

Proceedings



15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT)

Moscow, Russian Federation, 8-9 July 2010



**15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers
responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT)**

Moscow, Russian Federation, 8-9 July 2010

French edition:

15^e Conférence du Conseil de l'Europe des ministres responsables de l'aménagement du territoire (CEMAT)

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.

All requests concerning the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Directorate of Communication (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or publishing@coe.int). All other correspondence concerning this publication should be addressed to the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage.

Cover design and layout: Documents and Publications Production Department (SPDP),
Council of Europe

Council of Europe Publishing
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
<http://book.coe.int>

© Council of Europe, February 2012
Printed at the Council of Europe

Contents

I. Summary of the debates	5
II. Texts and documents adopted	13
CEMAT Moscow Declaration: “Future Challenges: Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World”	14
CEMAT Resolution No. 1 on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent	27
CEMAT Resolution No. 2 on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage: promoting sustainable spatial development “Rural heritage as a factor of territorial cohesion”	38
CEMAT Resolution No. 3 on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning	47
III. Speeches delivered during the ministerial conference	49
IV. Synthesis of national reports	157
V. CEMAT report of activities 2006–10	277
VI. CEMAT spatial development glossary	359
VII. Programme of the conference	363
VIII. List of documents	371
IX. List of participants	375

I. Summary of the debates

Introduction

1. The 15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) was held in Moscow on 8 and 9 July 2010, at the invitation of the Russian Government.

The conference was opened by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr Thorbjørn Jagland. Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, then welcomed the participants. Messages from the President of the Russian Federation, Mr Dmitry Medvedev, and the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Mr Vladimir Putin, were read out. Speeches were given by: Mr Dmitry Kozak, Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Ms Svetlana Orlova, Deputy Chair of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, on behalf of Mr Sergey Mironov, Chair of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, and Ms Galina Izotova, First Deputy Chair of the Committee on Federation Affairs and Regional Policy of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, on behalf of Mr Boris Gryzlov, Chair of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation.

2. The Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT (CSO) held a preparatory meeting the day before the conference to finalise the texts that were to be adopted at the close of the event.

3. The general theme of the conference was as follows: “Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world”.

4. Some 150 representatives of member states, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the INGO Conference, several Council of Europe steering committees, international governmental organisations and numerous officials from the government, parliament and NGOs of the host country attended the conference.

Conference proceedings

5. In his welcome address, the Secretary General said that population growth, urbanisation, concentration, competition, regional imbalance and

unequal development were major challenges that our societies must recognise and overcome. In his view, the solutions and remedies were not exclusively economic. As an instrument in the hands of public authorities, spatial planning was closely linked to the search for the common good, and must be directed towards long-term objectives. He accordingly considered that the work of CEMAT helped to achieve a mode of sustainable spatial development that would prevent, or at least considerably reduce, some negative aspects of current crises and social difficulties. He noted that by improving living conditions and standards, spatial planning was paving the way for a better society, which is one of the main tasks of the Council of Europe.

In his address, Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, said he believed that by joining forces and combining their intellectual resources, spatial planning ministers could find ways of resolving the spatial development problems facing the European continent and in so doing build closer pan-European co-operation.

Mr Dmitry Medvedev, President of the Russian Federation, conveyed his best wishes to participants on this, the 40th anniversary of CEMAT. He said that Russia had embarked on a process of comprehensive modernisation, based on democracy and making the most of human potential, which is what the Council of Europe is all about. He hoped that participants would use the conference to examine in detail the major issues connected with the integration of European countries.

Mr Vladimir Putin, Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, sent his greetings to the conference participants and hosts and his best wishes on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of CEMAT. He noted that this eminent international forum was concerned with key issues relating to spatial planning and sustainable spatial development on the European continent and said that Russia was contributing to the dynamic progress of the Council of Europe, that the regional integration processes were mutually reinforcing and that the focus was on tackling the current socio-economic development challenges together.

6. Participants proceeded to elect the chair after the opening session and Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, was elected chair of the conference.

7. The conference proceeded according to the programme. Participants heard statements by representatives of the main Council of Europe bodies, in particular Mr Nexhati Jakupi, representative of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, Mr Aleksei Lotman, representative of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Mr Apolonio Ruiz-Ligero, Vice-Governor of the Council of Europe Development Bank, and Ms Anne-Marie Chavanon, Chair of the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe. The speakers outlined the Council's work in the field of spatial development.

8. A number of delegations had submitted national reports on the conference themes and a document summarising the national reports had been drawn up. In addition, the CEMAT activities report 2006-10, containing the conclusions of the CEMAT seminars and symposia between 2006 and 2010 on "The accessibility and attractiveness of rural and landlocked areas: sustainable transport and services of general interest" (Andorra, 2007); "Challenges and strategies for metropolises and metropolitan regions" (Russian Federation, 2008); "The spatial dimension of human rights: for a new culture of territory" (Armenia, 2008); "A comprehensive approach to balanced sustainable spatial development of the European continent" (Ukraine, 2009), were presented. All the conference documents are available on the CEMAT website (www.coe.int/CEMAT).

9. After the discussions, during which most of the delegations spoke, the conference chair, Mr Viktor Basargin, and his representative, Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation and Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT, respectively presented the draft declaration and resolutions, which were adopted by the conference:

- Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World;
- Resolution No. 1 on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent;
- Resolution No. 2 on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage: promoting sustainable spatial development;
- Resolution No. 3 on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

10. At the closing session, participants thanked the Russian authorities for their hospitality and the excellent manner in which they had organised the conference, and also the Greek authorities for their offer to host the 16th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning in 2013.

Summary of the debates

11. The conference gave delegations from Council of Europe member states an opportunity to take stock of the progress made and the initiatives taken, but also to identify the obstacles encountered and the challenges that needed to be overcome in order to achieve sustainable spatial development of the European continent.

12. The introductory report by Mr Viktor Basargin showed how spatial planning policies were becoming a crucial part of governments' political agenda.

13. The delegations took the view that the overarching objective of territorial cohesion, as promoted by the guiding principles, should be interpreted primarily as a basic territorial dimension of human rights. They noted that it represented a fundamental value of European society that could reconcile European citizens and their daily aspirations in terms of human dignity, equity and security, and good living, working and cultural environments, with the unavoidable transformations in production systems and in the international and inter-regional division of labour, with changes in natural conditions such as climate change, and with the move towards a more multicultural society. They pointed out that territorial cohesion was the most comprehensive and ambitious objective which territorial development policies, in conjunction with other public policies, must strive to achieve.

The delegations considered that climate change, population ageing and social polarisation called for appropriate and efficient territorial policy responses. They noted that these new challenges called for urgent policy responses, especially on the part of territorial development policies, in conjunction with other public policies. They observed that the quality and efficiency of territorial governance were key factors in responding successfully to new challenges.

14. With regard to sub-theme No. 1, “The contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent”, the delegations were of the view that the “human rights” dimension should be incorporated into spatial planning policies and efforts made to foster territorial cohesion. It was noted that essential services, in the opinion of a member state, needed to be generally available. Such services were felt to be of crucial importance for spatial planning policies, especially in rural areas, and lack of access to such services jeopardised the right to an adequate standard of living as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). CEMAT had already expressed its views on specific aspects of these questions in its “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” (Committee of Ministers Recommendation Rec(2002)1 on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent) and in its ministerial declarations at the 13th CEMAT (Ljubljana, 2003) and 14th CEMAT (Lisbon, 2006). In the Ljubljana Declaration, it was, for example, stated that “uneven accessibility to essential goods and services generate marginalisation and exclusion”.

15. As regards sub-theme No. 2, “The rural heritage as a factor of territorial cohesion”, the delegations noted that Recommendation Rec(2002)1 recognised that enhancing the cultural heritage increased the appeal of localities and regions for investors, tourists and the general public and made an important contribution to economic development. It was accordingly felt that the provisions of the guiding principles related to “rural areas” and to “broadly-based participation of society in the spatial planning process” were to be implemented and the use of the “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT” promoted. In the delegations’ opinion, the rural heritage was a real asset and resource for territories, a factor and a driving force in sustainable development of the European continent, and played a decisive role in making rural areas more attractive and increased the balance between town and country.

16. In this context, the delegations discussed the Council of Europe’s future activities in the spatial planning field. They emphasised that CEMAT, bringing together European Union and non-European Union member states, was a unique forum for discussion of the future of the European continent and for promoting co-operation and partnerships with regard to new, emerging challenges and to all territorial developments generated by structural changes. They called on the Committee of Ministers to provide appropriate

support to CEMAT's policy recommendations and to maintain their support by providing CEMAT with sufficient resources.

Outcome

17. The ministers and heads of delegation adopted the following texts:
- Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World;
 - Resolution No. 1 on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent;
 - Resolution No. 2 on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage: promoting sustainable spatial development;
 - Resolution No. 3 on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

























II. Texts and documents adopted

CEMAT Moscow Declaration

“Future Challenges: Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World”

Adopted by the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning at the 15th Plenary Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 8 July 2010

We, the ministers of the member states of the Council of Europe, attending the 15th Plenary Session of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning, which also celebrates the 40th anniversary of CEMAT, in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 8 and 9 July 2010,

Considering:

- the commitment of the Council of Europe to the promotion of human rights and pluralist democracy, as embodied in various European conventions and charters, and the fact that CEMAT has given priority to promoting the territorial dimension of human rights and democracy, especially through stronger territorial cohesion and democratic approaches based on the increased involvement of regional and local authorities and civil society in territorial development processes;
- the considerable changes which have occurred over the past 40 years in the demands made on territorial development policies, caused by shifting contextual factors, emerging challenges and evolving societal values; the key role played by CEMAT over these four decades in promoting efficient territorial development activities at all levels, including across borders, in order to increase the well-being of European citizens and the quality and attractiveness of the European territory, as well as the need to provide CEMAT, on this memorable occasion, with an increased impetus adapted to the new context;
- the commitment of the Council of Europe to sustainable development, as recognised by the Final Declaration of the 3rd Summit of Heads of State and Government (2005), the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the

Conference of INGOs, and expressed by CEMAT, through the “Guiding Principles for the Sustainable Development of the European Continent” (2000) and the related recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states of the Council of Europe (2002), the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development (2003) and the Lisbon Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe (2006);

- that in this year of economic and social challenges, the priorities of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (May-November 2010) focused on achieving greater territorial cohesion are fully in line with the CEMAT commitments towards sustainable territorial development of the European continent;

Having regard to the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and the Territorial Agenda of the European Union and its First Action Programme agreed upon by the EU spatial development ministers at their informal ministerial meetings in Potsdam in 1999, in Leipzig and in Ponta Delgada in 2007;

Following the principles and objectives suggested in the work programme of the Committee of Senior Officials for the period 2007-10, highlighting the theme “Future challenges: sustainable territorial development of the European continent in a changing world”;

Adopt the following declaration:

Milestones in the history of CEMAT

CEMAT was established in 1970 with the purpose of developing transnational co-operation on common territorial development issues such as the growing regional imbalances generated by economic prosperity, the structural move towards a more service-based economy and territorial integration across national borders. Soon, new challenges emerged which had to be added to CEMAT’s agenda, such as increasing unemployment in manufacturing regions, the economic backwardness of European peripheries, the polarisation trends in and around metropolitan areas and the recognition of the importance of environmental issues. More recently, major innovations in telecommunication systems and especially the worldwide introduction of the Internet and related communication technologies made possible

both the emergence of the knowledge society and the acceleration of globalisation. Business clustering and area-based development then became appropriate strategies.

The most important political event of the post-war period on the European continent took place in 1989-91, right in the middle of the four decades of CEMAT activity, with the fall of the Iron Curtain. The transition period which followed, driven by the introduction of the market economy in the countries of central and eastern Europe as well as in Russia, had a considerable impact on territorial patterns, in regards to both cities and rural areas. Territorial integration could now proceed on a continental scale, and networks of all kinds have developed over the past two decades throughout the wider Europe. The European continent is again unified, in a context where territorial disparities still remain significant.

In the past four decades, the internal organisation of statutory powers within the Council of Europe member countries has changed considerably. The process of democratisation and the subsequent change of polarisation resulted in the allocation of significant territorial development responsibilities to regions and municipalities in most countries. In central and eastern Europe too, the decentralisation process, which started later, has progressed significantly, generating, as in western Europe, structures of multilevel territorial governance.

Since its foundation in 1970, CEMAT has played an invaluable role in promoting efficient territorial development policies throughout Europe, in line with the major changes in the general context:

Activities to raise awareness, exchange good practice and jointly explore future trends have marked the course of its forty years of activity. CEMAT has had an unquestionable impact on the improvement of territorial development legislation, policies, procedures, practices and tools in numerous countries. Its influence has been particularly strong when new groups of countries have joined the Council of Europe, as happened in the case of several countries of southern Europe in the 1970s and of central and eastern Europe in the 1990s.

A particularly valuable and influential achievement of CEMAT has been the joint formulation and political adoption of common forward-looking

territorial development doctrines, such as the European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter, adopted in Torremolinos in 1983 and the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”, adopted in Hanover in 2000, on the occasion of CEMAT’s 30th anniversary.

CEMAT has advocated the subsidiarity and reciprocity principles with a view to actively involving regions and municipalities in territorial development policies, and also as a means of preserving the unity in diversity bequeathed to Europe by its history and geography.

CEMAT has further demonstrated that well-conceived and efficiently implemented territorial development policies are essential to ensure sustainable development in the long term, as stipulated by the Rio and Johannesburg declarations, and to protect and enhance landscapes according to the provisions of the European Landscape Convention.

In the period between 2007 and 2010, with the Russian Federation in the chair, CEMAT has devoted specific attention, in the context of its international symposia, to the following topics: “Accessibility and attractiveness of rural and landlocked areas: sustainable transport and services of general interest” (Andorra, 2007), “Challenges and strategies for metropolises and metropolitan regions in a context of growing globalisation with regard to economic, social, environmental and cultural development” (Saint Petersburg, 2008), “The spatial dimension of human rights: for a new culture of the territory” (Yerevan, 2008), and “A comprehensive approach to balanced sustainable spatial development of the European continent” (Kiev, 2009).

The overarching objective of territorial cohesion, as promoted by the guiding principles, should be interpreted primarily as a basic territorial dimension of human rights. It represents a fundamental value of European society that can reconcile European citizens and their daily aspirations in terms of human dignity, equity and security, and good living, working and cultural environments, with the unavoidable transformations in production systems and in the international and inter-regional division of labour, with changes in natural conditions such as climate change, and with the move towards a more multicultural society. Territorial cohesion is the most comprehensive and ambitious objective which territorial development policies, in conjunction with other public policies, must strive to achieve.

2. Climate change, population ageing and social polarisation call for appropriate and efficient territorial policy responses

New challenges with significant territorial impacts have emerged over the past decade, which were not at all, or not sufficiently, taken into account in the guiding principles of the year 2000. They call for urgent policy responses, especially on the part of territorial development policies in conjunction with other public policies.

The acceleration of climate change and the need for a new energy paradigm call for urgent territorial development initiatives

Climate change, hardly noticeable a few decades ago, has been accelerating to the point of becoming one of the most serious global issues. Fossil energy systems, which generate the majority of greenhouse gas emissions, are widely recognised as the main drivers of climate change. The issues of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change have a growing impact on biological and physical systems and affect basic access to water, food production and other economic sectors as well as the environment. They also cause increasingly frequent natural disasters with social, economic and environmentally damaging impacts. Curbing the speed of climate change and limiting the extent of its negative impacts require significant initiatives in many public policy areas and also presuppose major changes in the functioning of society.

Territorial development policies have crucial tasks to fulfil in this field. With regard to facilitating a change of energy paradigm, they have to contribute to the adaptation of transport systems, to the implementation of energy-efficient measures in the design of buildings and urban settlements, to the good management of mobility needs, to the promotion and use of renewable energy sources, while ensuring environmental sustainability, social equity and to an optimisation of the economic benefits to be reaped, in European regions, from these new approaches, ranging from research and development activities to the widespread implementation of new practical solutions tailored to each individual region. Where territorial development measures are concerned, minimising the negative impacts of climate change requires, on the one hand, the intensification of preventive measures against potential damage from natural disasters (floods, drought, storms, landslides, etc.) and, on the other hand, the development of structural measures aiming at facilitating the adaptation both of productive systems (agriculture, forestry, tourism) and urban settlements

at strengthening the protection of natural resources and biodiversity, where potentially affected by climate change. Territorial development policies have to be significantly improved by integrating mitigation and adaptation measures into local, regional and national development strategies and into the various levels of decision making.

Developing appropriate territorial policy responses to the new demographic and sociocultural challenges

Several decades of low fertility rates are now resulting in accelerating population ageing and, in some countries, population decline. These trends will amplify in the future, with a particular intensity in central and eastern Europe as well as in some west European regions. The relative importance of migration in total population change, which is currently significant, will further increase. These demographic changes, combined with low birth rate and growing social polarisation in European society, will call for significant upgrading of the territorial development policies.

With regard to the impact of accelerating population ageing, labour shortages in a growing number of European regional labour markets should be anticipated and planned for – improvements must include, through the upgrading of qualifications, employment rates, productivity and innovation capacity, the strengthened provision of, and proper access to, appropriate services and infrastructure (health care, culture, transport, accommodation facilities) for the elderly; and development of the residential and heritage-based economy in regions with valuable natural and cultural assets, based on the attraction of a growing numbers of retirees.

In regions (mainly remote rural and low density population areas and old industrial districts) affected or threatened by vicious circles of social deprivation generated by the simultaneous effects of depopulation, loss of jobs and closure of services, territorial development policies have to ensure the provision of essential services and promote economic development and social cohesion in order to maintain the vitality of settlements and prevent further deprivation. In order to facilitate the integration of young people, and especially of women, into the labour market of their home region, curb outmigration trends and make the region more attractive for these groups and enhance their personal prospects, opportunities for higher education, lifelong learning and access to skilled jobs have to be significantly increased,

in particular through better provision of services and infrastructures also promoting intra-regional mobility, combining it with efforts to counteract the process of decline by creating new jobs.

In order to counterbalance the effects of growing social polarisation, especially in cities, which often result in social segregation, growing intolerance, insecurity and even violence, territorial development and urban planning measures, in combination with other public policies and against the background of the Council of Europe's objective of social cohesion, have to prevent such tensions, ensure social inclusion and alleviate social segregation by rehabilitating and regenerating problem neighbourhoods.

Cities also have an important role in economic recovery because of their added value of innovation.

3. Promoting innovative, sustainable and cohesive territorial development in a context of accelerating globalisation and as a means of responding successfully to economic challenges in the post-crisis period

Gaining increased benefits from the globalisation process through more efficient territorial approaches

The globalisation of economies, which has been the dominant trend since the 1990s, is driven by trade liberalisation and the development of information and communication technologies, which have increased the marketability of goods and services, facilitating the transnational fragmentation of production processes according to the most profitable locations. While a number of European regions significantly benefit from the globalisation process, others are confronted with increasing external competition. In the future, it is likely that the globalisation process will have substantially different characteristics, with competition moving more and more from low-wage production segments to technology-intensive products, including also, increasingly, services and agriculture.

Territorial development policies have the task of contributing to better positioning of the different European regions in the global context. Growth, stagnation and decline do not only cause problems and challenges, they also provide an opportunity to stress differences between different regions and bring change to enhance the attractiveness of the European continent as a

whole. Policies can do this by providing appropriate local responses to global challenges through the promotion of local economic development taking into account the territorial potential and in particular, heritage, local assets and resources, while linking it with the sustenance and preservation of this heritage and local identity. With this connection, they have to promote the territorial anchorage of businesses by strengthening their regional links with research and development, training, education, administrative and cultural institutions and civil society. They are required to facilitate the adjustment of labour markets and enable production systems to move closer to the frontiers of technology, mainly through the upgrading of education and skills in regions. They are also expected to help overcome the still significant fragmentation of the European economic/technological system by facilitating the creation of co-operation networks, and especially clusters, throughout Europe, involving businesses, research and development and education institutions, technology transfer centres, etc.

Innovative, sustainable and cohesive territorial development contributing to overcoming the consequences of the economic crisis

Europe is emerging from the deepest global economic depression of the post-war period. With the sharp decline in world trade and exports, the globalisation process has, for the first time, temporarily slowed down. It is essential that Europe's global positioning does not worsen as an outcome of the crisis and that Europe's regions efficiently exploit the potential of the new context to make a quantum leap in terms of competitiveness. Spatial and regional planning should contribute to economic recovery. Furthermore, the crisis and its consequences should also be considered and used as an opportunity for boosting territorial cohesion, especially in promoting place-based strategies which permit more rational and economical use of public resources. It is therefore of primary importance that the capabilities of territorial development policies be fully utilised and this requires a number of significant adjustments.

Territorial development policies should be helpful in reconciling the short-term, often sectoral measures adopted by governments to overcome the crisis with long-term values and principles, such as territorial cohesion and sustainable territorial development. In pursuing the aim of revitalising and consolidating the economy, more emphasis should be given to integrated

approaches, the only ones capable of generating synergy effects and preventing long-term inconsistencies, and support should be given to regional and local initiatives aimed at mobilising endogenous resources and territorial potential. For decades to come the economic strength and competitiveness of the European continent will be more and more determined by the skills of people and the strengths of our cities in which knowledge, education, innovation and research find a powerful base.

The debate on climate change is far from incompatible with the need to revitalise the economy, as significantly curbing greenhouse gas emissions offers considerable opportunities for economic development in European regions in terms of innovation and investment, and makes demands on numerous areas of territorial development (energy, transport, construction and renovation of buildings, agriculture and forestry, tourism, etc.). The adoption of new adaptation and mitigation solutions tailored to the local and regional contexts throughout Europe is likely to generate a great many new activities and significant numbers of new jobs, while contributing to improved quality of life and reduced risks related to climate change.

4. The quality and efficiency of territorial governance are key factors in responding successfully to new challenges

Territorial governance is increasingly recognised as being of primary importance in ensuring successful and harmonious territorial development, as was particularly stressed at CEMAT's 14th Plenary Session in 2006.¹ The present context is even more challenging in this respect, with the need to recover rapidly from the economic crisis and efficiently manage the transition to a more environmentally friendly energy paradigm.

Considering the increased number of member countries since 1989, with new borders and new administration systems and with higher cross-border permeability within the European Union and the Schengen area than outside, new forms of co-operation have to be developed to permit satisfactory and efficient territorial integration in all parts of the European continent.

As global competitiveness is rooted in the territory, especially in the numerous formal and informal networks of influence and co-operation

1. CEMAT Resolution No. 2 on territorial governance: empowerment through enhanced co-ordination, adopted in Lisbon in 2006.

existing in and between regions, significant European initiatives and impetus for sound, innovative and sustainable territorial development are necessary in the new context.

Territorial development policies should facilitate the transformation, in this new context, of European regions' territorial capital into concrete economic, social and environmental added values. This requires innovative territorial governance, in which regional and local authorities define concrete development strategies in co-operation with economic players and civil society, mobilise and organise institutions and stakeholders to carry out operational projects, including on the basis of public-private partnerships, and ensure the coherence and sustainability of the various initiatives by providing a long-term vision and a development framework. The development of new infrastructures and services and the delivery of essential services are particularly challenging issues, especially in relation to population ageing, social inclusion and the continued vitality of communities and settlements.

With regard to the numerous valuable initiatives of regional and local authorities aimed at promoting the development of territories, reducing their social, environmental and economic vulnerability and counteracting climate change, it should be ensured that their future involvement will not be endangered by insufficient financial resources, as a result of the crisis.

Considering that development in the post-crisis period will necessarily be based on more endogenous approaches, closely associating regional know-how, assets and innovation potential, co-operation and subcontracting networks, local business clusters, voluntary associations and other NGOs, territorial development policies should enable civil society to be more heavily involved in the preparation and implementation of territorial development strategies and projects at the regional and local levels. In this connection, regional and local authorities should be encouraged in their functions as facilitators for the setting up of project-related partnerships while ensuring the provision of necessary administrative and material support as well as the necessary links with upper-tier authorities. National policies and state interventions should be as effective as possible to provide transparency and predictability as far as national governmental actions are concerned. This also provides the necessary space for public-private partnership.

Because of their horizontal, cross-thematic character and orientation towards sustainability, territorial development policies are an invaluable tool for ensuring the protection, management and planning of landscapes, according to the provisions of the European Landscape Convention (2000), in a way which reflects the identity and diversity of the population living in the different European regions. Managing landscapes in the spirit of the convention is an integral part of modern territorial governance.

In order to enable appropriate decisions to be taken in due time, conventional territorial monitoring systems should be complemented, at times of rapid economic and social change related to crises and unexpected events, with more qualitative, expert-based short-term reporting of territorial changes.

In the light of the foregoing, we, the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning of the member states of the Council of Europe,

Emphasise that:

The Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), which brings together European Union and non-European Union member states, is a unique forum for discussion on the future of the European continent and for promoting co-operation and partnerships with regard to new, emerging challenges and to all territorial developments generated by structural changes.

With the aim of promoting sustainable and cohesive territorial development on a pan-European scale, while addressing highly strategic issues of common European interest, CEMAT is currently particularly committed to contributing to the recovery from the economic crisis and to implementing efficient and adequate mitigation and adaptation solutions regarding the challenge of climate change, as spatial development with its integrated and cross-sectoral approach and multilevel governance system can provide an adequate framework and a basis for implementation of adaptation strategies and measures respectful of European territorial diversity. It also devotes particular attention and significant efforts to the territorial impact of population ageing, migration issues, growing social polarisation and accelerating globalisation.

With a view to promoting innovative territorial governance, making it possible to co-ordinate different policies at different levels and also efficiently involving the regional and local authorities and civil society, CEMAT is

encouraging the formulation of long-term visions permitting comprehensive approaches and preventing undesired territorial effects.

Call on:

- the member states, the Committee of Ministers and the Secretary General of the Council of Europe to consider not only the importance of the work carried out by CEMAT over the past 40 years in promoting territorial development on a pan-European level while supporting human rights and democracy, but also its present strategic activities on crucial issues in a rapidly changing and challenging context, and therefore to maintain their support by providing CEMAT with sufficient resources as mentioned in the Action Plan of the 3rd Summit of Heads of State and Government (2005);
- the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe to provide appropriate support to CEMAT's policy recommendations in order to facilitate and strengthen their implementation by mobilising wider circles of public authorities and stakeholders of civil society;
- the European Union to counteract the declining trends in the territoriality of European policies and to promote coherence and synergies between policies which have significant territorial impacts, with the aim of strengthening territorial cohesion and sustainability as well as the competitiveness of European regions in a context of growing territorial challenges. In this connection, neighbourhood policies should also be given a greater territorial dimension.

Commit ourselves, within our means and competences, to:

- provide fresh impetus to our co-operation efforts on the occasion of CEMAT's 40th anniversary and against the background of a highly challenging context and to give a sharper focus to CEMAT's activities with the aim of contributing significantly to cohesive and sustainable solutions regarding the territorial development of the European continent;
- pay particular attention, in the territorial development policies of our respective countries, to the new challenges described above and to take

all initiatives, both within our respective countries and in the context of cross-border co-operation, enabling territorial development policies to be efficiently combined with efforts to regenerate the European economy in a sustainable way and to provide efficient and adequate mitigation and adaptation solutions to the issues related to climate change;

- mandate the Committee of Senior Officials to adapt the guiding principles concerning the new territorial challenges.

CEMAT Resolution No. 1

**of the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning
of the member states of the Council of Europe
on the contribution of essential services
to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent**

Adopted by the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning at the 15th Plenary Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 9 July 2010

The ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning of the member states of the Council of Europe,

Considering that essential services are indispensable for a decent life in a developed society, and that the demand for those services is increasing rapidly;

Considering that access to essential services is a basic public policy aim and a crucial factor in spatial development policies, helping to reinforce social, economic and territorial cohesion and contributing to proper spatial planning;

Recalling that, under Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers to the member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, “one of the aims of the Council of Europe is to strengthen local and regional democracy in Europe by means of a territorially more balanced development of the European continent”; and that “social cohesion in Europe has to be accompanied by sustainable spatial development policies that bring the social as well as the economic requirements to be met by the territory into line with its ecological and cultural functions”;

Recalling that, under the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development (CEMAT(2003)9 Final), “uneven accessibility to essential goods and services” is one of the many factors which are “challenging the sustainability of our common European future”, and that “to manage adequately the major challenges for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, relevant policies must be further improved, in

order to reduce disparities, particularly through a more balanced and effective territorial location of activities, infrastructure and services in order to improve their accessibility”;

Recalling CEMAT Resolution No. 3 on the EU Territorial Agenda and its relation to CEMAT, adopted in Lisbon, on 27 October 2006, and referring to Article 3 of the Territorial Agenda, which says that “Through the Territorial Agenda, we will help in terms of territorial solidarity to secure better living conditions and quality of life with equal opportunities, oriented towards regional and local potentials, irrespective of where people live whether in the European core area or in the periphery”; and to Article 8: “we regard it as an essential task and act of solidarity to develop preconditions in all regions to enable equal opportunities for its [EU] citizens and development perspectives for entrepreneurship ...”.

Noting the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities adopted in Leipzig, on 24 and 25 May 2007, in which “The Ministers declare: ... all dimensions of sustainable development should be taken into account at the same time and with the same weight. These include economic prosperity, social balance and a healthy environment ... In the long run, cities cannot fulfil their function as engines of social progress and economic growth ... unless we succeed in maintaining the social balance within and among them ...”.

Recalling that, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), everyone “is entitled to realisation of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity” (Article 22) and that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family” (Article 25);

Recalling the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (United Nations, 1966), in which “the states parties ... recognise the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family” (Article 11.1), the right to enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (Article 12) and the right to education (Article 13) and noting that this treaty was ratified by all the member states of the Council of Europe;

Recalling the declaration adopted at the Johannesburg Summit (2002), in which the signatories affirmed their determination “to speedily increase

access to such basic requirements as clean water, sanitation, adequate shelter, energy, health care, food security and the protection of biodiversity”;

Recalling the International Guidelines on Access to Essential Services for All (HSP/GC/22/2/Add.6) adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme at its 22nd Session in April 2009;

Recalling Recommendation No. R (2000) 3 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to the member states on the right to the satisfaction of basic material needs of persons in situations of extreme hardship (January 2000) and the action taken by states to give effect to the individual, universal and actionable right to satisfaction of basic material needs;

Recalling Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)4 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to the member states on local and regional public services;

Recalling Recommendation 235 (2008) of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on services of general interest in rural areas, a key factor in territorial cohesion policies, and the invitation of the Congress to the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) to continue its discussions on rural areas;

Having regard to the above-mentioned recommendation of the Congress to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to invite member states to “elaborate regulatory and financial mechanisms which enable the different tiers of government to offer support, incentives, grants, subsidies or equalisation measures to ensure adequate access to high-quality services of general interest for all”;

Recalling Recommendation 259 (2009) of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on public water and sewer service for sustainable development and the invitation of the Congress to the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) to integrate its recommendation into the present resolution;

Considering the progress made in implementing human rights and, in particular, economic and social rights, and the increasing attention devoted to underprivileged and marginalised groups and ethnic minorities;

Considering that access to essential services is necessary to implement the right to an adequate standard of living as enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and is indispensable for the effectiveness of the human rights provided for in this treaty;

Noting that, although most people in the Council of Europe's member states already have extensive access to essential services, more progress is still needed to guarantee such access for more individuals, and particularly deprived or marginalised groups;

Recognising that implementing social, economic and territorial cohesion policies involves improving access to essential services wherever such access is still inadequate;

Noting that although there is no single uniform definition of essential services, there is a common understanding of what they are;

1. *Adopt* the declaration on the contribution of essential services to sustainable spatial development of the European continent;
2. *Decide* to take account of the declaration and, within their means and competences, apply its principles in the design and implementation of their spatial development policies, thus contributing to the promotion of social progress and strengthening of the implementation of human rights for the benefit of their own populations;
3. *Decide* to identify, in their own countries, the services which should, in their view, be available to everyone if human dignity is to be respected, and to implement, within their means and competences, policies and programmes designed to improve access to essential services and their quality, particularly in rural areas, mountain and ultra-peripheral regions, small villages and peripheral urban areas;
4. *Decide* to promote sustainable spatial development policies taking into account social policy measures, solidarity policies and geographical and climatic adaptation measures, in order to ensure that the costs of essential services in remote, outlying or sparsely populated areas are compatible with those applied in urban areas or that alternative compensation measures are made in favour of vulnerable, marginalised or underprivileged population groups in their territory, including ethnic minorities;

5. *Ask* the Council of Europe to organise exchanges of experience and comparative analyses on measures adopted in member states with an eye to improving access to essential services in rural and peripheral urban areas, to promote sustainable ecological solutions in sparsely populated areas, and to make such services more accessible to vulnerable, marginalised or underprivileged population groups in their territory, including ethnic minorities.

Appendix to Resolution No. 1

CEMAT Declaration on the Contribution of Essential Services to Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent

The ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning of the member states of the Council of Europe declare the following:

1. Regional/spatial development in a developed society requires the harmonised availability throughout the territory of a set of infrastructures and services of general interest in order to enable populations to enjoy an adequate standard of living and create the conditions for economic and social development of the different regions.
2. Essential services are services to which everyone should have access in order to be able to live decently, have their human rights respected, have an adequate standard of living and live in a healthy environment. Despite the progress made in this area, not all such services are evenly distributed throughout the European continent or equally available to all social categories, even though they play a vital role in guaranteeing economic, social and territorial cohesion in the framework of sustainable spatial development.
3. The territories that may lack essential services are mainly rural areas, under-equipped peripheral urban districts, economically under-developed regions and ultra-peripheral areas where the demand for essential services is less strong or less easy to solve. The absence of essential services in some regions hampers balanced spatial development and is seen as a factor for exclusion, or even as a form of discrimination, thus contributing to depopulation of some regions. Similarly, charging high prices for such services excludes underprivileged households from such services.

Essential services contribute both to economic and social development and the implementation of human rights requires new measures to facilitate access by

all to such services and make their accessibility reasonable to reduce the number of citizens deprived of them in Europe. Such action will involve all levels of government including ministers responsible for spatial/regional development.

The provision of essential services will benefit from a clear distribution of responsibilities between territorial communities, regions and the state and from capacity-building and empowerment of such decentralised authorities which are made responsible for overseeing or managing essential services.

4. Essential services are chosen in each country by public authorities to meet the needs of their various population groups in accordance with spatial development objectives. They vary from time to time and from place to place. The following services are often chosen in member states as being essential services under their legal system: water supply and sanitation, energy supply, electricity and gas, telecommunications (including Internet access), postal services, refuse collection and disposal and public transport. This open list could possibly include other social services, it being understood that health and education services should be provided in all cases. Common lists should also be drawn up by mutual agreement between states following similar socio-economic policies and include quality requirements for essential services and measures designed to improve them when needed.

5. This declaration applies only to essential services which under internal law have to carry out public service missions or which are considered to be services of general interest. Its implementation will vary from one country to the other and may require amending current policies to increase access to all.

Choice of essential services

6. Each individual state, in consultation with the relevant authorities and civil society, should determine very precisely, in a transparent manner and in accordance with their spatial policies, the essential services which they intend to make available for all throughout their territory. This choice will be influenced by their level of development, general policy aims, and considerations of equity, traditions and culture and, generally, their policies on social, economic and spatial development. The practical arrangements for establishing the services must comply with the applicable rules as regards the provision of services of general interest. Harmonisation of the lists of essential services between countries with similar economic development would contribute to reducing economic and social disparities.

General principles

A. Essential services, spatial development and planning

Aims

7. Sustainable spatial development requires the provision of essential services throughout the territory under conditions which enable everyone to have access to them. Such services should be provided as close to the users as possible and equitably distributed through the territory in a non-discriminatory manner, generally in polycentric spatial structures. Measures for the delivery of essential services will need to be adapted to local conditions.

Within the limits of their means and competences and depending on available resources, public authorities should take the action needed to make essential services available to the public, taking account of the needs of present and future generations and of the protection of health and the environment. Such action is likely to involve several ministries and/or several local and regional authorities according to the country's legal framework, and may be supported by appropriate legal provisions and national strategies elaborated at interministerial level.

Improving access to essential services in regions where they are lacking is a priority in ensuring that everyone can live in his/her own region thus contributing to social, economic and territorial cohesion. It helps to improve regional economic development.

Setting up of essential services

8. Depending on available resources, public authorities should provide or support the availability of these services and should monitor them. They should define the roles and responsibilities of any regional or local bodies responsible for such services. Where they do not directly manage the services, they should retain political responsibility for them.

9. Public authorities should specify, within the limits of their competences, the general rules applicable to essential services (universal access, continuity, inalienability, security, adaptability, effectiveness, affordable charges, transparency, etc.) and the level of quality expected of them.

10. Public authorities should adopt and implement measures to guarantee access to essential services in normal situations, and also adopt special provisions for crisis situations. In some cases, users have to travel in order to have access to such services. Measures should be taken to facilitate easy and affordable access to these services by public transport when they are not locally available.

Decentralisation

11. Decisions on the spatial deployment of essential services and the corresponding operational regulations should take account of specific regional or local conditions, and should contribute to sustainable spatial/regional development in line with adopted policies, plans and guidelines for regional development of urban and rural areas, and in accordance with sectoral plans and decentralisation policies.

12. Local or regional authorities close to the users should play a major part, in the context of decentralisation, in establishing, monitoring and ensuring the proper functioning of essential services, in compliance with power-sharing rules. They should co-operate to ensure that essential services operate efficiently on an appropriate scale, in particular between urban municipalities and nearby rural areas.

Management

13. Public authorities may exercise their powers in the field of essential services either directly or, if permitted by law, by delegation. In these cases, they should have freedom of choice concerning modes of management, and ensure that this choice can be reversed. If management is delegated, the corresponding decisions should be valid for a limited time and subject to regular review involving users. Delegated services should operate in accordance with rules compatible with the requirements of sustainable spatial development, in a non-discriminatory manner, under the supervision of the public authorities and in a manner accessible to all.

Networked services

14. States should pay particular attention to the development of networked services in order to ensure sustainable spatial development and combat rural depopulation. They should earmark financial resources for new infrastructures

in their territory and make full use of information and communication technologies as a tool to encourage accessible essential services throughout the territory

15. States should apply the principle that “telecommunications networks must be improved and extended to cover the whole area and tariffs must not be prohibitive” (Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent). They should stress that “generalised access to Internet must be a priority objective” (Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe, adopted by the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning at their European conference in Lisbon, on 27 October 2006 (CEMAT(2006)14 Final).

B. Progressive extension of access to essential services

16. Public authorities should take appropriate action to promote the progressive extension of access to essential services under spatial development plans, depending on the financial resources available.

17. The investments required for the extension of access should be the subject of long-term development from the angle of sustainable development and sustainable spatial/regional development. Subsidies may be provided to take account of the extra costs of essential services in remote, outlying or sparsely populated areas or alternative price compensation measures may be taken in favour of vulnerable, marginalised or underprivileged population groups, including ethnic minorities, in accordance with the rules applicable to financial assistance.

C. Essential services and human rights

Right of access for all

18. In order to combat social inequality and geographical disparities, everyone should be granted the right of access to those services which are essential for living decently in a developed society.

19. Access to essential services may derive from general spatial development policies or from human rights, from obligations incumbent on public authorities or from provisions on economic and social rights enshrined in the constitution or treaties. The exercise of rights relating to essential services is

dependent on complying with the corresponding obligations, especially in terms of protecting natural resources and the environment.

Social and economic cohesion measures

20. The prices paid for essential services are a major factor in ensuring their effective availability particularly in remote areas where they are liable to be higher.

21. Prices should either be determined by the public authorities in respect of public services or be monitored, controlled or approved by them, so as to ensure their sustainability and strengthen social, economic and territorial cohesion. Where necessary, subsidies and fiscal measures may be used in order to ensure affordability to everyone.

22. The costs of essential services should be apportioned among all users so as to ensure that everyone has access to them under economic conditions acceptable to all. Public authorities should choose the methods to achieve such fair apportionment having due regard to the effects on spatial development of social, economic and territorial cohesion. They may introduce social measures for people in situations of hardship, provide targeted aid, operate social tariffs and adopt solidarity measures based on equalisation among the various users. They may also adopt price compensation measures for those exposed to unusually high prices for essential services.

D. Users' rights

23. The proper functioning of essential services should be promoted by a mode of management close to the users. Those responsible for essential services should report annually on service performance, investment made, state of infrastructure, incidents and complaints. Public authorities should regularly monitor any complaints from users about essential services and ascertain the action to be taken.

24. Users of essential services should have rights as users or consumers. In particular, each user should have access to easily understandable information on essential services, their quality and rates.

25. Public authorities should consult users of both sexes and their associations before taking any major decisions on essential services. They should envisage setting up and operating advisory boards on essential services.

E. International co-operation

26. International co-operation among member countries could facilitate the availability of essential services to all. Co-operation between local authorities in border areas should be promoted to facilitate access to essential services in these areas. Public authorities of a contracting party cannot be held responsible for disruptions in the provision of essential services which are caused by the lack of implementation of a treaty by another contracting party.

CEMAT Resolution No. 2

**of the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning
of the member states of the Council of Europe
on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage:
promoting sustainable spatial development
“Rural heritage as a factor of territorial cohesion”**

Adopted by the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning at the 15th Plenary Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 9 July 2010

The ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning of the member states of the Council of Europe,

Considering that Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development (Council of Europe, 13th CEMAT, 2003) and the Lisbon Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe (Council of Europe, 14th CEMAT, 2006) stress the importance of the enhancement of territories’ endogenous resources;

Considering that these texts emphasise the value of the natural and cultural rural heritage, its protection, its role in the development of the European continent and the participation and mobilisation of communities within the framework of the governance principles;

Considering that implementation of these principles calls for enhancement of rural areas by a consistent spatial development policy and that, with this in view, the rural heritage represents a crucial asset which should be preserved and enhanced;

Pointing out that the Council of Europe has already adopted several conventions, charters and recommendations, general or specialised, dealing with the rural heritage, in particular:

- the European Charter of Architectural Heritage (1975), which deals with traditional villages, the role of heritage in memory and the integrated conservation approach;
- the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, opened for signature in London on 6 May 1969, and revised in Valletta, on 16 January 1992;
- the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, opened for signature in Bern, on 19 September 1979;
- the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, opened for signature in Grenada, on 3 October 1985;
- Recommendation No. R (94) 6 for a sustainable development and use of the countryside;
- the European Landscape Convention, opened for signature in Florence, on 20 October 2000;
- the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, opened for signature in Faro, on 27 October 2007;

Considering the interest generated in several countries by the “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT”, of which the ministers responsible for regional/spatial planning took note at the 13th CEMAT Session (13 CEMAT(2003)4);

Considering that this charter, which appears as an addendum to the present resolution, seeks to establish an operational link between the provisions of these documents and to make rural heritage a real asset to its territory, a factor and a driving force in sustainable spatial development, and to play a decisive part in making rural areas more attractive and in the town-country balance;

1. *Adopt* this charter;
2. *Undertake* to implement it, within the limits of their resources and responsibilities;
3. *Recommend* that the governments of member states, at their various levels and in their various sectors of political action, consider the guidelines formulated below.

Appendix to Resolution No. 2

CEMAT pan-European charter for rural heritage: promoting sustainable spatial development “Rural heritage as a factor of territorial cohesion”

Rural heritage is a real asset and resource for territories, a factor and a driving force in sustainable development of the European continent, playing a decisive part in making rural areas more attractive and in the town-country balance.

Rural areas, even the most disadvantaged, have tangible and intangible elements, assets and skills, traditions and practices of recognised societal, cultural, architectural and natural value, a testament to the past and to the present. This heritage contributes to the quality of life of the inhabitants, to the quality of the landscapes and to the attractiveness of areas both to those who live there and to those who visit them.

The countryside and its heritage are particularly vulnerable, although they offer the potential for a new type of development and rural life. The decline of rural areas could cause irreversible damage to the living conditions and the identity of their populations and thus to many aspects of heritage;

Vigilance is essential when faced with the various threats hanging over this rural heritage:

- *the built and architectural heritage*, threatened by changes in housing and lifestyle, the acute challenges thrown up by energy issues, the obsolete nature of former farm buildings, which are nevertheless a typical feature of vernacular architecture;
- *the natural heritage and the rural landscape*, threatened by land use practices, farming and forestry methods and production techniques, the building of housing estates on the edges of towns and villages, the creation of new infrastructure, climate change and damage to the environment, particularly to biodiversity;
- *the intangible cultural heritage*, threatened by a somewhat backward-looking view that places tradition against progress and regards as obsolete the customs and skills of a rural community doomed in decline.

It is for stakeholders and policy makers to take full account of the guidelines set out below.

1. Knowledge and recognition of the heritage

The European continent has a rich rural heritage, shaped over the years by human activity and made up of an exceptional variety of soil types, reliefs, climates and crops.

This heritage covers areas as varied as history, architecture, archaeology, the arts, culture, in particular oral culture, techniques, and skills, including food-processing skills, the environment, and natural and built landscapes.

Heritage value not being self-evident, its recognition must come through a process of growing awareness inherent in the concept of “heritage formation”.

To place an item, object or skill (or a group of objects and skills) in a context of period, duration and space, and to pass it on to future generations, it is important to turn it into “common property” by giving it “meaning”.

In implementing policies for territories, policy makers have a role to play in promoting the heritage process through:

- working to make citizens, in particular the young, aware of the value of the rural heritage, and to involve them in the issues related to it;
- encouraging heritage preservation through mechanisms based on negotiations with the keepers and potential users of heritage elements;
- encouraging heritage education initiatives that build on the activities of the stakeholders and organisations concerned, and that are incorporated in school or extra-curricular activities, through the teaching of certain subjects (the arts, history, literature, environmental science, etc.) or in the form of awareness-raising activities (heritage classes, “exploration” classes, educational outings, etc.);
- encouraging and assisting the creation of places for the organisation of meetings, events, heritage days and forums for discussion on the heritage;
- facilitating or organising heritage recording, in particular at community level, as well as heritage research, using a combination of documentary sources and local knowledge;

- developing research and studies directed towards updated knowledge of the rural heritage and its adaptation to contemporary realities;
- providing all rural heritage stakeholders with national and/or regional guides compiled on the basis of the Council of Europe’s “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT”, and ensuring their distribution at local, regional, national and European levels.

2. Heritage use

The enduring nature of the heritage, which is an integral part of the heritage concept, requires us to think about how it is used.

Unless treated like a museum display, heritage items are destined to evolve. Depending on one’s viewpoint, this may involve various types of action: restoration, renovation, rehabilitation, reassignment, etc.

Since the aim is to pass the heritage on to future generations, whilst respecting its function, developing projects for it is the most appropriate way of ensuring a living future for it.

Policy makers and users will do their best to observe the different phases in the development of a project (preliminary draft, formalisation, familiarisation, follow-up, etc.), in association with each group of potential partners, so as to reinforce and enhance it.

