskaya St. RU - 125047 MOSCOW  
Tel. +70952520922 – Fax +70957753446 – E-mail: bashkin@ecocity.ru

Mrs Anzhelika BOBYLEVA, Assistant of Deputy Director Department of Economic Development and Spatial Planning, Ministry of Regional Development Russian Federation, Sadovaya-Samoteichnaya street n° 10/23, RU – 103051 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7 095 200 48 14/:Cel.: +7 916 855 04 36 – Fax: + 7 095 200 17 77  
E-mail: anzh2345@rambler.ru

Mr Alexander DROZDOV, leading Researcher, institute of geography russian academy of sciences, 29 staromonetny pereulok, RU - 119017 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7 095 951 90 70, 959 00 27, 930 24 49 – E-mail: a.drozdov@mtu-net.ru

Mr Alexander FROLOV, Head of Main Department, Government of Moscow Region, Stoleshnikov Lane 7, RU - 103031 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7095 229 66 30/0976 – Fax: +7095 229 23 93 – E-mail: glavvarh@mosreg.ru

Mrs Ekaterina GOLOULINA, Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, St. Petersburg City Administration, RU - 190000 ST. PETERSBURG  
Tel. +7812 31 99 571 – Fax +7812 31 44 166  
E-mail: galin\_@mail.ru; goloulina@cedipt.spb.ru

Mrs Yullia GREENFELDT, Senior Researcher, The Russian Academy of Science,  
Bolshaya Ordinka str., 21 RU - MOSCOW  
Tel. +7 095-951-50-89 – E-mail: green\_geo@mail.ru

Mrs Irina KARELINA, International Centre for Socio and Economic Researches  
«Leontief Centre» (ICSER) «Leontief Centre», President, Pereulok Antonenko,  
RU - 6190000 ST PETERSBURG  
Tel. +7 (812) 314-41-19 – Fax +7(812) 319-98-14  
E-mail: karelina@leontief.spb.su

Mr Valery Aleksandrovich KIM, Chief architect and Chairman of Leningrad Oblast,  
pl. Lomonosova 1, pod'ezd 5, RU - 191011 ST PETERSBURG  
Tel./fax: +7812 311 13 23

Mrs Marina KULESHOVA, Head of the Cultural Landscape Department, Russian  
Research Institute for Cultural and Natural Heritage, 2, Kosmonavtov str.,  
Ru - MOSCOW 129366  
Tel. +7 095-686 13 19 – Fax +7 095-686 13 24  
E-mail: culturalandscape@mail.ru

Mrs Anna KURBATOVA, Vice-Director, Institute of Ecology,  
8 Brestskaya St. RU - 125047 MOSCOW  
Tel . +7095 252 09 22 – Fax +70957753446 – E-mail: kurbatova@ecocity.ru

Mr Maxim PEROV, Deputy Director Department of Economic, Development and  
Spatial Planning , Vice-Chair of the Committee of Senior Official of the  
CEMAT-CoE, Ministry of Regional Development Russian Federation,  
Sadovaya-Samoteichnaya street n° 10/23, RU – 103051 MOSCOW  
Tel. +7 095 2000800 – Fax +7 095 2001777 – E-mail: maksim\_perov@mail.ru

Mrs Marie PRCHALOVA, Programme specialis for science, UNESCO Moscow  
Office for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, and the  
Russian Federation, Mytnaya str. 1, entrance 1, 11th floor, RU - 119049, Moscow,  
Russia.  
Tel. +7-095 230-05-54/06-43/10-65/-22-45 – Fax (7-095) 238-60-85; 956-36-66  
E-mail: m.prchalova@unesco.ru

Mrs Elena SADOVNIKOVA, Expert and Consultant, Ul. Zorge 2, Apt 44,  
RU - 123308 MOSCOW  
Tel./Fax +7095 195 82 65 – Mob. 7812 94 9548 – E-mail: elenas@atom.ru

Mrs Tamara SEMENOVA, Senior Researcher, Russian Research Institute for  
Cultural and Natural Heritage, 2, Kosmonavtov str.,RU - Moscow 129366  
Tel. +7 095-686 13 19 – Fax +7 095-686 13 24 – E-mail: tams@online.ru

Mr Alexander SHESTAKOV, Programme Director, WWF Russia, Nikoloyamskaya 19, building 3 RU - MOSCOW  
Tel. +7 (095) 727 09 39 – Fax +7 (095) 727 09 38 – E-mail: ashestakov@wwf.ru