3. Heritage as a driving force for sustainable development

To the extent that the purpose conferred through a particular project meets the expectations of the community or of user groups, a heritage item has the potential to give impetus to cultural and economic development.

Use for economic purposes requires policy makers and operators to take a two-pronged approach:

- striking a balance between small-scale production methods, traditional skills and innovation, making it possible to adapt to the modern world while offering alternatives to mass production;
- putting customs to practical use in tourist, craft, local or cultural products.

Legislation has provided a framework for some of these approaches, in particular in the food-processing industry, with the introduction of quality labels, but the range of opportunities is wide and should be extended to meet the high demand for authenticity and quality.

It is for policy makers to:

- promote a type of emerging economy based on heritage, by supporting professionals and practitioners in the development of products, in particular by combining different ways of adding value. Rambling as a means of exploring an area and finding out about its skills and local produce, experiences based on the scents and flavours of the countryside, cultural routes (roads and trails, etc.) on mutually complementary themes, and places devoted to particular skills are possible ways of doing so;
- use or reuse traditional methods of natural heritage conservation and management by adapting them to meet present-day requirements. Techniques for the preservation, grafting and utilisation of the genetic resources of old species and breeds are possible areas of application.

All these activities create jobs, directly or indirectly.

4. Heritage at the heart of territorial dynamics

Heritage enhancement can transform the image of the rural areas concerned.

As part of the process of making these areas more attractive and redefining them on the basis of a “living heritage”, it is vital to enlist the support and involvement of the stakeholders and communities concerned.

It is advisable to:

- provide information about the projects as well as to organise public participation;
- place economic initiatives in a wider development context;
- focus on the heritage’s cultural, social and societal dimension.

Culturally speaking, heritage enhancement represents an advantage for territories, communities and individuals. It helps to preserve cultural diversity and results in more rewarding exchanges.

Socially, heritage binds individuals together and builds a bridge between generations. In particular, it provides an opportunity to call on older members of the community, who possess knowledge and tend to be more available.

Creating a project strengthens dialogue and cohesion. In terms of the relationship with society, it contributes to people's sense of belonging and identity. It is a vehicle for, and a means of, celebrating community life.

It has been observed that heritage can play a major part in the successful settlement of newcomers in the countryside. It is important to ensure, however, that the heritage connection does not develop into a nostalgic attachment to rural life, or a form of introverted assertion of identity.

The process of heritage enhancement requires:

- a comprehensive approach within the territory concerned, translated into a project embracing the various facets of local development, in particular the availability of services for the community;
- an internal and external communication policy on heritage features and the activities conducted;
- a strategy for exchanging information with other areas facing similar heritage issues or, better still, for sharing experience and creating networks;
- inclusion in European, national, regional and local development programmes that provide both a methodological framework for project management and financial resources.

5. Heritage and its trades and professions

Heritage preservation and enhancement are often carried out by associations, using the services of volunteers. Such persons play a key role, but if the projects and related development processes are to succeed, trained persons must be involved as well.

In order to strike a balance between amateurs and professionals, and between activism and qualified intervention, training needs to be at the forefront of policy makers' concerns.

The first step is to:

- list the areas of competence and the disciplines concerned, as well as the professional skills to be adapted and passed on;

- examine heritage-related local development activities;
- compile reference job descriptions;
- develop a common vocabulary;
- target the different groups of stakeholders (policy makers, operators, heads of associations, administrative bodies, development agents, specialists, mediators, etc.).

These observations and assessments can then serve as a basis for developing heritage training and education, for example:

- training in the form of trade apprenticeships, combining general training and practical experience with an engineering/design element including innovation;
- multifaceted, heritage-related training for professionals in leadership, management, mediation, promotion and marketing;
- training for trainers, in particular those working in the voluntary sector.

Delivering this training and education involves:

- enlisting the support of training institutions, including, of course, vocational training institutions, but also those offering more specific forms of instruction such as mentoring, work-shadowing, etc.
- finding diversified funding, including through sponsorship.

The process of observing activities and increasing the professionalism of those involved, which requires the support of elected representatives, should:

- ensure better qualifications and social recognition;
- facilitate occupational and social integration, especially in the case of young people and women who tend to be more involved in support and co-ordination activities;
- combat the lack of job security that can often be observed in the heritage sector, by enabling professionals to acquire a range of skills.

Such an approach helps to forge a strong social bond between local residents, as well as between different sections of society and between generations. It will only be fully effective, however, if communities are educated about the heritage in a participatory manner.

Rural communities are the driving force in the development of the areas in which they live, and purveyors of changing societal values representing cultural diversity.

CEMAT Resolution No. 3

**of the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning
of the member states of the Council of Europe
on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe
Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning**

Adopted by the ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning at the 15th Plenary Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) in Moscow, Russian Federation, on 9 July 2010

The ministers responsible for spatial/regional planning of the member states of the Council of Europe, taking part in the 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT),

Express their warm thanks to the Government of the Russian Federation for organising the 15th CEMAT Session on “Challenges of the future: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world” and for its hospitality;

Appreciate the work done and the activities carried out by the Committee of Senior Officials,

Consider that sustainable spatial development, spatial/regional planning and territorial cohesion cannot be promoted and implemented without an active involvement of national, regional and local authorities, economic and social partners and the civil society,

Acknowledge that a reform is in progress within the Council of Europe;

Express their conviction that in the framework of this reform, due consideration must be given to the importance of pan-European spatial development policies in their role to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law together with the respect of cultural and territorial diversity and strengthened cohesion;

Acknowledge the kind invitation extended by the Government of Greece to host the 16th Session of CEMAT in 2013 and by the Government of Romania to host the 17th Session of CEMAT in 2016;

Mandate the Committee of Senior Officials to:

- i. make the necessary arrangements for the preparation of the 16th Session and ensure implementation of the resolutions and the declaration adopted at the 15th Session;
- ii. continue to formulate, on the basis of Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, practical and sustainable solutions and policies aimed at a better balanced and sustainable development and territorial cohesion of the European continent;
- iii. propose practical methods and identify the technical and financial needs to implement CEMAT activities in relation to the above-mentioned guiding principles;
- iv. foster cross-border, transnational and inter-regional co-operation by carrying out territorial development projects supported by the Council of Europe and the European Union, as well as national and international institutions;
- v. continue and extend their pan-European work on the results achieved so far by means of appropriate dissemination into networks and national contexts;
- vi. present a report with the results and evaluations of the added value of activities carried out at the next session of CEMAT,
- vii. focus CEMAT priorities in order to provide appropriate policy responses to the new territorial challenges which have emerged since the adoption of the guiding principles in the year 2000;
- viii. adapt the role of CEMAT within a future organisational structure and adopt a clear focus of its work with respect to the unique features of CEMAT.

Invite the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, as requested by the Action Plan adopted by the heads of state and government of the member states of the Council of Europe at their 3rd Summit (Warsaw, 17 May 2005), to continue providing the conference secretariat and the Committee of Senior Officials with the resources needed in order to organise the next session and implement its work programme.

III. Speeches delivered during the ministerial conference

Opening session

Welcome address by Mr Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Welcome address by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Welcome greetings on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Mr Dmitry Medvedev

Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Mr Vladimir Putin

Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Address by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Chair of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mr Serguey Mironov

Message read by the Deputy Chair of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Svetlana Orlova

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Chair of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mr Boris Gryzlov

Message read by the First Deputy Chair of the Committee on the Affairs of the Federation and Regional Policy of the Russian Federation, State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Galina Izotova

Report of Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Statement by Mr Nexhati Jakupi, representative of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe

Statement by Mr Aleksei Lotman, representative of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Statement by Mr Apolonio Ruiz-Ligero, Vice-Governor of the Council of Europe Development Bank

Statement by Mrs Anne-Marie Chavanon, Chair of the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe

Opening speech by Mr Thorbjørn Jagland

Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Dear Ministers, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentleman,

It is a great honour for me to open the 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), which is being held to mark the 40th anniversary of your active co-operation.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Government of the Russian Federation for their hospitality and the major role played by the Ministry of Regional Development and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in preparing this session.

As a forum for considering issues of sustainable spatial development and as a platform for exchanging and disseminating information, CEMAT is the only framework for pan-European co-operation on spatial development policies within which members and non-members of the European Union can gather on an equal footing. CEMAT provides a framework for the emergence of national and transnational strategies for sustainable spatial and socio-economic development in Europe.

CEMAT activities conducted since the first ministerial conference in Bonn in 1970 have developed and strengthened the concept and methods of spatial/regional planning. Several core documents have been adopted, such as the European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter (Torremolinos, 1983), the European Regional Planning Strategy (Lausanne, 1988) and the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” incorporated in a recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states in 2002. The draft declaration to be adopted during this Moscow conference offers an overview of the work achieved in the past together with the identification of new challenges.

CEMAT has also been active in promoting on-the-ground initiatives, involving several countries. I could mention, for instance, the Initiative on the Sustainable Spatial Development of the Tisza/Tisa River Basin, involving Hungary, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, and the Slovak Republic; the CEMAT Model Region Programme associating Armenia, Georgia and

Germany, or the co-operation in spatial development policy between Germany and the Russian Federation. In addition, investment in research and strategic planning from countries such as Germany, Norway and others contributes to building co-operation between the regions of the European continent. Furthermore, the Council of Europe's Regional Programme in South-East Europe and South Caucasus emphasises the quality standards in local development initiatives.

CEMAT has constantly and enthusiastically promoted territorial integration across national borders through numerous co-operation activities at all levels. It is now widely recognised that national borders should not be obstacles to harmonious and competitive territorial development. It remains, however, true that a number of national borders do have limited permeability, constraining the efforts to strengthen territorial integration.

There has been progress over the past 40 years in the move towards more comprehensive approaches and awareness about interdependencies between a number of factors influencing territorial change. A good example is the synthesis on the national reports prepared for this 15th Session. It aims at identifying the global evolution of territorial structures and imbalances in recent years, the territorial impacts of emerging and growing challenges and the related driving forces and, finally, the evolution of territorially significant policies. The results of this survey are an essential source of inspiration for the Moscow Declaration, to be adopted during this session.

The CEMAT "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent", as confirmed by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, stress the territorial dimension of human rights and democracy. This is why they contribute to promoting the three main fields of importance to the Council of Europe: human rights, democracy and the rule of law, together with the respect of cultural diversity and the strengthening of social cohesion. Spatial development strategies must encourage and facilitate access to essential services and improvement of the day-to-day living environment, whether in terms of housing, transport, work, culture, leisure or relations within communities. It promotes well-being on the part of each individual through employment and the benefits of economic, social and cultural services.

As the fundamental CEMAT texts point out, spatial planning must also be conducted in such a way as to ensure the participation of the populations

concerned. It cannot be implemented without the active involvement of the national, regional and local authorities, civil society and the relevant stakeholders. Drawing on the international conventions and the recommendations adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the aim is to address issues that are primordial in a changing society.

Steep population growth, urbanisation, concentration, competition, regional imbalance, unequal developments are the challenges that our societies must recognise and overcome. The solutions and remedies are not exclusively economic. As an instrument in the hands of public authorities spatial planning is closely linked to the search for the common good, and directed to long-term objectives. The work of CEMAT helps improve governance with an eye to achieving a mode of sustainable spatial development that will prevent – or at least considerably reduce – some aspects of current crises and social difficulties. By improving living conditions and standards, spatial planning is paving the way for a better society, which is one of the main commitments of the Council of Europe.

A major reform is now in progress to strengthen the role of our Organisation in Europe. Our work will have to be more streamlined and visible and respond to the present expectations of member states. The specific contribution of specialised ministerial conferences will be considered in this context.

Without further ado, I declare this 15th CEMAT Session open, voicing the hope that we will live up to our populations' expectations and find the ways and means to give meaning to this emerging “new territorial culture”.

Thank you.

Welcome address by Mr Viktor Basargin

Chair of the 15th CEMAT

Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Mr Secretary General,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Honoured guests and participants of the 15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning,

I am truly delighted to welcome you to Moscow. I would like to thank the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr Thorbjørn Jagland, for finding the time to personally support this conference. Your participation will undoubtedly give additional impetus to our quest for effective solutions to the tasks before us.

In this room today there are 150 participants, seven ministers of CEMAT member countries, 44 heads of delegation, high-ranking officials of the Council of Europe, guests of honour and participants from the 1st CEMAT conference held in Bonn in 1970.

Taking part in today's conference are the Deputy Chair of the Russian Federation Government, Dimitry Nikolayevich Kozak, the Deputy Speaker of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, a representative of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, Svetlana Yurevna Orlova, and representatives of the Government and Parliament of the Russian Federation.

Thank you all for deciding to take part in the work of this conference.

I am convinced that, by uniting our efforts and intellectual potential, we will find ways of resolving the spatial development problems facing the European continent and strengthen pan-European co-operation in matters of regional development.

Allow me, in my capacity of Chair of the 15th Session, to congratulate everyone in this room on the 40th anniversary session of CEMAT.

The Russian Federation considers it a great honour to host this jubilee CEMAT conference in Moscow.

Welcome greetings on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Mr Dmitri Medvedev

*Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of
the Russian Federation*

Madam, Director General of Education, Sport, Youth and the Environment,
Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragnoni,

Mr Director of Culture and the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Council
of Europe, Robert Palmer,

Madam Executive Secretary of the CEMAT Head of the Spatial Planning and
Landscape Division of the Council of Europe, Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons,

Ladies and gentlemen,

To the participants of the 15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers
responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

I am delighted to welcome you to Moscow and congratulate you on the
40th anniversary of CEMAT.

This conference marks the end of Russia's three-year presidency of CEMAT.
Our country is going through a process of comprehensive modernisation
based on the values of democracy and the fullest possible realisation of
human potential. All this undoubtedly corresponds to the aims of the Council
of Europe and is helping to accomplish all-important tasks such as forming a
single economic area and ensuring freedom of movement for our citizens.

I believe that you will be focusing on key issues of further integration of
European countries at this session. You will be exchanging cutting-edge
experience of regional development and of the extension of inter-regional
trade and co-operation in the manufacturing sphere. The recommendations
that you devise will be put into practice and the quality of people's lives will
improve as a result.

I wish you a fruitful session, every success and all the very best.

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Mr Vladimir Putin

Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

To the participants and guests of the 15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

My greetings to the conference participants and guests and my congratulations on the 40th anniversary of CEMAT.

This authoritative international organisation works to resolve major questions of spatial planning and sustainable regional development on the European continent.

It is symbolic that the current CEMAT session is being held in the Russian capital, and I see this as an acknowledgement of our country's contribution to the dynamic progress of the Council of Europe, the deepening of regional integration processes and the quest for joint solutions to today's socio-economic development challenges.

I wish the conference participants and guests a successful and fruitful session.

Opening address by Dimitry Kozak

Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation

Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Secretary General, good morning,

On behalf of the Russian Federation Government I would like once again to warmly congratulate all the participants in today's event on the 40th anniversary of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

As already pointed out, it is greatly symbolic that the 15th CEMAT conference marking this anniversary is being held in the Russian Federation. For our country, with its enormous potential, its huge territory and multi-ethnic population, questions of planning and administering spatial development are a priority area for state policy. The rational location of transport, energy and social infrastructure, the precise forecasting of internal and external migratory flows and the resolving of other issues facing the Russian Federation hinge on balanced socio-economic development of the country, the reduction of disparities in levels of regional development and the guarantee of equal opportunities for citizens to exercise their social and economic rights. And in following that path we are eliminating the causes of inter-regional and inter-ethnic conflict.

A wealth of practical experience of resolving regional development issues has been accumulated in Europe, and that experience is distilled in the activities of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning.

Russia's presidency of this authoritative organisation has been instrumental in forging active co-operation and exchanges of experience between the countries of Europe and Russia in the sphere of spatial development planning and regional policy.

Taking that European experience into account, the Russian Federation is working to create strategic planning documents for spatial development. The strategies now being devised at federal level for the socio-economic development of large regions, incorporating a number of Russian Federation constituent entities, are spatially linking together planning documents aimed at developing branches of the economy and the social sphere and

the investment programmes of constituent entities with natural monopolies, and are laying down an ideological basis for drawing up long-term regional development strategies and programmes at all levels of state authority and local self-government.

Collectively, spatial development and regional planning strategies are prompting public authority and natural monopoly schemes to do away with infrastructure limitations blocking the investment development of regions and make them transparent and predictable for business. In this way they are creating a favourable working environment for entrepreneurs. The subsequent implementation of those schemes ensures optimum exploitation of the economic potential of Russia's regions.

Spatial development schemes and programmes also mean transparency and predictability for our neighbours, providing a basis for developing economic co-operation in adjacent regions.

Another key priority of regional development for the Russian Federation relates to preserving regions' historical and cultural characteristics and ensuring favourable environmental conditions.

All in all, the approaches taken by the Russian Federation to strategic regional planning are in line with the fundamental principles of sustainable spatial development of the European continent.

And, to sum up, I would like to point out that the Russian Federation intends to fully pursue co-operation with our European colleagues within the framework of this organisation in tackling issues of spatial and regional development.

Once again, on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation, I wish all the participants in this conference a successful and fruitful working session.

Thank you very much.

Opening address on behalf of Serguey Mironov

*Chair of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly
of the Russian Federation*

*Message read by the Deputy Chair of the Council of Federation
of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Svetlana Orlova*

Mr Secretary General of the Council of Europe,
Dear participants and guests of the Conference,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, I welcome you to the 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT).

Our country is pleased to welcome here in Moscow guests of CEMAT from Council of Europe member states, the CIS and many Subjects of the Russian Federation.

I would particularly like to extend a warm welcome to the 40th anniversary of the first conference, which gave participants the opportunity to contribute, through their wide experience, to the sustainable development of greater Europe. The conference is undeniably a remarkable organisation, not to say a key institution, in local and regional spatial planning.

The “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”, adopted at the 12th Session of CEMAT in Hanover in 2000, have become an essential European document, helping to determine general territorial development policy and they offer Council of Europe member states and their local and regional authorities a flexible framework for co-operation and the framing of policies in this sphere.

I trust that the conference debates will have a “legislative dimension”. The outcome of each of these meetings should be a concrete text setting out conclusions, proposals and recommendations to the local, regional and national assemblies of Council of Europe member states.

At a forthcoming sitting of the Council of Federation we will not fail to consider how the conference’s recommendations are being applied and

parliament will ensure that the decisions taken at the conference are put into practice. In this way, I hope that we will help to uphold human rights at local and regional level. We would also like to enhance interparliamentary dialogue on this subject with the Council of Europe.

I firmly believe that all the events held under the auspices of the conference will be fruitful and effective.

Thank you for your attention.

Welcome address on behalf of Mr Gryzlov

Chair of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation

Message read by the First Deputy Chair of the Committee on the Affairs of the Federation and Regional Policy of the Russian Federation State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Galina Izotova

Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to this event of Europe-wide importance.

2010 sees the 40th anniversary of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning, and the 15th CEMAT Session is being held in Moscow, thus concluding Russia's presidency.

CEMAT's key policy document, the "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent", calls on European countries to pursue balanced and harmonious development. Like all countries in Europe, the Russian Federation fully supports these principles, thereby strengthening Europe-wide co-operation and, at the same time, contributing to the sustainable development of Europe as a whole.

Improvement of the quality of life, balanced socio-economic development of the regions, responsible management of natural resources and protection of the environment are priority objectives in your work.

CEMAT is an important forum for exchanging views and developing common, coherent action that helps Council of Europe member states to better work together and share experience in matters relating to spatial planning and improvement of the quality of life. We in Russia naturally support such action.

I hope that CEMAT will make an effective contribution to improving regional policy in Europe.

I wish you all a fruitful and productive session and further success in your endeavours.

Mr Nexhati Jakupi

*Representative of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers
of the Council of Europe*

Ministers,

Ladies and Gentlemen

It is a pleasure for me to address you today on behalf of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, on the occasion of the 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning, during which we shall also be celebrating the 40th anniversary of CEMAT.

It is also a source of great pride to be representing my country at a time when it is holding the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers. This is a challenging task at a time when Europe and the Council of Europe, the oldest European political organisation, are at a crossroad and must be able to rise to the challenges before them.

Our chairmanship's focus is geared towards carrying out the Organisation's core missions – in other words, protecting human rights and strengthening democracy and the rule of law – while adding our specific contribution regarding the construction of multicultural and inclusive European societies.

No doubt the general feeling prevailing today in this room is that spatial planning is of crucial importance to modern European society. Indeed it concerns the environment in which populations live. It is the spatial expression of societies' economic, social, cultural and ecological policies. It helps provide responses to citizens' needs by shaping the future of the territories, the spaces in which life goes on. Spatial planning can also be a tool for improving the organisation of the European territory and pinpointing solutions to problems which go beyond the national framework.

The Committee of Ministers values the work which has been conducted in this connection over the last 40 years. This work has contributed to Europe's integration while drawing attention to the territorial dimension of democracy and social cohesion.

In this context, CEMAT plays the role of a European forum uniting EU and non-EU member states with the aim of promoting sustainable and cohesive territorial development on the scale of the European continent. It promotes

innovative and sustainable territorial development strategies. It works with local and regional authorities, helping them to improve quality of life by encouraging democratic processes, institutional development and good governance, and facilitating public participation, including youth involvement.

A number of milestones have marked its achievements. They include the Torremolinos Charter (European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter) and the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”, both endorsed by the Committee of Ministers in the form of recommendations to member states.

The Committee of Ministers will of course closely examine the resolutions and declaration emerging from this conference as well as the messages and requests set out in these texts.

This will be done in a new political context within the Council of Europe.

The arrival of a new Secretary General, Mr Thorbjørn Jagland, last October, has brought a time of renovation and reform for the Council of Europe. This reform, called for by member states of the Organisation, aims at revitalising the Council of Europe as a political body by concentrating its work on fewer projects, so that it becomes more effective, visible and relevant for the citizens of Europe.

The reflection process for this reform is well under way. It will address both operational and substantive dimensions. In this context, one issue under consideration is the general question of conferences of specialised ministers, which, of course, may ultimately affect the proceedings of CEMAT. I should also underline that additional reflections are pending, in connection with the concentration of projects, which may in due course have an incidence on the scope of CEMAT’s future activities.

Whilst no decisions in this respect have yet been taken, we should all be aware of the fundamental reforms taking place and of the new light they may shed on our conference’s work.

We do indeed live in a changing world. In that changing world, spatial development must be based on policies which are well thought out with a view to fostering sustainability and social cohesion.

I trust that our conference will come up with innovative results based on our respective national experience.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Aleksei Lotman

*Representative of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe,
Chair of the Committee on the Environment, Agriculture and Local
and Regional Affairs*

It is a great honour for me to address you today on behalf of the President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Mr Çavuşoğlu, who is very sorry he is unable to attend and has asked me to wish you a very successful conference.

I should also like to extend particular thanks to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and the Russian authorities for holding this conference, the theme of which is clearly even more important in the period of crisis and reforms which we are currently going through.

On a purely personal note, I am particularly delighted to be attending this high-level meeting for the first time, which also gives me the opportunity to celebrate the 40th anniversary of CEMAT.

As Chair of the Committee on the Environment, Agriculture and Local and Regional Affairs, I believe that the environment, sustainable development and spatial planning are closely interconnected. I also believe that these issues are closely related to human rights as the latter have no meaning in a spoiled environment.

I would like to support the main ideas of the draft declaration on future challenges related to sustainable spatial development of our continent in a changing world, and the draft resolutions, especially the one concerning the rural heritage.

As we all know, spatial planning is not just a technical exercise – be it based on paper maps or more modern tools like geographic information system (GIS). It is also an important part of functioning of democratic institutions at all levels, from local to regional to national, and finally also to international. It can be said that the planning process is democracy and rule of law spread on the map. As a parliamentarian, I fully support the objective of developing the spatial dimension of human rights and democracy, while advocating the principles of subsidiarity and reciprocity so that regions and municipalities

can play the most active part possible in spatial development policies while at the same time the broader picture is also taken into account.

However, as we are all aware, sustainable spatial development is not possible unless account is taken of the climate change and energy policy dimensions, the need to halt the loss of biodiversity as well as other environmental constraints, and of course the need to maintain our cultural heritage. I am happy to note that the importance of the relevant conventions adopted by the Council of Europe is noted in the draft documents.

In this connection, I would like to emphasise that these issues form a major part of the Committee on the Environment, Agriculture and Local and Regional Affairs' work. I am myself working currently on the report on implementation of the Bern Convention.

I would also underline the importance of these issues and their links with the protection of human rights and respect for human dignity.

Allow me also to take the opportunity to refer to the report presented by Mr Mendes Bota on drafting an additional protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights concerning the right to a healthy environment.

The aim of this report, which I admit was ambitious, was to show policy makers the importance of ensuring that all citizens have the right to live in a healthy environment and to point out that some environmental assets are not renewable and environmental degradation is often irreversible.

I therefore can only hope that, in the reform process undertaken by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, proper account is taken of the vital aspect of the undeniable link between the environment, spatial planning and human rights.

Thank you.

Mr Apolonio Ruiz-Ligero

Vice-Governor of the Council of Europe Development Bank

“Main elements of a sustainable and spatial development of the European continent”

Spatial planning: reduction of economic and social inequalities; mobilises a whole set of intervening sectors.

Sustainable development: answer from all stakeholders: state, economic players and civil society; concerns all sectors: agriculture; industry; housing; family; services.

- Economic development: creating and maintaining viable jobs – productive investments; rural modernisation – local road networks; irrigation networks; industrial estates.
- Social politics in spatial terms: minorities, migrants, displaced persons and refugees.
- Housing politics: social rental and owner-occupied housing stock for persons on low-incomes.
- Infrastructure development: improvement of quality of life in urban and rural areas – urban infrastructure, utilities, public transport, social and cultural facilities; education and health; administrative and judicial public infrastructure.
- Water resources and their integrated management: supply and sewage networks; waste water treatment.
- Conservation and enhancement of the environment: environmental protection including solid waste treatment; improvement of energy efficiency and use of renewable energies; historical and cultural heritage; reconstruction after natural and ecological disasters.

The CEB: finances viable schemes which reconcile three aspects of human activity – economic, social and ecological: “three pillars” of well-balanced long-term development, namely sustainability.

The Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), set up in 1956, is a multilateral development bank comprising 40 European member countries.

With its unique mandate to finance “social projects”, the CEB is “the social development bank in Europe”. It offers flexible long-term loans at favourable interest rates to its member states, their regional or local authorities, and public or private financial institutions.

The CEB provides financing for a broad range of social projects, from housing and municipal infrastructure, to natural disaster preparedness and environmental management. The CEB also finances health projects, education and vocational training. Its finance is also available for the benefit of micro/small and medium-sized enterprises.

Since 1956, the CEB has granted some €30 billion in loans. In 2009, the CEB approved new projects worth €2.7 billion.

1. CEB and sustainable spatial development

Seeking a balanced development

Economic and social transformation often develops at an uneven pace. Hence, the need to diminish regional disparities through a broad variety of policies and projects. In line with its mandate as a social development bank, the CEB pays particular attention to a balanced development of urban and rural territories.

The CEB’s approach to sustainable spatial development comprises interlinked actions which seek to bring about a lasting improvement in economic, social and environmental conditions of an area.

Addressing sustainable spatial development requires a cross-sectorial approach

The CEB takes action in a number of sectors that integrate investments in the construction or rehabilitation of local infrastructure, such as:

- housing and housing-related infrastructure, including investments in energy efficiency;
- economic infrastructure: urban transport, development of industrial zones, rehabilitation of industrial brownfield sites;
- social infrastructure: educational and health infrastructure, playgrounds, green areas;
- utilities: water supply, waste water and solid waste treatment, electricity and gas provision;

- irrigation networks, road rehabilitation, etc., in rural areas.

Social inclusion contributes to spatial development

In the Bank's projects, particular attention is given to vulnerable populations such as refugees, migrants, and displaced people, the elderly, abandoned children, persons with disabilities, and victims of natural or ecological disasters. By helping the most vulnerable, the CEB thus contributes to improving their living conditions and, more generally, to promoting social inclusion. This should be in line with the basic aims of sustainable territorial development.

Examples of CEB-financed projects (50% of total project cost)

Poland: supporting social public infrastructure programmes at local level:

- CEB loans totalling €375 million;
- implemented with the regions of Malopolska, Mazovia and Pomerania, and the cities of Cracow, Warsaw, Gdańsk and Szczecin;
- modernisation of public amenities mainly in the areas of health, education, urban transportation, local road networks and environmental protection, and rehabilitation of the historic and cultural heritage of the region/city;
- some of these investments provided the CEB with an opportunity to cooperate with the EU and/or the EIB.

Finland: investing in social infrastructure programmes:

- CEB loans totalling €400 million since 1997 to municipal finance;
- modernisation of municipal infrastructure in the fields of education, health, environment, housing and related infrastructure.

Croatia: more specific contribution to the National Programme of Island Development:

- CEB loan of €26 million, implemented between 2004 and 2008;
- the objective was to improve the quality of life on the islands and to create conditions for sustainable development through investments in the fields of water supply, sewage, health care, education and social welfare;

- the improved living conditions resulting from these projects helped halt and reverse the depopulation of the islands.

2. The path ahead

In the years to come, the interlinkages between social, sustainable and territorial development will continue to grow in importance.

The CEB stands ready to further develop its activities towards sustainable development. As a social development bank in Europe, the CEB will remain committed to its social mandate and will be part of the necessary international support designed to improve the living conditions of populations throughout its member countries.

Mrs Anne-Marie Chavanon

*Chair of the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee
of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honour and an immense privilege to have the opportunity to address you on behalf of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe at this 40th anniversary of CEMAT.

I would also like to thank our hosts from the Russian Federation, and you yourself Mr Minister, Mr Deputy Prime Minister and Madam Vice-President of the Federal Assembly, for your exceptional welcome here in the magnificent city of Moscow, the largest capital city in Europe.

The Conference of INGOs is made up of 366 international NGOs, which have represented civil society at the Council of Europe since 1952. In 1976, at the request of the then Secretary General, they formed an institutional platform alongside the parliamentarians and local and regional authorities, which led Ms Calmy-Rey, the Swiss Minister for Foreign Affairs, in her capacity as Chair of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, to say that, given the intergovernmental representation, the Parliamentary Assembly, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the Conference of INGOs, “the huge diversity of our continent is represented within a single institution” and that “no other organisation can claim to be more representative of all Europeans”.

Mr Minister, on behalf of the Committee of Ministers, you spoke of “revitalising the Council of Europe as a political body”. We sincerely hope that, in the context of the reform being undertaken by the Secretary General, the “quadrilogue” that has existed over the last few years will continue.

As several speakers have already pointed out, co-operation between NGOs and local, regional and national authorities plays a decisive role in sustainable territorial development. It is an effective and vital way for us to promote human rights, democracy and social cohesion. And I know that Mr Basargin, your minister for regional development, is currently involved, alongside the INGO Conference, in a programme for the protection of regional and minority languages.

Civil society firmly believes that, in the current economic climate, your ministerial conference, CEMAT, is more than ever before the ideal political instrument to help Europe out of the crisis and raise awareness of the urgent issues connected with territorial cohesion.

NGOs' observations in the field provide confirmation that the gap between rich and poor is growing wider every day. Only CEMAT can play an effective, dynamic and moderating role in the European context.

The reason for this is simple: the Council of Europe's values, which are embodied by CEMAT, the values to which you referred, Mr Secretary General.

Having for several years now attended the meetings of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT, which represents you and your countries, I can assure you that its concerns and those of its experts reflect these values and their attachment to human rights.

This is exemplified by the texts that you are on the point of adopting, particularly the resolution on essential services.

They are welcomed in a declaration by the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee of the INGO Conference that has been handed out to you.

With regard to Resolution No. 1 on essential services, I have received a specific request from the NGOs, the mission of which is to combat extreme poverty, to urge you – once again – to ensure and guarantee that the most deprived populations have and continue to have access to these services.

To sum up my remarks,

I would like to reiterate that, given the major ecological challenges of not only global warming and the erosion of biodiversity – to which Mr Lotman referred – soil degradation and the scarcity of natural resources, but also the natural and industrial disasters to which Ms Orlova referred, only the overall sustainable development objectives assigned to Europe by CEMAT are capable of offering a satisfactory response to the imbalances on the European continent.

The INGOs are convinced of CEMAT's unparalleled role in Europe and, like the Russian Federation and other speakers, urge that it be enhanced. The values championed by CEMAT must lead to a new social pact for promoting

peaceful coexistence and be shared with all the Council of Europe's partners in Europe and elsewhere.

Last, but not least, on behalf of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe, I would like to pay tribute to the work carried out by CEMAT over the past 40 years and, like the Secretary General, hope that over the next 40 years you will find the ways and means to give meaning to this new territorial dimension.

Thank you.

Working Session I – General presentation of activities

Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Implementation of: the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”; the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development and the Lisbon Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe

National level

National reports (15 CEMAT(2010)2)

Synthesis of national reports (15 CEMAT(2010)3)

International level

CEMAT report of activities (15 CEMAT(2010)4)

CEMAT glossary of sustainable spatial development (15 CEMAT(2010)5)

Transnational, transfrontier and inter-regional level: the CEMAT Pan-European Model Network (Regions of Innovation)

Statements by ministers/heads of delegations

- Ms Dagnija Stake, Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia
“Sustainable planning for the future”
- Mr Vardan Vardanyan, Minister for Urban Development, Armenia
“Spatial planning – The architecture of harmonious human environment”
- Ms Guri Ulltveit-Moe, Deputy Director General, Department for Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, Norway
“Spatial planning and landscape in the reform process and priorities of the Council of Europe”

Ms Dagnija Stake

Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia

“Sustainable planning for the future”

Mr Chairman, Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, I would like to thank the Russian Federation for hosting this special 40th anniversary of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT).

This two-day meeting and the themes to be discussed indicate further evolution of CEMAT ideas and activities. Focusing on a more balanced and sustainable spatial development and territorial cohesion of the European continent becomes more and more significant. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to continue implementation of the CEMAT guiding principles adopted in Hanover in 2000.

Latvia has a strong commitment to close European co-operation, both via the Council of Europe and the European Union. Like other countries, we actively participate in macro-regional initiatives dealing with common spatial development issues. In relation to this, I would like to highlight the VASAB, an organisation for co-operation amongst the ministers responsible for spatial planning of the 11 Baltic Sea countries. At present, Latvia hosts the VASAB secretariat in Riga. During its 17 years of activity, this initiative has demonstrated co-operation among EU and non-EU countries on an equal basis.

A new document “Long-term perspective for the territorial development of the Baltic Sea region” was adopted at the VASAB ministerial conference in Vilnius last year. It focuses on:

- urban networking and urban-rural co-operation;
- internal and external accessibility;
- maritime spatial planning.

The proposed policy guidelines and action agendas foresee the build-up of a well-integrated and coherent macro-region.

Macro-regional co-operation is also being strengthened and encouraged by EU initiatives. The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region plays an important role in this. The EU strategy highlights that closer co-operation among all pan-Baltic and European institutions as well as regional and local authorities is needed for its successful implementation. Its implementation should help to overcome the still existing divides between different parts of the region, and to overcome current economic decline. We recognise the importance of European and macro-regional level co-operation. To achieve a more focused application of the limited financial resources, better co-ordination between regional and national strategies should be ensured.

Over the last couple of years the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia up to 2030 has been elaborated, and recently (June 2010) it was approved by the Latvian Parliament. The strategy is the first and main long-term planning document for the country. It defines sustainable development guidelines and the spatial development perspective. The concept of capital in the very broad sense has been applied in the document. People with their skills, capabilities, knowledge, and talents have been recognised as the key capital. Nature, environment, space, cultural heritage, creativity and ability to co-operate are indicated as additional capital.

The strategy defines that cities will be the major driving forces. Riga will become a significant cultural, tourism and business centre of Europe. The country itself is being presented as an attractive, creative and easily accessible green area in a global context.

The main targets are:

- environment of equal value for all inhabitants;
- good quality transport, communication infrastructure and public services in the entire country;
- enhancement of competitiveness and the role of bigger cities;
- preservation of natural and cultural heritage and landscapes.

The strategy was widely discussed by involving all social partners and stakeholders. From previous experience we have learned that much direct linkage between the strategies produced and budget planning should be established.

The new National Development Plan we are now preparing will become a major tool for implementation of the national strategy.

I would like to emphasise that successful implementation of these documents will be possible if appropriate territorial governance and sufficient financial resources are provided for.

Finally, I would like to thank all those involved in the preparation of this conference.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Vardan Vardanyan

Minister for Urban Development, Armenia

“Spatial planning – The architecture of harmonious human environment”

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, let me express my deep gratitude to my Russian colleagues for the hospitality and organisation of this significant high-level event.

The 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning coincides with the 40th anniversary of CEMAT, which is a unique forum in this sphere of activities, uniting all European countries. In connection with the anniversary I sincerely congratulate both previous and present participants involved in the activities of this organisation and wish them further success in achieving the sustainable spatial development goals of their countries, taking into account the invaluable experience gained through participation in CEMAT activities.

Architecture has been called frozen music. Music carrying inside it the harmony of form and spatial images, a man-made “cultural space” for the sake of the human spirit.

Spatial planning is a tool for optimal organisation of territories and vital spaces. In other words, the architecture of human living space is created by means of spatial planning.

The three pillars of architecture – durability, benefit and beauty – are three components of one whole woven together. Architecture expresses this harmonious combination for a living environment for people.

With regard to spatial planning, these basic abutments should be complemented by other fundamental principles which were rather exhaustively formulated in the 2000 Hannover document of CEMAT.

The emergence of civilisation caused a vast increase in the anthropogenic impact on the environment, which resulted in an unbalanced ecosystem that manifests itself in various critical occurrences. In a similar vein to this, at the end of the last century, the issue of sustainable development of human society came to the forefront by considering modern needs and the needs of

future generations. In this context, sustainable spatial development models which aim at achieving a balance between economic and social development present a special value.

How is it possible to ensure the sustainable development of territories? The cornerstone of the solution of these problems is the synthetic discipline of spatial planning, which is based upon the comprehensive study, analysis and agreed combination of natural and anthropogenic factors. The end result is to ensure the optimal organisation of territories and create a favourable living environment.

The Ljubljana Declaration (CEMAT, 2003) is devoted in particular to the territorial dimension of sustainable development, which defines a territory as the basis for sustainable development. The declaration also underlines the importance of the fourth aspect of sustainable development – the cultural stability introduced by the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” – in addition to the three previously accepted aspects of economic, ecological and social sustainability.

The path to achieving a harmonious living environment based on architectural purposes is a rather difficult one.

The principal distinctive characteristic of spatial planning is completeness and holistic. It is a multidisciplinary subject within the framework of which it is necessary to combine the factors that are frequently difficult to make compatible: affordability and reliability, functionality and aesthetics, and the interests of society as a whole with business interests – communities, etc.

Hence, while making decisions on sustainable territorial development, getting consensus from the interested parties is vital for spatial planning documentation at all levels and serves as a legitimate basis for the realisation of urban development tasks of state government and local self-government bodies.

The effective policy of spatial development assumes a strengthening of interaction efforts and interchanges at national as well as regional and local levels.

In such a context, issues like information exchange, discussion and the support of initiatives like the elaboration and perfection of strategies on complex spatial development acquire a special importance.

The Lisbon Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe (CEMAT, 2006) plays a significant role in the development and strengthening of European cooperation networks.

At the same time, spatial planning plays a decisive role in the human rights' point of view in order to provide a healthy, safe and favourable living environment. The architecture of this environment is conditioned by the interference of the inhabitants, along with other physical, social, and economic parameters. Due to these factors, ethical and aesthetic qualities acquire a special value.

Human beings and their interaction with the environment is the focus of spatial planning policy, the purpose of which is to provide people with a worthy living environment, contributing to the development of individuality.

The spatial criteria of democracy and human rights is the fundamental aspect of sustainable development and territorial cohesion, thus the architecture of the living space is called upon to ensure the ability of people to realise their indispensable rights.

In October 2008 the International Symposium on the Spatial Dimension of Human Rights: For a New Culture of the Territory was held in Yerevan, within the framework of CEMAT's 2007-10 action plan. Though a number of interesting reports were presented and comprehensively discussed during the symposium, I think that this major aspect of spatial planning requires further development within CEMAT activities.

Since 2004 the Republic of Armenia has been involved in all European model networks of CEMAT's innovative regions.

In my country, the experience acquired by active participation in CEMAT activities plays an important role in the improvement of spatial planning policy at national, regional and local levels. Without going into details, I will note only that at the end of the previous year the Government of the Republic of Armenia adopted the concept on spatial planning reform, as well as the framework of measures for its consecutive implementation in accordance with work on improvement of legislative and normative bases, an elaboration of projects on the territorial development of regions, master plans and projects on community zoning, as well as territories of nature protection.

Further, the development of national programmes is not considered separate from international ones, which are implemented in countries of the European Union and are based on contemporary European recommendations within this field.

The Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning is a creative forum, accumulating experience and knowledge, modern tendencies and visions of issues in the spatial planning sphere. CEMAT activities have resulted in significant investments in the improvement of national strategies on spatial planning, based upon the single conceptual approach, on the one hand, and the necessity to preserve national identity, on the other, through the “unity in diversity” principle.

In conclusion, let me wish CEMAT a future of fruitful development and success in searching for ways of solving the major problems of spatial development and planning, directly deriving from the generally accepted values of the Council of Europe’s member countries, which put the human being and his/her prosperity at its heart.

Thank you for the attention.

Ms Guri Ulltveit-Moe

*Deputy Director General, Department for Regional Planning
Ministry of the Environment, Norway*

“Spatial planning and landscape in the reform process and priorities of the Council of Europe”

Mr Chairman, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, let me convey the warm greetings of our minister for the environment and international development, Mr Erik Solheim. Unfortunately, he was not able to attend the conference. None the less, we thank the Russian presidency so much for chairing CEMAT over the last three and a half years and for hosting this magnificent event.

I can assure you that Norway supports the resolutions and the Moscow Declaration. In particular, I would like to draw your attention to section 4 of the declaration, stating that: “The quality and efficiency of territorial governance are key factors in responding successfully to the new challenges”. I believe this is the very context in which we need to give a sharper focus to CEMAT’s activities.

From the Norwegian side we are concerned about the future emphasis on spatial planning and landscape in the reform process and future priorities of the Council of Europe.

Norway is in favour of the reform process. Indeed, we welcome the revitalisation of the Council of Europe as a political body and innovative organisation, offering its member states activities of the highest added value and comparative advantages.

The Council of Europe’s activities within spatial planning and landscape provide a unique source of information and inspiration to our work at the national level in Norway. Most standards in this field have been developed by the Council of Europe, making the Organisation a major driving force in pan-European thinking. Besides, the Council of Europe comprises all of Europe with its 47 member states, while the European Union has only 27.

The link to democracy and good governance is apparent. Spatial planning and landscape affect our lives – maybe far more than we are aware of.

Torremolinos Charter

According to the Torremolinos Charter, the fundamental objectives of regional/spatial planning are to achieve concurrently:

- a balanced socio-economic development of the regions;
- improvement of the quality of life, in terms of housing, work, culture, leisure, etc;
- responsible management of natural resources and protection of the environment; and
- rational use of land, location and organisation of rural and urban development and infrastructure.

In this way, spatial planning is influencing where and how we live, where we go to work or attend school, and how we get there – by private car, public transport, cycling or walking, etc.

In Norway, municipalities and county councils are obliged to prepare municipal and regional plans according to our Planning and Building Act. However, this obligation is also a fundamental right in local and regional self-government – the right to evolve their own policies and strategies for urban and rural development and infrastructure, including how national policies should be applied within the community.

The European Landscape Convention

The convention helps us understand what the landscape means to people and community development. Landscape is not just the pretty countryside we look at – we live our lives in the midst of the landscape. Contrary to what some people think, the convention is not so much about preserving unspoiled nature or magnificent countryside, but forcing us to reassess everyday landscapes, in which most of us actually live and work.

Member states implementing the convention are therefore promoting:

- the quality of life and individual and social well-being of their citizens;
- local self-government, active citizenship and participation;
- sustainable local and regional development; and
- viable local communities, which are stimulating people's creativity and entrepreneurship.

This makes spatial planning and landscape a 1:1 school in good governance.

I will try to explain how.

Market forces do not provide us with public goods. Goods for all requires political initiatives and interventions. Here, representative and participatory democracy complement one another. Evolving policies is obviously the responsibility of politicians and a field for political innovation. However, politics affect the whole community and should not be left to the responsibility of politicians alone.

Ultimately, the primary resource of a modern society is the knowledge, creativity and ingenuity of its population, in particular their ability to deal with socio-economic change. In Norway, we believe that local challenges are most effectively met by local initiatives. Therefore, the government supports community development and the municipality as the driver of development. Mobilisation of local entrepreneurs, young people and voluntary associations has indeed brought new life to many communities.

Spatial planning and landscape widen the scope for active participation.

The European Landscape Convention emphasises landscape as people's living environment – and an issue for democratic debate. This is easily recognised – we all have some kind of attitude to the place in which we live.

When meeting at a personal level in this way, people do not appear as experts or non-experts who have different significance. Nor does the landscape, according to the convention, belong to one academic discipline alone. It is the common meeting ground for a number of professions. In landscape issues, professionals and citizens all have an equal say – regardless of academic, ethnic, social or cultural background.

Therefore, active citizens are likely to encourage political creativity, increase the spectre of feasible actions in the local community and stimulate the institutional capacity of its administration.

Lastly, active citizens and participation require transparency and openness in the planning and decision-making processes – thus discouraging corruption and foul play.

In conclusion, when applying spatial planning and the European Landscape Convention, differences may be prevented or solved in open, transparent

and democratic processes. We get development based on political reasoning and democratic debate – rather than a society governed by inaccessible legal procedures, lawyers and court decisions.

We trust the Council of Europe will find the right role and place for these activities within the future priorities of the Organisation. Maybe the activities of CEMAT and the Steering Committee for Cultural Heritage and Landscape (CDPATEP) – two separate bodies sharing common goals – could also be more closely integrated.

The size of the budget is not the crucial issue. Most important is the Council of Europe as a common meeting ground for its member states – and its capacity for disseminating information and organising an exchange of knowledge and best practices. Without this, the influx of new ideas and thinking to Norway and other countries would be much poorer. And in the larger context, give weaker stimuli to the reinforcement of good governance and soft security in Europe.

Finally, with this wish from the Norwegian delegation, I thank you all so much for your kind attention.

Working session II – Presentation of the declaration, discussion and adoption

Presentation of the draft Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World (15 CEMAT(2010)8)

Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Statements by ministers/head of delegations

- Mr Neoklis Sylikiotis, Minister of the Interior, Cyprus
“Sustainable territorial development of Cyprus in a changing world”
- Mr Roko Žarnić, Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Slovenia
“Spatial development policy responses for a sustainable, balanced and cohesive territorial development of the European continent”
- Mr Petr Osvald, Deputy Minister for Regional Development, Czech Republic
- Mr Arunas Zabulenas, Deputy Minister for the Environment, Lithuania
- Mr Péter Szaló, State Secretary for Regional Development and Construction Ministry for National Development and Economy, Hungary
“Preparation of territorial development policy for the new challenges in Hungary”
- Mr Jarosław Pawłowski, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development, Poland
“Spatial development in Poland as a key factor in European integration”

- Ms Maria Kaltsa, Secretary General, Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change, Greece
“Green energy and development – Prospects for Greece”
- Mr Harald Dossi, General Director of the Division for Co-ordination, Federal Chancellery, Austria
“New challenges in sustainable spatial development and their effects on CEMAT”
- Mr Vitor Manuel Marques Campos, Director General of Spatial Planning and Urban Development, on behalf of the Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Portugal
“Future challenges for sustainable spatial development in a changing world: Portugal’s perspective”
- Mr Manfred Sinz, Deputy Director General of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Housing and Urban Affairs, Germany
- Ms Ulla Koski, Director of Spatial Planning, Ministry of the Environment, Finland
- Mr Bart Vink, Deputy Director, Directorate of Spatial Planning, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Netherlands

Discussion

- Mr Jean-François Seguin, Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention
- Mr Marco Keiner, Director of the Environment, Housing and Land Management Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
“Future challenges: sustainable spatial development in the UNECE region”
- Mr Władysław Piskorz, Head of Unit, DG Regional Policy Unit, European Commission
“Territorial cohesion: a new objective for the European Union”
- Mr Dinos M. Michaelides, Chair of the 11th CEMAT
- Mr Enrico Buergi, former Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention

Mr Neoklis Sylikiotis

Minister of the Interior, Cyprus

“Sustainable territorial development of Cyprus in a changing world”

Mr Chairman,

Mr Secretary General of the Council of Europe,

Mr President of the Parliament of the Russian Federation,

Mr Minister of Spatial/Regional Development of the Russian Federation,

Honourable ministers of the member states of the Council of Europe,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great honour to deliver today, at the 15th Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning, a brief presentation of the efforts of the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Cyprus, which is the competent ministry for spatial and regional planning, to achieve sustainable spatial development. Please allow me firstly to express my deep gratitude to the Russian Federation, for the organisation of the conference and my appreciation for the warm hospitality extended to us all.

In the case of Cyprus, to address the future challenges for sustainable spatial development is somewhat more difficult and complicated than in the rest of the member states. As the world changes, the small world on the island of Cyprus is also changing: not only because of the constantly changing social conditions, the unstable economy, the ever-increasing threats to the environment, but, primarily, because of our strong efforts to change the 36-year-long situation of the island’s enforced division.

The case of Cyprus

As of 1 May 2004, Cyprus is a full member of the European Union. In accordance with international and national law, the Government of Cyprus has full authority and responsibility over the entire territory of the Republic of Cyprus. As you know, however, as a result of the 1974 Turkish invasion and the subsequent occupation of about 37% of the territory of the island, the government is not in a position to exercise effective control in the occupied area of Cyprus. So, although the relevant Accession Treaty covers the entire territory of the Republic of Cyprus, it stipulates that European *acquis* is not, at present, applied in areas outside the effective control of the government.

The division of Cyprus and the development of the island, for more than 36 years, as two entities, with no effective interaction or relationship between the part currently under military occupation by Turkey and the part controlled by the government, until very recently, has resulted in different approaches with respect to land-use planning, inadequate and sometimes duplicate infrastructure, and in conditions of overpopulation in some areas, whereas other regions suffer from severe economic depression, lack of amenities and other relevant problems. The situation is not irrevocable, but as in other cases of cities and countries developing separately for a long time, a relatively extended adjustment period will be needed, in order to address the significant problems stemming from this unsustainable situation.

The development and the planning system in Cyprus

Following the severe economic and social disturbances after the invasion of 1974, Cyprus soon began to exhibit impressive economic performance, adopting a market-oriented economic system, and developing a dynamic and flexible private enterprise sector, all supported by a highly educated and skilled labour force. Today, the economy is primarily dependent on services, with tourism as the dominant sector of the economy. However, transport, communications, trade, real estate and other fields are also important economic sectors.

This accelerated and robust economic performance during the first period after the invasion, beyond its positive achievements, has also resulted in urban sprawl, with the major urban centres expanding beyond their capacity, in order to accommodate the 200 000 refugees displaced from their homes due to the military invasion. It also resulted in the development of extended tourism zones, in order to support a rapidly recovering tourist sector, which to a large degree supported the economy in its entirety. This development was usually pursued without adequate concern for the environment and the negative effects on its quality and integrity. The result, taking into consideration the absence of any effective planning legislation until 1990, was a considerable degradation of both the urban and the rural environment.

Fortunately, since the enactment of the Town and Country Planning Law in 1990, in the government-controlled areas of Cyprus, and the publication of the first development plans, Cyprus has been experiencing a steady

overall improvement in the quality of the built and natural environment. Most importantly, the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Development that were adopted in 2002 have been effectively incorporated into the development plans, from as early as 2003. Development plans now include flexible policies which aim to promote sustainable patterns of urban and rural development, as well as measures for environmental protection and enhancement. Also, considering increased public awareness, as a result of new processes for public participation incorporated in the 2007 revision of the Town and Country Planning Law, there is clear improvement in the urban and natural environments. Citizens are increasingly actively concerned about the future of the settlements they live in, an attitude which we consider to be vital in achieving sustainable development.

Sustainable planning for a unified Cyprus

Unfortunately, the absence of any reliable information on the conditions prevailing in the occupied part of Cyprus, the lack of statistical data, and the prohibitions imposed by occupation forces on the free movement of professional staff and the undertaking of site surveys create impossible conditions to even theoretically address planning issues and set the basis for the possibility of promoting future sustainable development, after the reunification of Cyprus.

As stated in the Lisbon Declaration, which was adopted at the 14th CEMAT Conference in 2006, “it is necessary to devise and build bridges for the sustainable spatial development of the European continent”. The government’s vision and permanent strategic objective is that of a unified country, and our government is continuously working to build bridges and demolish physical, psychological and behavioural walls of any kind, as we consider these elements the main obstacles to reunification.

The need for proper short and long-term planning is urgent, especially in the expectation of dramatic change after the reunification of Cyprus. The government’s objective has been the undertaking of appropriate, effective and immediate decisions and actions which are needed for future reunification, so as to minimise the consequences of decades of enforced separation and the discrepancies that exist between the two parts of the island, and set the foundation for sustainable development of the whole of the territory of Cyprus.

The ministry of the interior is already promoting the implementation of the Island Plan, as defined in the planning legislation, which is a national strategic spatial planning document with strong links to the national economic and social development strategy.

Moreover, a number of regional development plans are under preparation, for clusters of settlements adjacent to the dividing line which cuts across the island. Plans take into consideration the “day after”, promoting polycentrism within each plan, within the overall region, and projecting it as a visionary polycentrism within the whole of the national territory, which includes the occupied part of the island. Plans also contain policies and measures to overcome the existing constraints, as well as incentives to promote sustainable development, to create quality public space, and to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

Most importantly, our government has established the Reconstruction and Resettlement Council, a consultative body, to which it has allocated the difficult task and challenge of preparing for the reunification of the island. The Council is mobilising human and other resources from many public, semi-governmental and, in some instances, private sectors, so as to be able to proceed with the ambitious project of reuniting the divided island, when the necessary conditions arise.

The Moscow Declaration

As stated in the Moscow Declaration, which is envisaged to be adopted during this conference, we will pay particular attention in the territorial development policies of our country and to the new challenges, and will take all initiatives, both within Cyprus and in the context of cross-border co-operation, enabling territorial development policies to be efficiently combined with efforts to regenerate the European economy in a sustainable way and to provide efficient solutions to the issues related to climate change.

Conclusion

The area of territorial and spatial planning is changing: there is an ever-increasing emphasis on the protection of human rights, on more democratic planning procedures, and on enhanced public participation procedures, at all stages of the process. In this changing world, CEMAT has been promoting efficient spatial development across our continent for the last 40 years. The

border across the island of Cyprus, dividing it for almost as many years as CEMAT has been elaborating planning policies for a better urban and rural future for the generations to come, ought to have been eradicated many years ago.

Cyprus is a part of the European community, and its 10 000 years of history and heritage does not belong to Cypriots alone – it belongs to Europe – and we plea for your support and active involvement in delivering a unified island to the generations of Cypriots and Europeans alike to come.

Mr Roko Žarnić

Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Slovenia

“Spatial development policy responses for a sustainable, balanced and cohesive territorial development of the European continent”

It gives me great pleasure to address this session of the CEMAT ministerial conference. Let me first congratulate the Russian Federation presidency and thank most sincerely all those who have contributed to the implementation of CEMAT activities over the last four years.

40 years of CEMAT

This conference is taking place on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of CEMAT. It has been a wide and continuous co-operation process pursuing a single objective: sustainable spatial development of the European continent.

CEMAT activities have focused on the promotion of an integrated, comprehensive approach in development decision processes, interactions between sectors and levels – covering the strategic as well as the operational level.

CEMAT documents have defined common European principles, aims and guidelines for a sustainable and balanced development. Sustainable spatial development has become a shared and acknowledged concept covering equally cultural, social, environmental and economic development dimensions.

We all benefit greatly from meeting new people, and the exchange and comparison of experiences, ideas and information.

We can be proud of CEMAT’s achievements to improve spatial development policies in the Council of Europe member states.

Today, we can declare with certainty that CEMAT’s activities and results have contributed to democracy, social and territorial cohesion and a better quality of life for the citizens of the member states of the Council of Europe.

A lot of sustainable, small but important steps have been taken during these last 40 years. The CEMAT network has created a lot of solid and long-lasting “bridges over Europe” and has, for the last 40 years, been a reliable partner in the Council of Europe’s efforts to promote democracy and human rights, and

to seek common solutions to the main challenges European society has been facing. Just a few of those who have been part of this long, exciting process and who have contributed to CEMAT's achievements over the last 40 years are here today. Their work motivates us to continue to pursue sustainable spatial development objectives and to meet future challenges.

The Moscow Declaration

I consider the draft Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World to be yet another step in the right direction, inspired by 40 years of CEMAT activity.

New challenges with significant territorial impacts have emerged over the past decade and they call for urgent policy responses. Spatial development policies have a crucial role and a specific task in finding suitable, tailor-made solutions, both in the member states and at European level.

Climate change, population ageing, social polarisation and other challenges are mainly consequences of inconsistent development policies, causing a risk to sustainable and balanced territorial development.

Almost 30 years after the Torremolinos Charter, the goal of comprehensive spatial development policies is still far from achieved.

Appropriate spatial policy measures and territorial development initiatives for the implementation of an integrated area based approach, taking into consideration regional characteristics and development resources, can help in finding innovative solutions, increase benefits from the globalisation process and overcome the impacts of the economic crisis.

CEMAT should continue to be a promoter of specific initiatives that will contribute to a trans-European, cross-sectoral and cross-level co-ordinated and integrated overall approach.

Slovenian proposals

In implementing our common principles, the Moscow Declaration and 15th CEMAT resolutions, Slovenia would like to propose to focus future CEMAT activities on measures and initiatives that will contribute to sustainable territories and a better quality of life – which is an important human right.

Territory is a complex system embodying a set of relationships. Our activities should contribute to a better understanding of territories and their characteristics; their structures, behaviour and the interconnectivity of the various parts of territories, their functional as well as structural relationships to each other.

Our mission is to fill in the gaps in the knowledge about territories, to propose indicators that measure territorial impacts, and assess the long-term sustainability and the efficiency of development policies.

This should help in finding, lasting, long-term sustainable solutions in order to:

- position the spatial policies at European, national and regional levels;
- better define territorial cohesion and the advantages for stakeholders and practitioners; and
- articulate the relation between strategic and regulatory planning.

These activities should lead us to a better understanding and efficient implementation of our key challenge: improving the quality and efficiency of territorial governance – a key factor in responding successfully to new challenges.

CEMAT activities should go beyond convincing the convinced. Although, in principle, everybody recognises that spatial planning contributes to various development policy objectives, the role of spatial development policies in Europe is weak. Even in the countries where spatial planning systems are in place, there are very diverse perceptions of their role and significance.

Good territorial governance is not an easy task. It is a complex and continuous process that needs to be better defined and structured. Spatial development policies and spatial planning discipline are not isolated in this process. Despite being only one part of it, they are by definition long-term oriented, cross-sectoral and therefore mandated for an active promontory role in this process.

Slovenia proposes to focus CEMAT activities in the next few years on finding answers to challenging questions like:

- What is the difference between spatial planning and territorial governance?

- What does the co-ordination role of spatial planners consisted of?
- Who should lead the process?
- Is there a need to better structure the process?

And when defining CEMAT activities, we propose to reach closer to stakeholders and practitioners in trying to promote CEMAT principles and the advantages of a comprehensive territorial approach. Our task is to convince the non-believers.

Finally, I would like to summarise our position by saying that Slovenia supports the proposed Moscow Declaration.

Mr Petr Osvald

Deputy Minister for Regional Development, Czech Republic

Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to thank Minister Basargin and other Russian colleagues for organising this conference and for inviting us to this beautiful city.

I appreciate the work done and I support the Draft Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World.

European co-operation, in general, creates synergies regardless of administrative boundaries. This event is a good example of real and functioning co-operation aimed at formulating common objectives and development priorities.

Let me kindly inform you about the activities of the Czech Republic.

In 2009, the spatial development policy of the Czech Republic was formulated by the Ministry of Regional Development. The spatial development policy, which reflects the unique character of the area and its settlement structure, takes into account the requirements as regards sustainable development and cohesion that are specified in the various international agreements to which the Czech Republic is a party, are based on the country's membership of international organisations (for example, the Council of Europe) and result from other international agreements, treaties and conventions related to spatial development that have been signed by the republic. The spatial development policy also takes into account the intentions contained within the planning documents of neighbouring countries.

In 2010, a common spatial development document of the V4+2 countries was formulated by the ministries for regional development of the Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. This document includes two parts: (1) delineation of development poles and axes and transport networks on the territory of the V4+2 countries and identification of disjunctions; (2) proposals for further work on the common spatial development document aimed at the withdrawal of barriers to spatial development and the strengthening of spatial cohesion.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Arunas Zabulenas

Deputy Minister for the Environment, Lithuania

Mr Chairman,

Dear colleagues,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all let me thank the Russian Government for their hospitality.

The importance of CEMAT activities and the documents we are discussing now is visible in the context of European and global processes; for instance, the activities of the Baltic Sea region – VASAB ministers responsible for spatial planning and development adopted, at their ministerial meeting in 2009 in Vilnius, a Long-Term Perspective for the Territorial Development of the Baltic Sea Region and the Vilnius Declaration – Towards Better Territorial Integration of the Baltic Sea Region.

In this respect we hope that the Moscow Declaration, which addresses the issues of future challenges and draws up directions to cope with these problems as well as giving a mandate to the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT on the activities after this session, marks an important step not only for Council of Europe. It builds on efforts under way in other organisations, notably within the EU.

Demographic changes are worrying the societies of our countries. These changes, aggravated by economic and climate change problems, together with other issues, need our constant attention. In this context, migration (namely, immigration, emigration as well as internal migration) processes and their territorial consequences are of importance both now and for future territorial development. We think that mention should be made of this in the declaration tabled today.

A fresh approach to the territorial dimension of human rights and democracy has to be noted as a positive achievement, as it deals with the issues of territorial cohesion and points to possible avenues to be explored in this difficult situation.

The issue of provision of services and infrastructure is inevitably linked to the development of enterprises and work places as economic bases for ensuring the quality of life. Without this link, lots of territories with

developed infrastructure might still fall into decline and become unable to maintain their infrastructure.

We agree with the principles contained within the declaration relating to the particular role of heritage preservation in the context of globalisation, which aim to withstand its negative impacts, respect traditions and maintain local identity and efforts to contribute to an increase in existing values as well as their use for the benefit of society.

And once again, we appreciate the positive approach to climate change – not only reminding us of the vulnerability of the environment and of society, but also revealing opportunities for economic and social development.

The 13th CEMAT Session in Ljubljana (16-17 September 2003) highlighted the need to monitor sustainable development. We see the current declaration as a step in the right direction as regards the development outlined, namely towards complementing the monitoring systems so as to report on and react to territorial changes.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we expect this declaration to serve us well and be used to the full extent in the forthcoming period of co-operation, not only within the framework of CEMAT but also in a wider context.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Péter Szaló

State Secretary for Physical Planning and Building Affairs Regional Development and Construction, Hungary

“Preparation of territorial development policy for the new challenges in Hungary”

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honour and pleasure for me to be here at this conference, which has a historical significance in the history of CEMAT. I think that the adoption of the Moscow Declaration represents a very good example of realising the most relevant problems and challenges that endanger the sustainable territorial development of the European continent and of trying to define together the new directions of territorial development policies, which should be implemented in our countries whilst taking into account local features. I believe that emphasising the objective of territorial cohesion helps us to find adequate answers to which the EU presidency of Hungary in 2011 will contribute in a significant way. In this speech, I will interpret the messages of the Moscow Declaration, taking into account the national report of Hungary prepared for CEMAT in December 2009.

The new challenges described in the Moscow Declaration affect Hungary as well. As far as climate change is concerned our country is extremely vulnerable. The impacts of climate change will, on the one hand, affect water levels – droughts represent a serious threat on the Great Plain and we are already experiencing sudden floods and extreme water distribution – and on the other, the frequency of heatwaves and forest fires are also expected to increase. The most affected sectors are water management, forestry and agriculture, tourism, health, energy and buildings, and transport.

Demographic trends can be regarded as altogether unfavourable. Since 1981 a continuous decrease of the population has been observed – only some prosperous regions encountered population gains, such as the Balaton Recreational Area and areas located along the Győr-Székesfehérvár-Budapest axis. Regions threatened most by depopulation are concentrated in the external and internal peripheries; the most important area of domestic migration is the capital city of Budapest and its agglomeration. Population ageing and its socio-economic impacts represent one of the most serious demographic

problems. Social polarisation can be observed, on the one hand, in the eastern and southern peripheries which are lagging behind, and, on the other hand, cities and towns where it is already manifest.

The detailed territorial impacts of the financial and economic crisis of 2008-09 can only be defined with significant uncertainty. Parallel to the significant withdrawal of foreign direct investment and to the decrease of incoming capital, demand has been shrinking and credit has been reduced. The financial crisis has spilled over into the real economy and employment has further decreased. As a result of these restrictions, direct resources for territorial development have been reduced.

Territorial development policies and certain territorial levels play an important role in facing these challenges. Putting territorial cohesion to the fore, the establishment and support of place-based strategies and the dissemination of integrated approaches are the key to sustainable territorial development. More and more successful examples can be found in Hungary that promote new forms of territorial governance, where different level authorities cooperate with economic and civil society actors in order to implement long-term strategies and programmes. We need to promote territorial data gathering, which analyses regional territorial potentials and underlines the establishment of territory-specific policies. The ESPON 2007-13 programme is an important contributor to this process.

As far as climate change is concerned, Hungarian territorial development policy has already started preparing for this new challenge. The four-year-long professional programme of spatial development to prevent the adverse effects of climate change for the period 2010-13 has been elaborated and is being implemented. It comprises different tasks related to the analysis, evaluation, planning and regulatory changes of territorial development and physical planning. As a final objective, territory-specific climate mitigation and adaptation objectives will be integrated into local, regional and national spatial development strategies and programmes. Besides these the promotion of a shift to a low-carbon economy with territorial policy measures, and the support of decentralised energy supply systems based on renewable energy sources and implementation of experimental pilot projects should also be enhanced. The integration of river basin management aspects – such as flood protection and water retention – into territorial planning is a pressing need as more than

one third of Hungarian territory is prone to flood. The support of integrated territorial programmes should be supported further. A good example of such a programme was the Special Target Programme of Homokhátság, which aimed at structural change in agriculture, development of tourism and use of renewable energy sources. Other programmes, such as the urban rehabilitation programmes co-financed with European funds, also need to be highlighted, and in which consideration of climate change is required.

Demographic challenges also need to be taken into account in the process of formulation of spatial development policies. The territorial concentration of spatial development funds contributes to the levelling up of regions lagging behind, to the maintenance of public services and thus to the retention of the population. We need to follow pilot programmes, which focus on lagging-behind micro-regions. The programme aiming at the integrated development of the 33 most disadvantaged micro-regions is a good example of such a scheme. Urban areas need to prepare an anti-segregation plan as part of their integrated urban development strategies; special social rehabilitation programmes are also under implementation. Improvement of education and training, and implementation of new forms of employment (such as mobile and distance education and employment) also contribute to population retention in areas that are lagging behind.

The challenges due to globalisation processes have intensified significantly as a consequence of the economic crisis. In order to decrease our vulnerability, support of local economic development initiatives needs to take into account local characteristics. Viable strategies are needed both in the Budapest metropolitan area and in rural areas. Promotion of small and medium enterprises (SME) needs special attention – such as increasing entrepreneurial opportunities – especially in disadvantaged micro-regions. Another important field is the promotion of clustering enterprises, among SMEs, and between the public, private and civil sectors. In addition to the implementation of sectoral measures, the maintenance of the integrated character of territorial development policy is essential and territorial aspects should not be forgotten during sectoral supports.

The Hungarian EU presidency, which begins in 2011, is an outstanding opportunity for the country. The upgrading of very important territorial documents is under our responsibility, such as the Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union and the Territorial Agenda. A manual is

under elaboration detailing questions on how to combat climate change in urban areas and a study and related high-level international conference is under preparation on analysing the relations of demographic and migratory processes in European cities and towns. The elaboration of the European Danube Strategy also needs to consider these aforementioned key challenges.

As far as our national tasks are concerned, supervision of the National Spatial Development Concept and renewal of the National Physical Plan need to take into account the aspects detailed above.

Hungary fully supports the adoption of the Moscow Declaration. I believe that our common views will contribute to an adaptation of the CEMAT guiding principles in light of the new challenges and the sustainable territorial development of the European continent.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Mr Jarosław Pawłowski

Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development, Poland

“Spatial development in Poland as a key factor in European integration”

Mr Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Large-scale planning nowadays has particular significance in Europe, which may win in the global competition if it pursues a territorial policy leading to the achievement of similar goals by all European countries. The role of sustainable territorial development is becoming increasingly important as an efficient instrument of development in three dimensions: social, economic and territorial.

The Polish Government is glad to sign the CEMAT Moscow Declaration as a further step in tightening co-operation in the area of territorial planning, which leads the way for deepening economic and social ties at a European level. We need territorial – place-based – co-operation in the European Union because the territorial approach is a good tool in solving the current problems of the economic crisis and making Europe more competitive. Such an approach shows in practice how to make use of the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty on territorial cohesion.

I believe such deepening of territorial co-operation in different dimensions is also needed between the EU and other countries sharing the same values. Such co-operation can spawn mutually beneficial economic and social development, and preserve great European culture and natural heritage.

As far as the territorial evolution of Poland is concerned, two of the most advantageous elements in the whole process of development are the settlement system of Poland, characterised by a quite balanced polycentrism, and its central location on the European continent, in geographical terms.

The particular position of Poland, being a European Union member state, offers extended possibilities for co-operation in the area of spatial planning at a European, macro-regional (such as Baltic Sea territory) and transborder level. A very good example of multicultural and multidimensional co-operation is the Vision and Strategy around the Baltic Sea project, in which all countries bordering the Baltic Sea can participate. We also have very good

examples of co-operation across our borders – the best one and best known is on the German, Czech and Slovak frontier.

At the same time, Poland, as a European Union member state, is treated as a peripheral country in spite of its central geographical position in Europe. Thus, effective spatial development policy in Poland is determined by another political issue: the further process of EU integration and EU foreign policy toward eastern Europe as well as the evolution of the EU cohesion policy and the increasing importance of its territorial dimension.

We in Europe are becoming more and more interlinked, and we are facing the same challenges but the solutions are different and at the same time similar.

I would like to inform you that we are, in Poland, developing a new National Spatial Development Concept 2030, which is the most important strategic document concerning spatial development. It gives a framework for the country's territorial policy and for policies with a territorial dimension. This document provides answers, or at least gives indications of initial reactions to current global challenges, which also affect Poland, like demography and migration, urban spread, energy and environment issues, transport, access to public services and transfrontier interactions.

Three main elements are extremely important for the vision in this document: transport infrastructure, access to public services and transfrontier forms of co-operation. Defined in a broad sense, transport infrastructure influences the scale and intensity of the functional relations between cities and regions. Poor access to public services discourages people from staying put and results in large differences in development, whereas lack of transborder co-operation may cause stagnancy in border regions.

Poland is trying to benefit from strong metropolitan areas such as in the west (Berlin), north and north-west (Malmö and Copenhagen), south and south-west (Vienna, Budapest and Bratislava) and the north-east (Stockholm and the Baltic countries), and to use existing ties as an opportunity to grow. The eastern Polish border is still not exploited enough, mainly due to a different institutional, legal and political framework.

To achieve territorial sustainability, to implement intelligent governance and comprehensive planning approaches we should make sure that the people are informed and aware by making them understand the problem. The Polish

National Spatial Development Concept 2030 will shortly be presented within a public consultancy process and in an international forum as well. Therefore, we count on strong internal participation together with comments from other European countries, especially remarks from our neighbours.

To end, let me just thank the Russian presidency for presiding over the work of CEMAT during the last three years and for having organised this conference.

Ms Maria Kaltsa

*Secretary General for Regional Planning and Urban Development
of the Hellenic Republic, Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate
Change, Greece*

“Green energy and development – Prospects for Greece”

“Green growth” or an eco-efficient economy is considered a key priority to tackle both climate change and the present economic crisis. In that context, the green economy can offer substantial business opportunities, new markets and the creation of new jobs, developing a powerful engine for sustainable growth and competitiveness. To achieve this, a fast transition towards a green growth economy in Europe is needed. This is expected to create more wealth while using less natural resources and causing less negative impact on the environment. For these reasons, an eco-efficient economy should be an essential element of the new Lisbon Strategy post-2010 for the EU.

To develop an eco-efficient economy, absolute decoupling of economic growth from environmental degradation is necessary, so we need to internalise external costs to set prices right, recognising the cost of inaction and the value of ecosystem services.

Greece is of the opinion that cost-effective economic instruments can reveal true environmental costs and allocate a predictable price on carbon emissions. Consequently, we should start discussions – at an EU level – on possible CO₂ taxes after careful examination of the criteria and procedures for the definition of the carbon footprint of products. Furthermore, Greece supports the call for a modification of GDP, with additional consistent and widely recognised indicators to measure progress towards a green economy.

We should promote green public procurement in line with the indicative 50% target for member states to be reached in 2010. We should improve the understanding of the economic value of ecosystems services and biodiversity, and propose adequate pricing mechanisms that reflect the true value of such services. One approach to the issue of balancing the use of resources and the carrying capacity of ecosystems is to launch action plans on sustainable consumption and production – at both national and international level.

Greece supports a full review of the European Energy Efficiency Action Plan in order to improve energy and resource efficiency. Accordingly, we believe that protection of the environment and climate change abatement are strongly linked to energy efficiency and the promotion of renewable energy sources. These are considered top priorities; therefore, the new government modified the previous ministerial formation to design a new ministry for the environment, energy and climate change to co-ordinate policies for all these subjects.

As quickly as possible, the new ministry presented several draft legislative acts covering environmental and energy issues such as a draft Regulation for Energy Efficient Buildings, Protection of Forests and Effective Promotion of Renewable Sources.

Sustainable development is an overarching objective of the European Union. The aim is to continuously improve the quality of life and well-being within the EU and elsewhere for present and future generations. To achieve that, we need to improve information and awareness concerning consumer behaviour and identify effective policy tools to change unsustainable consumption patterns.

We agree with the Commission communication on the 2008 environment policy review, the communication on GDP and beyond, and the communication on the 2009 review of the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development (SDS).

Finally, Greece firmly supports the EU's efforts to minimise the impact of climate change, in a global, ambitious, integrated and binding agreement under the UNFCCC.

Mr Harald Dossi

General Director of the Division for Co-ordination, Federal Chancellery, Austria

“New challenges in sustainable spatial development and their effects on CEMAT”

Austria would like to thank the Russian Federation for the organisation of the 15th CEMAT and for its efforts for a worthy celebration of CEMAT’s 40th anniversary.

Just to emphasise and appreciate CEMAT’s role in the past 40 years and to give an example to other ministerial conferences, I would like to mention the 4th CEMAT, which took place in Vienna in 1978. Already at that time, guidelines for the planning of rural areas had been decided, wherein also the provision of basic services had an important role. The second main subject of CEMAT in Vienna was, however, the role and activities of CEMAT itself.

Indeed, Austria did benefit significantly from the work delivered by CEMAT in terms of exchange and mutual development of basic strategies for spatial planning and development. Important subjects of our national planning policies, such as rural development, city renewal, development of border regions or sustainable spatial development have been influenced considerably by international exchange of ideas and knowledge through CEMAT, even if the influence of co-operation with and within the European Union have gained more and more priority during recent years.

On the other hand, preparatory work through CEMAT has also left its indelible mark on spatial development policies at EU level, in particular in their initial phase. Nevertheless, CEMAT contains a number of distinguishing qualities:

- in terms of the number of member states, CEMAT has almost twice as many as the European Union, thereby covering the entire European continent as a unique forum for spatial planning;
- CEMAT is an official ministerial format. Even at EU level, there is currently no such official format in place;

- CEMAT is deeply rooted in the principle of universal human rights, therefore receiving its legitimacy from different sources than a socio-economic context.

It is not only spatial planning which is facing new challenges – even CEMAT itself does. Austria would like to take the opportunity of this conference to listen carefully, to discern if the three unique qualities of CEMAT will also be strong enough in the future to shape the spatial development of the European continent as positively as it has in the past.

Mr Vitor Manuel Marques Campos

*Director General of Spatial Planning and Urban Development
on behalf of the Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning,
Portugal*

“Future challenges for sustainable spatial development in a changing world: Portugal’s perspective”

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Minister of the Environment and Spatial Planning of Portugal, I congratulate the Russian Federation and particularly Minister Basargin for convening this important meeting.

I also address a special word to you, Mr Chairman, for your personal contribution to the implementation of CEMAT’s work, through your chairmanship of CEMAT’s Committee of Senior Officials during the last four years. The theme of this 15th CEMAT is indeed most adequate in this time of economic and financial crisis. The sustainable spatial development of our continent is not only a duty towards future generations, it is also a tool to tackle the effects of the current crisis and provide answers to create a sounder basis for our common future. By gathering us here today to discuss and find new answers to the challenges we face in relation to the sustainable spatial development of our continent, CEMAT proves its relevance as forum for European-wide co-operation on territorial matters.

This meeting also commemorates 40 years of CEMAT activities. This should not be forgotten, as it is an occasion to underline the influence CEMAT has had in changing the perception of the territorial dimension in our policies as well as of the role of spatial development in improving quality of life and sustainability in our countries.

I am not going to repeat what is already stated in the declaration. Rather, I will focus on the influence CEMAT has had and still has on spatial development policy in Portugal.

The Torremolinos Charter, together with CEMAT’s guiding principles and the European Spatial Development Perspective, provided some of the basic doctrine and principles that led to the Portuguese Framework Law on Spatial and Urban Development Policy, adopted by parliament

in 1998. This law is a cornerstone in the process of changing from a “land-use zoning” concept to a policy of territorial development, based on an integrated, comprehensive and forward-looking approach aimed at promoting the quality of life of the population and a polycentric, balanced and cohesive, sustainable territorial development.

The same applies to our National Spatial Development Policy Programme, adopted by parliament in 2007, where the guiding principles are specifically mentioned as a reference document, along with the European Spatial Development Perspective. This programme co-ordinates the relevant sectoral policies with territorial impact and provides the territorial basis of the National Sustainable Development Strategy. Its preparation represented a joint commitment by the government as a whole.

Although it was adopted before the present crisis, the Portuguese National Spatial Development Policy Programme considers all the territorial challenges mentioned in the Moscow Declaration. Climate change is indeed one of the major challenges affecting us all, although it has diverse environmental, social, economic and even cultural regional impacts. Climate change is also an important priority for the Portuguese Government. This reflects not only the EU political priority, but also the fact that Portugal is particularly vulnerable to changing climate conditions. The 2007 Progress Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change identifies the Mediterranean region and southern Europe as one of the most vulnerable regions to suffer severe impacts.

Desertification, rising sea-levels, heatwaves, flooding and water scarcity are some of the major threats to be dealt with. Last April, a National Strategy for Climate Change Adaption was adopted by the government, after a period of public consultation. This strategy, the preparation and adoption of which was considered as one of the priority measures of the specific objectives of the National Spatial Development Policy, identifies a set of strategic topics to be detailed in lines of action and measures. Together, they will provide a co-ordinated, coherent and cross-sectoral action plan for adaptation to climate change. Spatial and urban development is one of the strategic topics to be developed by a working group, which included the participation of regional and local authorities, possibly the most important partners in the implementation of the adaptation strategy. “By its very nature, spatial development with its integrated cross-sectoral approach and multilevel governance system can

provide an adequate framework and a basis for implementation of adaptation strategies and measures respectful of the European territorial diversity.” This is a quotation from the statement made by the EU ministers responsible for spatial development in their contribution to the public discussion on the Green Paper on Adapting to Climate Change in Europe – Options for EU Actions, adopted at Ponta Delgada in 2007.

As mentioned in the Moscow Declaration, the challenge of climate change needs to be met by combined mitigation and adaptation measures, at the most adequate scales. Spatial development also has an important role to play in relation to climate change mitigation, by providing rules and guidelines for better spatial organisation of activities, land-use and infrastructure at different scales, contributing to enhanced energy efficiency and reduced use of fossil fuels. Linked to climate change but an important challenge on its own, energy presents specific challenges, related to availability, security, provision and distribution, besides general inefficient consumption.

Energy is also one of the challenges considered in our National Spatial Development Policy Programme. Portugal is totally dependent on outside provision of fossil energy. Its very imbalanced geographical distribution of population with a large proportion of low density population areas, combined with recognised low efficiency energy use, make energy provision and distribution a particularly relevant issue, both in economic and social terms. Our National Strategy for Energy Efficiency, the implementation of which is one of the specific objectives of the National Spatial Development Policy Programme, prioritises the implementation of energy-efficient measures in the design of buildings and urban settlements as well as the promotion and use of different renewable energy sources. Another priority is the co-ordination and coherence between spatial development options and the promotion and implementation of the use of renewable energy resources, making the best use of the diverse territorial potential of our regions.

New policy measures backed by public co-financing have been adopted in recent years and significant public and private investments are being made both to improve energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources based on new technologies. Portugal has an ageing and a declining population. Being traditionally a country of immigration, it has experienced a significant quota of emigration in the last decades. This presents specific and serious

economic, social, cultural and environmental challenges to our sustainable development and to our spatial development policy, in particular.

Depopulation of remote areas, non-equitable access to adequate infrastructure and essential services, and weakened cohesion are the specific challenges we face, namely in a time when economic-efficiency criteria dominate the implementation of sectoral policies. Enhancing social and territorial cohesion is one of the priority measures of our National Spatial Development Policy Programme, which also stresses the need for improved governance and public awareness of the territorial development challenges and priorities.

The programme recognises the need for better, adequate and innovative territorial governance to ensure a successful and harmonious territorial development, as stated in the Moscow Declaration. Horizontal and vertical co-ordination of policies with significant territorial impact and the right of public participation are key aspects of multilevel territorial governance, as clearly recognised in our Framework Law on Spatial and Urban Development Policy.

According to this law, the right of participation means that anyone can participate in each stage of the process of spatial development. It also means that he or she has the right to question the authorities and receive adequate information. This applies not only to those being directly affected by the policies, but to anyone that may show an interest. Territorial development is thus considered to be a matter of general interest, related to the rights of citizenship. Recognising the right of participation in the law does not mean “informed, active, broad participation” in practice. Our National Spatial Development Policy Programme specifically deals with this issue in a strategic objective aimed at enhancing the quality and efficiency of territorial management and promoting the informed, active and responsible participation of citizens and institutions.

Awareness-raising, education and mobilisation actions for a culture enhancing spatial and urban development, the landscape and cultural heritage are specific measures currently being implemented.

Just a short word about the reference to the landscape.

We consider landscape as part of the people’s memory, contributing to our territorial identity and culture. We also consider its diversity and quality

to be a crucial asset for territorial development and for quality of life. Portugal ratified the European Landscape Convention in 2005 and landscape protection, rehabilitation and enhancement are considered priority factors in our National Spatial Development Policy Programme.

Let me finish by saying that Portugal is committed to co-operate in the framework of CEMAT, as it is also committed to the informal co-operation of the ministers responsible for spatial development in the framework of the EU.

As I hope I have been able to show in this brief statement, Portugal is committed to actively participating in the implementation of CEMAT's work, putting its principles and agreed policies into practice at national, regional and local levels, with the involvement of our local and regional authorities, and with respect for the subsidiary principle, one of the basic principles of our spatial development policy.

Looking around this room proves that the topic of "networking" chosen for the previous CEMAT, during Portugal's presidency, was indeed appropriate. Co-operation is a good way to build bridges throughout Europe. Before I finish, allow me to quote the former Chair of CEMAT at the closing session in Lisbon:

"We, the ministers of CEMAT, are 'guardians of the European territory' and, as such, it is our duty to leave to future generations a more balanced, better integrated and territorially more cohesive continent, but one which is also more competitive and sustainable and provides quality of life to all its inhabitants."

At a time when the outcomes and the territorial impacts of the economic and financial crisis are still not clear, keeping in mind CEMAT's principles and commitments, and implementing them in our policies is indeed an important contribution to prepare the future of our continent.

Thank you.

Mr Manfred Sinz

Deputy Director General of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Housing and Urban Affairs, Germany

Some 40 years ago the very first CEMAT conference took place in my home country, in the former capital city of Bonn.

We all know how much the world has changed since then, and we can be proud that CEMAT has helped to bring about these changes. It was already something of a sensation in 1970 for people to actually hold a conference on spatial development. Now, 40 years later, we can look back with satisfaction at not only the success of CEMAT in encouraging dialogue and discussion among our member states but also the fact that CEMAT played a pioneering role in firmly establishing the concept of balanced and sustainable spatial development as an integral part of European policy.

Today's declaration therefore quite rightly refers to the history of CEMAT, which was and still is a success story. And I am proud that my country, Germany, has contributed to this success: many of you surely look back with fond memories to the 12th CEMAT Conference in Hanover, at which we adopted the "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent".

CEMAT has repeatedly made it clear for politicians and experts in this field that the prosperity of the entire European continent cannot be truly assured if discrepancies in development are too great, if regions which are not in the centre of the continent are "left behind" and, above all, if social differences are too great.

This is particularly true given the current challenges raised by climate change, and the demographic and social changes so aptly described in the declaration, all of which have a direct impact on our spatial development policies: How do we protect ourselves from floods? How can we provide sufficient public services for the growing number of elderly people in both rural and urban areas and, above all, how can we ensure that in particular young people in economically underdeveloped areas are not deprived of any prospects?

Germany therefore particularly welcomes the fact that, in view of these fresh challenges, the guiding principles drawn up in Hanover in 2000 are to be supplemented and considers two things to be particularly important:

The guiding principles are an excellent joint document that should not be fully redrafted but only supplemented by additional texts.

The main principles that we should apply in supplementing the original document are:

- sustainable spatial development must be based on an integrated approach: when planning their development, regions must consider the need for easy accessibility, extended infrastructure to support the economy and services such as environmental and climate protection;
- given that these are complex processes, they must be transparent and democratic and all stakeholders must be involved: it is now more necessary than ever to involve the general public, the economic sector and the trade unions in regional development, to ascertain their needs and to work with inhabitants/the local population to make their regions more attractive. Such processes must also increasingly be an integral part of cross-border co-operation.

Perhaps we could, in the course of our impending discussions, also consider how we might improve the way we use CEMAT to exchange best practices. It is important that people from our member states, for example those who work for spatial planning authorities, talk together about how they put the guiding principles into practice in their daily work. We must therefore ensure that there is more contact between them in their daily work.

The declaration describes not only the past but provides a sound basis for shaping the future of CEMAT. We must work together to shape the future spatial development of our European continent. In order to do so we must together consider how we intend to co-operate in the framework of CEMAT. Germany will continue, with pleasure, to make its contribution.

Ms Ulla Koski

Director of Spatial Planning, Ministry of the Environment, Finland

Mr Chairman, Dear Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank the Russian Federation for arranging this conference. Unfortunately, Minister Vapaavuori had to cancel his participation in this conference because of unexpected commitments in Finland. He sends his warm congratulations for CEMAT for the 40th anniversary and personally wishes me to mention the following issues in the Finnish contribution.

In the Lisbon Declaration in 2006, CEMAT pointed out the importance of spatial planning and development networks in the entire European continent. After Lisbon, there has been significant progress in concrete policies promoting territorial cohesion and integration in Europe.

From the Baltic Sea region's point of view, the EU-Black Sea Region strategy and the VASAB Long-Term Perspective have an inspiring connection with the pan-European approach of CEMAT.

CEMAT's planning principles have inspired Finland's cross-border co-operation in spatial planning and development both directly and indirectly. I can mention several examples from our range of cross-border activities with the Russian Federation. There is Euregio Karlia Neighbourhood Programme between the Finnish border regions and their counterparts in Russia. The fast-train connection between Helsinki and St Petersburg will replace the traditional one in December. The Helsinki Metropolitan Region is very active in co-operation with the global metropolis of St Petersburg.

These concrete projects illustrate CEMAT's message on networking across borders. I hope they serve as examples of innovative cross-border co-operation between countries of different sizes and different governance systems; more such projects should be effectively initiated. Potentially conflicting interests in the use of sea areas are rapidly emerging in the Baltic Sea region. Comprehensive maritime spatial planning is urgently needed to solve these conflicts in a sustainable way. This task definitely needs international co-operation.

I am convinced that the territorial dimension of human rights in Resolution No. 1 is a relevant addition to the human rights priority of the Council of

Europe. It is important to point out that member countries can include rights to essential services in their governance systems in their own way.

Finland still has large rural regions, and our policies are in line with the initiatives and approaches mentioned in Resolution No. 2. The Finnish experience has proved that rural areas have to be linked with the network of regional urban centres. Highlighting the heritage as a strong factor in territorial dynamics is important in securing proper living conditions in the countryside. We are ready to share our experiences on these issues.

It is correctly mentioned in the Moscow Declaration that there are new phenomena which need territorial policy responses. CEMAT countries have travelled very different social, economic, cultural and political paths to face common challenges such as climate change, ageing and energy questions.

There is now a momentum to share knowledge within CEMAT about the territorial impacts of new energy sources as well as spatial planning solutions for both regions and cities that improve energy efficiency and reduce consumption. The rapid increase of energy transfer has made it necessary to improve international co-operation.

Finland supports the resolutions as well as the Moscow Declaration. I can also state that Finland is ready to exchange experiences and knowledge on the issues mentioned in these documents.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Bart Vink

*Deputy Director, Directorate of Spatial Planning,
Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Netherlands*

Mr Chairman,

Thank you for your invitation. I would also like to thank all the participants for their contributions.

My remarks today are on behalf of the Minister of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment of the Netherlands.

The draft Moscow Declaration which lies on the table today shows the need to anticipate further challenges, regarding sustainability, economic growth and recovery, and socio-economic conditions in our countries.

Spatial and regional policies can contribute actively and explicitly to meet those challenges and to create attractive and inspiring perspectives or horizons for a sustainable and competitive future of our continent. Both go hand in hand in terms of policy and in terms of implementation and realisation.

That message of the draft declaration fits perfectly well with the goals we have set in the Netherlands and the attitude we promote. This is to show an inspiring version of the future in integrated spatial policies and their implementation as well as in sectorial policies like landscape policies, mobility, etc. A good example of the first one is the Structural Vision Randstad 2040 of the Netherlands. The Randstad is the economic heart of the Netherlands. This vision is a strategic policy document in which, at a global level, the desired spatial developments within the Randstad are described.

Furthermore, regarding the draft declaration I would like to stress four items that have been put forward by the Netherlands to strengthen the declaration:

1. Growth, stagnation and decline are happening simultaneously in different regions of the European continent. Next to problems and challenges that can be attached to this, this also provides an opportunity to stress differences between different regions and gives the chance to enlarge the attractiveness of the European continent as a whole. Improvement of cross-border links and international railroad, sailing and motorway connections can stress this even more and enlarge the attractiveness of the European continent.

2. Our present economic challenges make it all the more necessary that spatial and regional planning contribute to economic recovery. Of course this can and should be done in a sustainable and attractive way, combining spatial policy and related projects.

3. For decades to come the economic strength and competitiveness of the European continent will be more and more determined by the skills of people and the strengths of our cities in which knowledge, education, innovation, research and innovation find a powerful and fertile base. This base – the skills of people as well as the strength and attractiveness of our cities – should be used and strengthened to improve the economic power of the European continent.

4. National policies and state interventions should be as effective and selective as possible to provide transparency and predictability as far as national governmental actions are concerned. This also provides the necessary space for public-private partnerships.

I am happy to see that those items are now integrated into the Moscow Declaration.

Finally, a few words on the future role of CEMAT. I would like to stress that the Netherlands supports the reform discussion within the Council of Europe. We think that the Council of Europe should focus on its three main tasks: human rights, the rule of law and democracy. I therefore conclude by saying that it is of great importance for the future of CEMAT to make it as explicitly clear as possible how spatial planning in general and the goals in the declaration are of added value to the main tasks/principal goals of the Council of Europe.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Jean-François Seguin

*Chair of the Council of Europe Conference
on the European Landscape Convention*

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and the authorities of the Russian Federation for inviting a landscape representative to this Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning. The invitation to us gives a very clear indication of the strengthening of the natural link between landscape and spatial/regional planning.

The European Landscape Convention applies everywhere. It concerns not only outstanding landscapes, but also both ordinary and damaged landscapes.

There is one requirement common to landscape and spatial/regional planning work: they must concern all territory. Since landscape is, according to the European Landscape Convention, a key element of individual and social well-being, a policy must be implemented wherever people live – and people live everywhere. Throughout the 47 Council of Europe member states, we must meet people's aspirations for a better environment in which to live.

If we wish to meet these aspirations, particularly those of the younger generations, it is our duty to invite them to participate in devising and implementing landscape and spatial/regional planning policies. As we see every day, the European Landscape Convention is bringing about a major change, with landscape no longer reserved for experts, having become a political subject in its own right.

Territory and landscape are like two parts of the same ladder enabling us to get a clearer view of our Europe and to take action that is more relevant. It is not by chance that a single ministry is often responsible for landscape and spatial/regional planning.