Mr Nikola SOBOLEV, Programme Head, Biodiversity Conservation Center, OF. 2, 41, Vavilova Str., RU – MOSCOW 117312  
Tel. +7 095 124 50 22 – Fax +795 124 71 78 – E-mail: laecol@online.ru

Mr Valeriy V. SUDARENKOV, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Member of the Committee on Science, Culture, Education, Public Health and Ecology, Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, The Council of Federation, 26, B. Dmitrovka, RU - MOSCOW 103426  
Tel. +7095 986 60 79 – Fax: 7095 692 67 18  
E-mail: vvsudarenkov@council.gov.ru

Mr Alexandre TIMOSHENKO, International Council of environmental law, representative, PO Box 14, RU - MOSCOW 125183  
Tel. +7 8-909-692-7220 – E-mail: alexandre.timoshenko@kurkino.net.ru

Mr Vladimir YAKOVLEV, Minister of Regional Development of the Russian Federation

## **SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE**

Mrs Miloslava PAŠKOVÁ, Head of Spatial Planning Department Ministry of Construction and Regional Development, Prievozská 2/B, 825 25 BRATISLAVA  
Tel. +421 2 58317 429 – Fax +421 2 58317577 – E-mail: paskova@build.gov.sk

Mrs Stella HORVÁTHOVÁ, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Construction and Regional Development, Prievozská 2/B, SL - 825 25 BRATISLAVA  
Tél.+421 2 58317432 – Fax +421 2 58317577 – E-mail: horvathovas@build.gov.sk

## **SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE**

Mrs Margarita JANČIČ, Undersecretary, Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy, Dunajska 21, SLO - 1000 LJUBLJANA  
Tel. +386 1 478 7024 – Fax: +386 1 478 7222 – E-mail: margarita.jancic@gov.si

## **SPAIN / ESPAGNE**

Mme Margarita ORTEGA, Chef de Division de l'Unité de Développement Territorial, Ministère de l'Environnement, Plaza San Juan de la Cruz s/n, E - 28071 MADRID  
Tel. +34 91 597 68 67 – Fax: +34 91 597 59 71  
E-mail: margarita.ortega@seac.mma.es

## **SWEDEN / SUEDE**

Mr Simon JONEGÅRD, Trainee, National board of forestry, Skogsstyrelsen SE - 551 83 JÖNKÖPING

Tel. +46 (0)36 15 55 57 – Fax +46 (0)36 16 61 70

E-mail: simon.jonegard@svo.se

## **“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” / « L'EX-REPUBLICQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE »**

Mrs Danica PAVLOVSKA, Head of Department of Physical Planning, Ministry of Environment and Physical planning, Drezdenska 52, MK - 1000 SKOPJE

Tel. +389 2 366 930/164 – Fax: +389 2 366 931

E-mail: dpavlovska@moepp.gov.mk

## **UKRAINE**

Mr Vyacheslav OLESCHENKO, Secretariat of the President of Ukraine, General State Legal Service 11 Bankova St., UK - 01220 KYIV

Tel. +380 44 255 60 99 – Fax +380 44 255 64 79

E-mail: olvch@adm.gov.ua; olvch@stpu.gov.ua

## **COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

### **Congress of Local and regional authorities of the Council of Europe / Congrès des pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe**

M. Günter MUDRICH, Secretary of the Chamber of Region, Conseil de l'Europe, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX

Tel. +33 (0)3 88 42 22 46 – Fax: +33 (0)3 88 27 51

E-mail: Gunter.mudrich@coe.int

Mr Boris PERIL, Membre du Bureau de l'ENTO, Académie d'administration publique de Saint-Pétersbourg, Botkinskaya Str. 15/2, apt 50, 194044, SAINT-PETERSBURG, Russian Federation

Tél +7 (812) 323-5148, ext 222 – Fax +7(812) 323-2460

E-mail: bperil@yahoo.com

M. Vyacheslav TOLKOVANOV, Administrator, European Network of Training for Local and Regional (ENTO), Council of Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX

Tel. ++33 (0)3 9021 47 47 – Fax +33 (0)3 88 41 27 47

E-mail: vyacheslav.tolovanov@coe.int

**DG IV - Éducation, Culture et Patrimoine, Jeunesse et Sport/  
DGIV - Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport**

Mme Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Directeur général, Conseil de l'Europe,  
F-67075 STRASBOURG Cedex  
Tel. +33 (0) 3 88 41 22 35 – Fax: +33 (0) 3 88 41 27 50  
E-mail: gabriella.battaini-dragoni@coe.int F