Spatial/regional planning is based on territorial cohesion and continuity, inviting us to take an interest in both national and transfrontier territories. Similarly, while every landscape is peculiar and unique, this does not mean that it is isolated. A landscape is not a piece of land unconnected with other landscapes and other populations.

Landscape gives us an opportunity to consider territory on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity. We do not forget that the European Landscape Convention stems from an initiative of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

The reports presented during this conference in Moscow show that greater co-operation between CEMAT and the European Landscape Convention improves the quality and efficiency of local and regional governance. Thus Europeans' individual and social well-being will increase, and Europeans will be more fully involved in their environment at every level: local, regional, national and European.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Marco Keiner

*Director of the Environment, Housing and Land Management Division,
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*

“Future challenges: sustainable spatial development in the UNECE region”

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour and pleasure for me to address this conference today. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the organisers for inviting me to represent the UN Economic Commission for Europe at this important event. During my intervention, I will give you an overview of the activities of UNECE in the area of housing, in particular those relevant to the challenges of urbanisation and climate change.

The current millennium is often called an urban millennium as, for the first time in the history of human civilisation, more than half of humanity is living in towns and cities.

Furthermore, it is expected that by 2030 about 60 per cent of the world population will live in urban areas, and over 2 billion people will add to the growing demand for basic urban infrastructure services.² We live in a time of unprecedented and irreversible urbanisation, particularly in developing countries where the cities are growing faster than those in the developed world and experiencing many environmental, economic and social challenges.

Such challenges include but are not limited to the provision of effective urban infrastructures (for example, transport systems); effective water supplies, sanitation and waste management; development of sound urban real estate markets and ensuring sustainable housing financing; ensuring access to adequate and affordable housing; and maintaining community support systems in a sustainable manner.

These challenges are closely related and amplified by the severe problems already faced by the world, in particular climate change and limited energy supplies.

2. UN-HABITAT, “Global report on human settlements”, 2005.

Addressing these challenges and achieving the objective of sustainable urbanisation requires a comprehensive approach that integrates urban policies with policies in other sectors, including those addressing climate change. With this approach, climate neutrality in cities should be seen as the goal to which all urban areas should aspire not only as a step to reduce global warming, but also a way to confront their economic, environmental and social challenges.

Let me now share with you how UNECE is contributing through its work towards addressing some of the challenges linked to urbanisation and promoting climate neutrality in cities.

Being responsible for a large proportion of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, cities are the key to tackling climate change. Although there is no clear approximation of the contribution that cities make to carbon emissions, estimates for individual countries vary from 20% to up to 75-80%. Many countries in the UNECE region are addressing the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in cities as an important step towards achieving any post-Kyoto commitments.

However, while cities may be blamed for causing climate change, they are also an important part of the solution to the problem. For instance, the International Panel on Climate Change estimates that there is a potential to reduce approximately 29% of the projected baseline emissions by 2020 in the urban residential and commercial sectors.

Therefore, climate change mitigation must be an integral part of contemporary urban strategies. And if we want to succeed in implementing mitigation policies in cities, we need to start at the level of individual buildings.

Indeed, in the UNECE region, buildings are responsible for over a third of total final energy consumption. Much of this energy is used by the residential sector (on average, 20-30% of the total final consumption across the region). It will not be an exaggeration to argue that the residential sector is wasteful as it uses far more energy than it needs to provide comfort and services. It is also widely acknowledged that improving energy efficiency in the housing sector brings better and quicker results than increasing capacities for energy supply.

The problem is similar in both developed states and economies in transition, and the solution is at hand: modern technologies can reduce buildings' energy consumption between 30% and 50% without greatly increasing investment

costs. Most countries have the potential to reduce their energy consumption in the housing sector through regulatory and financial instruments.

What is essential is greater awareness of the building sector's potential as an efficient avenue for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. However, personal awareness of daily energy use patterns among the population is inadequate and trends are going in the wrong direction – energy use in dwellings is rising across the region. Furthermore, buildings are still being constructed below standards and existing buildings are not being renovated despite the economic and quality-of-life benefits that this would bring.

To contribute to a better understanding of the challenges of energy efficiency in housing, UNECE has published a study, “Green homes: towards energy-efficient housing in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe region”. The study also provides recommendations to governments on how to address challenges in the field of energy-efficient housing.

Furthermore, UNECE has developed an Action Plan for Energy-Efficient Housing, which provides a policy framework for governments in the UNECE region to raise energy efficiency in the housing sector and thus enable them to more effectively address environmental and economic challenges and meet social needs. This document will be presented for adoption to the 71st Session of the UNECE Committee on Housing and Land Management to be held in Geneva on 20 and 21 September 2010.

Thus, energy-efficient buildings are definitively crucial for climate change mitigation in cities. However, effective mitigation policies should focus also on emission reductions in other key sectors, such as urban spatial, transport infrastructure and land-use planning.

Spatial/urban planning is relevant for all sectors of the urban economy and finds itself today right at the heart of climate change adaptation and mitigation. Energy efficiency and climate change considerations should be integrated into the planning process at different levels with a general aim of reducing urban areas' energy demand and carbon footprints. Energy demand is determined by many spatial characteristics, such as the design and spatial orientation of buildings and green areas, their relationship with surrounding area (including transport flows) and the spatial organisation of neighbourhoods and communities at large. Achieving certain levels of residential density,

development of attractive public transport and non-motorised transportation options, as well as integrated district heat-cooling-electricity systems, are some of the important planning considerations for energy efficiency and reduced GHG emissions.

To contribute to raising awareness among politicians and the general public about the importance of spatial planning, UNECE prepared a study, “Spatial planning: key instrument for development and effective governance with special reference to countries in transition”. This study provides guidance on how to improve the functioning of the spatial planning systems in the UNECE member countries, particularly in the countries of eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe, based on the experience of and practice in the more advanced economies in the UNECE region.

Transport infrastructure planning is an important component of urban strategies. One of the key elements is the choice of transport means. Transport planning for climate-neutral cities envisages a number of interconnected steps. The first key step is the development of alternative transport solutions such as non-motorised transport systems, the increased use of public transport and incentives for the decreased use of cars.

Disincentives to car use can discourage cars in the proximity of urban centres when the same locations can be reached via other means, such as trains and buses. In addition, the attractiveness of public transport has to be increased, in particular attractiveness of rapid urban transport like trolleys and trams. This could, for example, include the development of integrated ticketing systems.

Furthermore, another area of action should be promoting safe walking and cycling in urban areas. Despite the benefits of walking and cycling, the systematic promotion of human-powered mobility as a more sustainable part of the transport system has up till now received little attention in most countries. A good example of advocacy in this area is the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme to which UNECE contributes and which is developing tools and policies to promote walking and cycling to be implemented by UNECE member states.

The second step of transport planning for climate-neutral cities is the use of clean energies and hybrid technologies for city buses and municipal vehicles. This step is interrelated with the previous one, for if clean energies are not part of

the increased fleet of public (and private) vehicles, urban planning alone cannot reduce the contribution of traffic to emissions. While in many western countries in the UNECE region, in particular due to European Union regulations, vehicles are following agreed energy standards, the vehicle stocks in several countries of eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe are still characterised by highly polluting engines and obsolescence.

UNECE is particularly active in these areas. Through its work on transport, UNECE is addressing the challenges of reducing car emissions by developing vehicle regulations within the framework of two UN agreements. The UNECE World Forum for Harmonization of Vehicle Regulations has so far developed around 130 vehicle regulations regarding both safety and performance requirements of road vehicles. Some 30 of these regulations cover the reduction of emissions, including CO₂ emissions as well the promotion of environmentally friendly vehicles. Thanks to this regulatory activity, emissions of pollutants have been reduced by 80% in new vehicles. UNECE is also working on intelligent transport solutions (ITS) to tackle the need for green and safe roads, updating or creating new legal instruments on intelligent vehicle systems, which are dealing with communication between vehicles and between vehicles and infrastructures. Further improvements in safety and environmental performance of transport modes, particularly with regard to global warming, could be fostered if ITS applications are streamlined. To this aim, the UNECE Transport Division is developing a road map in the different areas of its competencies regarding ITS technologies and their implementation in the future in a harmonised way.

Land-use planning is another important component of urban strategies. Land-use planning for climate-neutral cities should include policies for urban green space, natural areas and biodiversity to mitigate climate change in urban areas.

Policy recommendations and advice in the field of urban biodiversity, forest and environmental performance are produced by UNECE on a regular basis, and shared with member states through the work on sustainable management of forests and publication of the Environmental Performance Reviews.

Countries in our region have already implemented solutions that have proven to be viable and bring about results. For instance, urban green infrastructures have added value as tools for mitigating climate change and providing

ecosystem services. Green roofs can help reduce carbon dependency by sinking carbon and decreasing the need for artificial cooling. Urban green spaces contribute to curbing the greenhouse effect, and an increasing number of cities are launching plans to enhance the size of the urban canopy. Policies that prevent urban sprawl and create more compact, densely populated cities with effective public transport systems and bicycle-friendly urban designs can decrease the number of miles travelled per vehicle and reduce emissions from transport.

I started my presentation today by saying that modern cities are the key to tackling climate change and to mitigation policies. However, urban areas are not only the main contributor to climate change; they are also themselves vulnerable to its adverse effects. Concentrating people and infrastructure, these areas will experience significant human and economic losses both from natural disasters and from progressively changing climatic conditions. Therefore, cities must also embrace policies of adaptation to minimise the present and future negative impacts, and both aspects – mitigation and adaptation – must be part of contemporary urban policies.

To address these issues in a comprehensive manner, UNECE is currently developing a study on climate-neutral cities. The study will review the principles and cross-sectoral mechanisms that should underpin mitigation and adaptation strategies as far as cities are concerned. It will provide recommendations regarding the establishment of comprehensive governance frameworks, raising awareness and capacity building, and stakeholders' engagement in the development and implementation of relevant urban policies. The study will also develop targeted guidelines for the individual sectors and fields of the urban economy and review and develop recommendations for such measures, while providing necessary reference to the UNECE region and its internal differences.

An extended outline of the study will be discussed at the 71st Session of the UNECE Committee on Housing and Land Management in September 2010. Please contact us should you be interested in this study and providing contributions to its discussion.

UNECE is also promoting climate-neutral cities through its Country Profile Reviews of the housing and land management situation of its member states. The country profiles not only analyse housing policies, institutional, legal,

financial and socio-economic frameworks of countries under review, but they also provide them with specific recommendations. In particular, the country profiles promote policies and advance suggestions on how to increase energy efficiency in buildings and to reduce energy consumption in the main urban sectors. Advice is always ad hoc and based on a thorough analysis of the situation undertaken by local and international experts working in a team.

Finally, I would like to emphasise that this conference is an important opportunity to strengthen co-operation between UNECE and the Council of Europe, as well as with the European Union by sharing knowledge and best practice experiences to address the issue of sustainable urban development on the European continent.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Władysław Piskorz

Head of Unit, DG Regional Policy Unit, European Commission

“Territorial cohesion: a new objective for the European Union”

With the recently adopted Lisbon Treaty, territorial cohesion has become an additional objective for the European Union, as a shared competence between the EU and member states, alongside the economic and social dimensions of cohesion.

This paper presents some ideas which the European Commission would like to share with the Council of Europe. We will successively go through important milestones, and recent and possible forthcoming developments for territorial cohesion.

1. Brief history: the most important milestones

Community cohesion policy was officially launched in 1986 with the perspective of the Single Market and the acceleration of European integration. The assumption was that integrating markets would require actions to counteract imbalances resulting from operating without economic borders.

It was progressively acknowledged that crucial questions for territories could not be addressed only at the national or local level, independently of the European dimension. This recognition of the European dimension of spatial planning, which had been initiated by CEMAT in the 1980s, paved the way for 10 years of studies and discussions, culminating in 1999 with the adoption of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP).

The Commission went on to develop two instruments arising directly out of the ESDP:

- greater territorial co-operation by way of INTERREG III and its three strands (transnational, cross-border, inter-regional); it gradually gained in strength to become, in the 2007-13 programme period, an objective in its own right (referred to as “European Territorial Co-operation”) within the Cohesion Policy;
- an applied research network for spatial planning, ESPON (European Observation Network on Territorial Development and Cohesion),

aiming at a better understanding of the dynamics of the territories and the territorial impact of sectoral policies.

A continuous discussion process between the ministers in charge of spatial planning and of urban development, accompanied by the European Commission, led to the adoption of the Territorial Agenda of the EU and the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities in 2007.

2. Recent developments

2.1. The legal basis for territorial cohesion

Since the 1990s, stakeholders have asked for explicit recognition of the EU's territorial competence.

The notion of territorial cohesion was put forward at a meeting of the Assembly of European Regions (AER) in 1995; it was to make a discreet entry two years later into the Amsterdam Treaty (Article 16), stipulating that services of general economic interest should work to promote social and territorial cohesion.

Following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, Article 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU now says that: the EU “shall promote economic, social and territorial cohesion”. The treaty also states that while reducing regional development disparities “particular attention should be devoted to regions which suffer from severe and permanent natural or demographic handicaps such as the northernmost regions with very low population density and island, cross-border and mountain regions”.

Moreover, Article 175 of the treaty stipulates that: “Member States shall conduct their economic policies and shall coordinate themselves in such a way as to attain the objectives set out in Article 174 The formulation of the Union's policies and actions shall contribute to the achievement of the objectives of economic, social and territorial cohesion set out in Article 174”. This will pave the way for increased coherence between policies.

The distinction with spatial planning, for which the competence remains national or regional, is clearly established. Nevertheless, the legal competence in the area of territorial cohesion requires a common reflection on its policy implications.

2.2. *The Green Paper on territorial cohesion, towards a common understanding of the concept*

Anticipating the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the Commission adopted a Green Paper³ on the subject in October 2008.

The Green Paper identified three levers for action:

- overcoming differences in density by a “reasonable” concentration;
- overcoming distance by connecting the territories;
- overcoming divisions by way of co-operation.

It also identified questions to structure a five-month debate on territorial cohesion and the options for putting it into practice. Almost 400 contributions came from national, regional and local stakeholders, experts in the field of spatial planning and citizens.

It appears from the debate that territorial cohesion is a rich and complex concept that may vary substantially according to contexts and cultures. Territorial cohesion should be an evolving concept and a learning process. It should respect the principle of subsidiarity (with its renewed status in the Lisbon Treaty) and the institutional structure of member states and regions in order to achieve political acceptance.

Aiming at a common understanding of the concept, we can say that territorial cohesion is about achieving a balanced, inclusive and sustainable development of territories, making value of their specific potential, through an integrated approach based on:

- multilevel governance and broad partnership;
- co-ordination of policies applicable to those territories;
- co-operation and networking between territories, transcending administrative boundaries.

3. Communication from the Commission, Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength, COM(2008)616.

3. Possible forthcoming developments for territorial cohesion

The policy framework: the Europe 2020 strategy

The Europe 2020 strategy is the overarching strategy to which any EU policy will have to contribute in the future. Besides smart and green growth the Europe 2020 strategy sets inclusive growth as its 3rd priority entitled “fostering a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion”. It also stipulates: “Economic, social and territorial cohesion will remain at the heart of the Europe 2020 strategy to ensure that all energies and capacities are mobilised and focused on the pursuit of the strategy’s priorities.”

Cohesion policy can be considered as a key delivery tool of this strategy and territorial cohesion finds a double place in it:

- all territories should make value of their potential to participate in the global competitiveness of the EU;
- the governance principles of territorial cohesion (integrated approach, multilevel governance, co-ordination of policies) could help to reach the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy).

On the basis of the Green Paper debate, the Lisbon Treaty and the Europe 2020 strategy, four areas where EU regional policy (and sometimes other policies) may implement territorial cohesion can be considered:

3.1. Strengthening territorial programming

“Territorial” programming means incorporating a territorial dimension into every stage of programming policies (diagnosis, selection of priorities, method, monitoring, evaluation, etc.).

The territorial cohesion concept should make us reconsider the levels and scales at which challenges should be addressed. Territorial scale, at which a particular problem could best be handled, often differs from the administrative territory, since people, goods and services move beyond boundaries. As the World Bank Development Report 2009 and Green Paper have demonstrated, political and administrative division is a major obstacle to development. In order to take into account this feature there is the need to apply a functional approach towards territories.

Functional territories can be metropolitan areas, functional urban areas, rural areas with services located in towns, etc. Of course, functional areas cannot be defined top down. Flexibility in addressing functional problems is necessary in light of the subsidiarity principle.

Below the regional level, there is a need to pay more attention to local development, capitalising on the achievements of current and past local development initiatives (URBAN, LEADER, EQUAL). Local development methodology (LDM) can be described as area-based initiatives built around local partnership. Together, public, private and civil society actors develop integrated local development strategies based on their knowledge of the needs and potential of their areas. By being close to citizens, LDM helps to tailor actions to local needs and adds a local dimension to national policies. It allows more targeted problem solving at problem level with bottom-up solutions adapted to each local environment, social innovation, empowerment, mobilisation and exploitation of endogenous potential.

At the higher level, facing the challenges and making use of potentials may require co-operation at multi-regional level, be it within mountain ranges, river basins or more simply grouping regions facing the same thematic challenges.

This opportunity for cohesion policy to intervene at the functional level should not call into question the key role of the regional level (NUTS II), which remains relevant for regional policy, because it allows maintenance of the coherence of public intervention at infra/inter-regional and cross-border/transnational levels and organisation of solidarity between urban and rural territories (for example, public services).

3.2. Territorial co-operation for further integration

Territorial co-operation as one of the objectives funded by the EU is specifically tailored to the objective of territorial cohesion and to the necessity to progress towards better territorial integration, which is understood as a rich multidimensional concept (economic, political, cultural, etc.). It is organised in three specific strands of co-operation, which are different from a territorial point of view.

Cross-border co-operation concerns neighbouring regions separated by land or maritime national borders; cross-border regions are mentioned in the

Lisbon Treaty as having “a severe and permanent handicap”. Indeed, they often face several difficulties due to geographical obstacles, such as mountains or seas, or barriers due to language or culture, that need to be surpassed by cross-border information, education and training. However, they can also build on assets created by territorial proximity. Cross-border regions claim to be “trailblazers of European integration” in which experimenting with a new European citizenship model may take place. To tackle such challenges and fully exploit such potentials, an integrated approach is required through spatial development strategies and appropriate governance.

Transnational co-operation, based on the delineation of geographically coherent macro-spaces, allows advantage to be taken of shared development opportunities in facing common global challenges (structural, economic changes, climate change and demographic trends). In the future, this strand should be made more strategic, and should achieve greater articulation with other EU and national policies.

Macro-regional strategies, such as the Baltic Sea Strategy adopted in 2009 and the Danube Strategy still in its elaboration phase, clearly demonstrate the added value of an integrated approach linked to a territorial strategy, involving multilevel governance, co-ordinated planning of policies, alignment of regulations, as well as funding. They are prime test cases of what form transnational co-operation may take in the future. Additionally, they are an opportunity to develop innovative co-operation between the EU and its neighbours.

Inter-regional co-operation allows non-adjacent regions with similar objectives to exchange experience, less affluent territories to access innovation networks and all regions to benchmark themselves. EU-wide inter-regional networks such as ESPON, INTERREG IVC, URBACT and INTERACT allow for capitalisation and provide awareness and knowledge of territorial development.

Territorial cohesion is also fostered by linking the European territory with its broader environment, reinforcing co-operation with neighbouring countries and regions. Co-operation impacts upon the role of external borders by allowing joint development on both sides of the border.

Concrete co-operation with CEMAT member states which are not EU members is supported by transnational and cross-border co-operation

programmes funded by the EU (ERDF, ENPI, IPA), involving candidate countries, potential candidate countries and third countries.

There is a clear request from stakeholders that co-operation programmes financed by neighbourhood policy should be given a greater territorial dimension.

3.3. Achieving greater policy coherence through the integrated approach, multilevel governance and co-ordinating policies

The multilevel governance (MLG) scheme of cohesion policy brings an added value in ensuring delivery of EU objectives on the ground and encouraging ownership amongst regional and local stakeholders. MLG should be strengthened by producing greater fluidity across the levels in the decision process, involving all relevant stakeholders (from local authorities to transnational bodies) in the design and delivery of programmes (vertical co-ordination). The Lisbon Treaty justifies the reinforced role of local authorities in designing and implementing policies.

Territorial cohesion implies public policies that are coherent on the ground. It demands that we move beyond the field of territorial policies alone to ensure that they articulate with sectoral policies having a territorial impact (the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), transport, competition, the environment, etc.), with the territory constituting the operational framework for such a link.

On the basis of Article 175 of the treaty, horizontal co-ordination of policies should be reinforced, including better co-ordination of funds (for example, ERDF, EAFRD, ESF). This would result in ensuring better policy coherence.

The Commission has recently launched an inter-service group on territorial cohesion with a double mandate:

- How can cohesion policy help other EU policies to maximise their positive territorial impacts through its integrated place-based approach?
- How can the contribution of other EU policies improve economic, social and territorial cohesion, based on Article 175 of the treaty?

Policy co-ordination is not needed exclusively at the EU level and there is also a need for more coherence between all policy levels – EU, national, regional and sub-regional. Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) can help to ensure the overall coherence between EU policies and between EU and national/

regional policies. This does not require the creation of new instruments but rather the optimisation of existing ones.

3.4. Territorial knowledge for evidence-based policy making

The common understanding of territories is a precondition for designing and implementing more coherent, tailor-made and efficient public policies on the ground. Efforts are necessary for:

- developing a common awareness about territorial diversity and dynamics and about disparities and functional relations between our territories;
- finding relevant data at different geographic scales and particularly below NUTS II;
- developing indicators targeting the key territorial characteristics for analytical purposes: quality of life, sustainability, accessibility, vulnerability to natural risks;
- devising a better monitoring system making use of all existing data and analysis;

experimenting with territorial impact assessment (TIA) instruments.

All these efforts imply the reinforcement of the basis for territorial statistics issued from national statistical offices and EUROSTAT (and the EEA) and of analytical programmes such as ESPON, the Urban Audit and the Urban Atlas.

4. Conclusions

European diversity is not to be used in a prescriptive, top-down way led by a uniform definition but through key underlying concepts and guiding principles that are to be applied in a flexible way, according to specific contexts. EU institutions, without seeking to homogenise national and regional cultures, can certainly contribute to the development of a shared responsibility in the area of territorial cohesion, on the basis of the Lisbon Treaty.

Territorial cohesion's added value can be considered as twofold:

- territory matters: we must examine where policies are implemented and which territory they affect; we must also adopt a kind of “territorial reflex” incorporating territorial considerations into every stage of policy programming;

- coherence matters and requires an integrated approach: the three principles of territorial cohesion, multilevel governance, co-ordination of policies and co-operation between territories, aim at producing more coherence and efficiency in our policies.

Territorial cohesion principles could appear in the near future as key governance principles ensuring an efficient delivery of the Europe 2020 strategy and more sustainable development on the ground.

The Commission is also actively taking part in inter-governmental activities, such as the Conference on the Contribution of the EU Transport Policy, which the Belgian presidency plans to organise on 28 and 29 September; and the ongoing review of the Territorial Agenda that the Hungarian presidency intends to finalise in 2011.

In Toledo on 22 June 2010, the ministers in charge of urban development agreed to support greater coherence between territorial and urban issues and agendas, and to foster the urban dimension in the context of territorial cohesion. The Commission warmly welcomes this declaration.

According to the declaration and resolutions CEMAT intends to adopt, the Council of Europe and the European Union clearly share a common understanding of territorial cohesion.

Towards a common understanding of territorial cohesion

By territorial cohesion, we mean on the one hand a policy objective of the EU, an ideal state for the European territory and, on the other, certain principles of governance that have to be used to progress towards this objective.

Territorial cohesion as an objective is about three priorities:

1. ensuring more sustainable and balanced (polycentric) development at every level, exploiting the diversity of the territories (including the specific conditions arising from their geography);
2. achieving greater European integration and ensuring that citizens and enterprises benefit from and contribute to this integration and the functioning of the single market wherever they happen to live and operate;
3. providing all citizens with fair opportunities and living conditions and fair access to essential goods and services of general interest.

In order to progress towards territorial cohesion, we should make use of three principles of governance, based on an integrated approach:

1. “vertical” co-ordination, to produce greater fluidity across the territorial layers in the multilevel governance scheme;
2. “horizontal” co-ordination of territorial policies and sectoral policies that have an impact on the territories, at each territorial level;
3. co-operation between territories allowing “functional” approaches transcending administrative boundaries.

Mr Dinos M. Michaelides

Chair of the 11th CEMAT

First of all allow me, Mr Chairman, to thank you very much for your invitation to attend this CEMAT session in Moscow, as Chair of the 11th CEMAT Session which took place in Cyprus in 1997.

Allow me also, Mr Chairman, to congratulate you on the excellent way you are handling the work of this 15th Session.

I should confess that I feel deeply honoured, because today I have the rare opportunity to address an assembly of highly distinguished people, who individually and collectively may influence, through their decisions, many significant aspects of the quality of life and the prosperity of the European peoples.

The participants and the observers of this 15th CEMAT Session have gathered in Moscow in order to examine the course of action and evaluate the strategic objectives of our work, the progress in attaining these objectives and any possible weaknesses which may create obstacles and delays. They have to re-evaluate the alternatives and the strategic choices lying ahead of us. At this turning point of their joint involvement in the realm of regional and spatial planning they are obliged to make decisions which are bound to have far-reaching effects on the future of greater Europe.

These decisions are necessary and fundamental if they intend to remain active and productive in the shaping of their common future. They all share the understanding that such decisions might not always be popular with the European societies represented by us, the people who are to be affected by them, both directly, in the short term and in the long run. Despite the appreciation, I would suggest that it is necessary to proceed with their work and their involvement with courage, conviction and vision, because developments throughout the world, which eventually affect Europe and the Europeans, are changing the context and the quality of our future at an ever-increasing rate.

I have no doubt that I speak for all present when stressing that greater Europe is not an imaginative or theoretical entity which only exists in the minds of dreamers. Greater Europe is a very real, pragmatic and vibrant sum-total of nations, peoples and societies who share much more than the possible differences which seem to distinguish one from another.

As our governments have been working to make pan-European co-operation more meaningful and productive, the officials with responsibilities for spatial and regional planning have an obligation to turn the wealth of our social, economic and cultural diversities and experiences into a generator for prolonged, evenly distributed, shared and sustainable progress, development and prosperity throughout our continent.

In order to achieve such an ambitious but nevertheless tangible objective, we need to persist with our efforts to create a vision for the future of sustainable development of Europe which should be shared by all Europeans. Such a vision must express the aspirations of all citizens of greater Europe; it should draw its strength from the trust and commitment of all Europeans. It should, therefore, be founded on an unlimited respect and enjoyment of basic human rights, which, in fact, replace the absence of our common cultural and societal values and heritage. For a wider Europe to exist and progress in the 21st century, our continent needs to develop in such a way as to provide all its peoples, and peoples beyond its boundaries, with the hope and realistic prospect of a future based on peace, democracy, justice, equity, freedom of the individual, welfare, socio-political and cultural tolerance and mutual respect of our enriching differences.

These elementary qualities are in fact absolute preconditions for Europeans to develop a sense of common past and shared future. We all should make sure that all Europeans have an opportunity to live within these conditions. Here and now is the place and the time when the viability of and validity of our common future and the vision of greater Europe will be put on trial. We should not fail to prove our solidarity and support for each other.

I am confident that you are aware of the tragic division of my country, forcibly imposed and maintained by the Turkish occupation forces for the last 36 years. This state of affairs is abnormal and anachronistic. The continuing occupation of the northern part of Cyprus is violating both individual and collective human rights of the whole population. The refugees, the missing and the enclave epitomise the tragedy of Cyprus.

The Cypriot Government aims at a just, viable and functional solution of the Cyprus issue under a federal structure that would guarantee the independence, territorial integrity, unity and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus, free from the occupation of troops and illegal settlers. A solution which would

ensure full respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all Cypriots, irrespective of ethnic origin or religion. We hope that the Turkish side will show the necessary goodwill and respect for international law and will co-operate so that a just and lasting solution is found to the benefit of the whole population of Cyprus.

I believe that I should refrain from using more of the conference's time for this address. I want only to stress once again that the existence and the future of greater Europe depends on the political will of our nations, states and governments to face contemporary challenges, to take up responsibilities and obligations, to share both the limitations and the opportunities, to bridge the gaps and promote cohesion, and to co-operate and co-ordinate at numerous levels. Our task will surely not be easy or without obstacles. Nevertheless, it is the only one which might lead to a peaceful and prosperous future for all.

Thank you.

Mr Enrico Buergi

*Former Chair of the Council of Europe Conference
on the European Landscape Convention*

Mr Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation and Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT, Sergey Yurpalov,

It is a great honour for me to be invited to take part in the 15th Session of CEMAT here in Moscow, a session which coincides with the 40th anniversary of CEMAT.

I would like to touch briefly on three points which I consider to be of major importance.

First of all the need to highlight the fundamental role of spatial planning at local, regional, national and international level, so as to increasingly enhance the modern, future-orientated management of landscape in its entirety, in other words urban, peri-urban, rural and natural landscapes, and the constant improvement of the quality of life of all members of the population, on the basis of simple, comprehensible criteria clearly aimed at ensuring sustainable development.

The second point that I would like to underline is the Council of Europe's essential role in this sphere. The Council of Europe unites all the inhabitants of greater Europe, with our different cultures and our different landscapes; it encourages us to care for our cultures and to manage our landscapes parsimoniously, taking account of the specific features of each landscape and managing, to the best of our ability, this valuable asset that is fundamental to our lives and with which we identify on a daily basis.

A high quality of life, which can be achieved through a form of management designed to ensure the quality of life of all our landscapes and in all our landscapes is quite simply a human right. It also fits in perfectly with all other Council of Europe activities.

The third message is one I would like to propose directly to all the participants from the Russian Federation, which is hosting this conference here in Moscow. It concerns the incalculable value of biodiversity in your vast territory. Spatial planning also plays a decisive role in maintaining biodiversity, for which human beings bear sole responsibility. I trust that in the future you will be able to develop your considerable commitment to biodiversity to its full extent.

Thank you for your attention.

Working session III – Presentation of draft Resolutions Nos. 1 and 2

Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

- Draft Resolution No. 1 on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent (15 CEMAT(2010)6)
- Draft Resolution No. 2 on the pan-European charter of rural heritage: for a sustainable territorial development (15 CEMAT(2010)7)

Statements by ministers /heads of delegations

- Mr Ioan Andreica, Secretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism, Romania
“Access to essential services and territorial cohesion”
- Mr José Luis Paz, Counsellor at the Spanish Embassy in Moscow, Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs, Spain
- Mr Jean-Claude Sinner, Government Adviser, Department of Spatial Planning, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, Luxembourg
- Mr Robert Bechina, Head of Delegation of the European Co-ordination Forum for the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan 2006-2015 (CAHPAH)
“Integration of people with disabilities through appropriate spatial/regional planning”

Discussion

- Mr Jarosław Pawłowski, Undersecretary of State of the Ministry of Regional Development, Poland
- Ms Maria Ulfvarson Östlund, Head of Section, Ministry of the Environment, Sweden
- Mr Pierre Dartout, Interministerial Delegate for Spatial Planning and Territorial Attractiveness (DATAR), Ministry of Rural Areas and Territorial Development (MERAT), France

Presentation of draft Resolution No. 3. on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (15 CEMAT(2010)9)

Statement by Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Mr Ioan Andreica

Secretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism, Romania

“Access to essential services and territorial cohesion”

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should like, first of all, to thank the organisers, the Council of Europe and our Russian colleagues, who have made great efforts to enable us to discuss very important and topical issues. I should also like to congratulate everyone involved in drafting the resolutions; they did very good work which produced equally good results. We now have the task of implementing the resolutions so as to bring about an improvement in the quality of life for Europe’s citizens and greater balance in access to goods and services throughout Europe.

Providing fair access to essential services for all citizens, a desire related to the Declaration of Human Rights, was one of the first steps taken by the European Community towards territorial cohesion and the balanced and harmonious development of Europe. There is a very strong relationship between essential services and territorial cohesion. One of the recent documents drawn up by the European Commission on territorial cohesion, the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength, sets out three main ideas: concentration (overcoming differences in density), connecting territories (overcoming distance) and co-operation (overcoming division). These three concepts are directly linked to the process of boosting access to essential services, in particular public transport, communication infrastructure and the Internet. An emphasis on remote services is a possible solution for ensuring fairer access and also reducing the disparities between major European centres and regions which are disadvantaged on account of their location or certain geographical characteristics, for example, mountain regions and islands, and thereby achieving better territorial cohesion.

It has to be said that, in practical terms, fair access to essential services involves the projection in a territorial dimension of certain human rights, in particular families’ right to quality of life, an obligation of which member states are fully aware. I trust that states will take account of this resolution, which should add to the efforts which have already been made in this respect and support a fairer distribution of services throughout Europe.

I would note that the resolution will be adopted at a time when the ESPON 2013 territorial co-operation programme (European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion) is funding (with EU funds) applied research on the subject of indicators and perspectives for services of general interest in territorial cohesion and development.

The challenge for us all will be to identify means to implement the resolution: instruments for assessing the territorial impact of policies, territorial monitoring systems and improved co-ordination of sector-based policies will all play an important part in achieving the proposed objectives. In conclusion, I can assure you that Romania, which is currently developing a national territorial development strategy, will take account in this connection of all the conclusions and documents adopted at this 15th Session of CEMAT.

Mr José Luis Paz

*Counsellor at the Spanish Embassy in Moscow,
Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs, Spain*

On behalf of the Spanish Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs and in my own name, I would like to thank the Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation for his invitation and warm welcome to this 15th Plenary Session of the Council of Europe Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), and for allowing me to give my address in Spanish.

I would also like to thank the members of his team for the work they have done in performing the tasks of the chairmanship of the Committee of Senior Officials over the past three years, the results of which have been submitted to this conference

Finally, I would like to extend my gratitude to the Council of Europe and, in particular, to Ms Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons, Head of the Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division and her team, which, as CEMAT permanent secretariat, has been a guarantee of the continuity and rigour with which the terms of reference given by the ministers to the Committee of Senior Official have been fulfilled, particularly on this special occasion of the 40th anniversary of this sector of the Council of Europe.

Importance of the approach taken by CEMAT as a long-standing and as a sound basis of reference for the spatial development of the European continent

The 40th anniversary clearly demonstrates the consolidation of a long-standing and pioneering approach in this sphere – which offers us a sound basis of reference for using spatial development as a response to changing practices and the changing conditions of our environment.

In the Moscow Declaration adopted by the conference well-deserved reference is made to the consistency of this approach and its valuable contributions over the last 40 years.

The recent publication of the CEMAT *Basic texts 1970-2010*, edited and disseminated by the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage of the Council of Europe, to mark this anniversary, is very much welcomed

not only on account of its usefulness but above all for its validity in providing guidelines for spatial development.

The Spanish Government most especially wishes to thank CEMAT for its pioneering influence in regional development thanks to its launching of the extremely important European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter (the Torremolinos Charter) adopted in 1983 at the 6th Plenary Session of CEMAT, which was hosted by Spain. The charter was a precursor in defining and recognising this activity as a political duty and a public responsibility, and also for its European dimension as a basis for seeking answers outside administrative confines and in an increasingly integrated Europe. The Torremolinos Charter also served to fill the conceptual vacuum in countries such as Spain, which were beginning to prepare a new administrative structure to implement this activity in accordance with the principles of democracy and decentralisation embodied in the 1978 constitution.

In fact, the charter has been of fundamental importance in the allocation of these responsibilities, which in Spain falls to the regional tier of government (the autonomous communities) and is given as a reference in Spanish spatial planning legislation.

In keeping with our administrative system, Spain has given its backing to and regularly taken part in CEMAT activities, currently through the Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs (MARM) and its Directorate General for the Sustainable Development of the Rural Environment, which facilitates the dissemination of relevant documents to the institutions which share responsibility for spatial development issues. For example, the ministry has had the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” (Hanover, 2000) and the “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT” (Ljubljana, 2003) translated into Spanish and published. The ministry’s website contains information concerning CEMAT activities.

Finally, I would also like to point out that, since the recent Spanish presidency of the European Union, the Spanish Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs has taken special interest in the European Territorial Agenda and the European ESPON Programme as a means of maintaining and strengthening co-operation between the activities taking place in both organisations, already acknowledged at the 14th Session of the conference

in Lisbon (2006) on sustainable spatial development, as a means of accomplishing the goal of territorial cohesion recently incorporated into the EU Lisbon Treaty .

**Support for the themes proposed by the Russian Federation
in the two resolutions and in the Moscow Declaration**

Spain fully approves the two resolutions and the Moscow Declaration.

Both resolutions fully comply with the spirit and, in some cases, the letter of our recent “Law on the Sustainable Development of the Rural Environment” of 2007 and, therefore, have our clear support.

Resolution No. 1 on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent

This resolution recognises both the existence of inequalities and of the need to deal with these inequalities through measures that are co-ordinated between the various administrations and forms of government, and through the improvement of infrastructures, services and opportunities, with special attention and priority being given to the most underprivileged areas and/or those far from centres of decision making and wealth creation.

According to the resolution, three out of every four regions which are likely to have a lack of essential services are rural areas, or those that could be considered as such, under-equipped peripheral urban districts, economically underdeveloped regions and ultra-peripheral areas where the demand for essential services is less strong or less easy to solve. There is also an explicit reference to the fact that one of the basic objectives of these measures is to avoid rural depopulation.

Last but not least, the document establishes a close link between access to services and the exercise of basic human rights, which goes much further than the simple presence of certain types of infrastructure close at hand. In other words, the aim is not to establish the minimum distance at which people should be able to find a pharmacy, nor even the existence of suitable opening hours and public transport to reach the pharmacy, but to ensure that it is relatively easy for the entire population to gain access to basic medicine and personal medical advice at attainable prices and reasonable times, to obtain the results of clinical tests, etc.

*Resolution No. 2 on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage:
promoting sustainable spatial development*

Of the two resolutions submitted for discussion, the one on “the rural heritage as a factor of territorial cohesion” is of particular interest to Spain, as it corresponds to a large degree with the aforementioned rural development law.

The aim of the said law is to ensure that the inhabitants of rural areas have relatively easy access to basic services and rights and are able to exercise their rights as citizens, wherefore special attention to the most deprived areas.

This should be achieved not only by improving infrastructures, services and telecommunication networks and bringing them closer to the locals, but also by enhancing the rural heritage and through the contribution of the rural environment, in terms of environmental services, which will affect the whole of society.

CEMAT’s pan-European charter highlights the richness and complexity of the rural heritage and its relationship not only with the sense of belonging and the living conditions of rural populations but also in terms of cultural identity.

It is therefore interesting to notice that, unlike certain human interventions over the last decades aimed at dealing with the expansion and meeting the leisure needs of urban populations, rural populations have in many cases, with their wide range of traditional activities, helped to preserve the so-called natural heritage and its biodiversity and the landscapes which we now recognise as part of our common heritage

We also agree that the rural heritage is not only an aesthetic or historical element or a sign of identity but also a source of inspiration and of initiatives which lead to the creation of jobs, to a better knowledge, enhancement, attractiveness and development of its endogenous potential. All this has been achieved through processes of social participation, training, co-ordination and the improvement of specific tiers of government and national and international co-operation.

The charter mirrors the development of the “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT”, which, as indicated, has been translated into Spanish and published by the Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and

Marine Affairs and can be found on the Internet. In Spain, the pan-European charter will serve as a basis for the Rural Development Programme recently approved by the enactment of the Law on the Sustainable Development of the Rural Environment and in practical terms by a current project of the ministry to help highlight the rural heritage as one of the assets of this environment.

The Moscow Declaration

As regards the Moscow Declaration, we agree that we are facing undeniable challenges such as climate change, population ageing and social polarisation, which no state will be able to meet on its own and which require joint action based on the principle of territorial cohesion, within each country and at international level.

Territorial cohesion is complementary to economic and social cohesion, which our country has actively helped to define and extend to the common European area.

Although we believe in an “Alliance of Civilisations”, which must overcome prejudices and long-standing cultural differences, we also believe that with a view to achieving sustainable development the territorial dimension of development is not a barrier or an obstacle but, on the contrary, is an indispensable asset for such development.

Undertaking to disseminate the declaration

Finally, I would like to ensure you that Spain undertakes to disseminate the two resolutions and the declaration, which have already been translated into Spanish. And, in view of the distribution of powers and responsibilities in Spain, it will be transmitted to the Spanish regions and other relevant institutions concerned with rural and regional development.

Many thanks for your attention.

Mr Jean-Claude Sinner

*Government Adviser, Department of Spatial Planning,
Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, Luxembourg*

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues,

I would like to say something about Resolution No. 1 on essential services. Essential services are absolutely vital to citizens, they are a right and also the first condition for local and regional development.

It is true that essential services are easier to supply in some areas than in others. I must point out as well that differences in development – essential services being a truly vital part of development – are currently greater between regions of a single country than between different countries in general and on average.

Essential services are sometimes affected by a declining population, so although they are available and are supplied, it is difficult to supply them in satisfactory economic conditions.

And this is where I wish to begin: it is useful to consider a process whereby areas and regions either side of a border work together to overcome the difficulties of supplying essential services in satisfactory conditions. I am thinking of health care, provided that suitable arrangements are made for social security cover. I am also thinking of culture and education, provided that language difficulties are resolved. And I am thinking of water supply projects and joint water treatment facilities, of which we have some examples in Luxembourg, often jointly financed with structural funds.

Nevertheless I wish to go beyond the very basic “essential services” to which the resolution refers and look at aspects which are just as essential for local, regional and economic development, such as culture, innovation, access to information technology, and higher education.

And Luxembourg has, with its French, German and Belgian neighbours, started a process of setting up a polycentric transfrontier metropolitan region to which the abbreviation RMPT is applied. We refer to this as a metropolitan region because it is not based on a city and includes the intervening areas, as polycentric because it is based on several towns and cities in the four states, and this makes it a transfrontier region.

The move towards our RMPT, a rather technocratic term, is an ongoing process: the RMPT will not come into being on 1 January of a given year. All decisions in the sectors referred to should ideally take account of the need to share higher-level services in an area that lacks the critical mass to be able to split everything up as it might wish.

The approach which I have described also entails implementation of our Moscow Declaration, where it refers to “Innovative, sustainable and cohesive territorial development contributing to overcoming the consequences of the economic crisis” and states that “The quality and efficiency of territorial governance are key factors in responding successfully to new challenges”.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr Robert Bechina

*Head of Delegation of the European Co-ordination Forum
for the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan 2006-2015 (CAHPAH)*

“Integration of people with disabilities through appropriate spatial/regional”

Honourable Chairman, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to take the floor on behalf of the CAHPAH, the European Co-ordination Forum for the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan.

CAHPAH is the main forum for disability issues in the Council of Europe. We have elaborated the so-called Disability Action Plan 2006-2015, a road map for policy makers.

Maybe you as participants of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning celebrating your 40th anniversary ask yourselves: What additional value has the contribution of the CAHPAH to CEMAT?

In a nutshell: the plan of the Council of Europe is to point out the situation of persons with disabilities whenever there is a conference of importance and so to draw the attention of a larger public to the special situation of persons with disabilities.

CEMAT sees as well as the Council of Europe social cohesion as one of the main instruments in spatial/regional planning, so to respond to the changes in economic and social conditions and to the growing challenges in our society.

There is a link between persons with disabilities and spatial/regional planning and the spatial/regional planning impact on the daily life of persons with disabilities.

As the 15th Session of CEMAT takes place in the Russian Federation, it is worth mentioning that the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan was also launched at a pan-European conference in Russia, in St Petersburg, in 2006, organised under the Russian chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

The aims of any modern disability policy are expressed in the St Petersburg Declaration, adopted at the above-mentioned conference. I quote “to improve the quality of life, inclusion and active participation of people with disabilities in society, and to strengthen equal opportunities and non-discrimination”.

In this context, regions and municipalities are relevant. For persons with disabilities it is essential that spatial/regional measures are taken. All efforts taken to improve social services or the infrastructure always contribute to a more independent and self-sufficient life of persons with disabilities.

Disability is part of human diversity. The St Petersburg Declaration also expresses the fundamental paradigm shift taking place in society: “away from seeing the disabled person as a patient in need of care who does not contribute to society to seeing him/her as a person who needs the present barriers removed in order to take a rightful place as a fully participative member in society”.

Being “a fully participative member in society” means that people with disabilities and/or their organisations are actively included in the whole process of spatial/regional planning at all levels in the decision-making process.

So, finally, the CAHPAH wishes to draw attention to the important role that ministers and senior officials in the field of spatial planning play when it comes to improving the quality of life of people with disabilities in Europe. The right decisions in spatial/regional planning will help people with disabilities lead a more inclusive and active life.

Thank you for your attention and we do wish you well for your conference.

Ms Maria Ulfvarson Östlund

Head of Section, Ministry of the Environment, Sweden

Sweden supports the Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World.

Along with Finland, Sweden is the most sparsely populated country in the EU, with only 22 inhabitants/km². Sweden's population is concentrated in the southern parts of the country, and the northern parts have large areas that are very sparsely populated. Only 2 per cent of Swedes live in sparsely populated areas, situated more than 45 minutes by car from an urban area with a population of at least 3 000. Rural areas in Sweden vary widely in the different parts of the country.

Basic infrastructure in the form of communications and a good basic level of services is crucial to favourable development in rural areas. A good level of service both public and private cannot in turn be maintained without an adequate population base. Some rural areas have experienced extensive depopulation, which has also led to a deterioration in the range of services on offer. This is together with all the other concerns something CEMAT has to take in to consideration in future and continued work.

Sweden has had the presidency of the Council of the European Union during the second half of 2009. The Swedish presidency's vision was a strong and effective Europe to meet the biggest and most important challenges, namely the economy, employment and climate issues.

These challenges together with issues concerning energy and infrastructure influence land-use planning and spatial structure in Sweden.

The Swedish Government has just presented to the Swedish Riksdag a bill on the new Planning and Building Act. The Swedish Planning and Building Act regulates the planning of land and water as well as building.

Sweden would like to express its gratitude, and thank you for this fantastic conference in Moscow – the 15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT).

IV. Synthesis of national reports

Synthesis of the 15th CEMAT national reports

Preparation of the Moscow Declaration

*Document prepared by Mr Jacques Robert
Expert consultant of the Council of Europe*

Introduction

During the period 2007-10, under the presidency of the Russian Federation, CEMAT has devoted its activities to the new challenges facing territorial development in Europe. Some 10 years after the adoption in Hannover of the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent”, it seemed appropriate to realise a survey among member states aiming at identifying the global evolution of territorial structures and imbalances in recent years, the territorial impacts of emerging and growing challenges and the related driving forces and, finally, the evolution of territorially significant policies. The results of the survey form an essential source of inspiration for the CEMAT Moscow Declaration (to be adopted on 9 July 2010). The survey was carried out in 2009 and early 2010. The following member countries had submitted a national report to the CEMAT secretariat at the requested deadline of 29 March 2010: Armenia, Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and Ukraine.⁴

1. Global evolution of territorial structures and imbalances over the past five years

Demographic evolution

As demographic structures change rather slowly, the impact of changes is long lasting. Europe is now entering a period in which demographic factors are likely to become critical and strategic. Low birth rates during several decades in numerous countries result now in population ageing in a global context where migration flows, especially international ones, are growing

4. These national reports and the national reports received after this date are available on the Council of Europe CEMAT website: www.coe.int/CEMAT in the section ministerial conferences – National reports 15 CEMAT.

significantly. Within individual countries, disparities in demographic processes are often significant.

A first contrast can be observed between the countries where the population is globally growing and those where it is declining. Population decline in recent years has been affecting countries like Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, the Russian Federation and Ukraine. In various countries, the population is stable or slightly growing, such as in Armenia, Czech Republic, Finland and Slovakia. Some countries show clearer trends of population growth, such as Austria, France, Ireland and Norway. In Austria and Norway, immigration is the main factor of demographic dynamics, while in France the increase in birth rates plays a significant part too. In a number of countries, which have been lastingly affected by emigration, the migration balance has recently become positive, such as in Armenia, Croatia, Slovak Republic and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”.

Demographic contrasts between regions are, however, stronger than those prevailing between countries. Polarisation processes can be observed in numerous countries, with a number of regions attracting more and more people and others being affected by population decline and emigration. The most important factor of discrimination, in this respect, is the level of urbanisation in the regions. Regions with large cities, especially capital cities, are more inclined to attract population, especially the younger qualified population groups, while remote rural areas are rather prone to lose inhabitants. Rural-urban migrations can be observed in Armenia, Croatia, Czech Republic, eastern Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”. In Poland, however, it is reported that cities have generally lost inhabitants (emigration, negative natural balance) while the population of the countryside has increased (positive natural balance and low migration volume). In Ukraine, the deep demographic depression, which has lastingly affected the country, has not left potential in rural areas for further migration towards the cities. The level of urbanisation is, however, not the only factor explaining the demographic disparities between regions. The geographic location and accessibility, the economic structure, the attractiveness are also important factors. Numerous regions along the eastern EU borders are subject to negative demographic trends (eastern Latvia, eastern Poland, eastern Slovakia, and eastern Hungary). The same processes can be observed to countries farther in the east or south-

east of the continent, such as the Russian Federation, Ukraine and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”. Regions with industrial reconversion problems (north and north-east of France, north-east of Hungary, eastern regions of Ukraine) are generally losing population in relation to the decline in employment. It can also be observed that regions with attractive natural characteristics are gaining population through the development of the tourist and residential economy. Numerous coastal regions and mountain valleys belong to this category.

Population ageing is probably the most important common feature of demographic trends in Europe. The average median age of the population is growing in most countries and this trend is likely to continue and even intensify over the coming decades. There are, however, significant differences in the intensity of the ageing process between countries and even more between regions. Population ageing in Armenia, France and Norway is less advanced than in numerous other countries such as Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia and Ukraine. At regional level, population ageing is generally particularly strong in remote rural areas, which have lastingly been subject to emigration (Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, eastern “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, east German regions, Great Plain of Hungary, regions of eastern Poland, various regions of the European part of the Russian Federation). There are, however, situations where population ageing is also very advanced in metropolitan areas. This is the case in Budapest and Bratislava.

Changes in the demographic characteristics of Europe, especially the ageing and internationalisation processes of the population, are likely to have strong impacts for numerous public policies (employment, health care, social and cultural policies).

Economic evolution

Economic disparities within Europe are still significant. Despite the strong catching up process in the central and east European countries during the decade preceding the economic crisis, the west-east slope in terms of GDP/head remains steep. Within the countries themselves, the regional disparities have generally been growing, more strongly, however, in central and eastern than in western Europe. A reduction of regional disparities in recent years is only reported in Norway and in the Russian Federation. Globalisation favours economic growth in metropolitan regions much more than in regions

only endowed with small and medium-sized towns. The urban-rural divide in terms of economic growth prevails in practically all countries. There are, however, other factors of differentiation in the field of regional economic performance, which add their effects to the preceding ones. In central and eastern Europe, the western border regions generally perform much better than the eastern ones. This can be seen in Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and Ukraine). In the Russian Federation, the oil and gas producing regions have been performing as well as large metropolitan areas. In Germany, beside metropolitan areas, employment has also progressed in various areas without large cities (north-western regions, various Bavarian regions). The knowledge economy concentrates, in all countries, in large metropolitan regions, especially in capital cities, as well as in various second-rank cities with universities and research institutions (such as Łódź, Cambridge, Montpellier and Karlsruhe). In the Russian Federation, the “science towns” and the “special zones for technological development” are worth being mentioned. With a few exceptions, the knowledge economy strengthens the process of territorial economic polarisation. There are various categories of lagging regions, primarily the remote rural regions and the regions of industrial reconversion. In both cases, the main handicap is the lack of economic diversification. In addition, a number of regions concerned suffer from insufficient accessibility and from peripherality. Lagging rural areas are often situated in mountainous regions (Armenia, Austria, Croatia, France, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”), but can also be found in plain and hilly landscapes (Latvia, eastern Poland, Great Plain of Hungary, eastern Germany, northern regions of the Russian Federation). Regions of industrial reconversion are frequently based in regions which were well endowed with raw materials (coal and lignite deposits, iron ore, etc.). Many are located along the European coal belt, stretching from northern France to Upper Silesia. Other regions with weakly competitive manufacturing activities are to be found in north-eastern Hungary, in north-eastern Estonia, in the east of Ukraine, in various parts of the Russian Federation as well as along the coasts, where shipbuilding activities are concentrated. More recently, the globalisation process has affected a large number of regions with labour-intensive activities using low or medium-level technologies. The main sectors concerned are textile, electro-technical, electronic and mechanical engineering. Corresponding activities are rather widespread throughout the European territory. Industrial reconversion

processes have a longer history in western Europe than in central and eastern Europe, where they, however, boomed during the transition period

Numerous regions in Europe benefit from the tourist and residential economy. Beside highly attractive regions where tourism is the major source of revenue (coastal regions, Alpine mountains), soft tourism is becoming a complementary source of income in a growing number of regions with high-value natural and cultural heritage and attractive landscapes. While these activities are rather well developed in western Europe, a number of regions of central and eastern Europe and of the Russian Federation are progressively catching up, especially those with sufficient accessibility. The increasing number of retirees and of self-employed persons favours the development of the residential economy in attractive areas, sometimes far away from large cities. Social transfers (pensions, social allowances) contribute more and more to some forms of territorial equalisation, to the benefit of a number of less developed areas. This trend is, however, stronger in western than in central and eastern Europe, because the volume of social transfers is substantially larger.

Significant evolutions of the settlement systems

The evolution of settlement systems in Europe is a complex process. Although the driving forces shaping the process of urbanisation show significant similarities among the various countries and regions, they apply their influence in regional contexts, which are rather different. The urbanisation process has not been homogeneous, time wise, throughout Europe. In some regions, it started considerably earlier than in others, so that the present picture of settlement systems reflects different historic trajectories. In addition to this, the countries of central and eastern Europe and the Russian Federation have inherited urban settlements, which had been significantly influenced by the policies of the communist era. A patchwork of heterogeneous situations results from this. At both extremes, one finds on the one hand regions with significant flows of peoples leaving the large cities, especially the core areas, to settle rather far away in small or medium-sized cities, even when keeping their professional activities in the large cities and, on the other hand, regions where rural-urban migrations are still significant and contribute to accelerating the urbanisation process.

Against this background, a major common driver is the move towards the knowledge economy under the influence of the globalisation process, which

leads to the accelerating growth of large metropolitan areas, especially the capital cities. This process can be observed in western as well as in eastern Europe. For instance, in Norway, the major cities of Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger and Trondheim are growing more rapidly. The growth is also spreading towards small and medium-sized towns. In France, the population of large metropolitan areas, such as Paris, Lille, Lyons, Marseilles or Strasbourg is growing. In Germany, growth and innovation areas are mainly the metropolitan regions and other important agglomerations, especially in the western regions. In Austria, city regions are becoming the growth poles of the economy. Also in Finland, the main poles of Helsinki, Turku, Tampere and Oulu contain a major part of the growth. In central and eastern Europe, the process of metropolitan growth is even stronger than in western Europe, reflecting a catching up process, which started during the transition period. This is particularly obvious in countries with a strongly monocentric settlement pattern dominated by the capital city: Croatia (Zagreb), Armenia (Yerevan), Czech Republic (Prague), “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (Skopje), Hungary (Budapest), Latvia (Riga), Estonia (Tallinn) and Slovakia (Bratislava). In countries with a more polycentric urban structure, growth is generally better distributed among various large cities, as it is for instance the case in Poland (Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, Poznań, the Górnośląska conurbation, Gdańsk-Sopot-Gdynia and Łódź) and in the Russian Federation (Moscow, St Petersburg, Belgorod, Krasnodar and others).

Urban growth, in terms of population, is, however, not limited to the metropolitan regions (which includes also a number of small and medium-sized towns). It has been observed in a number of cases that medium-sized urban entities, although distant from metropolitan areas, may exhibit population increases. In France, for instance, a number of medium-sized towns benefit from inter- and intra-regional migration flows, sometimes because of specific attractiveness (coastal areas or mountain valleys). In Austria, urban settlements in regions with significant tourism and competitive agriculture are also progressing in terms of wealth and population. In Armenia, the return of emigrants favour the development of medium-sized towns with high attractiveness (Tsakhadzor, Hanqavan). In central and eastern Europe, the number of medium-sized and smaller towns is generally significant, but these are too weak in relation to the functions of the capital cities for enabling the development of an autonomous and sustained growth process. This can be observed for instance in Croatia or in Hungary.

The segments of the settlement systems, which are subject to decline, are generally to be found in the remote, badly accessible rural areas and peripheral regions. In Armenia, most settlements in mountain and border regions are declining. In Hungary, a significant population loss has taken place in numerous former agricultural market towns of the Great Plain. In Norway, peripheral towns and districts are declining. The same process affects small rural settlements in eastern Germany. The peripheral settlements of northern and eastern Finland are also affected by population decline. This raises the question of how to maintain the services of general interest.

Various old industrial towns are also subject to decline (such as in the north-east of Hungary, in the eastern regions of Ukraine or in the North-Bohemian regions in the Czech Republic). A relatively new trend is the population decline of various large cities in a number of countries. In Germany, this applies to large agglomerations in the eastern *Länder*. In the Russian Federation, the number of cities with over 1 million inhabitants is falling. In Ukraine, only five regional agglomerations showed positive demographic trends during the period 2001-08. The others were declining. The strongest decline was observed in Ternopil, Sumy and Kherson. With regard to the acceleration of population ageing and the existing or expected population decline in a growing number of countries, the management of urban decline will become a new and challenging task for public policies throughout Europe.

Looking at the evolution at the scale of metropolitan and other urban regions, the most striking common phenomenon has been, in the past years, that of suburbanisation. The process is generally one of concentrated de-concentration, with concentration of population in metropolitan areas viewed at a larger scale and de-concentration from the metropolitan core area towards the outskirts when examined on a smaller scale. This trend is common to western and eastern Europe. It affects particularly Vienna in Austria, Helsinki, Turku and Tampere in Finland, Zagreb in Croatia, Prague, Brno and Ostrava in the Czech Republic, Bordeaux, Montpellier, Toulouse in France, Skopje in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Riga and Daugavpils in Latvia, the Oslo conurbation in Norway, Warsaw, Gdańsk, Poznań, Wrocław and Cracow in Poland, Bratislava and Kosice in Slovakia, and Tallinn and Tartu in Estonia. In the Russian Federation, suburbanisation is still modest due to various constraints (climate, transport, etc.). New villa communities

emerge, however, especially around Moscow and St Petersburg. In addition, new satellite developments are planned near large Russian cities.

Even in the context of metropolitan growth, it happens that the population of the core urban areas declines. This happens rather frequently in countries of central and eastern Europe, where the process of re-urbanisation has hardly started, as is the case in the Czech Republic, in Riga (Latvia) or in various large Polish cities. Similar trends are also reported in western Europe, for instance in France.

The progress of suburbanisation, associated, in a number of cases, with the depopulation of core areas, is raising concerns with regard to the sustainability of urban development, especially the increase of traffic flows and the consumption of valuable agricultural land or of nature areas. Population ageing and the related decline of population, the interest of aged population groups in more urbanity, better access to services and cultural life, and the need to curb greenhouse gas emissions are now converging towards the shaping of more compact cities, mainly through redevelopment measures, through the development of public urban transport and through the improvement of the quality of life in cities.

Significant evolutions of rural areas

The most common trend with regard to rural areas, reported by most countries, is their growing economic diversification. The main factor of differentiation in rural trajectories is the location of the respective rural areas in relation to large cities. Other factors play an additional part, such as the natural conditions (soil, climate) for agricultural production and the endowment of factors of attractiveness (natural and cultural heritage, climate, availability of services, etc.). The process of economic diversification of rural areas is generally more advanced in western Europe than in central and eastern Europe, where it started just at the end of the transition period. There, rural areas are in general more dependent upon agriculture. Despite this difference, three categories of rural areas can be distinguished in western as well as in central and eastern Europe: those which are directly under the influence of large cities; those which are remote and peripheral with a weak settlement structure; and, finally, those which are in-between and may be rather diverse in nature. The first category is generally the one with the best economic performance and with the most diversified economic structure (agriculture, SMEs, services, commuters to

cities, etc.). They are, however, subject to growing suburbanisation and to significant pressures on the environment (increasing traffic, destruction of natural areas, reassignment of agricultural land, etc.). This evolution can be observed in Armenia in the surroundings of Yerevan, in Austria around Vienna and along main transport corridors, in Croatia around Zagreb, in the Czech Republic around various large cities, in France in the surroundings of larger agglomerations, in the surroundings of Polish cities, in the green belts around large Russian cities, and in the surroundings of Bratislava. Paradoxically, the performance of agriculture in areas close to large cities is generally very satisfactory. This is due to the proximity of large consumer markets, enabling small agricultural holdings to be highly productive.

The most remote and peripheral rural areas, without significant cities in their surroundings, are generally subject to marginalisation and depopulation. This is observed in the mountainous areas of Armenia, in northern Lower Austria and in southern Burgenland, in the border areas of the Czech Republic, in a significant number of French rural areas with poor accessibility and an ageing population (Auvergne, Limousin, Lorraine, Normandy, Brittany, etc.), in the mountainous areas of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, in some eastern German regions, in eastern Hungary as well as in southern Transdanubia, in eastern Latvia, in numerous Norwegian regions (north, west, south-east and the interior), in eastern Poland, in Russian rural regions with unfavourable climatic and soil conditions, in the Slovak border regions of Banska Bystrica and Nitra, and in numerous Ukrainian rural regions. In this category, some rural regions are facing specific challenges, as for instance in various Hungarian rural regions with Roma and other ethnic minorities and numerous deprived rural settlements, or the north of Norway with its sparse population and long distances between settlements and small labour markets.

The third category of rural areas, located between the two other ones, is rather heterogeneous in character. It shows, however, interesting dynamics, also for rural areas that are not under direct metropolitan influence. A number of these areas exhibit the development of productive and competitive agriculture (North Mazovia/Podlasie in Poland) or of tourism (Armenia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Norway, mountainous and coastal areas of Poland, Slovak Republic). In Norway, the economic diversification of rural areas has a long tradition. It started one century ago with hydroelectricity and related metal and chemical industries. The coastal areas benefited from fishing, aquaculture,

shipbuilding and tourism. In France, the so-called “new countryside” is subject to revitalisation thanks to the tourist and residential economy. Such areas can be found in south-eastern France, along the Atlantic coast and along the French-Spanish border as well as in Corsica. In various cases, the residential and tourist economy is, however, not sufficient to counterbalance the decline of industrial and agricultural activities.

Various factors will in the future continue to determine changes in rural areas, such as population ageing, the increasing production of green energy, the further extension of metropolitan areas, the further liberalisation of trade in agricultural commodities on a global scale, the injection of exogenous capital into the rural economy of certain regions and, last but not least, the revitalisation policies for rural areas implemented in a large number of countries.

Issues related to the maintenance of services of general interest in rural areas will become more and more critical. Because of the diversity of situations, there is a need for individual and comprehensive approaches and strategies, in order to avoid growing imbalances between rural and urban areas.

Progress of transnational and cross-border territorial integration

Territorial integration across national borders means developing functional relationships similar to those existing within each national territory and overcoming the historic and artificial segmentation of the European territory, which has prevailed during long periods and has been particularly exacerbated by the Iron Curtain between western, and central and eastern Europe during the communist era. The permeability of borders is a key factor for the development and blossoming of territorial integration. In this respect, very heterogeneous situations prevail throughout Europe. With regard to political and administrative factors, the national borders, which have the longest tradition and highest intensity of openness, are those between the western European countries. The accession to the EU of a large number of countries of central and eastern Europe in 2004 and 2007 has greatly increased the permeability of their internal borders. With regard to the mobility of persons, the Schengen borders are also a significant constraint. In addition, the permeability of borders is also conditioned by natural factors, such as the existence of natural obstacles like mountains or seas, as well as by the existence of efficient transport infrastructure. The speed and intensity of cross-border territorial integration is also related to the importance of

historical and cultural factors. The regions where territorial integration has progressed most are those where large cities are situated close to the border. In a context of permeable borders, this leads to the emergence of cross-border urban agglomerations or to networks of cities.

Outstanding examples of the emergence of cross-border relations are Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai at the French-Belgian border, the urban agglomeration of/around Geneva at the French-Swiss border, the agglomeration around Bratislava at the Slovak-Austrian and Slovak-Hungarian borders, where suburbs of Bratislava have been developing recently on the neighbouring territories of Austria and Hungary.

Numerous networks of cities and towns have also emerged across national borders in recent years, such as for instance the networks of Upper Rhine cities across the German-French-Swiss borders (Basel, Freiburg, Mulhouse, Strasbourg, Karlsruhe and several medium-sized towns), the MAHL network at the Belgian-Dutch-German border (Maastricht-Aachen-Heerlen-Liège), the areas Miskolc-Kosice and Komarno-Komaron at the Hungarian-Slovakian border, the areas Debrecen-Oradea, Szeged-Timişoara and Bekescsaba-Arad at the Romanian-Hungarian border, the area Nakykanizsa-Zalaegerszeg-Szombathely-Graz at the Austrian-Hungarian border, and the area Valka-Valga at the Latvian-Estonian border. Along external EU borders and other non-EU related borders, permeability is generally lower. There are, however, various examples of progressive integration, for instance in the area Latgale-Vitebsk at the border between Latvia and Belarus, and in the area Nyiregyhaza-Zahoni at the Hungarian-Ukrainian border.

Territorial integration is also progressing along corridors with well-developed transport infrastructure, such as those linking Norway to Sweden (Oslo-Göteborg, Trøndelag-Jämtland, Nordland-Norrbotten), the corridor linking northern Finland to the Barents region in Russia, the Via Baltica through the Baltic States or the pan-European corridors being developed in south-east Europe, connecting for instance “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” to Greece and Bulgaria (corridors 8 and 10).

Major mountain areas are generally significant obstacles to territorial integration (Alps, Pyrenees and Carpathians). In a number of cases, however, integration is progressing across the mountains, such as for instance between Visoke Tatri-Zakopane at the Slovak-Polish border. Maritime borders have also a low degree

of permeability. In the case of straits or short sea distances, integration is also possible, as for instance between southern Norway and Denmark and between Croatia and Italy. The case of totally closed borders, making any form of territorial integration impossible, is rather exceptional. Examples are, however, the borders between Armenia, and Azerbaijan and Turkey.

Cross-border and transnational co-operation contributes significantly to the progress of territorial integration across borders. The numerous EU supported INTERREG programmes have significant impacts on normalisation and development of functional interactions across borders. Transnational initiatives like VASAB, the Baltic Strategy or the Danube Strategy are also significant in this respect. The constitution of cross-border co-operation structures at regional scale (euroregions) is an important prerequisite for the development of cross-border functional interactions.

2. Territorial impacts of emerging and growing challenges and related driving forces

Territorial impacts of climate change

There is evidence of the significant territorial impacts of climate change in all the countries surveyed. Globally, a distinction can be made between two categories of impacts: long-lasting impacts with structural socio-economic and environmental consequences in large parts of the territory (global warming, long-lasting drought areas, melting of permafrost in Nordic regions, modification of ecosystems), and extreme meteorological phenomena or natural hazards causing severe and sudden damage on more limited parts of the territory (floods, landslides, storms, whirlwinds, hail). Some impacts, like forest fires, are at the intersection of both categories. They are caused by long-lasting drought but have severe impacts at a more local level.

With regard to the first category of impacts, the decrease in average annual precipitation in the context of global warming is mentioned by a number of countries (Armenia, Croatia, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic), but changes in the seasonal repartition of precipitation are also significant in various countries, generally with drier summers and more rainy winters (Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland). Rather atypical changes can also be observed, such as the increase in average precipitation in certain regions (southern and north-western areas as well as the Sevan Lake Basin in Armenia;

north-western French regions; and a decrease in average summer temperatures in central Russia). Negative socio-economic impacts are reported by various countries, especially regarding the fertility of soils and productivity of agriculture (Armenia, Croatia, France, Poland, Russian Federation). Negative impacts are also observed in the field of environment (surface water quality) and ecosystems (destabilisation of forests, migration of species). In the Russian Federation, the melting of the permafrost is destroying the foundations and stability of buildings and facilities. This process is particularly acute in the northern towns of Nadym, Surgut, Vorkuta and many others.

Impacts belonging to the second category, although more local, are generally more intense and damaging, including threats to human life. The most widespread are severe floods. They are reported in Armenia (Ararat and Artashat regions), Croatia (hilly lowlands, valleys of the rivers Drava, Sava, Danube and Mura), Czech Republic, France (south-eastern regions), “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (regions of Skopje, Pelagonia, Strumica and Struga), Germany (Rhine Valley and north-eastern regions), and Hungary (flood plains cover more than one third of the national territory, especially along the valleys of the Danube and Tisza and of their tributaries), Latvia (Daugava Valley), Norway (lowlands of the south-east), Poland (Carpathians) and the Slovak Republic. Fires are the second type of hazards in order of importance caused by global warming and drought. They are reported as particularly damaging in Armenia (Yerenos Mountain, Geghil area), Croatia, Hungary, Norway, Russian Federation and the Slovak Republic. In addition, several countries mention increasing risks of landslides, storms, whirlwinds and hurricanes.

Positive aspects of climate change are mentioned only in the case of Poland (higher temperature of water, smaller incidence of diseases/low mortality in winter, energy savings).

The territorial impacts of globalisation

The globalisation process accelerates the economic transformation of territories and is both a constraint and an opportunity. It is supported by trade liberalisation and technological progress, mainly information and communication technologies. Globalisation finds its expression in the growth and transformation of trade flows, in the geographical segmentation of production processes, in foreign direct investments and in the short-term exploitation of regional comparative advantages.

At macro-territorial scale, globalisation has been a significant opportunity for the economic catching-up process of the countries of central and eastern Europe, which has taken place mainly under the influence of FDIs. Almost everywhere, globalisation is, however, generating an increase in regional disparities, which take place through the concentration of investments, mainly in metropolitan regions (knowledge economy, finance, services) and in a few other privileged locations as well as, conversely, through the closing down or relocation of activities which are no longer sufficiently competitive. The concentration of FDIs in metropolitan areas, especially in capital cities, is mentioned in Armenia, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Estonia, Russian Federation and Slovakia. In addition to metropolitan areas, globalisation favours investments in oil and gas producing regions (Russian Federation, Norway) as well as in regions with specific advanced manufacturing activities (motor car industries in particular) or with tourist potential.

The negative impacts of relocation and externalisation processes have already been observed for a long time in most west European countries, for instance in France (northern and north-eastern regions; more recently in Rhône-Alpes, Normandy, Brittany, the Loire) and in Norway. Relocation processes have also started in the countries of central and eastern Europe where the FDIs in cheap labour manufacturing industries are progressively losing their competitiveness, compared with countries with even cheaper labour forces (Asia, Ukraine, Moldova, etc.). The economic crisis seems to have increased the threats of expanding relocation processes, as it is reported by various countries (Czech Republic and Estonia in particular).

Globalisation generates a particularly significant challenge in the field of innovation to maintain competitiveness. This has induced the constitution of numerous clusters of enterprises in various countries, as is reported in the case of the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The development of transnational pipelines for energy transport (from the Russian Federation towards western Europe and Asia; from the Caspian region towards western Europe) is also a consequence of the globalisation process.

Territorial aspects of the changing energy paradigm and the promotion of renewable energy resources

Two factors are supporting a change of energy paradigm: on the one hand, the increasing prices of conventional fossil energy sources (oil and gas in

particular) resulting from the increasing imbalance between supply and demand on a global scale and the prospects of possible oil depletion in the medium term and, on the other hand, the need to rapidly curb greenhouse gas emissions generated by the use of fossil fuel sources. Conventional energy systems are based on heavy infrastructure and capital-intensive facilities, so that inertia is significant. The move towards a different energy paradigm is therefore rather slow, even in a context where new forms of energy production based on renewable sources are much more decentralised and less capital intensive. Additionally, energy production and distribution has largely been an activity of the public sector. Liberalisation and privatisation measures have modified the context in a number of countries during the past decade but major decisions remain publicly driven. The exploitation of renewable energy sources involves a very large number of private stakeholders, but the public influence remains significant for reasons of profitability. Public financial incentives are generally necessary to motivate private stakeholders to invest.

Energy systems are closely related to the territory. At the time of the Industrial Revolution, heavy industries developed in areas where coal deposits were available. Nuclear power plants are dependent upon the proximity of rivers or coasts for cooling purposes. The renewable energy sources are closely related to the climate (solar energy), to the presence of hilly or coastal zones (wind energy), to soil fertility conditions (biomass) and to the presence of mountains (hydropower).

All national reports show evidence of a move towards a new energy paradigm, which is less dependent upon fossil energy sources and is more sustainable in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. The measures taken are, however, in no way limited to the exploitation of renewable energy sources. Various countries report an intensification of energy savings, with sometimes interesting spatial aspects related to urban planning (for example, the “energy certificates for settlements” in Lower Austria). Conventional power plants are being modernised to increase their efficiency and reduce their emissions (Croatia, Germany, Latvia and Poland). New nuclear power plants are being built or planned (Armenia, France, Poland and Croatia). Co-generation plants producing heat and electricity are being built in various countries (Slovakia, Germany, Estonia and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”).

With regard to the exploitation of renewable energy sources, which is now widely recognised throughout Europe, the production of hydropower plays a major role in numerous countries. Some countries with mountainous topography, such as Norway, have a long tradition in this field. Various countries report the existence of additional capacities in hydropower potential and are planning new plants, either large or small-scale ones (Armenia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Latvia and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”). Most countries promote the development of solar and wind energy. In countries where geothermal energy resources are available, exploitation plans are being developed (Armenia, France, Poland and Slovakia). The production and exploitation of biomass and biogas are also becoming more and more generalised. A number of countries mentioned the need to pay particular attention to the environmental sustainability of energy systems based on renewable resources, in order to avoid environmental damages. This applies in particular to the location and size of wind or solar energy parks and to the production of biomass through intensive agriculture. The construction of large hydropower plants may also be detrimental to ecosystems. Various national reports show the importance of technological progress for more efficient and more sustainable energy systems. Examples are, for instance, the mixed fuelling of conventional power plants with fossil energy and biomass (Latvia, France), the development of tidal and osmotic power plants (Norway) and the emergence of clean coal technologies (Poland).

*Territorial aspects of immigration and social polarisation
and related integration policies*

Growing social disparities in society are observed in most European countries. They are mainly related to the transformation of the economy (growing importance of the knowledge society and of advanced services, and reduction of the amount of medium-level skills needed by the labour market), and to increasing immigration (with generally low-skill levels and cultural differences making integration more difficult).

In general terms, the process of social polarisation is more advanced in the western European countries than in central and eastern Europe, because it started earlier (especially with regard to immigration). The countries of central and eastern Europe are, however, facing increasing problems due to the fact that the transition period and the following economic catch-

up courses have generated a growing social segmentation and left behind numerous unemployed people. In addition, numerous ethnic minorities exist in these countries, which are threatened by growing marginalisation.

Social polarisation generally has a very strong territorial impact resulting in social segregation. It is mainly in large cities that the highest levels of social polarisation are observed, driven by immigration flows (Croatia, France, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Russian Federation). In various countries, the number of problematic urban neighbourhoods (located either in the core cities or in the immediate urban outskirts) is growing, and are often characterised by multiple deprivation. The process of urban sprawl also contributes to a growth in social segmentation; however, with different impacts according to the countries concerned. In western Europe, numerous less well-off groups leave the core areas of cities because of increasing house prices, transferring precariousness and poverty to the surrounding areas (as observed for instance in France). In central and eastern Europe, young families belonging to higher income groups are leaving the core cities and settling in suburban areas with a better living environment.

Poverty and marginalisation are, however, also frequent in specific rural areas, especially in central and eastern Europe. In numerous cases, the areas concerned are inhabited by ethnic minorities (Roma and others) confronted with high unemployment, very low income and difficulties in access to services, health care and higher education. Rural poverty and marginalisation is observed in Armenia, Czech Republic, Hungary (small villages near the northern and southern borders) and Poland (region of the Warmia Lakes and Mazury, and the Świętokrzyskie mountains). In western Europe, rural poverty also exists in a number of regions, but to a lesser extent.

Policies addressing social polarisation and aiming at strengthening social integration are applied in most European countries and are rather diverse in character. It has been recognised that a combination of national policies and of more local policies is necessary. In addition, comprehensive policies addressing at the same time various issues of social integration are considered as more efficient. With regard to national policies, those that are reported to contribute most to social integration are: employment, housing, health care and social welfare policies, as well as support policies for urban redevelopment and rehabilitation. Interesting examples include the housing

and urban renewal policy in the city of Vienna (property developers' competition, experimental projects), the Joint Inclusion Memorandum signed in 2007 between Croatia and the EU, the policy of cities in France, the German programme Urban Districts with Special Development Needs – A Socially Integrated City, the Hungarian programme for the most disadvantaged micro-regions and the OXLO policy for Oslo.

Territorial impacts of the economic/financial crisis (2008-09) and of national top-down measures aimed at boosting the economy

The economic/financial crisis of 2008-09 has strongly and lastingly affected European economies. In the short term, a number of economic sectors (construction, manufacturing and mining activities, banking and finance, tourism) were more affected than others. In addition to the reduction of employment in these sectors, the crisis has also generated impacts of a more structural nature, such as the reorganisation of value chains, including the acceleration of the transition towards the knowledge economy and the relocation outside Europe of labour-intensive activities based on low-level technologies. The real impact of such transformations will only become apparent in the medium term.

A decline in manufacturing regions has been experienced in a large number of countries, such as Armenia (Kotayk region), Croatia, Czech Republic (Most, Karvina, Chomutov, Teplice, Ostrava-Mesto, Frydek-Mistek, Novy Jicin, Sokolov), France (north-eastern regions, Normandy, Loire, Rhône-Alpes, region of Toulouse), Germany (industrial regions of west Germany producing steel and iron products, machinery, chemical products, motor cars and electro-technical products), Hungary (western regions), Norway (regions specialised in the production of wood, paper, metals and car parts, and in shipbuilding), Poland (the two old industrial regions of Łódź and Upper Silesia), Estonia (north-eastern region and Pärnu), Russian Federation (regions of Oryol, Ulyanovsk, Novgorod, Samara, Chuvash), Slovakia (regions of Banská Bystrica, Presov and Kosice). A number of tourist regions have also been affected by the crisis, for instance the cities of Tsakhadzor, Garni and Goght in Armenia. In Croatia, quite the opposite, the tourism sector proved to be stable and did not follow the anticipated negative trend.

The regions which were the least affected by the crisis were generally those which were less involved in international trade and where a large

share of employment is to be found in the public sector or in person-related services as well as regions with a more rural character. Examples are the southern regions of France, the east German regions, the less developed regions of eastern Poland or the rural Russian regions where agribusiness is well developed. The impact of the crisis on the structural transformation of value chains are mentioned in Austria, where it is expected that high-ranking locations in and near urban regions, and high-quality educational and research institutions will continue to expand. Generally, metropolitan regions, also affected by the crisis, are expected to recover more rapidly than less competitive manufacturing regions. With this in mind, a number of regions, especially in central and eastern Europe, feel threatened by possible relocations of activities (western Hungary, Lower Silesia and northern regions in Poland, regions with a narrow specialisation, and towns with a single economic mainstay in the Russian Federation). A specific territorial impact reported in Hungary is that the crisis has caused a slowing down of urban sprawl.

Most European national governments have adopted specific programmes aimed at boosting the economy in order to overcome the negative impacts of the crisis. Although the national programmes contain a wide variety of measures, they exhibit a rather significant convergence. The first common priority has been to safeguard employment in the short term in sectors considered as strategic, through the boosting of domestic demand, subsidies, allocation of loans and fiscal advantages to enterprises. Such measures are mainly sectoral in character (the best example being the motor industry) and have benefited the manufacturing regions, which are already rather well developed. The second common priority has been to speed up the development of all types of infrastructures through public investments (higher-level education and research facilities, transport infrastructure, social and health infrastructure). National public support has been given to the investments of local and regional authorities (urban renewal, housing enhancement of cultural heritage, refurbishment of buildings, etc.). While measures under the first common priority are deliberately short term in character, those under the second common priority combine short-term aspects in the field of safeguarding employment and more long-term structural aspects related to the improvement of the business and living environment as well as to the attractiveness of territories.

3. Evolution of territorially significant policies

Intensification of comprehensive approaches

A clear trend towards more comprehensive approaches to territorial development can be observed in most countries. However, there are in quite different fields of public action: legislation, regulations, decentralisation, elaboration of territorial development programmes at various scales, multilevel governance, involvement of private stakeholders, etc. Numerous examples illustrate the diversity of initiatives leading to more comprehensive approaches of territorial development.

At the highest institutional level, legislation is modified to strengthen vertical and horizontal co-ordination in various policies with territorial impacts and inter-ministerial commissions which are established to ensure synergy and coherence between the various national policies. This is explicitly mentioned in the case of Armenia.

A number of countries elaborate national strategies of sustainable and/or regional development, the implementation of which is based on comprehensive approaches. The countries of central and eastern Europe, which have less tradition in comprehensive territorial development approaches, are rapidly catching up. This is for instance the case with the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia for 2030, which will be the highest planning document in the country, with a comprehensive and integrated horizontal approach, providing a general framework and setting main principles, targets and implementation directions for social, economic and spatial development.

The regional development programmes supported by EU structural funds, which have financial impacts for various sectors (enterprises, innovation, research, infrastructure, rural development, etc.), are also considered a significant opportunity for developing more comprehensive approaches. In Hungary, the National Spatial Development Concept, the New Development Plan and the New Rural Development Strategic Plan for Hungary formulate messages and territorial priorities for the different sectors. They refer to territorial cohesion as a horizontal objective. In Poland, the objective of the new regional policy is to ensure an increased horizontal and multilevel co-ordination of activities at the level of the country and of the regions. It is recognised that synergy has to develop between the various public investments and that the sector-oriented approach, which has dominated up until now, has to be given up.

Decentralisation and regionalisation favour the emergence of true multilevel governance. In Norway, the spatial planning reform of 2009 made the regional planning system more efficient and powerful in a context of horizontal and vertical co-ordination. The regional government reform of 2010 strengthens the regional level of government and creates strong and committing alliances between the regional and national levels. In France, comprehensive approaches are applied to the Joint Multiannual Programmes for Project Development of the state and regional authorities, which are aimed at promoting the competitiveness and attractiveness of the territory, sustainable development as well as territorial and social cohesion. Similar procedures are applied for specific areas subject to economic restructuring, with approaches involving all partners.

Also outside the EU, comprehensive approaches are adopted in the case of national initiatives, which are relevant for territorial development. In the Russian Federation, the strengthening of horizontal and vertical co-operation takes place in the devising and implementation of national projects, especially in the sectors of health, education and housing policies, involving also regional and local authorities. The move towards a system of long-term strategic planning also reinforces comprehensive approaches. A specific department has been created within the Federal Ministry of Regional Development to co-ordinate long-term sectoral development strategies and federal targeted and departmental programmes. In Ukraine, new schemes for territorial planning are created for various regions, in which special attention is paid to trans-regional and cross-border aspects as well as to the specific development potentials (planning schemes for the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and for the Odessa *oblast*).

Comprehensive approaches are also applied at the scale of micro-regions. Examples are the inter-municipal co-operation in Lower Austria (59 micro-regions with a “micro-regional development concept” and a “micro-regional framework concept”). In Germany, the Demonstration Projects of Spatial Planning (MORO), supported by the federal ministry, aim at testing and realising innovative, spatial planning oriented strategic approaches and instruments involving co-operation between academics and practitioners of the local and regional levels. Micro-regional comprehensive approaches are also developed in Slovakia.

Territorial development strategies at a cross-border scale are, in the context of cross-border co-operation, also moving towards more comprehensive approaches, as mentioned by various countries (France, Norway and Germany).

Promotion of sustainable territorial development

The promotion of sustainable territorial development has increased in importance in recent years in a large number of countries. This generally accepted priority finds very diverse ways of expression and implementation, a fact demonstrating that sustainable territorial development is an ambitious task, involving many aspects of public policies.

In a number of countries, sustainable territorial development is embedded in the planning legislation (as for instance in France). Various countries have developed national strategies or programmes for sustainable development (Latvia, France) or have introduced the concept of sustainability in their national, territorial or regional development strategy. This is the case for the Czech Republic (Strategy for Regional Development), Hungary (National Spatial Development Concept), Poland (Territorial Vision for 2030) and Slovakia (Conception for the Territorial Development of Slovakia). In the national strategies, specific attention is generally paid to the balanced development of the settlement system based on the concept of polycentrism (Armenia, Norway, Poland and Slovakia).

At the operational level, sustainable territorial development is being promoted through a wide diversity of measures and initiatives, such as “Green Urban Development” (Armenia), “Area Sustainable Development” (Czech Republic), the development of high-speed railways and the promotion of public transport in agglomerations (France), the regulation of biomass production (Environment and Energy Operational Programme in Hungary), the promotion of high-quality housing, efficient services and job opportunities in less-developed rural areas (Norway), the integration of the maritime zone into the planning area (Poland), the enlargement of areas under nature protection (Norway), and the economic diversification of areas too dependent upon a single or small number of basic manufacturing industries (Russian Federation).

Innovative approaches to sustainable territorial development are also developed in various countries, such as the regional management bodies

in Austria (support for the implementation of projects developed by the civil society), the demonstration projects (MORO) and the development of indicators for monitoring sustainable territorial development (Germany), the elaboration of a handbook on territorial cohesion including the spatial interpretation of sustainability and the possibilities for its enforcement through practical examples (Hungary).

Policies aimed at strengthening regional competitiveness

The accelerating globalisation process generates increasing competition between regions, so that the strengthening of regional and territorial competitiveness has become a general priority of public policies throughout Europe. Numerous strategies and instruments are being used for this purpose. With regard to the levels and types of actions, it appears that national governments implement specific policies and measures to attract foreign investments (support for research and innovation, and for specific clusters, promotion of education and employment, and support to infrastructures) while the regional/local levels identify, organise and promote the endogenous development based on specific territorial potentials. Efficient strategies result in a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches, generating complementarities and synergy. EU countries benefit in addition from the support of structural policies, which also aim at strengthening regional competitiveness.

The training, qualification and re-qualification of human resources is considered essential for attracting modern enterprises using advanced technologies (Armenia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary). The promotion of the knowledge economy, research and development, technological innovation and innovative clusters is of equal importance. Support to clusters is specifically mentioned in Croatia, France, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia. Various types of infrastructure play an important part in the strengthening of regional competitiveness. That transport infrastructure contributes to improving accessibility is mentioned in the case of Latvia and the Russian Federation. Other types of infrastructure, which are more directly business related but equally important, are broadband networks, enterprise zones and technology parks (Hungary, Poland, Russian Federation). Various countries pay significant attention to the development of SMEs and to the improvement of their operating environment (Czech Republic, France, Norway, Hungary and Germany). More specific approaches are, for instance,

developed in Norway, with the relocation of national administrations from Oslo towards less-developed areas, with the aim to spread power and expertise throughout the national territory. The enhancement of landscapes in rural areas is also considered in Norway to be important in increasing the attractiveness and competitiveness of the territory (attraction of highly skilled manpower, and development of tourism and the residential economy). In the Russian Federation, housing policies and the promotion of public-private partnerships are also considered to be significant for strengthening territorial competitiveness.

Prevention and mitigation of the impacts of climate change

Territorial policy aspects related to climate change can be divided into two broad categories: those which aim to limit and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and those which aim to prevent and limit the damages caused by natural hazards and other structural impacts related to climate change.

It must first be acknowledged that a number of countries have elaborated a national strategy or a communication addressing the issues of climate change (Czech Republic, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Germany, France, Slovakia). In the French strategy adopted in 2007, it is foreseen that the elaboration of “energy-climate change” territorial plans will become compulsory for all agglomerations with more than 50 000 inhabitants. Germany in 2008 adopted a national strategy for adaptation to climate change, which is to be followed in 2011 by an action plan. Within this strategy, territorial development is considered as having a co-ordinating role in protecting, ensuring and sustainably developing the settlement, transport and open space structures, as well as natural resources and as having an important role in terms of concrete measures to be taken in regions and cities.

Strategies and measures aiming at reducing greenhouse gas emissions concentrate mainly on energy savings, the promotion of renewable energy sources, and the development of environmentally friendly transport systems. A number of other measures are, however, mentioned, such as the restoration of forests cut down during the 1990s (Armenia), the use of Agenda 21 for addressing issues related to climate change (France), the model regions (MORO) “spatial development strategies to combat climate change” and “climate change oriented urban development” (Germany), and the “climate change financial instrument” (sale of emission quotas) developed in Latvia to finance measures

aimed at the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (improvement in energy efficiency, reduction of emissions in transport, etc.).

Measures aimed at mitigating and reducing the damages caused by climate change include mainly preventing measures against flood (conception of flood retention areas, construction and strengthening of dykes, non-attribution of building permits in threatened areas, etc.). In Armenia, anti-hail stations are being constructed. In the Czech Republic, measures have been taken in the field of agriculture and water management (flood prevention combined with water supply). In Hungary, a particularly significant initiative was the Special Target Programme 2001-07 for the area between the Danube and the Tisza, which is endangered by drought and desertification. Structural changes have been promoted in agriculture, with the cultivation of drought-tolerant plants, the promotion of co-operatives and the use of renewable energy sources.

Measures and policies promoting territorial integration across borders

Territorial integration across national borders, which means normalisation of functional relationships after long periods of historic territorial segmentation, is an important task for public policies. With regard to the intensity of territorial integration across intra-European borders, there are still wide differences, with borders, on the one hand, where functional relationships have strongly developed over the past decades and others, on the other hand, where permeability and functional relationships are very low, with extreme cases of closed borders (between Armenia, and Azerbaijan and Turkey). A great variety of co-operation bodies, procedures and practices are at work throughout Europe to promote territorial integration. Co-operation structures at interstate level comprise bilateral and multilateral organisations. The co-operation commissions on spatial planning between Germany, on the one hand, and the Netherlands and Poland, on the other, belong to the first category. Multilateral interstate organisations for co-operation in large-scale geographical areas (Nordic Council for the Nordic region; numerous interstate bodies, such as VASAB for the Baltic Sea region) or in more limited transnational areas (Upper Rhine, Lake of Constance, Saar-Lor-Lux) belong to the second category. The statutory powers of such interstate bodies vary from case to case. Some of them have only advisory functions, while others are empowered to take or prepare decisions. Interstate co-operation for promoting territorial integration is appropriate for the development and

financing of large-scale projects, such as cross-border motorways or high-speed railways, location of power plants, etc. States are also involved in the management and financing of the EU-supported cross-border, translational and neighbourhood co-operation programmes.

Cross-border co-operation at regional/local levels has gained tremendous importance and intensity during the past decades, when it comes to develop harmonious cross-border relationships for the daily life of citizens and enterprises. A great deal of activities are carried out at that level: co-operation in the fields of agriculture, of sustainable socio-economic development, of tourism, of the management of natural resources, of culture, health and social care, of spatial planning, of risk prevention, etc. The numerous euroregions, which have been established along the borders of western and eastern Europe, play an important part in this respect. Within the EU, the EGTC (European Groupings for Territorial Cooperation) are elaborate institutional structures empowered to manage co-operation programmes.

Despite the existence of all these institutions, bodies and structures, territorial integration still faces constraints and obstacles in a number of border areas, which may result from poor accessibility, cultural and social differences, economic competition, etc. Promoting territorial integration across borders is a long-lasting task, which will require numerous efforts on the part of public policies in the decades to come.

Boosting the economy through the decentralised promotion of endogenous resources and new growth sectors

The economic/financial crisis of 2008-09 has been a particular challenge for regional and local authorities, which are confronted by numerous bankruptcies of enterprises and growing unemployment. A large number of local and regional authorities have taken initiatives, sometimes with the support of national governments, to safeguard and promote employment and to mobilise endogenous resources. Various types of initiatives have been taken. For example, the speeding up of the realisation of local infrastructure (education, childcare, health, social welfare, nursing homes, kindergarten, etc.) aimed at reactivating the construction sector and at offering better opportunities for citizens to combine family life and professional activities. The city of Vienna (Austria), for example, has invested a considerable sum

in such local infrastructure, and also in measures aimed at integrating young people into the labour market through the improvement of skills.

A second important field of local/regional initiative is the promotion of small businesses, for instance through the facilitation of access to credit (public guarantee, micro-credit schemes) as in Germany and Hungary, in providing real estate with advantageous conditions (Latvia), in developing enterprise and business areas, etc. The reactivation of the rural economy is also taken into consideration (for instance, through promotion of rural poles of excellence in France). Support to conventional and new forms of tourism is being allocated in Armenia (spa tourism, tours to vineyards, etc.). The promotion of energy savings and of renewable energy sources is considered important not only for environmental reasons in relation to climate change, but also because such activities are a new source of growth and job creation. Examples are to be found in the Czech Republic (“Green light to energy savings”), in Norway and Slovakia.

The decentralised initiatives of local and regional authorities to overcome the consequences of the crisis is a valuable complement to those taken at a national level, which are of a more sectoral character. Such initiatives have, however, generally substantially increased the level of public debt of local and regional authorities, a situation which will act as a budgetary constraint in the years to come and will strongly limit the volume of new initiatives.