**Spatial Planning and Landscape Division /  
Division de l'Aménagement du territoire et du paysage**

Mme Maguelonne DÉJEANT-PONS, Chef de la Division de l'aménagement du  
territoire et du paysage, Conseil de l'Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG Cedex  
Tel. +33 (0) 3 88 41 23 98 – Fax +33 (0) 3 88 41 37 51  
E-mail: maguelonne.dejeant-pons@coe.int

Mme Andrée TERSER, Assistante secrétariale, Division de l'aménagement du  
territoire et du paysage, Conseil de l'Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG Cedex  
Tel. +33 (0) 3 88 41 31 97 – Fax +33 (0) 3 88 41 37 51  
E-mail: andree.terser@coe.int

**INTERPRETORS / INTERPRETES**

M. Evgueni AVRORIN, 32/245 rue Ostrovitianov, RU – 115647 MOSCOU

M. Konstantin GOLOTA, P.O. Box 53, RU – 119234 MOSCOU

Mme Natalia IVASHCHENKO, I vojkovsky proezd 16-2-190,  
RU - 125171 MOSCOU

M. Andrei KLEYMENOV, ul. Ostrovitianova. d.9, k.4, kv. 116,  
RU - 117437 MOSCOU

Mme Elena MOKROUSHINA, Profsssojuznaja ul. 142-2-109  
RU - 117321 MOSCOU

Mme Anna USPENSKAYA Stroitelei st. 9-43, RU – 119311 MOSCOU

**Publications appearing  
in the same series**

13th European Conference of  
Ministers responsible for Regional/  
Spatial Planning (CEMAT)  
(Ljubljana, Slovenia, 16-17 September  
2003, No. 71 (bilingual version)

Second meeting of the Workshops for  
the implementation of the European  
Landscape Convention (Nov. 2003)  
No. 72 (bilingual version)

Spatial development governance:  
institutional co-operation networks  
(Yerevan, Armenia, October 2004),  
No. 73 (bilingual version)

First meeting of the Workshops for  
the implementation of the European  
Landscape Convention  
Strasbourg, May 2002), No. 74  
(bilingual version)

Spatial planning and landscape in  
Armenia (Yerevan, October 2003),  
No. 75 (bilingual version)

The role of training in the implementa-  
tion of the policy of sustainable spatial  
development in Europe (Strasbourg,  
March 2005) No. 76 (bilingual version)

Spatial planning and landscape  
(Moscow, Russian Federation,  
April 2004) No. 77 (bilingual version)

Landscape and spatial planning (Tulcea,  
Romania, May 2004) No. 78 (bilingual  
version)

**Publications parues  
dans la même série**

13<sup>e</sup> Conférence européenne des  
ministres responsables de  
l'aménagement du territoire (CEMAT)  
(Ljubljana, Slovénie, 16-17 septembre  
2003), n° 71, (version bilingue)

2<sup>e</sup> réunion des Ateliers de la mise en  
œuvre de la Convention européenne du  
paysage (novembre 2003),  
n° 72 (version bilingue)

Gouvernance territoriale: les réseaux de  
coopération institutionnels (Yerevan,  
Arménie, octobre 2004), n° 73 (version  
bilingue)

Première réunion des Ateliers de la mise  
en œuvre de la Convention européenne  
du Paysage (Strasbourg, mai 2002),  
n° 74 (version bilingue)

Aménagement du territoire et paysage  
en (Erevan, octobre 2003), n° 75  
(version bilingue)

Le rôle de la formation dans la mise  
en œuvre de la politique du développe-  
ment territorial durable en Europe  
(Strasbourg, mars 2005)  
n° 76 (version bilingue)

Aménagement du territoire et paysage  
(Moscou, Fédération de Russie,  
avril 2004) n° 77 (version bilingue)

Paysage et aménagement du territoire  
(Tulcea, Roumanie, mai 2004) n° 78  
(version bilingue)





COUNCIL OF EUROPE    CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

*The Council of Europe has 46 member states, covering virtually the entire continent of Europe. It seeks to develop common democratic and legal principles based on the European Convention on Human Rights and other reference texts on the protection of individuals. Ever since it was founded in 1949, in the aftermath of the Second World War, the Council of Europe has symbolised reconciliation.*

*Le Conseil de l'Europe regroupe aujourd'hui 46 Etats membres, soit la quasi-totalité des pays du continent européen. Son objectif est de créer un espace démocratique et juridique commun, organisé autour de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'Homme et d'autres textes de référence sur la protection de l'individu. Créé en 1949, au lendemain de la seconde guerre mondiale, le Conseil de l'Europe est le symbole historique de la réconciliation*