Conclusion

The survey carried out covers roughly half of the member countries of the Council of Europe. It does not provide exhaustive results, but delivers information that is sufficiently representative in order to draw a number of useful conclusions.

Compared with the situation which prevailed in the year 2000, when the guiding principles were adopted, it appears that progress has been achieved in a number of fields pertaining to territorial development policies, especially with regard to objectives, approaches and procedures.

Most national reports show that the objective of sustainability in territorial development is high on the agenda. This objective is being implemented in rather different ways, encompassing the elaboration of national strategies for sustainable development, the introduction of additional environmental

considerations into the territorial planning documents of the different levels, the development and use of sustainability indicators in territorial development policies, etc. A major factor that has significantly contributed to the promotion of sustainability is the current debate on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Closely related to this, progress has also been achieved in a move towards more comprehensive approaches. Stronger awareness has been developed about interdependencies between a number of factors influencing territorial change and about the need to strengthen coherence and to generate synergies. The “institutional power” of sectoral planning is becoming more and more constrained in a significant number of countries to the benefit of more integrated area-based approaches, taking into consideration the peculiarities and potentialities of the territory. In some countries, there is still a resistance from the promoters of sector-based approaches, who struggle to maintain their planning and decision autonomy, but new institutional arrangements are progressively being established, which are likely to eliminate or strongly reduce, in the medium term, the risks of inconsistencies.

Promoting territorial integration across national borders has been pursued constantly and enthusiastically in all countries concerned, through numerous co-operation activities at all levels. It is now widely recognised that national borders should no longer be obstacles to harmonious and competitive territorial development. It remains, however, true that a number of national borders have limited permeability, constraining the efforts towards stronger territorial integration.

Progress is also quite general when it comes to mitigating the impacts of climate change and to promoting a new energy paradigm. These two issues were hardly addressed in the guiding principles. Their importance has been growing in such a way during the past decade that they are now at the centre of territorial development policies. Preventing and mitigating the territorial impacts of natural hazards and calamities (especially floods, landslides, forest fires, excessive drought, etc.) has become a widely shared priority of public policies at various levels. Similarly, territorial planning authorities pay considerable attention to the promotion of renewable energy sources, while ensuring the sustainability of their expansion, when the environment is threatened.

There are, however, a number of fields where territorial changes are not totally in line with the guiding principles and territorial development policies are

facing new challenges and difficulties. With regard to the balance of territorial evolution and especially of settlements, the last decade has confirmed the concentration of economic and population growth in and around large metropolitan areas, also involving numerous small and medium-sized towns in their expansion process. This happens often at the expense of medium-sized and smaller settlements in more remote locations. This process also results in badly controlled urban sprawl in the wider metropolitan regions, endangering nature areas and contributing to the spread of traffic flows. Further densification processes outside metropolitan regions are also taking place in valuable and attractive areas, especially along the coasts, and hilly and mountainous areas, often threatening valuable landscapes.

On the other hand, a number of remote rural areas and old industrial districts are still experiencing further emigration, population ageing and decline, and a reduction in jobs opportunities. Maintaining efficient infrastructure and services of general interest in these regions is becoming an ever-increasing challenge.

New problems are progressively emerging, which will require appropriate answers on the part of territorial development policies. Population ageing, in addition to growing needs for specific infrastructure and services, will lead to population decline in a number of settlements, sometimes on a large scale, with a growing number of empty dwellings and houses. Managing urban decline will require new strategies in various European regions.

Promoting territorial competitiveness in the context of accelerating globalisation generates an increasing dilemma: should the strongest regions be more substantially supported, by modern clusters, advanced services and performing research institutions? What would the price be in terms of regional disparities and what strategies should be adopted for the less-developed regions? Is there sufficient potential outside metropolitan areas to justify such an approach? Can a further expansion of metropolitan regions be realistically combined with a more polycentric settlement strategy in order to avoid over-congestion? The policy response to the recent crisis, aiming to boost the economy, has not elucidated the dilemma, but rather has often intensified it.

Social polarisation, especially in cities, driven by the growing knowledge economy and by increasing flows of immigrants, has already given rise to tensions, urban violence and increasing social segregation, with the

emergence of a growing number of problematic neighbourhoods, either in the core areas of cities or in their peripheries. Despite numerous efforts carried out by public policies, the issue of social and economic integration of disadvantaged population groups, especially in cities, but also in a number of rural areas with ethnic minorities, is likely to remain serious and will require new approaches.

Last but not least, the worldwide debate on climate change, which has generated a constructive but difficult international negotiation process, starting in Copenhagen in 2009 and to be continued in Cancún in 2010, is likely to have a significant impact on territorial structures, both in terms of constraints and opportunities. Drastically reducing greenhouse gas emissions will necessarily change numerous aspects and functions of daily life and of economic organisation (mobility, energy consumption, production processes, etc.) and of territorial organisation (transport, urban planning, energy production, rural development, etc.). Not only will innovation be boosted, but also concrete implementation on a wider scale of new systems and techniques. Considerable job creation and added value could be generated by the new “green economy”.

Tables

Table 1: Global evolution of territorial structures and imbalances over the past five years (approximately 2005-10)

Table 2: Territorial impacts of emerging and growing challenges, and related driving forces

Table 3: Evolution of territorially significant policies (1)

Table 4: Evolution of territorially significant policies (2)

Table 1: Global evolution of territorial structures and imbalances over the past five years (approximately 2005-10)

Demographic evolution	Economic evolution	Significant evolutions of the settlement system	Significant evolutions of rural areas	Progress of transnational and cross-border integration
Armenia				
<p>The migration balance of the country, which was negative during the 1990s, turned to positive after 2000 (stabilisation of the socio-economic situation). Slight population increase. Rural-urban migrations continue, mainly from mountain areas to lowland cities.</p>	<p>Significant territorial imbalances and strong growth of the capital city (building activities; knowledge economy). Regions exporting industrial products and mining areas were most affected by the economic crisis. Economic diversification in progress in regions with tourist potential.</p>	<p>Strong development of settlements in and around the capital city. Returning emigrants also favour attractive areas with high recreation and tourist potential (Tsakhadzor; Hanqavan). Decline of small settlements in mountain and border regions.</p>	<p>The economy of rural areas still largely depends upon agriculture. Positive development in irrigated areas and wine growing areas as well as in the areas surrounding Yerevan. Tourism becomes important for several rural regions. Decline of the rural economy in various mountain regions.</p>	<p>The country is particularly landlocked with no direct access to the sea and two out of four land borders are closed. Cross-border and inter-state co-operation is developing with Georgia and Iran in various fields.</p>

<p>Austria</p>	<p>Trends and perspectives show further population growth in the country, especially in the Vienna region and in Lower Austria (impacts of strong immigration flows). Western regions show moderate population growth. Southern regions as well as intra-Alpine regions/valleys are threatened by stagnation and decline. Population ageing is progressing in numerous regions, but less intensely in the capital city.</p>	<p>Rather strong regional disparities with stronger employment growth in recent years in Upper Austria, Styria, Burgenland and Carinthia, especially in agglomerations. Stronger productivity rise in Upper Austria, Vorarlberg and Carinthia. High concentration of knowledge economy in the capital city. West-east slope in the tourist economy: Alpine ridge, lake resorts of Carinthia, Upper Austria and Salzburg and major cities (heritage and cultural life)</p>	<p>City regions are becoming the growth poles of the Austrian economy. Urban settlements in regions with significant tourism and competitive agriculture are also progressing in terms of wealth and population. Greatest increase in built-up and transport surfaces in Lower Austria and Styria. Suburbanisation has progressed significantly around Vienna, causing increasing car traffic. Development of serious social problems in core cities, although some areas of the core cities benefit from their attractiveness for well-off population groups and are subject to upgrading.</p>	<p>Contrasting evolution of rural areas. The least favoured areas are the more peripheral ones in relation to metropolitan areas (northern Lower Austria, southern Burgenland), with higher unemployment rates and outmigration. Rural areas close to Vienna and along main transport corridors are performing better (especially north of Burgenland). Individual approaches and strategies are required for the rural areas.</p>
-----------------------	---	---	---	--

<p>Croatia</p>	<p>Croatia is a country with an elderly population and weak demographic potential. This is the result of several decades of insufficient birth rates and outmigration. The migration balance has now become positive, but it cannot compensate for the negative natural balance. Regional demographic disparities are significant, with strong urban-rural polarisation. There are strong differences in population density between the counties. The highest share of aged population is to be found in the counties of Lika-Senj, Karlovac, Sibeniĉ-Knin and Sisak-Moslavina. Demographic forecasts show an accentuation of the ageing process in the coming decades, which</p>	<p>The country has strong socio-economic regional disparities. The population, economic activities and income are all polarised. Depressed regions cover almost half of the surface of the country. The city and county of Zagreb comprise the most important economic core. Secondary cores are located in the counties of Split-Dalmatia, Primorje-Gorski Kotar and Istria. Depopulation in the periphery leads to a further decrease in working and development potential, making the present regional disparities even larger. The main development obstacles for a large number of counties lagging behind are: the weak population</p>	<p>In Croatia, there is a well-developed network of medium-sized and small towns relatively evenly distributed throughout the country. The functioning of a large part of them is too weak in relation to the functions of the capital Zagreb and of several coastal cities. The issue of access to services of general interest is therefore very topical. A de-concentration and relocation process of activities is taking place on the scale of urban agglomerations for reasons of operational costs, which may lead to the devitalisation of core areas. The national settlement system is dominated by the metropolitan area of Zagreb (1.08 million inhabitants) and the</p>	<p>Almost all rural areas in Croatia have been exposed for a while to depopulation and desertification. The war in the 1990s has aggravated the situation, with the exodus from the war-struck areas. Exceptions are the rural areas surrounding the metropolitan area of Zagreb, but they are more and more affected by urban sprawl. In the rural areas, agriculture is still the main economic activity. Farms are, however, very small and produce mainly for their own needs. The share in market production is very small. Economic diversification of rural areas depends first upon tourism. Such areas are located not only on the coast. Recently,</p>	<p>Croatia has borders on land and at sea. On land, its neighbours are Slovenia, Hungary, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro. The maritime border is with Italy. The nature and intensity of cross-border interactions are conditioned by various factors: historical, cultural and traditional links; the specific situation of Croatia in South-East Europe; and the EU membership or non-membership of Croatia's neighbours. Various policies contribute to strengthening cross-border interaction and integration: participation in various programmes of cross-border and transnational</p>
-----------------------	---	--	--	--	---

<p>could be one of the largest obstacles to future economic prosperity. The areas subject to depopulation and abandonment of land are those with a lack of endogenous resources and potential.</p>	<p>basis, unfavourable educational structures, the lack of economic power and of funds for development, low regional employment rates, inadequate accessibility and weak functions of medium-sized and small towns. Youth unemployment is high in the country. Entrepreneurship in the SME sector is insufficient. Tourism is one of the most important sources of revenue for Croatia. Although the largest part of tourist revenue originates from the Adriatic coast, continental tourism is ever-increasing (agritourism, sport, recreation in national and nature parks, culture).</p>	<p>three conurbations of Split, Rijeka and Osijek (together 0.7 million).</p>	<p>awareness has been growing about the potential for organic farming. The potentialities of the Slavonian-Baranja region are far from being fully utilised. The third element of key importance for the revitalisation of the rural economy is the development and accessibility of services of common interest as well as the expansion of the networks of transport and telecommunication and infrastructure. The rural development policy aims at promoting sustainable development while developing employment opportunities and improving living conditions.</p>	<p>co-operation and the development of pan-European transport corridors.</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>Czech Republic</p>	<p>During the past five years, all regions have experienced modest population growth, with the exception of Olomouc. The highest increase was recorded, in addition to the capital city of Prague and the central Bohemia region, in the regions of Liberecky, Ustecky and Plzensky. Inter-regional migration, which is the most important factor in the regional demographic dynamic, is mainly motivated by labour market considerations. The regions subject to strong population ageing and/or demographic decline are mainly remote rural areas, distant from urban agglomerations and from major transport networks, often situated</p>	<p>Between 2003 and 2008, GDP has been growing in all regions. The regions that are the most developed are the capital region of Prague as well as the regions of Stredocesky, Plzensky and Jihomoravsky. Prague, Brno and Ostrava belong to natural poles of development and the knowledge economy. They have innovation potential in various fields. These are followed by Plzen. Favourable conditions for the knowledge economy and innovation are also present in the regions of Jihoceski, Pardubicky and Kralovehradecky. The economic performance of regions situated far from development</p>	<p>The Czech Republic is characterised by a fragmented settlement structure with a high number of municipalities and a dense network of small and medium-sized cities. The country has only three cities larger than 250 000 inhabitants (Prague, Brno, Ostrava). The weakly urbanised areas of the Czech-Moravian Highlands and parts of north Moravia represent a particular challenge. Since 1998, there has been a continuous trend of growth in regional cities (above 100 000 inhabitants). Later on, this process has concentrated mainly on Prague. Brno and Ostrava at the expense of other regional towns. Suburbanisation</p>	<p>Rural areas are rather diverse and the areas are subject to different processes of evolution according to their location in relation to urbanised areas and development centres. Three main types of rural areas can be identified. The rural areas around large cities are performing best, but they are subject to suburbanisation. The marginal rural areas are particularly affected by decline and abandonment of land. These are mainly border areas and areas with "internal peripherality". The third category is composed of rural areas with average levels of development, good accessibility and recreation/tourist</p>
------------------------------	---	--	--	--

<p>in border or peripheral areas. Poor access and a lack of employment opportunities are the main factors leading to depopulation, abandonment of land and ageing of local residents. The regions most affected by population ageing are Moravskoslezsky, Zlinsky, Vysočina, Karlovarsky and Jihocesky. Population ageing is, however, a widespread process in the country. During the past five years, it has affected all regions with the exception of Prague.</p>	<p>poles and out of the development axes is generally weaker. Regions with the weakest economic performance are Karlovarsky, Olomoucky, Ustecky and Moravskoslezsky. In addition to peripherality, a number of the areas concerned are handicapped by economic reconversion, insufficient levels of education and the outmigration of young population groups. The tourist economy benefits mainly, in addition to the capital city of Prague, the intermediate countryside, with an average level of development, good transport accessibility and high recreation potential. Balneology (West-Bohemian spas) has a significant position in the tourist economy.</p>	<p>around large cities is progressing, affecting the small towns of the surrounding areas. As opposed to residential suburbanisation which develops mainly around existing settlements, new commercial premises are almost always built on greenfield areas, especially in the surroundings of Prague, Brno, Ostrava, Usti nad Labem, Liberec, Jihlavaz and Olomouc. A negative aspect of suburbanisation is that the built-up area, the transportation and technical infrastructure as well as service areas are not rationally used, thus investment and operating costs are growing. The majority of cities are not experiencing a massive suburbanisation process like that of Prague. The</p>	<p>potential. This category has specific development potentialities (tourism, agri-food industries, special local products). The potential for economic diversification depends, however, largely upon the proximity of urban agglomerations.</p>
---	---	--	---

		<p>inner-city areas of the large agglomerations are subject to depopulation as a consequence of suburbanisation and withdrawal of the socially stronger young residents. Commercial suburbanisation often causes the rise of brownfields in the inner-city areas, bringing considerable problems.</p>		
Estonia				
<p>Population is growing in and around the largest cities. The most intensive population densification has occurred in the closest hinterland areas of the largest cities (Tallinn, Tartu, and Pärnu) due to urban sprawl. Some 40% of the Estonian population lives in the capital region.</p>	<p>The main areas of economic development and employment are the Tallinn and Tartu urban areas. These have been the only two regions where the regional share of GDP has increased between 2000 and 2007. The two largest cities are home to most of the</p>	<p>During the past decade, only the largest cities of Tallinn, Tartu and Pärnu have retained their population and experienced relative population growth. The smaller county centres and towns have mostly experienced a decline in population during the past two</p>	<p>Rural areas characterised by more successful economic revival and relatively diversified local economies are located near cities (spillover of urban economies and urban-rural relationships). Rural areas crossed by the main transport routes or benefiting from specific advantages</p>	<p>Tallinn is the area with the most intense cross-border socio-economic interactions (link with Helsinki via an important transport corridor). Tallinn and Helsinki and their hinterlands have established a euroregion. The border cities of Valga and Valka (Latvia) have significantly</p>

<p>The most intensive population ageing and decline has taken place in peripheral areas situated far from urban centres, especially in the counties of Jogeva, Viljandi and Järva.</p>	<p>university education and knowledge economy. There were no regions affected by economic weakness or decline until the economic crisis. Tallinn, western Estonia (with the largest islands) and the south-eastern areas are influenced the most by the tourist economy. Some tourism progress can also be observed in the north-eastern region.</p>	<p>decades, with some exceptions (for example, Kuressaare and Haapsalu which benefit from tourist and recreational activities). The agglomerations of the largest cities are influenced by remarkable suburbanisation. No intensive depopulation or densification processes are visible in inner-city areas.</p>	<p>(tourism, higher population density, good soil fertility) are also performing well. Rural areas with a peripheral location and lower population density suffer most from the relative economic decline. Some settlements with relatively mono-functional economic structures are also declining. The same is true for mining areas in the north-eastern region.</p>	<p>tightened their cross-border interactions at the municipal level in recent years. The EU territorial co-operation programmes have significantly contributed to intensify socio-economic interactions across all borders. Territorial integration also intensified along the international corridors: Via Baltica (Tallinn-Pärnu-Rīga), Tallinn-Narva-St Petersburg and Tallinn-Tartu-Pskov (Russia).</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>Finland</p>	<p>Population growth is likely to end in the 2020s. Immigration is expected to continue. In the growth areas (mainly Helsinki, Turku, Tampere) the proportion of young people and birth rates are expected to be higher than the average. Demographic change will generate spatial planning problems with increasing numbers of empty dwellings and business premises in declining areas, while new construction is significant in growth areas. In depopulated areas, problems of maintaining infrastructure and services will emerge, while urban sprawl problems will intensify in the growth areas.</p>	<p>National economic performance has been strong, despite the peripheral location of the country, especially driven by innovation systems and high technology. Disparities between regions are increasing. Growth is concentrated in the main urban regions (Helsinki, Turku, Tampere, Oulu), while a decline in population and employment is experienced in remoter regions, both urban and rural. Finland efficiently exploits external markets (China, India, Russia) and benefits from the growing multinational economic area around the Baltic Sea. St Petersburg has the potential to become a global centre, which is</p>	<p>The winners in attracting population are the urban regions located within the reach of high-speed trains, highways and good flight connections. The advantages of scale are leading urban regions to networking and specialising. Occasional features, such as new industries geared towards growing branches or favourable public images, may bring out previously unsuspected success stories. Oulu has been an example of such development. Network relations and regional co-operation gain increasing importance for successful development of urban centres.</p>	<p>The population figures in sparsely populated areas are going down. A specific problem for maintaining the vitality of rural areas is that the urban network does not sufficiently cover the entire country. Problems are less severe for the rural areas in southern Finland and in Ostrobothnia (stronger presence of urban centres) than in the sparsely populated eastern and northern regions. The rural areas close to cities have the best opportunities of attracting businesses and residents. They will also remain strong in primary production, with good diversification potential. In rural development strategies, production based on highly</p>	<p>International transport corridors are essential for territorial integration (Nordic Triangle, Baltic motorway, etc.). Because of the long coastline, maritime motorways are also of primary importance. The coastal urban networks between Finland and Sweden are important integration areas (biggest concentration of industry, high-tech know-how and logistics in northernmost Europe). Improved co-operation between the central parts of Norway, Sweden and Finland open up possibilities to connect territorial potentials from the Atlantic coast to Russia. Interactions are intensifying between Finland and Russia, especially with regard to the development of the Barents region.</p>
-----------------------	---	---	---	--	--

	<p>significant for Finland. The spatial structure in northern Finland is influenced by the exploitation of natural resources in the Barents region (oil and gas).</p>		<p>qualified know-how is being promoted, such as dispersed production of renewable energy, mining operations and entrepreneurship based on the natural environment.</p>	
France				
<p>Quite significant demographic revival at country level with strong disparities between regional and especially sub-regional entities. Regions with significant population increase are those of south-west France, the Atlantic and Mediterranean coastal zones and the environs of the Paris agglomeration. The less dynamic areas are those of north-east France, the outskirts of the Paris Basin and the central mountainous areas. Regions with</p>	<p>In relation to the national GDP average, a number of regions have performed better in recent years (Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, Corsica and Limousin, as well as PACA, Poitou-Charente, Aquitaine, Lorraine, Nord-Pas-de-Calais), while others have achieved less positive results (Ile-de-France, Champagne-Ardenne, Bourgogne, Franche-Comté, Rhône-Alpes, Pays de Loire, Bretagne, Haute-Normandie, Picardy,</p>	<p>While large metropolitan areas are attractive for highly skilled people and employees, medium-sized towns also benefit significantly from inter- and intra-regional migration flows. Small, isolated urban entities are far less favoured by migration flows. The population of large metropolitan areas is growing (Paris, Lille, Lyons, Marseilles, Toulouse, and Strasbourg). A number of smaller towns also have significant population growth</p>	<p>Rural areas are characterised by contrasting evolutions, according to their location. Those located in the surroundings of agglomerations generally show strong population growth. Remote, badly accessible rural areas with ageing population are frequently subject to decline (Auvergne, Limousin, parts of Lorraine, Normandy, Bretagne, Burgundy, Pyrenees and Languedoc). A third category is the rural areas subject to</p>	<p>Cross-border interactions are significantly developing, especially along the northern and eastern borders of the country. Such interactions generate the constitution of cross-border agglomerations, as in the case of Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai or of polycentric urban systems, as in the Upper Rhine region (Basel, Freiburg, Mulhouse, Strasbourg, Karlsruhe and several medium-sized towns). The level of territorial integration along</p>

<p>decreasing population are those without a large agglomeration and with a declining rural or industrial economy. Most of these have weak economic diversification and low accessibility. The demographic revival somewhat alleviates the population-ageing trend. This is particularly the case in Île-de-France with an important increase in the young population and the outmigration of retirees towards attractive coastal and mountain areas.</p>	<p>Alsace). Disparities are somewhat alleviated by the redistribution of wealth (residential economy) which largely benefits the southern regions. The knowledge economy is concentrated in large metropolitan areas, especially those of Île-de-France and Rhône-Alpes. It is progressing, however, more strongly in other regions, such as Midi-Pyrénées, Bretagne and Alsace. The regions most affected by economic difficulties are the industrial regions of northern and eastern France as well as various landlocked rural areas. The regions benefiting most from the residential and tourist economy are those of western and southern France.</p>	<p>(in various coastal areas and valleys). Suburbanisation is progressing significantly in coastal regions of western and southern France, as well as around some large metropolitan areas (Bordeaux, Montpellier, and Toulouse) and generates environmental problems. Since 1975, core cities have been losing population to the benefit of surrounding municipalities, where a significant number of commuters live. Densification trends can be observed there, together with certain more distant rural areas.</p>	<p>economic revitalisation, called the “new countryside” (tourist and residential economy). They can be found in south-east France, along the Atlantic coast and the French-Spanish border as well as in Corsica. They generally have a positive migration balance. In such areas, tensions may arise between the endogenous population and the newcomers (housing and real estate markets, pressure on agricultural and natural areas, growing demand for services, etc.). In numerous cases, the residential and tourist economy is, however, not sufficient to counterbalance the decline of industrial and agricultural activities.</p>	<p>national borders depends upon the situations. It is particularly strong in the metropolitan region of Geneva, with a strong population increase on the French side of the border. It is much weaker in the region of Dunkirk. Along the southern borders, integration is limited by natural obstacles (mountains).</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>Germany</p>	<p>During the past decades, the country has been subject to significant changes which will have a strong impact on the future. The drop in fertility rates, combined with increasing life expectancy, is causing rapid population ageing. Such trends are only counteracted by in-migration. Although ageing and internationalisation of the population will concern all regions, population decline will not be general. During the next two decades, there will be a juxtaposition of growing and declining areas. Growing population associated with ageing will take place in the north-western and</p>	<p>The German regional pattern is characterised by strong economic disparities between east and west. North-south disparities are also noticeable (with the exception of Hamburg). Growth and innovation areas are mainly the metropolitan regions and other agglomerations, especially in the western regions. Employment has been growing in recent years mainly in large agglomerations, but also in urban and rural areas in north-west Germany and Bavaria. Most of the regions with declining employment are in eastern Germany, although some improvement can be observed since 2000. Regional policy measures benefit</p>	<p>The process of “declining towns” in Germany is closely related to demographic changes. In order to foresee which towns are likely to grow or to decline in future, the following indicators are used: total population change, migration balance, employment change, unemployment rate, tax revenue, and purchasing power. The results show that declining cities will most likely be concentrated in the eastern regions, but also in some western regions. It is remarkable that growing and declining cities are frequently located close to each other.</p>	<p>Due to the presence of a dense network of cities of various dimensions and functionalities, most rural areas in Germany are closely linked to urban areas and to powerful nodes of the settlement system. For that reason, rural areas are not identical to backward areas and many of them possess significant potential and are multifunctional (productive activities, residential functions, ecological functions, recreation and tourist activities, natural resources and renewable energy, infrastructure). Despite this, some rural areas are facing difficulties, especially in eastern Germany, due to the outmigration of young, especially</p>	<p>Cross-border and transnational co-operation with neighbouring countries and regions has a long tradition in Germany, especially along the western borders. Territorial integration has therefore significantly progressed with the neighbouring regions of Austria, Switzerland, France, Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark. Along the eastern borders (Poland, Czech Republic), territorial integration is less advanced, but cross-border and transnational co-operation are progressing well.</p>
-----------------------	---	---	--	---	---

<p>southern regions. Population decline, associated with ageing, will characterise the rural areas of the eastern <i>Länder</i>. An increase in population (positive migration balance) will occur in the cities, especially in southern and western regions, including also small towns. In the eastern <i>Länder</i>, population increases based on migration will affect only a few agglomerations. The demographic changes bring with them considerable challenges to various policy fields.</p>	<p>primarily the eastern regions as well as the western areas situated along the eastern border of the former West Germany.</p>	<p>female, population. Public policies in favour of rural areas are quite diverse (economic diversification, landscape enhancement, integrated approaches).</p>	
--	---	---	--

<p>Hungary</p>	<p>Persistent population decline has taken place in the country since 1981. Only minor parts of the country have favourable demographic changes. In recent years, population growth has taken place in the outskirts of major cities in the form of suburbanisation (primarily Budapest) and in the economically prosperous areas (Lake Balaton area, the Budapest-Győr-Székesfehérvár axis). This results from both internal migration and natural population growth. West Transdanubia also has a positive migration balance. During the past five years, the population has been</p>	<p>Regional disparities are significant in Hungary and have been growing in the past years. The most developed regions are central Hungary, and western and central Transdanubia. They have benefited most from foreign investments. Two thirds of industrial added value is produced in central Hungary and in western and central Transdanubia. The knowledge-based economy is strongly concentrated in the capital city as well as in university centres and regional poles. Progress can, however, be observed in Western Transdanubia, in northern Hungary and in the northern Great Plain. The economically</p>	<p>The Hungarian settlement network is monocentric. Middle-sized towns are decreasing. With the background of general population decline, the population of new towns has been constantly growing in the last few years. The population of the new cities has not reached 5 000 inhabitants and is not able to sustain proper management functions. These are located in the suburbs of Budapest. The highest population increase has taken place in the towns located around the Budapest agglomeration. The population of economically prosperous cities has also increased. On the contrary, a</p>	<p>Rural areas are very diverse in Hungary. Only those which are rich in natural, cultural and landscape values and those with good accessibility experienced positive development in the past decade. The more peripheral rural areas with a predominance of small villages and/or ethnic minorities or Roma show declining trends. This is particularly true for the eastern parts of the country, together with the territories of small villages of southern Transdanubia and northern Hungary as well as the eastern and southern border areas. The number of deprived and remaining-deprived rural settlements has</p>	<p>The revitalisation of natural catchment areas and of traditional socio-economic relations has been strengthened by EU accession. The intensification of cross-border relations can be observed predominantly at the Austrian-Slovakian-Hungarian and at the Romanian-Hungarian borders (increase of cross-border interactions and town networks, revitalisation of natural catchment areas). Cross-border accessibility has improved (Schengen border with three states, simplified border crossing with Romania) and the use of urban services has become easier. The main cross-border catchment areas</p>
-----------------------	---	---	---	--	---

<p>declining in northern Hungary, southern Transdanubia, and south-western parts of the Great Plain. The sources of internal migration are dominantly the backward areas of north-eastern and south-western Hungary. Population ageing has been constantly rising since 1990 and further increases are expected in the next decades. It is particularly high in Budapest and in other major cities and has significantly increased in central Transdanubia and in the Great Plain.</p>	<p>backward regions are southern Transdanubia, northern Hungary and the two regions of the Great Plain. Disparities have been increasing in recent years (investments, employment rate, GDP). Hungary has a long tradition in tourism. However, apart from Budapest and Lake Balaton, Hungary has no significant internationally competitive destinations.</p>	<p>significant population loss has taken place in numerous former agricultural market towns of the Great Plain and in the disfavoured old industrial cities of north-eastern Hungary.</p>	<p>more than tripled between 1995 and 2005, despite EU and national subsidies. The main handicaps to the development of rural areas are the lack of qualified manpower and the weak commuting facilities. The transformation of their economic structure is slow. The traditional productive sectors – industry and agriculture – are gradually decreasing. Rural tourism is progressively developing. Rural areas with small towns providing services perform better. The location in the country remains, however, the most determining factor. Western Transdanubia is more favoured in this respect than the eastern rural areas.</p>	<p>are: the Budapest-Vienna-Bratislava metropolitan area; the area Miskolc-Kosice at the Slovakian-Hungarian border; the area of Zahony-Nyiregyhaza at the Ukrainian-Hungarian border (still the most difficult to cross); the areas of Debrecen-Oradea, Szeged-Timişoara and Bekescsaba-Arad at the Romanian-Hungarian border; and the area Nagykanizsa-Zalaegerszeg-Szombathely-Graz at the Austrian-Hungarian border.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>Ireland</p>	<p>Population growth has been taking place across all regions and at a high level in the Mid-East and Midland regions due largely to growth driven by Dublin over-spilling into these neighbouring regions. Relatively slower growth has taken place in the Mid-West and South-West regions while the other regions have grown at rates which have approximately matched the overall national average. Two main broad areas have experienced decline: the most western areas along or near the seaboard and a broad central band running from Dungarvan in the south through Roscommon and Leitrim and into south and west Donegal.</p>	<p>The decade up to 2007 was a period of rapid national increase in employment terms. However, the distribution of this expansion was not balanced between regions. The slowest rates of growth occurred in the Dublin Region. However, the adjacent Mid-East Region, which has experienced significant commuting and other links to the Dublin Region, had high growth. Slow growth took place in the Mid-West Region, while the West Region has relatively high growth, showing that growth is not confined to the eastern side of Ireland. Growth in the South-West Region corresponded to the national average.</p>	<p>In the recent past, population growth has occurred most strongly in areas lower down the urban hierarchy, with slower growth taking place in the highest levels. The population share of the five gateway cities (Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford) has been declining. In absolute terms, however, they have been growing. The population growth of the four non-city gateways (Sligo, Dundalk, Letterkenny, Athone-Tullamore-Mullingar) was significantly higher than that of the gateway cities. This is due to the movement of population from the large cities towards very large catchment areas.</p>	<p>The share of population living in rural areas has slightly declined over the past two decades. The differential of growth between urban and rural areas has, however, increased during the period 2002-06. The regional variation of growth patterns between rural areas is less significant than between urban areas. The South-East Region stands out as having population growth in the countryside at a rate which is considerably higher than in other regions. Relatively low regional countryside growth rates were recorded for the Dublin Region and the Mid-East Region.</p>	<p>The level of connectivity between Ireland and Northern Ireland (cross-border commuters, trade flows, freight traffic) is relatively low. This low level of economic interaction suggests that there is considerable scope for developing new economic relationships and expanding existing linkages on an island of Ireland basis. Broadening and deepening such links would have benefits not just for the Border Region, but also for the rest of Ireland and Northern Ireland, by building larger local markets and creating a framework for the more efficient allocation of productive resources. In spatial terms, there is a momentum for</p>
-----------------------	---	---	--	---	---

				<p>enhancing the Dublin-Belfast corridor, strengthening the Dundalk/Newry link, building up the Letterkenny-Londonderry Gateway and improving markets and other economic linkages in the central sections of the Border Region.</p>
Latvia				
<p>The total population of the country has been decreasing since 1991, mainly through negative natural balance. The main demographic trend in Latvia remains the decrease of population due to ageing and outmigration. In recent years, the negative migration balance has been growing. This trend should continue because of rising unemployment. During the period</p>	<p>The Riga Region concentrates more than 70% of the national GDP. At the beginning of 2008, the highest unemployment rate was in the Latgale Region and the lowest in the Riga Region. Latvia is lagging behind in the field of the knowledge economy, which is essentially concentrated in Riga (connectivity, adequate infrastructure and</p>	<p>The population of Latvian cities varied considerably during the period 2003-08. Various towns (Balozī, Ikskile) had growth rates above 20%, while others (Viesīte, Līgatne, Ape, Vilaka, Aināzi) experienced a decline above 10%. Urban sprawl can be observed around the cities of Riga, Daugavpils, Jekabpils, Jelgava, Jūrmala, Liepāja, Rezekne,</p>	<p>With regard to population change, there are significant differences among the various rural areas. Over the period 2003-08, some had considerable population growth (Garkaine, Marupe, Olaine) while others showed significant population decline (Kaļincempīl, Ukri, Kepova). Generally, the decline of the rural population has been</p>	<p>Significant efforts are made to strengthen territorial integration among the Baltic States and, more generally, within the Baltic Sea Region (VASAB). Cross-border and transnational co-operation also favour integration across the external borders (Pskov and Leningrad <i>oblasts</i>). Along the Latvian-Estonian border, integration is significant</p>

<p>2003-08, the population decline was highest in the Latgale Region (bordering Russia and Belarus) and smallest in the Riga Region. In 2007, the population declined in all regions, except Riga which had a slight increase. Population ageing is rapidly progressing.</p>	<p>critical mass of human resources, presence of universities and research institutions). Other cities, such as Valmiera, Liepāja and Daugavpils also possess business development units, universities and research institutions. The decline of the Latgale Region is closely associated with the lack of employment and poor accessibility. During the past five years, the regional disparities have increased in terms of employment, but the welfare have reduced. The main regions benefiting from the residential and tourist economy is the Riga Region (cities of Riga and Jurmala), followed by the Latgale, Kurzeme and Vidzeme regions. There is unused tourist potential in the rural and coastal areas.</p>	<p>Valmiera and Ventspils. Suburbanisation started in the early 1990s and accelerated after 2000. Developments occurred outside the administrative borders of cities and towns up to 2009 in the form of uncontrolled sprawl. The economic recession has temporarily halted this trend. In the capital city, a double trend can be observed: movements to the core city (concentration) and towards the suburban areas. However, the core city is subject to strong depopulation to the benefit of the peripheries. Suburban areas frequently lack the required infrastructure and the associated services. They are characterised by increasing commuting to the city. Inter-regional commuter flows are also intense throughout the country. The</p>	<p>slowing down over the period 2003-08.</p>	<p>between the twin cities Valka-Valga. Efforts are developed to promote integration between the border areas of Latgale and Vitebsk (Belarus).</p>
--	---	--	--	---

		<p>development policy of the capital city favours compact urbanisation, the revitalisation of the degraded areas and the protection of natural areas.</p>		
Norway				
<p>An overall growth in population can be observed in all parts of the country, mainly due to net migration from abroad. The general trend is an increase in population in the centrally located municipalities, while more peripheral areas combine negative migration balance and birth deficit. The concentration of population does not seem excessive in a European perspective. Norway has managed to maintain viable communities of varying</p>	<p>Regional economic disparities are diminishing in Norway. The counties of Oslo and Rogaland had in 2006 the highest level of GDP per employed person and per inhabitant. Compared to previous years, most of the counties converged towards the national average, including the most peripheral ones of north Norway. Regional disparities also exist in the field of disposable household income and consumption, but they remain modest. The knowledge economy is concentrated in the</p>	<p>The major cities of Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger and Trondheim are growing more rapidly. This growth is spreading also to small and medium-sized towns in central locations, while peripheral towns, urban centres and rural districts are declining. Previously, migration from the surrounding municipalities enabled urban regions in peripheral districts to maintain their population, despite migration to more central parts of the country. As the population and birth rates of the surrounding</p>	<p>Only along the south coast (Aust- and Vest-Agder) is there a slight increase in the rural population. Rural decline is strongest in the counties of North and West Norway, in the peripheral parts of south-Norway and inland. Decline affects most villages and rural areas without an urban centre of some size, that are too far away for commuting and where the endogenous development factors are weak. North Norway faces particular challenges resulting from its sparse population,</p>	<p>Territorial integration across the borders of the country is constrained by several factors (mountains, sparsely populated areas, and maritime borders). Integration is most advanced along the major corridors, especially in the region of Oslo with the adjacent Swedish region (Götaland, Värmland). Other transnational corridors link Trøndelag with Jämtland in Sweden, Nordland with Norrbotten (Sweden), Narvik with Kiruna (Sweden), Finnmark</p>

<p>size throughout the national territory. The largest population growth takes place in the central areas of south-east Norway (Oslo and Akershus) and west Norway (Rogaland and Hordaland). The strong growth is caused by both immigration and high birth rates. A relatively young population is to be found in and around the regional centres and along the coast in the south and west of Norway. Some counties have had a domestic migration deficit (in north, west and inland Norway). Population ageing is limited by the high birth rates and by immigration.</p>	<p>metropolitan areas of Oslo and Bergen as well as in other cities with universities and research centres (Kristiansand, Stavanger, Trondheim and Tromsø). A few counties are performing worse (north Norway, Nord-Trøndelag, inland counties and Aust-Agder) but are not affected by general decline. Migration of retirees is not a widespread phenomenon in Norway. There is a slight migration towards the south coast. Retirees do move though to Mediterranean countries like Spain. In the fjord and coastal areas, the tourist economy is important, particularly in rural areas.</p>	<p>municipalities are now decreasing, numerous small and medium-sized urban regions in the periphery are experiencing stagnation and decline. Suburbanisation is widespread around major cities as well as small and medium-sized towns in centrally located regions. The city growth is absorbing the towns and villages, transforming them into suburban centres. The development is producing extensive housing and labour markets that are scattered over wide areas and generating large commuter volumes. This is particularly the case in the Oslo conurbation, around the cities of Stavanger-Sandness (Rogaland), Bergen (Hordaland) and Trondheim. Mechanisms for governing inter-municipal growth (urban sprawl) are not sufficiently implemented.</p>	<p>long distances between settlements and small labour markets. The economic diversification of rural areas results from numerous factors. Already in the early 1900s, the development of hydroelectricity made possible the development of heavy metal and chemical industries. The coastal areas benefit from the maritime industry (shipyards, oil and fishing). Fisheries and aquaculture are highly developed and their products are one of the largest export commodities of the country, in addition to oil and natural gas. Norway also has a rich tourist potential spread over the country. It is particularly important for the rural economy of the fjord and coastal regions of west and north Norway.</p>	<p>with Lappland (Finland) and Murmansk (Russia). The southern regions are connected by sea to Denmark, Sweden and Germany.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

<p>Poland</p>	<p>Depopulation, population ageing and migration mainly condition the demographic evolution of the country. In recent years, the population of Poland has tended to decrease, with significant differences between areas. Cities have generally lost inhabitants (emigration abroad, negative natural balance), while the population of the countryside has increased (positive natural balance and low migration volume). International mobility quickens the process of internal mobility.</p> <p>Inter-regional migration flows have been intense from the less-developed regions of eastern Poland towards the more developed regions of</p>	<p>The economic diversification of Polish regions has been increasing in recent years. Regional disparities have, however, been increasing, especially between urban and rural and reconversion regions. With regard to capital expenditure per head, the contrast is highest between eastern Poland with the lowest values, and central and southern Poland with the highest. The period 2004-08 has been characterised by a significant increase in the employment rate, although with strong regional disparities. Poland is still backward in the knowledge economy (R&D expenditures). The largest part of R&D</p>	<p>The inherited settlement system of Poland is characterised by a quite balanced polycentrism, although the western regions have a greater density of urban units than the eastern ones. The most important Polish cities that combine a high level of development, rapid growth and strong positive influence in their regional surroundings are, beside Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, Poznań, the Górnśląska conurbation, Gdańsk-Sopot-Gdynia and Łódź. Some urban areas (especially Szczecin) have developed more slowly in recent years. The cities most affected by various problems are mainly situated in the northern and central</p>	<p>The gap between rural and urban areas is getting wider, particularly with regard to GDP and productivity growth. The rural economy is still dominated by agriculture, especially in eastern Poland. In some regions, agriculture becomes competitive (North Mazovia/Podlasie). Economic diversification is, however, progressing, especially in the rural areas linked to cities, as is the case in western Poland. Rural areas in eastern Poland, with their scattered agrarian structure, low productivity agriculture and larger distance to large cities, face the risk of depopulation. They have, however, a development potential</p>	<p>Territorial integration is handicapped along the southern border by the mountains and along the northern border by the sea. Along the eastern border (with Russia, Belarus and Ukraine), integration is much more limited than along the western and south-western by the low permeability. In the western regions, integration is facilitated by the high accessibility of Berlin and of other German cities, while the western Polish border regions are generally distant and weakly connected to the national capital and to other large Polish cities. In these areas, individuals maintain close, daily cross-border relations. The potential for economic development</p>
----------------------	--	---	---	---	---

<p>central and western Poland, in particular towards large urban centres (Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, Poznań, Łódź and Katowice). Intra-regional mobility is highest in western Poland. Foreign immigration has started and favours the large cities and their functional areas, mainly Warsaw and Poznań. The largest decrease of population has affected the peripheral regions, especially the south-east of the country, where it has reached 20-25% of the local population. Rural areas of this part of Poland are affected by depopulation, resulting also in population ageing. The regions where population ageing is the highest are eastern and central Poland. The young population groups</p>	<p>expenditures concentrates in several centres situated in the economically strongest regions. Foreign investments, which largely contribute to technological innovations, are also concentrated in the most developed regions. The regions of eastern Poland, despite a significant improvement in the socio-economic situation in recent years, are still characterised by a low level of development, population ageing, lower education level, infrastructural backwardness, and poor access to goods and services. These regions are, however, heterogeneous, with areas performing well (Białystok, Kielce, Lublin, Olsztyn). Polish regions have a large</p>	<p>part of the Śląskie voivodship and in the southern part of the Łódzkie voivodship. The process of suburbanisation in Poland is mainly caused by the decline and degradation of city centres, which remain an attractive place to work, but not enough to live in. Concentration of population at the metropolitan scale generating suburbanisation trends concern the largest cities: Warsaw, Gdańsk, Poznań, Wrocław, Cracow as well as cities in eastern Poland: Rzeszów, Lublin, Białystok and Olsztyn. Suburbs are diversified and gain new functions. Commuter flows and environmental pressures are, however, significantly growing. In</p>	<p>resulting from the quality of their natural environment (agritourism, organic farming). Mountainous rural areas in south-eastern and south-western Poland as well as the seaside areas in the north benefit from substantial tourist income. In these areas, sustainable territorial development is a significant challenge.</p>	<p>represented by the proximity of German regions is not, however, fully exploited. Along the eastern borders, co-operation is starting with Lithuania and, with some difficulty, with Ukraine. The only Polish agglomeration close to the western border is Szczecin. Its economic development is, however, handicapped by its peripherality in the national context and by the proximity of Berlin.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

<p>tend to leave the rural areas. This may contribute, in the long run, to increasing regional disparities, especially at the expense of eastern regions.</p>	<p>share of areas of great natural value with significant tourist potential. The most attractive regions for tourism are the mountainous areas in the south as well as the seaside and the lake areas in the north. Agritourism is also developing. The relatively low level of retirees' income, the short life expectancy and the low mobility of retired people inhibit the development of the residential economy.</p>	<p>the western part of the country, urbanisation is undergoing a more rapid process of suburbanisation, shaping a network of towns of medium dimensions, intense migration from smaller towns to larger ones. In eastern Poland, a classic form of urbanisation is dominant, consisting of migration from rural to urban areas. Suburbanisation is accompanied by a decrease in population in inner-city areas, but only on a small scale.</p>		
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Russian Federation</p>	<p>Between 2004 and 2009, the total population of the Russian Federation declined by 1.6%. During that period, the population increased in 14 regions, remained stable in one region and decreased by more than 5% in 10 constituent entities of the Russian Federation. However, during the years 2007 to 2008, the rates of decline have slowed down. High natural growth of the population is observed in the North Caucasus and southern Siberia, as well as in the oil and gas producing areas of western Siberia (high proportion of young people). Natural population decline and ageing are being observed in a number of regions of the European</p>	<p>Socio-economic disparities between Russian regions are extremely wide, but are beginning to narrow. At the top of the ranking, in terms of GDP per head, are the regions dominated by raw material sectors geared to export (oil, gas, iron and steel, non-ferrous metal industries), as well as Moscow and St Petersburg, the economy of which is based on the services sector. The sector of the knowledge economy is most dynamic in these as well as in other large cities. The development of the knowledge economy is linked to the so-called "science towns". The Moscow region has the most science towns and the</p>	<p>The share of population living in small towns has remained stable in recent years. The number of cities with over one million inhabitants is falling (13 in 2003; 11 in 2005). Only Moscow has remained unaffected by this population decline. Population in the capital has been steadily growing. In recent years, the share of population living in large cities above 0.5 million has been growing. In a large number of regions, the regional capitals stand out in terms of dynamism and their level of socio-economic development. However, 40% of Russian towns have a single economic mainstay and are therefore vulnerable.</p>	<p>There are marked differences in the level and dynamism of socio-economic developments of rural areas in Russia. One important factor of differentiation is their location within the region: urban green belt or outlying. The situation has proved to be more favourable for agricultural production in urban green-belt areas, especially around cities, with the development of better production and of economic sectors linked with the servicing of <i>dacha</i> residents and city-dwellers having moved out for continuous summer residence. The second important factor of differentiation is that agricultural activity</p>	<p>There are wide disparities in the transnational integration of Russian regions into the world economy. At the top of the scale, there are highly developed regions with diversified and significant volumes of external trade. Besides Moscow and St Petersburg, this applies to the republics of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan and Sakka, Rostov, Samara, Novgorod, Nizhnyi Novgorod, the <i>oblast</i> of Sverdlovsk and the kray of Khabarovsk. At the opposite end, there are regions with poorly developed international trade and weak export potential. These are the kray of Zabaykalskiy, the <i>oblast</i> of Ulyanovsk and Penza and the republics of North Caucasus.</p>
----------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

<p>part of Russia (central and north-west federal districts). These regions have also got a negative migration balance. The most attractive regions for migrants are the “capital regions” of Moscow and St Petersburg, as well as the <i>oblast</i> of Belgorod, the kray of Krasnodar. Regions with strongly negative migration balance are the Far East federal districts, although the rate of outmigration has been slowing down in recent years. Outmigration is also characteristic of a number of Siberian regions and northern regions of the European part of Russia.</p>	<p>North Caucasus and Far East have the smallest number. High-tech development will be fostered, alongside the science towns, in four special economic zones for technological development (in Moscow, St Petersburg, the town of Dubna in the region of Moscow and Tomsk) and in a series of science parks. The ethnic republics of the southern federal district show markedly lower levels of socio-economic development. New job creation cannot keep up with the population growth. A federal programme, South of Russia, has been set up to tackle these problems. An additional federal programme has been adopted for the Far East. Problem regions are turning their attention</p>	<p>Suburbanisation is still modest in Russia, owing to insufficient development of transport and social infrastructure, low living standards and comparatively harsh environmental and climatic conditions. People prefer to live in the city and to benefit from <i>daic/hac</i>. Nevertheless, in the largest cities (above all Moscow and St Petersburg) an upward trend can be observed in the number of villa communities intended for permanent residence. Another significant factor in urban sprawl is the encouragement of low-weight construction. The changing face of towns will also be linked with the elimination of rundown and dilapidated housing stock. Its</p>	<p>is carried out in all environmental and climate zones, ranging from those with highly favourable conditions to those with conditions that are utterly unfavourable to its development. The situation in key agricultural regions is distinctly better than in the territories where agriculture plays a secondary role, in many cases limited to small-scale selling or home-grown produce for personal consumption.</p>
---	---	--	---

	<p>towards the potential of tourism. Seven tourism- and leisure-oriented economic zones are being created in Russia, four of which will be established in less-developed regions (republics of Altay and Buriyaya, and Altay and Stavropol krays), the other ones being created in the regions of Kaliningrad, Irkutsk and Krasnodar. In addition, good conditions for developing tourism also exist in well-developed regions (Moscow, St Petersburg).</p>	<p>replacement with new upmarket residential districts and conversion of old office blocks into residential apartments will depend upon the specific situation. State policy supports the construction by private companies of new satellite developments near cities. Some 22 projects have already been selected on a competitive basis. These will be towns with a new quality of life and new architectural approaches. The hope is to curb the rapid rise of house prices in regional capitals.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

<p>Slovak Republic</p>	<p>The population is slowly growing at a national scale as a result of natural demographic growth, but mainly because of the positive migration balance. Between 2004 and 2008, population growth was highest in the county of Bratislava, followed by the counties of Presov, Tmava, Kosice and Zilina. Three counties (Banska Bystrica, Nitra and Trencin) registered a population decrease. In the counties of Bratislava and Tmava, the quickest growing in the country despite natural population decline, the positive migration balance is significant. The process of population ageing, now typical among the general Slovak population, varies,</p>	<p>Economic growth has been particularly strong in Slovakia between 2000 and 2008. Because the economy of the country is small and extremely open, it was seriously hit by the economic crisis. In terms of economic performance and employment, the key region is the Bratislava-Tmava core area with Bratislava city as its centre. On the other hand, eastern Slovakia is the poorest region of the country. There is a clear west-east economic slope throughout the country (economic output, investments, productivity, unemployment, etc.). The knowledge economy is mainly concentrated in the Bratislava region. The housing sector has</p>	<p>During the past decade, there has been a continuous decline in the population of cities, while the rural population has been slightly increasing. Following a dynamic growth phase and exodus of the population from rural to central urban areas, which was typical for all cities before 1990, stagnation has persisted throughout the 1990s, accompanied by a gradual diffusion of cities within their agglomeration spaces, the most well-off groups leaving the core city for the suburbs where single family houses, enterprises and commercial centres were built. During recent years, the urban agglomerations have showed evidence</p>	<p>There are significant regional disparities among the rural areas with regard to economic performance and attractiveness for the population. Paradoxically, the region of Bratislava has the best performing agriculture in terms of direct output and of agro-food industries. Eastern Slovakia, although more rural in character, has poorly performing agriculture and declining agro-food industries. The most rural regions are the counties of Banska Bystrica and Nitra. Smaller municipalities are particularly unable to secure the living standard of their population and the required employment opportunities. Young</p>	<p>The accession of Slovakia to the EU and, more importantly, its inclusion into the Schengen space, have strengthened cross-border interactions. From the point of view of settlement and agglomerative tendencies, cross-border activities are more evident near the city of Bratislava. In addition to the intense relationships with Vienna, the suburbs of Bratislava have been developing more recently on the neighbouring territories of Austria and Hungary. A natural cross-border agglomeration is emerging. Mutual interactions also emerge between cities on both sides of the borders with Poland, Austria and Hungary (Komarno-</p>
-------------------------------	---	--	---	---	--

<p>however, from county to county. It is greatest in the county of Bratislava, followed by the counties of Trenčin and Nitra. These counties also exhibit the highest median age (almost 40 years). The ageing process is weakest in the county of Presov. It is a long-term trend for all Slovak counties.</p>	<p>developed most in the Bratislava-Tmava conurbation. It is weakest in the counties of Trenčin and Presov. Slovakia has significant tourist potential (mountains, spas), which is insufficiently exploited. The tourist sector was most affected by the economic crisis in the poorest areas of the country (Presov, Zilina).</p>	<p>of concentrated de-concentration: inflow of dwellers and activities from other areas and suburbanisation within the vicinity of the largest cities. Relocated urban functions are concentrated mostly along motorway corridors. The quality of the residential environment in suburbs is endangered by the development of warehouses, logistic centres and service businesses. The development of transport systems (public and private) is considerably lagging behind the need resulting from the development of settlements. Suburbanisation is strongest around the two largest agglomerations: Bratislava and Kosice. In the case of Bratislava,</p>	<p>people are continuously migrating out of rural areas, while there has been a decline in birth rates and a growing population ageing. A particular constraint for rural areas is poor accessibility caused by insufficient development of transport infrastructure. The significant tourist potential is mainly utilised in rural areas located in peripheral parts of rural settlements and in the vicinity of major transport corridors. The sustainable long-term development of rural areas is closely related to the diversification of traditional and prevailing agricultural production.</p>	<p>Komarom; Sturovo-Ostrihom; Kralovsky Chimec-Cierne nad Tatou; Visoke Tatric-Zakopane; Skalica/Holic-Hodonin, etc.).</p>
---	--	--	--	--

		<p>suburbanisation trends are also polarised around smaller towns in the environs of the agglomeration. A continuous decline of population is taking place in the smaller rural settlements as well as in the core areas of large cities, while intermediate urban entities and the environs of large cities are growing slightly.</p>		
<p>“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”</p>				
<p>The population in the Republic of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” is slightly over 2 million people. “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” has a long tradition of emigration, especially of young people, mainly for economic reasons. However, it was positive in 2007. In recent years,</p>	<p>Between 2004 and 2008, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” had a satisfactory rate of economic growth. The situation of the labour market was, however, not favourable, with low employment rates and high unemployment. Manufacturing activities are concentrated in urban areas (Skopje,</p>	<p>Urban development is still largely centralised, with the highest concentration of population, of public functions and of infrastructure development in the capital city of Skopje. In the last few years, the state policy has been oriented towards the decentralisation of</p>	<p>There are huge differences in terms of population concentration, economic development, infrastructure and quality of life between urban and rural areas. During the last years of the transition period, important processes have been initiated towards the activation of</p>	<p>The development of cross-border interactions is facilitated by activities of cross-border co-operation with the neighbouring regions of Albania, Bulgaria and Greece, as well as by the construction of cross-border pan-European corridors (corridors 8 and 10). Co-operation in the lake district focused</p>

<p>birth rates have declined significantly, whereas mortality rates have stabilised and the death rates of young children diminished. The population is, however, unevenly distributed in the country and polarisation trends are increasing. The eastern parts are characterised by demographic stagnation and the western parts by demographic expansion. More than one quarter of the total population is concentrated in the capital city of Skopje.</p>	<p>Bitola, Ohrid, Prilep, Tetovo, Gostivar, Kumanovo, Strumica, etc.). In most rural areas, the economy relies solely on agriculture. According to the national spatial plan, the establishment of free economic zones and zones for technological industrial development is planned in the regions of Skopje, Pelagonia, Gevgelia, Shtip and Strumica. With regard to productive specialisations, the textile industry has a long tradition in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and is widespread throughout the country. Another important sector is that of the food industry (processing of fruits and vegetables, wine production, etc.), which is prominently</p>	<p>certain functions in the field of education from the national centre to other major urban centres (Tetovo, Stip, Ohrid). Urban sprawl takes place primarily at the expense of productive agricultural land.</p>	<p>a number of villages and rural areas through the development of various economic activities (in particular, tourism). Special economic zones are developed in rural areas, outside the settlements. In order to counteract the process of land abandonment, support is provided to agriculture. An active policy of rural development is being carried out, including also the revitalisation of villages.</p>	<p>on environmental protection (Lake Ohrid, Prespa Park Project). Along land borders with Bulgaria, Albania and Greece, co-operation also includes economic sectors (development of potential, promotion of tourism).</p>
--	--	--	---	---

	<p>developed in the southern part of the country and in the surroundings of Skopje and Kumanovo. The level of FDI in the country is still modest. The tourism sector grew significantly until 2008.</p>			
Ukraine				
<p>Ukraine has been characterised by a long period of population decline (low birth rates and outmigration). In 2007, for the first time since 1990, five Ukrainian regions (the <i>oblasts</i> of Zakarpattia, Rivne, Volyn, Lviv and Kiev) experienced more births than deaths. This demonstrates a positive trend in increasing birth rates in the last couple of years. With the exception of Kiev, all regions with a positive natural demographic</p>	<p>Regional disparities in Ukraine are not extremely high, but they have been increasing in recent years. The most developed regions (<i>oblasts</i>) are Kiev, Zaporizhzhya, Odessa and Dnipropetrovsk. The weakest regions are Zakarpattia, Crimea, Zhytomyr, Cherkasy, Vinnytsia and Kherson. The greatest differences amongst regions can be observed in the field of business sophistication, and the greatest homogeneity in that</p>	<p>Since the beginning of independence, the country has lost 5 million people. The increase of the urban population at the expense of the rural population has been practically impossible. During the period 2001-08, only five regional agglomerations showed positive demographic trends (Kiev, Vinnytsia, Khmelnytsky, Chervnivtsi and Ivano-Frankivsk). The strongest demographic decline affected the</p>	<p>Rural settlements are very diverse in nature (dispersed, grouped, linear, autonomous and included in urbanised territories). The population of rural settlements has continuously declined. The number of large villages in the rural population has declined, while that of small villages has increased. The distribution of villages by size is not homogenous. Large villages dominate the settlements of rural</p>	<p>Territorial integration across national borders is favoured by both the constitution of euroregions (Bug, Karpaty, Nyzhni Dumai, Yaroslavivna, Dnipro, Slobozhanshchyna, Verhni Prut and Donbas) and by cross-border co-operation along the 7 national borders with Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Belarus, Russia and Moldova. The Ukrainian-Romanian border consists of two separate</p>

<p>balance were, however, in the western parts of the country, which shows the existence of regional differences in birth rates. Outmigration has been significant since the beginning of the transition period. It is estimated at roughly 3 million people.</p>	<p>of health and primary education. The region of Zaporizhzhya is the best performer based on “innovation and sophistication” factors.</p>	<p>regional agglomerations of Ternopil, Sumy and Kherson. The reserve of human potential for increasing the population of cities is almost exhausted in the villages. Living in cities has become less attractive. The population of cities, even of large ones, has strongly declined. Present urban policy aims at developing compact cities, so as to stop the loss of population, while integrating the requirements for sustainable development (energy saving and environmentally friendly approaches). The increase of car traffic in cities has become a serious problem.</p>	<p>areas in the regions of Zakarpattia, Chernivitsi and Ivano-Frankivsk. The largest share of small villages can be found in the regions of Dnipropetrovsk, Poltava, Sumy, Kharkiv and Chernigiv.</p>	<p>sectors: the Carpathian and the Lower-Danube zones. The territorial planning legislation contains provisions for joint projects of city planning development in cross-border regions.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

Table 2: Territorial impacts of emerging and growing challenges, and related driving forces

Territorial impacts of climate change (examples)	Territorial impacts of globalisation (examples)	Territorial aspects of the changing energy paradigm (examples)	Territorial aspects of immigration and social polarisation (examples)	Territorial impacts of the economic/financial crisis
<p>Armenia</p> <p>During the past 80 years, the average annual temperature has been growing by 0.85°C and annual precipitation has decreased by 6%. The northern and central (Ararat Valley) regions of the country are becoming dryer, while in the southern and north-western parts and in the Sevan Lake Basin, precipitation has increased during the last 70 years, causing an activation of landslides in the northern regions. Drought has significant impacts on the fertility of soil and on the productivity of agriculture, limiting</p>	<p>Investments are more and more concentrated in the metropolitan area of Yerevan. In order to ensure a stable and more balanced development in the country, it is necessary to increase the level of investments in other regions. Considerable investments are needed in rural areas (irrigation, road network, horticulture, cattle breeding).</p>	<p>The main source of renewable energy is hydropower, due to the very mountainous character of the country. There are plans to construct three new large hydropower plants and to exploit the potential of smaller ones. Numerous efforts are made to promote other renewable energy sources: wind in the mountainous areas; the construction of wind power plants started in 2005 and is accelerating; solar energy (significant potential; the production of solar thermal collectors has started);</p>	<p>Poverty is significant in most Armenian towns (except Yerevan). The growth process tends to strengthen territorial and social polarisation.</p>	<p>The economic crisis had a considerable impact on the construction and industry sectors (mining, machinery and textiles) as well as in the sectors of education and communication. The cities most affected by the crisis are those of the Kotayk region (large industrial areas) as well as the cities of Tsakhadzor, Gami and Goght (tourism).</p>

<p>substantially the possibilities of irrigation. Various types of natural hazards have intensified in recent years: flooding (especially in the Ararat and Artashat regions), frost and hail (which damaged the Kapan, Meghri, Sisian and Goris regions in 2008), and fires in pastures (Yerenos mountains in 2008; Geghii in 2008).</p>		<p>geothermal energy (possible sites for power stations have been identified), biogas (a project is already being implemented in Niubarashen); and bio-ethanol (research is being carried out to estimate the potential).</p>		
Austria				
		<p>The development of renewable energy is a priority in Austria. A striking example is that of the region of Güssing in southern Burgenland which used to be one of the poorest Austrian regions. Güssing has become an energy self-sufficient region (biomass, biogas, photovoltaic systems), resulting in 1 000 newly</p>		<p>After a period of significant economic crisis during the years 2004-08, the crisis has accelerated the economic restructuring process. Cost pressures and the pressure to relocate production into countries with lower wage levels will accelerate. Current value chains will have to be reorganised. The existing pressure on</p>

		<p>created jobs and 50 new businesses. The city is aiming at becoming the first Austrian centre for further education in the field of renewable energy. Another significant example is that of the Pamdorferr Platte (Burgenland) in the field of wind energy. Some 190 wind turbines have been constructed, the energy from which covers some 50% of the electricity requirements of Burgenland.</p>		<p>achieving a transition towards a knowledge-based economy has further increased. It can be expected that high-ranking locations near urban regions, and high-quality educational and research institutions will continue to increase in value, which would lead to an increased focus on agglomeration areas.</p>
Croatia				
<p>Croatia is exposed to the impacts of drought, floods, forest fires and a rising sea level. Fires cause most damage during the summer months, which endangers human life and the environment. Drought affects the coast as well as the lowlands with intensive</p>	<p>In Croatia, globalisation had the strongest impact on the banking and trade sectors, which are considered as vital. Efforts are made to promote the entrepreneurial sector through the development of business development units in large agglomerations. Foreign</p>	<p>The modified energy paradigm is leading to several basic policy objectives (Energy Strategy of the Republic of Croatia): to increase the energy efficiency of existing systems, as well as the share of renewable energy sources, in particular wind, solar</p>	<p>Croatia has been subject to significant migration flows, but these were mainly related to internal migration (caused by the war and then by rural-urban disparities). Mainly large cities benefited from such migration flows: Zagreb, Osijek, Rijeka, Split and Zadar.</p>	<p>Industrial production has been significantly decreasing as a result of the crisis. On the other hand, the tourism sector proved to be stable and did not follow the anticipated negative trends. The problems of the Croatian economy are mainly of a structural nature.</p>

<p>agriculture (Slavonia, Baranja) and is additionally aggravated by an inadequate and insufficient irrigation system. Floods represent a threat to hilly lowlands, and valleys of the rivers Drava, Sava, Danube and Mura.</p>	<p>direct investments started later than in other east European countries. FDI was mainly concentrated in the financial and trade sectors, as well as in a few industrial sectors (chemical industry, petroleum products). There is a shortfall in FDI in the production sector. FDI favours the most developed regions: 75% of FDI goes to the region of Zagreb.</p>	<p>and biomass energy. The strategy envisages, besides the construction of thermal power plants, the construction of new large hydropower plants as well as the construction of a nuclear power plant. Solar energy is being promoted as well as the production of wind energy on the coastal hinterland. The construction of gas pipelines is also under way.</p>		
<p>Czech Republic</p>				
<p>Threats related to climate change in the Czech Republic concern the increasing occurrence of extreme meteorological phenomena (floods, snow storms, whirlwinds, long-lasting droughts), the decrease of surface water quality</p>	<p>The globalisation process had positive impacts on the Czech economy until the economic crisis, due to the openness of the economy and to the competitive advantages of a cheap labour force. FDI has been focused mainly on large cities</p>	<p>The priority of the Spatial Development Policy with regard to energy is to create conditions for the development of decentralised, effective and safe energy production from renewable energy sources. It is, however,</p>	<p>occurs and continues to increase through the emigration of more educated and the immigration of more problematic population groups. It takes place to a greater extent in areas with very unfavourable economic Social polarisation</p>	<p>The regions most affected by the economic crisis are mainly those with concentrated state aid (Most, Karvina, Chomutov, Teplice, Ostrava-Mesto, Frydek-Mistek, Novy Jicin, Sokolov).</p>

<p>The most important during dry periods, and the transformation of ecosystems (destabilisation of pine tree forests, migration of species, etc.).</p>	<p>(Prague, Plzen, Brno and Ostrava) and in other regions with significant development. In the new context, the negative aspects of globalisation are now emerging. The competitive advantage of a cheap labour force is gradually diminishing. Particular threats are the relocation of manufacturing plants and the extinction of whole manufacturing sectors (shoe and textile industry). Economic restructuring will become necessary. With this in mind, support is given to the development of competitive clusters, to overcome the isolation of enterprises.</p>	<p>necessary to use them in a sustainable way. There are favourable conditions for the production of wind energy (Ustecky, Krusne Hory), but there is a risk of too intense exploitation, endangering the natural heritage. Further attempts are made to use reclaimed land from mining areas for the production of energy and technical crops and to build further small hydropower plants along the main rivers (Elbe, Odra).</p>	<p>or environmental conditions. The situation is likely to worsen if no specific measures are taken to mitigate the trends. In addition, the Czech Republic has a large proportion of its population threatened by poverty. Specific groups are particularly threatened by social and economic exclusion (persons with poor qualifications, aged people, Gipsy minorities, immigrants, etc.). Foreign immigration has been low up until now, but the trend is increasing.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

<p>Estonia</p>	<p>The globalisation process mostly affects economic development in the largest cities, which play a more important international role in economic relationships. The majority of FDI, foreign labour, knowledge-intensive economies and activities related to participation in international clusters are concentrated in Tallinn and Tartu. Some international investors, which have previously made their investments in Estonia primarily due to low labour costs, have moved their manufacturing to other countries because of labour cost increases in Estonia.</p>	<p>The majority of investments related to energy production are continuously allocated to the north-eastern region, where the main capacity of electric power generation is located (oil shale burning plants). Green energy production is developing on a small scale in a few rural areas. The islands of western Estonia and the coastal areas of the mainland are the most suitable areas for wind energy production and a number of small-scale wind farms have already been established there. In addition, co-generation plants have been built or are planned in several cities.</p>	<p>The immigration rate is very low. Still, a remarkable socio-spatial segregation of the Russian-speaking population can be observed in the north-eastern cities and to a smaller extent also in Tallinn, deriving from historical labour immigration in the Soviet era. Various public policy measures have been implemented to facilitate the integration of Russian-speaking people into Estonian society.</p>	<p>Almost all regions have been more or less affected by the economic/financial crisis. The most striking effects have been in northern Estonia and in the Pärnu region. This trend is partly related to the recession in the construction sector. Unemployment growth has been lower in south-eastern Estonia and in other areas with a higher relative importance of agricultural employment. At a local level, the most dramatic impacts can be seen in settlements where one or a few dominant employers have got into difficulties and where enterprises in the declining sectors (timber, textile etc.) used to dominate.</p>
-----------------------	---	--	--	---

<p>Finland</p>	<p>Further global warming and precipitation increases are expected in Finland. Northern Finland is particularly sensitive to climate change (reindeer husbandry and tourism). Heavily urbanised areas could suffer from heavy floods. Because of the dispersed settlements, traffic has to operate almost entirely with fossil fuels.</p>	<p>Large urban regions benefit from globalisation, while certain cities dominated by a mono-industrial base, for example the wood-processing industry, have suffered heavy job losses. The main consequence of globalisation for spatial planning has been the development of closer networking between cities in order to connect their potentials. Finnish regions and cities have prepared development strategies to deal with globalisation (international co-operation networks and improvement of accessibility).</p>	<p>An important priority is energy saving (transport, urban structure, district heating, promotion of light traffic and of public modes). There is a move towards the increased use of wind and bio-energy. Specific energy saving norms and diversification of energy sources are being introduced.</p>	<p>During the economic turbulence, the prevailing trend of concentration and growth in the biggest urban conglomerations, especially the Helsinki metropolitan region, has continued and even accelerated. Job losses have been observed in traditional centres of heavy industries such as wood processing.</p>
-----------------------	---	---	--	--

<p>France</p>	<p>The long-term evolution of average temperatures shows some regional differences. Global warming is stronger in the south-western regions and hardly noticeable in the northern regions. Precipitations are increasing slightly more in the north-western regions. The most important threats in terms of natural hazards related to climate change are floods, storms and whirlwinds, and heatwaves. The south-eastern regions are the most affected and threatened by floods. The risk of heavy storms is higher in the coastal Atlantic and Channel regions. Climate-related phenomena may have, in addition to the environment,</p>	<p>The French regions are not homogeneous in terms of openness to international trade. The regions of northern and eastern France, which had strategic manufacturing poles have a longer tradition in internal exchanges and have been subject to the relocation and externalisation processes of businesses, especially in the automotive industries. Since 1995, the regions most affected by relocation processes (mainly towards China) are Rhône-Alpes, north-eastern France, Normandy, Bretagne and Pays de Loire. The service sector is becoming more and more internationalised. Regions with significant business and financial services (Île-de-France, PACA, Languedoc-Roussillon) are most</p>	<p>The national objectives in the field of energy are to reduce the external dependency of the country, to promote renewable energy sources as well as to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear power plants produce a large part of the electricity in the country. The endowment of the territory with potential for renewable energy varies from region to region. The main priorities are solar and wind energy, biofuels, heat pumps and geothermal energy. Solar energy is progressing rapidly, especially in Alsace and Rhône-Alpes. Power plants fuelled by biomass are also progressing in numerous regions. Energy issues are systematically considered in territorial development policies at local level.</p>	<p>Social polarisation has been increasing in the country. Social deprivation is mainly concentrated in certain urban areas, where immigrants are generally numerous. The flows of immigrants are taking place in large agglomerations. The largest proportion of immigrants come from North Africa. The strongest growth, however, concerns the flows of immigrants originating from sub-Saharan Africa and from Asia. The immigrants are facing significant difficulties in terms of economic and social integration. Growing poverty and unstable social situations are also progressing outside urban agglomerations, in the surrounding areas as well as in remote rural areas in decline.</p>	<p>The regions most affected by the crisis are those which are the most open, in terms of international trade and manufacturing activities. These are mainly the regions of the northern half of the country, especially the north-eastern regions, Normandy and Pays de Loire. In the southern half of the country, only a few regions have been seriously affected (Rhône-Alpes and the region of Toulouse). On the other hand, the regions with a large share of employment in public or people-related services, like numerous regions of southern France, were less affected.</p>
----------------------	---	--	--	---	--

<p>also significant impacts of economic, social and demographic character (tourism, water shortages, risks for agriculture, migration related to natural risks, etc.).</p>	<p>concerned. Employment related to FDI is mainly concentrated in the Paris region and in Rhône-Alpes, as well as in some border regions. Another impact of globalisation is the constitution of clusters of enterprises, supported by public policies.</p>			
Germany				
<p>The regions most affected and threatened by climate change are the mountain and coastal regions as well as the Rhine Valley and the north-eastern regions. Floods, storms and heatwaves have so far been the most frequent natural hazards related to climate change. The federal government in 2008 adopted a national adaptation strategy to the challenges of climate change. Territorial</p>	<p>Globalisation is a particular challenge for metropolitan areas in relation to their activities in the field of innovation. In order to increase the exploitation of territorial potential, the federal government has developed guiding principles aimed at promoting partnerships between the various metropolitan areas and other towns in their surroundings. This strategy also aims at</p>	<p>In Germany, the share of renewable energy in final consumption amounts to 9.5%. In 2007, the federal government adopted an integrated programme related to climate and energy which aims at significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing energy efficiency, increasing the share of renewable energy and developing co-generation plants. In</p>	<p>The social and economic integration of people originating from immigration is a basic priority of the various policy levels. In a total of 550 municipalities, 1 500 neighbourhoods were identified in which significant integration needs exist. A high concentration of such areas is to be found in manufacturing regions (especially in Rhine-Ruhr and Stuttgart). Integration needs are</p>	<p>The large manufacturing regions with export-based activities are mainly situated in west Germany. These have been most affected by the economic crisis, especially those producing steel and iron products, machinery, chemical products, motor cars and electro-technical products. Metropolitan areas are also handicapped by a reduction of activities in the banking sector. The</p>

<p>development policies will play a key role in the strategy's coherence and co-ordination of its implementation. Prevention and adaptation are the two main axes of the envisaged policy.</p>	<p>including large parts of the territory in the areas likely to benefit from the positive aspects of globalisation.</p>	<p>the field of renewable energy, hydropower plants exist mainly in the southern German regions. Wind energy is mainly produced in the northern and eastern regions of the country. Power plants using biomass are to be found in rural regions where large quantities of energy crops can be produced. Photovoltaic solar energy shows a more dispersed pattern, with numerous small facilities in operation. It is recognised that the development of renewable energy, especially wind and biomass, may endanger the environment.</p>	<p>strongly related to ethnic segregation. The development of integration strategies at neighbourhood level is a widespread strategy.</p>	<p>east German regions are less exposed to international demand and competition and have been less affected. Their unemployment rate increased (in percentage terms) much less than in the west German regions.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Hungary</p>	<p>Hungary is considered to be increasingly vulnerable with regard to climate change. Increasingly extreme hot and dry summers and gentle but more rainy winters are expected, which might be interrupted occasionally by strong storms and rainstorms. Altogether, the climate in the Carpathian Basin is expected to become similar to the Mediterranean climate. The lengthening of the drought periods and the intensification of water shortages are a particular threat to the whole territory of the Great Plain and to the southern parts of the Transdanubian region. Forest fires have intensified in the</p>	<p>FDI has played a significant role in the structural transformation of the Hungarian economy. The territorial concentration of foreign capital has been increasing. It is highest in the central Hungarian region (Budapest) and in central and western Transdanubia. The most important external partner of Hungary is Germany. Export orientation is extremely differentiated spatially. It is highest in the central and western Transdanubian regions. Islands with strong export orientation are also to be found in various parts of the country (depending upon the location of multinational companies). Regional</p>	<p>Immigration has steadily increased since the new millennium. The proportion of immigrants is, however, still modest. The main target points of immigrants are the capital city and its surroundings, Lake Balaton and the settlements close to the borders. Immigrants belong mainly to ethnic minorities of neighbouring countries (Romania, Ukraine, Serbia). The second significant immigrant group originates in Asia (China, Vietnam). With regard to social polarisation, one third of the Roma population lives in the most disadvantaged regions (near the north-eastern and southern borders) in small villages.</p>	<p>The economic impacts of the crisis are still difficult to identify with precision. The crisis in the banking sector has had a significant impact on employment and on domestic consumption, mainly in Budapest and in other cities (Győr, Szeged, Pécs) where the real estate economy was strongly developing. The suburbanisation process has been slowing down. Impacts are also significant in export-oriented regions (western Hungary). Various industrial cities are threatened by the possible relocation of manufacturing plants. In addition, it is likely that FDI in the future will prefer the countries of the European Monetary Union instead of</p>
-----------------------	---	---	--	---

<p>northern and south-eastern regions. More than one third of Hungarian territory is situated in the flood plains of the Danube and Tisza rivers and their tributaries. This means a serious threat for the socio-economic life of the country. Large floods with tragic impacts occurred in 2001 and 2006. The threat of floods is highest in the catchment area of the Tisza, on the banks of the Danube in northern Transdanubia and in the northern mountainous regions.</p>	<p>clusters, as territorial patterns of specialisation emerged around the new millennium, mainly in the fields of automotive, timber and furniture, electronic, food, textile industries as well as in the construction and tourism sectors. These clusters concentrated mainly in the Transdanubian region. Out of the 100 clusters existing in the countries, 16 are accredited innovative clusters. They are mainly based in the central Hungarian region and in the southern part of the Great Plain. They are working in the fields of the health industry (biotechnology and medical industry) and information technology.</p>	<p>The proportion of Roma is increasing in these regions. Social segregation has been progressing in cities. Anti-segregation plans have been prepared for 157 settlements in the country.</p>	<p>Hungary. High public debt will have an impact on the budget of territorial development policies. The economic recovery is expected to start in urban centres, but in those areas where transnational companies are not sufficiently embedded in the local economy, the risk of an emergence of a long-term crisis increases.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Ireland</p>	<p>Population growth has been taking place across all the regions and at a high level in the Mid East and Midland regions due largely to growth driven by Dublin over spilling into these neighbouring regions. Relatively slower growth has taken place in the mid West and South West regions while the other regions have grown at rates which have approximately matched the overall national average. Two main broad areas have experienced decline: the most western areas along or near the seaboard and a broad central band running from Dunganvan in the south through Roscommon and Leitrim and into south and west Donegal.</p>	<p>The decade up to 2007 was a period of rapid national increase in employment terms. However, the distribution of this expansion was not balanced between regions. The slowest rates of growth occurred in the Dublin region. However, the adjacent Mid East region, which has experienced significant commuting and other links to the Dublin region, had high growth. Slow growth took place in the Mid West region, while the West region has relatively high growth, showing that growth is not confined to the eastern side of Ireland. Growth in the South-West region corresponded to the national average.</p>	<p>In the recent past, population growth has occurred most strongly in areas lower down the urban hierarchy, with slower growth taking place in the highest levels. The population share of the five gateway cities (Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford) has been declining. In absolute terms, they have been however growing. The population growth of the four non-city gateways (Sligo, Dundalk, Letterkenny, Athone-Tullamore-Mullingar) was significantly higher than that of the gateway cities. This is due to the move of population from the large cities towards very large catchment areas.</p>	<p>The share of population living in rural areas has slightly declined over the past two decades. The differential of growth between urban and rural areas has however increased during the period 2002-2006. The regional variation of growth patterns between rural areas is less significant than between urban areas. The South-East region stands out as having population growth in the countryside at a rate which is considerably higher than in other regional countryside growth rates were recorded for the Dublin region and the Mid East region.</p>	<p>The level of connectivity between Ireland and Northern Ireland (cross-border commuters, trade flows, freight traffic) is relatively low. This low level of economic interaction suggests that there is considerable scope for developing new economic relationships and expanding existing linkages on an island of Ireland basis. Broadening and deepening such links would have benefits not just for the Border region, but also for the rest of Ireland and Northern Ireland, by building larger local markets and creating a framework for the more efficient allocation of productive resources. In spatial terms, there is a momentum for enhancing the Dublin-Belfast corridor, strengthening the Dundalk/Newry</p>
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	--

				<p>link, building up the Letterkenny-Derry Gateway and improving markets and other economic linkages in the central sections of the Border region.</p>
Latvia				
<p>The impacts of climate change in Latvia mainly concern coastal erosion caused by storms and by global warming (lack of ice in winter) and the risks of flooding in the basin of the Daugava River.</p>		<p>Major investments in the sector of renewable energy are concentrated in the hydropower plants on the Daugava River in order to increase their generating capacity and to upgrade their technology. Wind power stations, located in the western parts of the country, are being further developed. Biogas and biomass power plants are spread throughout the country, according to the availability of resources. A special solid fuel (coal and biomass) power plant is expected to be implemented in the city of Liepaja on the coast.</p>		

<p>Norway</p>	<p>Norway is a coastal nation, with many settlements spread along the coast. The climate is rough and exposes the inhabitants to severe risks (gales, heavy rainfall and snow, landslides and flooding). Climate change seems to be causing more storms. The lowlands of the south-east are threatened by flooding along the main rivers. In summer time, dangerous forest fires occur during dry periods.</p>	<p>FDI is not widespread in the Norwegian mainland economy. Traditional labour intensive industries moved to low cost countries years ago. The remaining industry is highly specialised and competitive on global markets (petroleum and marine industry, electronic clusters in the south-east and Trøndelag, electrochemical and electro-metallurgical process industry mainly in the west). The remaining export industry is affected by falling demand on the global markets, causing serious problems in the communities concerned. The recent years were characterised by growing job-related immigration from Sweden, Poland and the Baltic States, concerning the services and construction sectors.</p>	<p>Hydroelectric power has been the basis for settlements and the economy in many municipalities for a century. The oil and gas resources off the Norwegian coast have, since the 1970s, attracted tremendous investments in extraction, transport and technological development. There are also substantial wind resources along the coast of west and north Norway. Some wind power plants have been established. However, in Norway, wind power is not yet economically competitive with hydropower.</p>	<p>The proportion of the population originating from immigration amounts to more than 10%. The growth of the immigrant population is going to have profound effects on the country's future development. The immigrant population is, however, very diverse. Oslo has the largest population group of immigrant origin, followed by the city of Drammen. The polarisation may cause certain problems related to immigration and social coherence. The present housing and social policies are not designed to counteract market mechanisms.</p>	<p>Norway went through a financial crisis around 1990. The experience from that gave rise to precautions that have made the country more robust in terms of financial requirements, safeguarding funds, etc. Still, industrial communities relying on exports to the global market (such as wood, paper, metals, car parts and shipbuilding) have been badly affected. Many such locations do not provide other options for employment. As such, the crisis has hit entire communities.</p>
----------------------	--	--	---	---	---

<p>Poland</p> <p>Poland is a country characterised by a relatively low level of natural risks. Most serious risks include floods, landslides and, in some regions, hurricanes and rainstorms. In certain years, extreme situations have occurred throughout the country (drought in the region of Podlasie; floods in the Carpathian mountains; excessive rainfall in southern and western Poland). Proper protection against threats caused by natural factors and by calamities has so far not been included in planning policies. Projections related to climate change in Poland show a series of threats (waves of very hot weather; intensive rain; floods and landslides; drought during the</p>	<p>The globalisation process influences in particular the economically strongest areas, subject to intense investment flows from abroad. Large cities have been growing faster than intermediate ones and rural areas. A qualified workforce and the quality of infrastructure are the most important strategic criteria for foreign investors. Cities like Warsaw, Wrocław, Poznań and Katowice fulfil these criteria best. The concept of economic clusters, especially clusters of advanced technologies, has been implemented during the past decade. The following Polish regions have the best conditions for the establishment and development of</p>	<p>Poland's energy supply is still strongly dependent on fossil energy sources (coal, brown coal, oil and gas). The share of renewable energy is very small. The government has decided to strongly develop nuclear energy production and to strengthen Poland's connections with neighbouring countries in terms of energy transport infrastructure (electricity, gas pipelines, LPG terminals). The construction of new power plants with lower emissions is planned. The development of renewable energy is also foreseen (biogas, biomass, solar and geothermal energy, wind farms). Poland has rich deposits of coal and</p>	<p>Foreign immigration has just started in Poland. It will not compensate for the negative demographic trend of population ageing: the country is not prepared to face intense immigration, which would affect the social cohesion. Immigration favours the large cities as well as the western regions. Social polarisation has been increasing in Poland, especially between the large cities and the rural areas. In large cities, poverty is concentrated in specific neighbourhoods. In rural areas, it mainly concerns the areas of former state-owned farms, where inhabitants are professionally and socially passive. Areas threatened by poverty</p>	<p>With regard to vulnerability to the global crisis, the Warsaw metropolitan area and the relatively less-developed regions of eastern Poland should be the least affected by the crisis, while the two old industrial centres (the regions of Łódź and Upper Silesia) are the most vulnerable. Since the early 1990s, the restructuring of these two regions has been based on the production of durable consumer goods and many people continue working in traditional industries affected by the recession (textiles, foundries). Serious difficulties may also emerge in Lower Silesia (numerous factories were located there during the last decade). In non-</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>vegetation period; strong winds; lack of snow; development of pathogens related to warming; higher sea levels), but also some positive opportunities (higher temperature of water; smaller incidence of diseases/lower mortality in winter; fuel savings).</p>	<p>clusters: Mazovia (Warsaw), Malopolska (Cracow), Lower Silesia (Wrocław), Pomerania (Gdańsk). The specialisation of regions depends strongly upon the activities inherited from the past.</p>	<p>lignite that may become a competitive advantage in the global market, if clean coal technologies are applied.</p>	<p>are like islands: for example, the region of the Warmia Lakes and Masury, and the region of the Świętokrzyskie mountains. Social polarisation is reflected in access to social services, to health care and higher education.</p>	<p>metropolitan areas, northern Poland may be particularly affected by the crisis, being the main area of furniture production.</p>
<p>Russian Federation</p>				
<p>Global warming has a significant impact on the socio-economic situation in many Russian regions (krays of Altay, Irkutsk and Zabaykalskiy, and the Republic of Altay in southern Siberia). At the same time, the summer temperature in central Russia has increased. In the northern regions (4 million square kilometres), the permafrost is melting, destroying the</p>	<p>Globalisation has affected all affected Russia's largest cities, the mining and oil/gas producing regions and the territories the economic-geographic situation of which favours the development of external trade links. There is a significant concentration of FDI in Moscow and St Petersburg, as well as in the regions with significant raw materials. FDI also plays</p>	<p>The new energy paradigm, providing for a transition to renewable energy sources and massive energy saving, drawn up in Russia in 2007-08, has yet to attain the projected scale and, for the time being, is not making a substantial impact on territorial development.</p>	<p>In the period 2004-09, migratory influxes into Russia compensated for only 5% of the depopulation. The number of legal labour migrants working in Russia is steadily growing (around 380 000 in 2003; roughly 1 million per year in the period 2006-08). The proportion of migrant workers within Russia's employed population remains</p>	<p>The structural consequences of the economic crisis are most apparent in the regions that previously stood out in terms of growth (kray of Tatarstan, Republic of Krasnoyarsk, oblasts of Sverdlovsk and Novosibirsk). One of the sectors which suffered least is the agro-food complex. Accordingly, the lowest rates of decline in production were</p>

<p>underlying structure of buildings and facilities. This process is particularly acute in the northern towns of Nadym, Surgut and Vorkuta, and many other towns. Rainfall has decreased in nearly 20% of the territory of the Russian Federation and droughts are becoming more frequent on the southern territory of western Siberia, Rostov <i>Oblast</i> and the krays of Stavropol and Krasnodar, the main cereal producing regions. The risks of forest fires are increasing (south of the European part of the country and south of western Siberia, eastern Siberia and the Far East).</p>	<p>a significant role in manufacturing activities (new car industries in St Petersburg and in the region of Kaluga). In order to diversify and intensify the exports of oil and gas, new pipelines are being built (Eastern Siberia-Pacific Ocean Pipeline, etc.). A significant priority is the development of seaports, including in the Far East. New ports are being built (Ust-Luga on the Baltic Sea, a huge project in Murmansk).</p>	<p>relatively small (1.5%). Migrant workers originate mainly from the CIS countries and from the Far East (Asia) The biggest supplier has been Ukraine. The main target territory of migrant workers is central Russia (where 40% of migrant workers are employed), mainly the Moscow agglomeration. Estimates indicate that non-registered migrant workers have added some 10-20% (1-2 million people) to the city's population. The second pole of attraction for labour migrants is the Urals federal district (oilfields of Yamalo-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi). The Far East also attracts significant numbers of labour migrants, mainly from Asia.</p>	<p>typically to be found in predominantly agricultural regions. The oil-producing regions where large investment projects are under way (<i>oblast</i> of Sakhalin and autonomous okrugs of Nenets), production has been growing. On the other hand, the worst rates of recession were in mechanical engineering (regions of Oryol, Ulyanovsk, Novgorod, Samara and Chuvash). The regions specialising in fertiliser manufacturing also suffered. The crisis has exacerbated the problem of narrow specialisation of regions and the problem of towns with a single economic mainstay. Territories with a more diversified economy are finding it easier to survive the crisis.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Slovak Republic</p>	<p>There is evidence of a long-term trend of climate change in Slovakia. The average amount of precipitation has declined; more strongly so in the southern parts of the country. All forecasts indicate that there will be an increase in winter and spring run-offs and a decline in summer and autumn run-offs. The western and southern parts of the country will be most impacted. During the period 1996-2000 various strong floods affected relatively small territories. Forest fires remain an important factor of risk (damaging fires in the period 2004-05). Substantial changes are expected in ecosystems (mainly forest areas). The environment of</p>	<p>The main comparative advantage of Slovakia lies in its relatively low labour costs, well-developed infrastructure, political stability and strong GDP growth. FDI constitutes the engine of the Slovak economy, but it creates huge regional disparities in the country. The regions most favoured by FDI are Bratislava as well as the whole region of western Slovakia and the region of central Povazie and Kosice. Industrial clusters have been either recently established or their establishment is being planned (automotive, electrical engineering, IT, wood-processing clusters). They benefit from public support.</p>	<p>The most utilised renewable energy is hydropower. There is still remaining potential in this field. The potentialities of solar energy are also substantial and their exploitation benefits from public support (subsidies). Geothermal energy is available mainly in the countries of Trnava, Nitra and Zilina. Its exploitation is, however, subject to technological constraints. The highest technological potential is to be found in biomass which can be burnt; together with fossil fuels, in thermal power plants as well as in cogeneration plants. So far, three wind parks have been developed. There is much more exploitable potential (western</p>	<p>While Slovakia has, during a long period, been a country of emigration, one can observe a changing trend in migration flows in recent years. Immigration prevails over emigration. Immigrants originate mainly from central and eastern Europe. The share of immigrants from Asia is, however, increasing. Economic migrants outweigh political migrants. The outflow of educated people from Slovakia is still significant, causing problems for the Slovak economy.</p>	<p>As a consequence of the economic crisis, the number of jobs threatened by mass lay-offs is estimated at around 40 000 (motor and electrical/electronic industries). The regions of Banska Bystrica, Presov and Kosice are among the ones which were most heavily impacted with regard to their increase in unemployment.</p>
-------------------------------	---	---	--	--	---

<p>large cities is likely to be affected also, with increasing temperature and decreasing humidity, storms and heavy rainfalls.</p>		<p>Slovakia, Low Tatra mountains). In 2009, the government adopted a Strategy for the Higher Utilisation of Renewable Energy Resources.</p>		
<p>“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”</p>				
<p>Particular attention is paid to the occurrence of floods as a consequence of climate change and appropriate protection systems have been established. Floods cause major problems and damage agricultural areas, infrastructure, industrial facilities, houses, etc. These problems result from defective drainage systems in the country and from the lack of erosion control in the upper streams of rivers and torrents. Large control systems are built for flood protection in the following areas: Skopje, Pelagonia, Strumica and Struga.</p>	<p>“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” has a small, open economy with relatively limited resources and it is promoting an export-oriented strategy for development. In order to overcome the chronic trade deficit and the overall balance sheet, it is necessary to devote special attention to the increase of exports, to the improvement of economic relations and to the enhancement of the competitiveness of the export sector. Efforts are made to increase the flows of FDI, to modernise infrastructure, to enhance local production and to promote tourism.</p>	<p>A strategy for the development of the energy sector for the period 2008-30 is in preparation. Significant investment is foreseen in the field of hydropower plants and co-generation plants. With regard to energy transportation networks, a cross-border electricity connection is planned between Stip and Nis (Serbia). A feasibility study is being made about a gas pipeline system throughout the country.</p>		

Table 3: Evolution of territorially significant policies (1)

Intensification of comprehensive approaches (examples)	Promotion of sustainable territorial development (examples)	Policies for strengthening regional competitiveness (examples)	Prevention and mitigation of impacts of climate change (examples)	Promotion of renewable energy resources (examples)
<p>Armenia</p> <p>In order to strengthen vertical and horizontal co-ordination, an interministerial commission has been established. Examples of vertical co-operation are directed towards the fostering of entrepreneurship, the creation of new jobs, the improvement of the social conditions of the population and the increase of global competitiveness of local products. The agricultural policy aims at strengthening horizontal connections and co-operation (with transport, machinery, communication, trade, financial institutions, etc.).</p>	<p>Sustainable territorial development is being promoted in various fields. A principle of “green urban development” has been adopted (balanced settlements based on polycentrism). The stable development of agriculture, the balanced use of natural resources and the stability of energy systems essentially condition the development of rural areas. In rural and frontier communities, large scale programmes are implemented, also by international organisations, to foster the development of frontier villages which are handicapped by destroyed infrastructure, high unemployment and strong immigration</p>	<p>The policy which is to be implemented for increasing the competitiveness of territories (2008-12) is aimed at subsidising agriculture in non-favourable climate conditions, in order to exploit capacity resources. Training is also an important aspect of the competitiveness policy.</p>	<p>In order to limit greenhouse gas emissions, it has been decided to build a new nuclear power plant and to reduce the use of fossil energy. Action is also taken to restore the forests cut during the 1990s and to plant new forests. Anti-hail stations have been reconstructed and developed. Measures are being implemented to mitigate and prevent the impacts of floods. Adaptive measures are being developed in various other fields in order to limit the negative impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>The main measure to develop the production of renewable energy is the planning of 115 small hydropower plants with a total capacity of 147 MW throughout the country. Other measures aim at promoting the development of wind, solar and biogas energy.</p>

<p>Austria</p>	<p>Inter-municipal co-operation is an important approach in Lower Austria. It is based on the principle of 59 volunteering micro-regions that have been formed in the last 25 years for this purpose. The regional government and regional management support them. Inter-municipal co-operation is concretised through the elaboration of “micro-regional development concepts” and “micro-regional framework concepts”. The first category is related to the development of economic, social and cultural diversity in the micro-regions, including visions and strategies for the future developed with the participation of the population. The second category refers to the optimisation of</p>	<p>A significant example of sustainable territorial development in Austria is that of regional management bodies (RMBs). Since their foundation in the mid-1990s, RMBs are acknowledged as an important innovation throughout the regional development community of Austria. Initiated by the Federal Chancellery, they are institutionally located at the interface between the level of regional administration and the smaller self-governing entities, where strategic planning and co-operation beyond local administrative borders has the highest potential of effectiveness (organisation of networking processes, promotion of development projects). RMBs are the first contact partners in the</p>	<p>Examples related to the prevention and mitigation of climate change impacts can be found at various administrative levels. At the federal level, the integration of mitigation and adaptation measures related to the impacts of climate change into the National Strategic Reference Framework for EU Structural Policies is explicit. Incentives are provided for involving energy experts in the design and implementation of investment projects. Energy savings and efficiency are strong priorities in large projects supported at the national level. At the local level, for the past 10 years, the city of Vienna has implemented a broad climate protection programme, with the aim of</p>	<p>An interesting example is the introduction of “Energy Certificates for Settlements” in Lower Austria. The principle is the calculation of the total cost of energy consumed by residential units (including the initial investment for the construction and maintenance costs of technical utilities and waste disposal infrastructure as well as the transport infrastructure). The determined energy level enables a comparison between various construction possibilities at various locations within a municipality. It is an illustrative way to demonstrate the influence of various construction types and costs, and the extent to which the location of a residential area affects costs and levels of CO₂ emissions.</p>
-----------------------	---	---	---	--

<p>the spatial structure for a planning horizon of 10 to 15 years, defining the best locations and potentials. Both documents are complementary.</p>	<p>regions for citizens and project promoters (support for project implementation and acquisition of funds from different levels, sectors and institutions, including private ones). In the beginning, RMBs focused on rural areas. During the last years, they gained particular importance in urban agglomerations for supporting development and planning processes.</p>		<p>preventing an increase in annual emissions of CO₂ equivalents. The follow-up programme will run until 2020. It is related to energy production and use, mobility and city structure.</p>	
Croatia				
<p>The principles of comprehensive approaches are embedded in various legislations, regulations and strategic policies. This is the case of the Physical Planning and Building Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the National Environmental Strategy, the Strategy</p>	<p>The Physical Planning and Building Act foresees, among others, spatial monitoring measures as well as the preparation of mandatory physical planning documents at various levels. Physical planning policy is decentralised. Local authorities are responsible for</p>	<p>Competitiveness of specific regions is covered by the economic and regional policy of the Republic of Croatia. The Ministry of the Economy, Labour and Foreign Entrepreneurship implements measures through which support is provided to clusters and FDI. Re-qualification of</p>	<p>The environmental protection policy stipulates, among others, the implementation of environmental impact statements and strategic environmental assessment. A number of other regulations and acts in the field of environmental protection are also in force, the aim of which is the</p>	<p>The framework for use of renewable energy sources is provided by the Strategy of Energy Development adopted in 2009 and by environmental policy. Renewable energy sources do not hold an appropriate share and position in the energy sector, although they have great significance</p>

<p>for the Sustainable Development of the Republic of Croatia, and the Regional Development Act.</p>	<p>spatial management and protection. They ensure the conditions for social and economic development, environmental protection and rational use of natural and historical resources following the principles of an integrated approach to spatial planning.</p>	<p>human resources is jointly dealt with by employment and labour policies and the education policy. At the same time, the regional level (counties) proposes strategies for their endogenous development and coordinates them with the national level. Such a comprehensive two-way system (top down and bottom up) should be further encouraged and linked to European policies and funds. The Regional Competitiveness Operational Programme 2009-13 is an arrangement for the use of EU structural funds.</p>	<p>prevention and mitigation of climate change impacts. In addition, the National Environmental Strategy and the Environmental Operational Programme 2007-09 determine priorities and measures in the field of environmental protection.</p>	<p>and availability (particularly solar, wind and biomass energy). The promotion of the use of renewable energy benefits, however, from governmental support (solar energy, wind energy, biomass, small hydropower plants, geothermal energy, tidal energy, etc.).</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>Czech Republic</p>	<p>The Czech Republic cares about the creation of balanced territorial conditions in order to protect the environment, foster economic growth and promote community cohesion (sustainable development). The Spatial Development Policy defines strategies for the activities of regions and municipalities, and for the process of creating sectoral concepts. In compliance with this, the planning documentation of regions and municipalities is being administered in order to create conditions to balance the three pillars of sustainable development and for an overall stabilisation of the settlement structure.</p>	<p>The priorities of the Strategy for Regional Development of the Czech Republic are related to the creation of conditions for dynamic economic development of regions, the strengthening of the competitiveness of SMEs, the promotion of innovative business activities and research in the regions, the creation of job opportunities and the promotion of human capital investment.</p>	<p>As follow-up to the 2004 National Programme to Abate the Impacts of Climate Change, a new climate protection policy is being prepared for adoption in the second half of 2010. In recent years, significant progress has been achieved in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, thanks to the use of renewable energy sources (wind, solar, biogas power stations). Measures have been taken in the field of agriculture and of water management (flood prevention while ensuring water supply). Difficulties still exist in the transport sector (significant traffic growth).</p>	<p>The Czech Republic has developed significant efforts to increase the share of renewable energy in the production of electricity. The aim is to achieve a share of 8% in 2010. The government is preparing three policy documents related to energy: the State Energy Strategy (for the next 30 years), the Territorial Energy Strategy (objectives and principles at regional level) and the State Programme for the Promotion of Energy Savings and the Use of Renewable Energy Sources.</p>
------------------------------	--	---	---	--

<p>Estonia</p>	<p>No significant intensification of vertical or horizontal co-operation in territorially significant policies during the past five years. Still, some larger cities (Tallinn, Tartu) and their surrounding municipalities have started special formats of co-operation with the aim of strengthening co-operation and joint planning in larger urban agglomerations (land-use planning, public transport, waste management and provision of some other public services). Vertical co-operation in territorially significant policies is at a constant level.</p>	<p>Since 2008, a special programme has existed, Development of Urban Areas, which is targeted to support investments of the five largest cities and their surrounding agglomerations in the field of developing public urban space, sustainable urban transport and social services.</p>	<p>Numerous programmes and schemes contribute to the improvement of regional competitiveness in Estonia, such as the Regional Competitiveness Improvement Programme (EU support), the Support Programme for Developing Regional Competence Centres (EU support), the Regional Competitiveness Improvement Grant of Small Projects, the Support Programme for the Development of Regional Colleges and various others.</p>	<p>Investments aimed at increasing the use of renewable energy are supported under the Operational Programme for Developing the Living Environment (EU support): small-scale co-generation plants and electric generation plants for complementing wind parks. Investments by farmers in the production of bio-energy (bio-electricity, bio-heat, bio-fuels) are supported by the Estonian Rural Development Plan. Wind energy does not benefit regional development as subsidised investments are made by external investors.</p>
-----------------------	---	--	---	--

<p>Finland</p>	<p>The National Land Use Guidelines are a regularly updated planning instrument which relate to the regional and community structure, the quality of the living environment, communication networks, energy supply, the natural and cultural heritage and the use of natural resources. These may have a impact on horizontal co-ordination.</p>
-----------------------	--

<p>France</p>	<p>Comprehensive approaches are those involving all partners and stakeholders of the public and private sector. Examples of such approaches are the joint multi-annual programmes for the development of projects of the state and regional authorities. They aim at promoting the competitiveness and attractiveness of the territory, sustainable development, and territorial and social cohesion. Similar procedures are applied for specific areas subject to economic restructuring, with approaches involving all partners. Comprehensive approaches are also developed in the context of cross-border co-operation.</p>	<p>For the period 2003-08, a National Strategy for Sustainable Development was adopted, which will be followed by a new one, to be approved in 2010, including the outcome of the debate on the "Grenelle de l'Environnement". Concrete initiatives concern the construction of 2 000 km of high-speed railways, the promotion of public transport in agglomerations (for example, Montpellier, which is planning the largest tramway network in France).</p>	<p>It is considered that the increase in territorial competitiveness should be based on support to more advanced clusters. A national policy was adopted along this line in 2004, which involves large companies and various public and private research institutions. Some 71 clusters have so far been accredited for support, among which there are some with worldwide significance (Aerospace valley in the Midi-Pyrénées and Aquitaine). In addition, regional innovation strategies are targeting SMEs and are supported by the regional authorities, the state and the EU. The French Agency for International Investments has the task of increasing the attractiveness of French regions for FDI through a variety of incentives.</p>	<p>In 2007, the government approved a national strategy related to climate change. The elaboration of "energy-climate" territorial plans will become compulsory for all agglomerations with more than 50 000 inhabitants. The local Agenda 21 makes it possible, at local level, to implement the principles of sustainable development. It is also envisaged to elaborate, at regional level, "regional framework concepts of ecological coherence" to be used as reference to assess the various planning and development decisions. The policy in favour of renewable energy sources contributes significantly to the priorities related to climate change.</p>	<p>France is aiming at a 20% (of final energy consumption) share of renewable energy by 2020, against 10.3% in 2005. With this in mind, a national plan for the development of renewable energy sources was adopted in 2008. It comprises 50 operational measures, a number of them with specific territorial aspects (rationalisation of wind energy parks, exploitation of geothermal energy, etc.). The plan also concerns the overseas territories (example of the GERRI Programme on renewable energy for La Réunion).</p>
----------------------	---	---	---	--	---

<p>Germany</p>	<p>Vertical and horizontal co-operation procedures have been strengthened since the 1990s. Significant examples are the Demonstration Projects of Spatial Planning (MORO), supported by the federal ministry, for testing and realising innovative, spatial planning oriented strategic approaches and instruments involving co-operation between academics and practitioners, namely local and regional stakeholders. Examples are the spatial development strategies to combat climate change (KlimaMORO); the supra-regional partnerships in functional interconnected cross-border regions; innovative projects to</p>	<p>Many of the demonstration projects (MORO) serve to realise sustainable spatial development interests. A special strategy to observe the progress but also the setbacks in the field of sustainable spatial development is an indicator system measuring the sustainability deficits. Regional sustainability is evaluated by summing up all indicators. The regions themselves should be able to identify specific sustainability gaps or deficits from which the political need for action can be derived.</p>	<p>Within the demonstration projects (MORO), examples of supra-regional partnerships strengthening growth and innovation, and thus increasing competitiveness, are concretised and tested in terms of their practical suitability. The thematic focus is on the following fields of action: knowledge and education, innovation, clusters, spill-over, financial networks, and joint supra-regional economic development. They aim at producing transferable recommendations for future application in the regions and for specific support by federal government measures.</p>	<p>In 2008, Germany adopted the Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change, which is to be followed in 2011 by an action plan on adaptation. Within the strategy, territorial development is considered as having a co-ordinating role in protecting, ensuring and sustainably developing the settlement, transport and open space structure as well as natural resources and an important role in terms of concrete measures to be taken in regions and cities. In particular, the regional level is predestined to implement adaptation strategies while prevention strategies are increasingly realised at local level. Examples of actions</p>	<p>The Federal Republic of Germany has a large set of instruments to promote renewable energy sources. They comprise of legal provisions, financial incentives, research, awareness raising and various funding approaches. In particular, the law on the priority of renewable energy sources aims at promoting increased electricity and heat production based on renewable energy sources. It provides among other things for a guaranteed feed-in tariff scheme for electricity from renewable energy sources.</p>
-----------------------	--	--	---	---	--

<p>promote co-operation among city regions and networking, and to share responsibility over a large area; and strategic approaches to regional planning to guarantee services of general interest.</p>			<p>being implemented are: the model regions' "spatial development strategies to combat climate change", and climate change oriented urban development (counteracting causes and the consequences of climate change through urban concepts; competition on the energy-efficient refurbishment of large housing estates).</p>	
Hungary				
<p>One of the main objectives of the Hungarian regional development policy is the territorial harmonisation of sectoral policies and developments, and the establishment of synergies with regional development strategies and programmes. The National Spatial Development concept formulates messages and territorial priorities for the different sectors in</p>	<p>Over recent years, the enforcement of sustainability has become an important aim in regional development and in development policy itself. The real integration of sustainability in projects is still under way. The national spatial development strategy has introduced the concept of sustainability at a conceptual level</p>	<p>The New Development Plan for Hungary concentrates EU funds in two fields in order to support the international competitiveness of Hungary: the increase of employment and the promotion of stable growth (R&D and innovation, complex development of enterprises focusing on SMEs, improvement of the modern business environment, increase</p>	<p>A particularly significant initiative was the Special Target Programme 2001-07 for the Homokhatsag area, between the Danube and the Tisza, which is the most endangered by climate change (risk of desertification through drought). The initial programme element was the promotion of structural change in agriculture and experiments promoting</p>	

<p>this spirit. It can be regarded as a real innovation in development policy that both the New Development Plan for Hungary and the New Rural Development Strategic Plan for Hungary refer to territorial cohesion as a so-called horizontal objective. This means that territorial aspects should be taken into account in all programmes and projects co-financed by European funds. The territorial content of every sectoral strategy varies significantly, however. Altogether, the sectoral strategies are not organised on a territorial basis. They take into account territorial aspects to a modest extent. Their territorial content should be enhanced in order to promote synergetic effects.</p>	<p>into territorial policy. The principles of spatial sustainability can be transposed in a limited way into lower level development documents. The spatial sustainability principle is, for instance, taken into account in the Environment and Energy Operational Programme in relation to biomass production. A handbook on territorial cohesion has been produced, presenting, among others, the spatial interpretation of sustainability and the possibilities for its enforcement through practical examples. Sustainability is also enforced through spatial plans at regional and local levels.</p>	<p>in accessibility, improvement in adaptability of human resources, etc.). At a conceptual level, the National Spatial Development Strategy introduced the concept of spatial competitiveness into territorial policy (every region should define its own, unique factors of competitiveness). The territory has also been enhanced through the development of a system of entrepreneurial zones and industrial parks. Clusters are relatively new types of spatial structure of the economy. The first clusters were established in 2000 and are strongly supported by EU funds.</p>	<p>change and technology transfer of farming knowledge. In the model area, many alternative drought-tolerant plants were planted which produced, even in this area, good average yields. The programme also contained a rural development component aiming at developing tourism, the promotion of co-operatives and renewable energy sources.</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>Latvia</p>	<p>A significant example of the application of comprehensive approaches is the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia up to 2030, which is currently being finalised. This strategy will be the highest planning document in the country. The strategy is seen as a comprehensive and integrated horizontal strategy that does not look at the development of specific policies and sectors, but provides a general framework and sets the main principles, targets and directions of implementation for social, economic and spatial development. This process has already taken a couple of years of intense analytical work and has included</p>	<p>Support for the largest and potentially strongest municipalities in Latvia is carried out with an overall aim to facilitate polycentric development, especially in providing support for developing the competitiveness, accessibility and attractiveness of urban territories and city regions. In the context of the EU's structural funds, 17 municipalities are eligible for support for infrastructure development. They are identified as driving forces of national and regional economic development. Support for assisted territories is of equal importance to ensure the balanced development of the country and to avoid growing disparities.</p>	<p>Latvia has established a climate change financial Instrument (sale of emission quotas). Latvia has signed agreements with the Netherlands and Austria on sales of emission quotas. It is expected to sign more agreements in the future. The financial resources should be used for measures aimed at the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the country. The activities envisaged are related to the improvement of the energy efficiency of public and private housing, the reduction of emissions in transport, electricity savings in the public and private sector, and the development and use of technologies based on renewable resources. Financial allocations will be</p>	<p>The most characteristic example concerns the production of electricity from renewables with a higher purchase price guaranteed by the government. The largest share is allocated to hydropower electricity, followed by electricity from biogas, wind and biomass.</p>
----------------------	---	--	---	---

<p>the involvement of the general public and stakeholders (expert discussions, etc.). The strategy is expected to be approved by the national parliament in 2010.</p>		<p>Support to areas lagging behind aims at improving living conditions, accessibility to services and creation of jobs.</p>	<p>given to municipalities (improvement of heating efficiency) and to universities (improvement of energy efficiency).</p>	
<p>Norway</p>				
<p>The intensification of comprehensive approaches takes place in various fields (system of multilevel governance). The regional government reform of 2010 strengthens the regional level of government and creates strong and committed alliances between the regional and the national levels. The spatial planning reform of 2009 makes the regional planning system more efficient and powerful in a context of horizontal and vertical</p>	<p>More sustainable forms of territorial development are being widely promoted. In order to avoid too strong a concentration in large urban centres, the government promotes high-quality housing, the availability of efficient services and job opportunities in less developed, more rural areas. The multifunctional character of agriculture is being supported. Efforts are made to limit car transport and related emissions through better</p>	<p>Strengthening the competitiveness of specific regions is an important priority in Norway, which is implemented through various instruments. The government is spreading power and expertise across the country by relocating specific administrations from the capital city of Oslo. The development agencies play an important part in facilitating innovation and development of companies, to the benefit of less-developed areas.</p>	<p>Municipal and regional planning authorities are required to address civil protection, including risk and vulnerability analysis for all development areas. In their overall municipal plan or in a separate thematic plan, the municipalities are obliged to include measures and means to reduce emissions of greenhouse gas and to ensure more efficient energy consumption and conversion to environmentally friendly energy. The county</p>	<p>Hydroelectric power is the major source of energy for both industrial and domestic purposes. The potential of wind energy in coastal areas is significant. R&D activities are carried out in the field of tidal power and pressure-retarded osmosis. The world's first osmotic plant was opened in 2009. There is significant potential for electricity generation according to this technology, which could have great impacts on territorial development</p>

<p>co-ordination. It enables better enhancement of the specific regional potentials. The government supports community development initiatives. Territorial co-operation across borders is being intensified, with broader participation and improved dissemination.</p>	<p>land use and transport planning. Impact assessment and concept choice studies aim at facilitating decision-making processes along more sustainable forms of territorial development. The policy related to protected areas aims at enlarging the areas under protection (archipelagos, specific habitats, etc.).</p>	<p>Support is given to investments in businesses that are based on regional resources and potentials, especially to new enterprises started by young people and women. The enhancement of landscapes in urban and rural areas is also considered as important for increasing the attractiveness and competitiveness of the territory. The High North Policy will be an important strategic priority for the years ahead, calling for significant international co-operation.</p>	<p>councils are equally responsible within regional planning and their own field of activity.</p>	<p>in the regions where resources are abundant. The exploitation of bio-energy (wood and waste) is also important. The potential for solar energy is more modest, although the solar energy industries are growing fast. They export a large part of their products.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

<p>Poland</p>	<p>The objective of the new regional policy is to ensure an increased horizontal and multilevel co-ordination of activities at the level of the country and of the regions. It is recognised that synergy has to be developed between the various public investments and that the sector-oriented approach, which has dominated up to now, should be abandoned. Stronger co-ordination will allow better coherence between the actions undertaken by the government and by the regional/local authorities and those of public and non-public partners. Simplification of the implementation process is also necessary.</p>	<p>The territorial vision for Poland presented in the draft KPZK 2030 shows an internally coherent and well-integrated conception of Poland in the European space. Its backbone is a polycentric metropolitan network, created by dynamic development centres; an open system of numerous metropolitan areas together with their peripheries and other growth centres which are all interconnected. In this approach, spatial planning is integrated with socio-economic planning. The planning area integrates the sea zone and gives more importance to transborder connections at the internal and external borders of the EU.</p>	<p>A significant example of an initiative aiming at strengthening territorial competitiveness is the Operational Programme for the Development of Eastern Poland (EU funding), concerning the five most disadvantages voivodships of the country. This programme is selective in terms of eligible areas and thematic priorities. It favours the knowledge-based economy, access to broadband Internet, the development of selected metropolitan functions in cities and the enhancement of sustainable tourism. The programme targets supra-regional interests, common public services and goods, and a common strategy for cross-border co-operation.</p>	<p>Greenhouse gas emissions have somewhat increased in recent years as a result of the strong economic development of the country. They are, however, much lower than the levels of 1988, before the transition period.</p>	<p>Renewable energy sources are used to a small extent in Poland. The modernisation of the energy supply system will be based on the modernisation of large power stations in order to reduce their environmental impact. Some two or three nuclear power plants and new coal power plants will be built in line with new technological standards (liquefaction and capture of CO₂). Renewable energy sources will be promoted through support to small power generators (using biomass and biogas, solar energy and geothermal energy). The electricity grid will be adapted to transmit energy from such sources. The high-voltage grid will also be adapted to transmit power from wind farms.</p>
----------------------	--	---	---	---	--

<p>Russian Federation</p>	<p>Examples of more comprehensive approaches in territorial planning can be found in various fields. Strengthening horizontal and vertical co-operation takes place when devising and implementing national projects (especially in the sectors of health, education and housing policies), involving also regional and local authorities. The move towards a system of long-term strategic planning also reinforces comprehensive approaches. Strategic planning is being backed up by measures to strengthen interaction between authorities at various levels (vertically) and also develop interaction between regions and</p>	<p>A major characteristic of economically unsustainable territories is their low level of economic diversification (too high dependence upon a small number of basic industries). This type of problem is even more acute at the level of individual municipalities. An inter-departmental working group has been set up in the Federal Ministry of Regional Development to tackle the problems. The strategies developed are designed to make the individual enterprises of the municipalities concerned more competitive and to create new alternative activities. A few years ago, a priority was adopted to let the economy move from a raw materials economy</p>	<p>A whole range of instruments contributes to increasing the competitiveness of territories, such as the federal development institutes and other federal economic policy instruments. Specific programmes are aiming at supporting the development of backward regions, such as the Far East and Zabaykalskij kray, the south of Russia, the North Caucasus and the <i>oblast</i> of Kaliningrad and Kuril islands. The federal government supports the development of infrastructures, including the business-related ones. The Russian Federation Investment Fund has been set up to develop public-private partnerships in the</p>	
----------------------------------	--	---	---	--

<p>co-ordination of the different ministries and departments (horizontal interaction). A specific department has been created within the Federal Ministry of Regional Development to co-ordinate long-term sectoral development strategies and federal targeted and departmental programmes.</p>	<p>to an innovative economy. The new policy instruments reach far beyond the framework of regional policy. Different federal ministries and departments are handling the implementation of the corresponding measures. Examples are: science parks, special economic areas and a whole host of other federal development institutes.</p>	<p>regions. The housing policy also contributes to increasing the attractiveness of cities.</p>		
<p>Slovak Republic</p>				
<p>During the period of transition, the Slovak Republic was characterised by growing territorial disparities and increasing social polarisation. The most important approaches that has emerged within the last decade to eliminate the causes and mitigate the</p>	<p>Sustainable forms of territorial development are embedded in the various categories of spatial development plans at the various levels. At national level, the Strategy of Territorial Development of Slovakia, adopted in 2001, addresses recommendations for</p>	<p>Incentives to attract FDI are among the most important instruments aimed at strengthening the competitiveness of regions. Support for the constitution and consolidation of clusters also help in this respect.</p>	<p>The main policies related to the prevention and mitigation of the impacts of climate change are contained in the following policy documents: the National Climate Programme (estimates of possible impacts; adaptation strategies in the socio-economic area and</p>	<p>In 2006, the government approved a proposal for an energy policy, a priority of which (among others) was to increase the share of renewable energy sources in electricity and heat production in order to create adequate additional sources necessary to cover</p>

<p>effects of territorial polarisation concern the support to socially and economically weaker regions, changes in the institutional framework (regional development policy, regional self-governance, decentralisation), and support of inter-municipal co-operation aimed at creating regional and micro-regional strategic partnerships and attraction of EU funds.</p>	<p>the arrangement and structural hierarchy of settlements and settlement nodes, as well as for economic agglomerations in international and national connections. It also evaluates the requirements of sectoral strategies in terms of spatial organisation and functional utilisation of the territory. Numerous projects of transnational and cross-border co-operation are centred on issues of sustainable territorial development.</p>	<p>natural environment protection); the Fourth National Communication on Climate Change and the "Report on demonstrable progress to achieve the commitments of the Kyoto Protocol", the National Forest Programme (2009-11) and the National Strategic Plan for Rural Development for 2007-13. Various projects of territorial co-operation also contribute to developing solutions with regard to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>domestic demand. A governmental decree also made it mandatory to develop strategies that would allow greater utilisation of renewable sources in the country. Significant potential still exists in various fields. The Act on Support to Renewable Energy Sources has been very significant in the development of the use of renewable energy. Efforts have been developed to identify the potential of the various sources, to outline options for commercial utilisation and to propose targets to be reached by 2015, as well as measures to reach these targets.</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”</p>	<p>The government has published two reports (2005 and 2008) on national communications on climate change, which contain data on greenhouse gas emissions by source, climate scenarios, analyses of the most vulnerable sectors to climate change, draft measures and actions to reduce and adapt to climate change, activities to raise public awareness, etc. The National Strategy for Clean Development (2008-12) provides institutional and technical recommendations for the implementation of projects; other strategic documents elaborate the issue of climate change: the National Strategy for Sustainable Development, the second National Environmental Action Plan, etc.</p>
---	---

<p>Ukraine</p>	<p>New schemes of territorial planning and development are elaborated for the various regions. Four of them are already completed. In this context, special attention is paid to projects concerning the joint development of several regions and the development of cross-border regions with neighbouring countries. The planning schemes of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and Odessa <i>Oblast</i> are of special importance. They have both been approved at a political level. The regional schemes are elaborated on the basis of a new methodology, considering the potential and level of development of each individual region. All aspects of territorial</p>
-----------------------	---

<p>development are investigated. Spatial plans are also elaborated for territories building a common geographic and socio-economic unity, such as the coastal region along the Black and Azov seas, the Carpathians, Polissya, etc.</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

Table 4: Evolution of territorially significant policies (2)

Measures/policies on the territorial impacts of social polarisation (examples)	Measures/policies promoting territorial integration along borders (examples)	Probable territorial impacts of policies for boosting the economy after the crisis	Boosting the economy through decentralised promotion of endogenous resources and new growth sectors (examples)
<p>Armenia</p> <p>In the context of growing territorial disparities, social polarisation can be observed at both the inter-regional level (poverty in rural areas) and at the intra-urban level. It is considered that the main tool to reduce social polarisation is the development of employment. Measures are taken to increase the quality of the entrepreneurial and investment environment. In urban areas, attention is being paid to the development of SMEs and to the attraction of foreign investors (long-term loans).</p>	<p>Considering that only two out of four borders are open (with Georgia and Iran), efforts in the field of cross-border co-operation are limited due to these circumstances. They concentrate, however, on the joint management of resources, on the prevention of risks and on the solution of environmental problems. Along the northern and southern borders, close co-operation is carried out in the field of agriculture, favouring territorial integration. Euroregions have been set up in several cross-border areas (Shirak-Kars, Lori-Javakheti).</p>	<p>In order to counteract the sharp economic recession caused by the crisis, the government has adopted measures aiming at strengthening employment and at adapting qualifications. New growth is expected from the construction and service sectors. It is also envisaged to orient the economy towards production investments and knowledge. The industrial policy aims at the construction of internationally competitive modern industrial complexes, including new technologies and highly qualified human resources. The attraction of foreign investors in this field will be motivated by the provision of adequate infrastructure and the development of training and high-level education.</p>	<p>In order to achieve a balanced territorial development, support will be given to tourist activities in regions which have potential in this field (spas, Alpine skiing, tours to vineyards, establishment of a gold/diamond jewellery centre).</p>

<p>Austria</p>	<p>The city of Vienna has increased its investments to boost the economy and secure jobs. The main priorities are still in the expansion of the infrastructure, education, childcare, health, social welfare and culture. The city of Vienna has invested €4.4 billion into the recovery of the economy, with special importance given to the backing of SMEs, and to hospitals and nursing homes. Another priority is the integration of young people into the labour market through improvement of skills. Measures for improving infrastructure concern the R&D and technology sectors, as well as public transportation. A new programme for the development of social housing has also been adopted. The construction of new free kindergartens is also being promoted.</p>
<p>A particular example of public action for preventing social polarisation is the housing and urban renewal policy in Vienna. Strategic localisation of public and subsidised housing, spread over different city areas, and a comprehensive model of urban renewal are considered as very important. Vienna has a long tradition of social housing and sustainable urban renewal. The benefits of preventing social polarisation are well known at international level too. Today, social housing includes approximately 220 000 community-owned and 200 000 subsidised rental apartments, and also those built by non-profit or commercial building societies. Since 1995, special emphasis has been placed on the comprehensive quality of subsidised housing (property developer's competition). Experimental projects, such as the free model estate, housing projects designed by and for women, integration projects and passive houses are important to further improve quality. Around 7 000 subsidised new apartments are built each year.</p>	

<p>Croatia</p>	<p>Almost all counties of the country are situated along borders (with the exception of three). Territorial integration along borders is being promoted through cross-border co-operation programmes, both with EU countries (Adriatic Programme) and with non-EU ones (Croatia-Bosnia and Herzegovina Programme). Co-operation stretches over a wide range of activities and issues: promotion of sustainable socio-economic development, protection of the environment and of the natural and cultural heritage, development of tourism, etc.</p>
<p>Social polarisation and marginalisation has increased over the past two decades as a result of the deep transformations in the country and also of the effects of the war. It affects both marginal rural areas and cities. Specific programmes are targeted at the development of specific disadvantaged regions (for instance, islands). In 2007, a Memorandum on Joint Inclusion was signed by Croatia and the EU to stimulate social inclusion. The programme comprises housing policy measures, measures in the field of active labour market policy, measures for people in a disadvantaged social position (disabled people, refugees and war veterans, Roma) as well as measures on health care and social welfare.</p>	

<p>Czech Republic</p>	<p>Measures adopted to curb the impact of social polarisation concern: the solving of problems of long-term unemployment; the support of social integration in the regions, especially of social and ethnic groups; the improvement and development of new forms of social and health services; the support of the complex care of the elderly; and the optimisation and restructuring of the public health care network.</p>	<p>Cross-border co-operation is largely based on the 13 euroregions. The border regions belong to the most underdeveloped areas of the country. The objective is to raise the standard of living of their inhabitants and to promote co-operation in the fields of culture, social care, the economy, the environment, spatial planning, and development of infrastructure. In this way, territorial disparities should be progressively counterbalanced.</p>	<p>A particular example is the programme Green Light to Energy Savings, dealing with better insulation of houses subsidised by the government. The aim is the reduction of energy consumption as well as the creation of job opportunities and the development of small businesses.</p>
------------------------------	---	---	---

<p>Estonia</p>	<p>Not a major issue in Estonia.</p>	<p>Territorial integration across borders is promoted by the territorial co-operation programmes of the EU.</p>	<p>The top-down policies for boosting the economy and mitigating the impacts of the economic crisis comprise wage subsidies for enterprises, free training and retraining programmes for job seekers, increased re-adjustment funds for municipalities, etc. There are no visible territorial impacts.</p>	<p>This type of measure has been applied only to the largest cities. The city of Tallinn is implementing a special local support package, including a large variety of measures (social jobs creation by private companies and municipal companies; financial support to entrepreneurs; training programmes and advice for long-term unemployed; financial support for the population for specific purposes such as to cover increasing heating costs, etc.).</p>
<p>France</p>	<p>It is considered that a mixed policy is necessary to counteract social polarisation, combining local measures and national social policy measures. The national policy in favour of cities, which has a long tradition in France, attempts to counteract social polarisation in</p>	<p>Territorial integration across national borders is mainly favoured by cross-border co-operation. France is involved in 20 programmes of cross-border co-operation. Territorial integration can be increased through the improvement of territorial governance in cross-</p>	<p>A national programme for boosting the economy after the crisis was adopted in February 2009. The main objective was to maintain employment and economic activities through support of enterprises, fiscal measures and the speeding up of public investments.</p>	<p>Public policies emphasise more and more the development of “territorial excellence” (or territorial outstanding capital) in the context of boosting the economy. These can be developed in various sectors: tourism, environment, economy etc. A specific example, in this</p>

<p>favouring access to employment for citizens living in deprived neighbourhoods, in improving the quality of life and in favouring social mix, especially through housing and urban renewal policies. In addition, specific support is provided by the state to agglomerations with acute problems of social polarisation (multi-annual programmes based on global approaches). The containment of urban sprawl is also a possible answer, limiting the social segmentation process, which leads to the location of less privileged groups in the outskirts of large cities. Specific measures are also designed for rural areas, which are more and more confronted with problems of social marginalisation, poverty and deprivation.</p>	<p>border areas. The creation of the European Groupings for Territorial Co-operation (EGTC) in the context of the EU has been a significant step in this respect. The first EGTC was created in the case of the cross-border agglomeration of Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai. Local authorities are in fact the engines of cross-border co-operation. Territorial integration is particularly strong in the region Luxembourg-Lorraine-Saarland, where 140 000 commuters cross the border of Luxembourg every day.</p>	<p>The improvement of the attractiveness of territories through the development of infrastructures is one of the main priorities (high-level education and research facilities, enhancement of the cultural heritage). Support for investments by the local and regional authorities is a significant part of the programme. In addition, a national fund for the revitalisation of territories was created in April 2009, with the aim of providing loans to enterprises threatened by the crisis, enabling them to maintain employment. It has been estimated that 250 000 jobs were saved in 2009 in the context of the national programme for boosting the economy.</p>	<p>respect, is the policy of the “rural poles of excellence”, launched in 2006, which aims at developing employment in disadvantaged areas. Projects are supported which belong to the following categories: technologies for industries and handicraft in rural areas, services and housing for new inhabitants, exploitation of bio-resources, enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage and tourist development. This initiative has generated the creation of a significant number of jobs.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>Germany</p>	<p>The urban development programme Urban Districts with Special Development Needs – the Socially Integrated City was launched in 1999 with the aim of stopping the downward spiral in depressed urban districts and of significantly improving living conditions. Today, there are 523 urban areas benefiting from the programme in 326 municipalities. The social city programme adopts an integrated and complex neighbourhood development approach. Measures and projects can be attributed to a catalogue of 13 thematic fields of action. Related demonstration projects mainly focus on the integration of migrants, participation, school and education, community cohesion and other social activities.</p>	<p>Territorial co-operation and integration across national borders has a long tradition in Germany. Since the 1950s, cross-border co-operation structures between local and regional authorities have emerged on the internal and external frontiers of the EU, which are often called euroregions. They involve political, administrative, economic and social stakeholders as well as citizens and other stakeholders, according to the principle of consensus. Some euroregions have a cross-border parliamentary representation. There are also other types of structures and instruments to promote co-operation between national authorities. Apart from binational spatial planning commissions (for example, German-Polish and German-Dutch border) they include agreements putting</p>	<p>In order to counteract the effects of the financial crisis, the federal government has successively adopted national stimulus programmes (acts). The first package of measures, adopted in November 2008, promotes investments and orders to companies, private households and local authorities up to an amount of around €50 billion. The programme contains many diversified measures, such as those aimed at safeguarding employment, accelerated depreciations for SMEs, energy-efficient refurbishment of buildings, accelerating transport investments, etc. The second programme, adopted in January 2009, includes measures amounting to €50 billion. It focuses first on measures with short and medium-term effects. Secondly, comprehensive investments in the future-oriented areas of education,</p>	<p>Decentralised measures to tackle the depression are mainly taken by the <i>Länder</i> and the regions. Examples are the loan and suretyship programmes of the <i>Länder</i> loan and guarantee banks, which were adjusted to the current situation or newly launched. It was decided at the <i>Länder</i> level to speed up investments in infrastructure or to launch additional investment programmes.</p>
-----------------------	---	--	---	---

	<p>governmental commissions with a larger area of responsibility into force (Upper Rhine area; Lake Constance). Other examples are provided by the working consortia dealing with cross-border co-operation across a larger area or across several national borders (for example, ARGE Alp and ARGE Donauländer). In addition, there are also some cross-border urban networks or links such as MONT (Münster-Osnabrück-Netwerstad Twente), Quattro Pole (Luxemburg, Metz, Saarbrücken, Trier) and the double town of Zgörzelic (Gorlitz; Zgorzelec).</p>	<p>infrastructure and climate change mitigation aim at strengthening and modernising these sectors in the long term. A large part of the programme is also devoted to the development of all kinds of infrastructure (educational, social, health, transport infrastructures, urban renewal).</p>	
Hungary			
<p>Measures aiming at counteracting social polarisation are taken at a regional and micro-regional level, rather than at an urban level. Resources for regional development are allocated, among others, to areas with complex backwardness.</p>	<p>Several types of cross-border and transnational co-operation activities are promoting territorial integration. Along the Hungarian borders, 14 euroregions promote cross-border co-operation. Their fields of activities have been</p>	<p>Several economic recovery measures were put into force in order to overcome the financial and economic crisis. In the summer of 2009, various action plans were adopted in the automobile, logistics, medical and biotechnological</p>	<p>Internal trade was strongly hit by the economic crisis: the turnover of retail trade has significantly decreased. The strategy adopted aims at strengthening the market position of small retail enterprises, by lowering</p>

<p>The government has also launched an integrated development programme for the most disadvantaged micro-regions (33 in total within the country), which is financed by the New Hungary Development Plan. Project packages are financed in the following fields: renovation of nurseries, schools, consultation rooms, development of waste and rainwater collection and implementation of educational, employment and health development programmes with special emphasis on the integration of Roma, according to the needs of the micro-region. Specific incentives to attract enterprises to the most disadvantaged micro-regions are also part of the programme.</p>	<p>enlarged in recent years. In order to improve territorial governance in cross-border areas, two EGTCs were created, one along the Hungarian-Slovakian border, the second for the co-operation area along the Slovakian-Hungarian-Ukrainian-Romanian borders. The EU programmes of territorial co-operation play an important part in the strengthening of territorial integration across Hungarian borders. The co-operation of the Visegrád Group (Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia) contributes to territorial integration. Romania and Bulgaria also joined this co-operation. The harmonisation of regional development policies, for instance in the field of transport networks and cross-border development axes, is part of this co-operation.</p>	<p>industries, as well as in information and communication technologies. The functions of these measures are several. They have effects in various fields like regulation, public policies (especially education, vocational training and human resource development) and direct transfer measures.</p>	<p>the administrative burden of commercial enterprises, improving the marketability of domestic products and widening cross-border relations in commercial activities. In addition, several financial programmes aim at supporting enterprises (micro-credit programmes, easing of credit accessibility, New Hungarian Current Assets Credit Programme, SME Investment Credit Programme).</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>Latvia</p>	<p>In order to mitigate the impact of the economic crisis and to boost the economy, the Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government has elaborated Latvia's Strategic Development Plan 2010-13, which focuses government policy on three priorities: renovation of economic development (reduction of regional disparities through targeted investments in local municipalities), social safety (pecuniary aid) and public administration and effectiveness of its services (improved availability of services to citizens either in electronic form or in person throughout the whole territory, establishing one-stop agencies).</p>	<p>Special attention is paid to activities at the local level (municipalities) for promoting economic development. The range of available support measures at the disposal of local municipalities varies: for example, tax rebates on real estate, provision of investments in infrastructure, creation and development of industrial areas, and assistance to entrepreneurs in the creation of new products, services or markets. Municipalities can also establish business support centres. The increase of quality and effectiveness of public services at local level is also a priority.</p>
----------------------	--	---

<p>Norway</p>	<p>It is considered that successful cities and societies in the future will be intercultural. They will be capable of exploiting the potential of their cultural diversity to stimulate creativity and innovations and thus generate economic prosperity and a better quality of life. In conformity with these principles, policies aim at developing a creative economy, receptive and supportive of diversity, (enabling immigrants to develop their own activities), at addressing issues of the housing market and social geography (greater ethnic and social mix) and at renewing the public space (accessible and attractive to everyone, with common meeting grounds for a diversity of citizens). A significant example is the OXLO policy (Oslo Extra Large – A City for All).</p>	<p>A wide range of organisations, policies and programmes contribute to territorial integration across national borders. The Nordic Council of Ministers deals with topics that are of common Nordic interest. There are numerous co-operation areas within the fields of environment and nature. Norway is involved in four cross-border INTERREG programmes. The Kolarctic European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) is promoting cross-border co-operation within a region including the northern parts of Finland, Sweden and Norway and a large part of north-west Russia. Sami co-operation concerns joint school and kindergarten programmes along the Norwegian-Finnish border. The Arctic Council, active in circumpolar co-operation, was established in 1996.</p>	<p>The Norwegian economy has been affected by the financial crisis and the global recession, but to a lesser extent than in most other industrialised countries.</p>	<p>Besides classical export-oriented activities (marine sector with seafood products; maritime industries with specialised shipyards), other endogenous activities are being promoted (research, technological development and commercialisation of environmentally friendly energy like wind power stations; development of environmental technologies). Tourism is a very important activity for Norway and has numerous possibilities for further development (northern regions, tourism in Sami areas, coastal tourism, mountain tourism, urban tourism).</p>
----------------------	---	---	--	---

<p>Poland</p>	<p>In order to counteract the increase of social polarisation in cities, redevelopment projects are being carried out. A particular example is that of Warsaw, where the strategy is aiming at co-ordinating several policies in the areas covered by redevelopment schemes and to support individual city districts in their activities in the field of sustainable urban redevelopment of areas that have lost their previous social and economic functions. The main criteria for selecting redevelopment areas are social ones: high rate of unemployment, social pathologies and inertia. The strategies comprise the activation of the local economy, the redevelopment of buildings, and the improved management of open spaces, so as to create real conditions for self-development of local communities. The approach is comprehensive. It is not only physical, but also social and includes social projects aimed at professional and social activation.</p>	<p>Along the borders of the EU countries, the border areas have benefited from the elimination of barriers (trade, mobility of people, capital and services) and they have gained new positive incentives (economic growth, international co-operation, exchange of experiences and good practices). The progress of territorial integration in these areas is still affected by some constraints, such as poor accessibility, cultural and social differences, and competition from neighbouring regions, especially in the west of Poland. Territorial integration is progressing much less rapidly along the borders with Russia, Belarus and Ukraine.</p>	<p>There is no special survey on the impacts of top-down public policies.</p>
		<p>The draft National Regional Development Strategy proposes to convert regional policy, traditionally understood as a tool of financial redistribution, into a policy aiming at fully using the endogenous potential of territories to achieve the goals of national development: growth, employment and cohesion. In the present strategy (National Strategic Reference Framework), one of the most important ways to achieve growth and cohesion is through support given to large cities as regional growth poles. It is expected that their strengths will also provide benefits to their surroundings (small towns and local territories).</p>	

<p>Russian Federation</p>	<p>The objective of developing human potential and increasing the quality of life of the population have been drawn up for all Russian regions. Given the existing imbalances at the level of socio-economic development, it is hardly possible to guarantee equal living conditions throughout the country's territory, but definite steps are being taken in this direction. In particular, federal support for regional budgets is a strong focus of attention in Russia, as a significant proportion of socially oriented expenditure is borne by regional and local budgets.</p>	<p>The legal and regulatory basis for implementing inter-regional and transfrontier co-operation in the Russian Federation is laid down mainly by the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities. A significant role in the development of transfrontier co-operation is played by the business councils of chambers of trade and industry of transfrontier regions. One example was the setting up of the Business Council of the Chamber of Trade and Industry in the Belarus-Russia-Ukraine border zone. Friendly relations at the local level supplement international and external political links between regions.</p>	<p>The programme of the Russian Federation to counteract the economic recession comprises a variety of measures related to social obligations, the development of the industrial and technological potential, the stimulation of domestic demand for Russian products, the stimulation of innovation, the forging of a powerful financial system and the ensuring of macro-economic stability. Federal support is concentrated on the regions, which have suffered most from the crisis. These are those with a high or medium level of economic development. One example is the car industry. A whole host of measures were taken to stabilise the situation in this sector. Large car industries are located in well-developed cities like St Petersburg, Samara, Nizhny and Novgorod. Further efforts to create a stimulus for economic growth are concentrated on the best-placed regions, which</p>	<p>Recognising the advantages of decentralised decision making, the federal authorities empowered the constituent entities of the Russian Federation to independently devise anti-crisis measures, which were partly funded by the federal budget, in the form of subsidies to regional budgets. Examples are: the support of measures easing tensions on the labour market (vocational training of workers in companies, organisation of community work, etc.) or measures in favour of SMEs and self-employment.</p>
----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

		<p>have the greatest potential for economic development, and the best conditions for innovative activity. At the same time, regional policy aims at creating conditions for socio-economic development in problem areas.</p>	
Slovak Republic			
<p>There are no ethnically segregated areas in Slovak cities, but Slovakia has a relatively high proportion of Roma, leading to the existence of segregated Roma settlements exhibiting rather extreme representations of social polarisation, high poverty and social exclusion. These settlements are mostly located in the rural areas of eastern and partly central Slovakia. A Roma ghetto also exists in the city of Kosice (Lunik IX). In order to reduce the deepening of polarisation in cities, various types of measures are envisaged, such as the mapping of community resources,</p>	<p>The border regions of Slovakia are still subject to numerous development constraints and territorial integration progresses slowly, with the exception of the south-western part of the country bordering Austria and Hungary. The measures taken to increase integration across borders comprise the promotion of co-operation in the euroregions, at the level of self-governing regional units, the formation of regional and micro-regional associations of municipalities of the cross-border regions and various cross-border initiatives of local self-governments. The self-governing counties assume a</p>	<p>Short-term measures adopted by the government to lessen the impacts of the economic crisis are related to the expansive fiscal policy, the use of EU structural funds and investment projects in the area of highways. A second group of measures with medium-term impacts aims at improving the business environment.</p>	<p>In the context of structural policies, measures with medium-term impacts and with regional character are implemented in the fields of education, employment and energy. It is, however, not yet possible to assess the territorial impacts of such measures.</p>

<p>support for employment stability, resolving the housing and security problems, development of community financial institutions, and enhancing the use of social assistance benefits.</p>	<p>position as the most significant promoters of integration in marginalised cross-border regions. Municipalities focus generally only on the development of cultural and social cross-border co-operation (bottom-up approach).</p>		
---	--	--	--

V. CEMAT report of activities 2006–10

Introduction

Since 1970, CEMAT has promoted competitive and sustainable territorial development throughout the member states of the Council of Europe. CEMAT activities reflect the fundamental orientations of the Council of Europe and therefore devote special attention to the social and cultural dimensions of territorial development. During the past decade, CEMAT has concentrated its efforts on the specific requirements of the new member countries of the Council of Europe. The “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent”, adopted in the year 2000 in Hanover and developed in Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, have provided a common doctrine for east and west and have emphasised the continental dimension of territorial development in the wider Europe. The 13th Session of CEMAT held in Ljubljana in 2003 has demonstrated that integrated territorial development is one of the most powerful tools for ensuring global sustainability. The 14th Session held in Lisbon in 2006 has promoted territorial integration throughout Europe through a variety of networking activities.

In a spirit of continuity of efforts for promoting sustainable territorial development, CEMAT activities for the period 2006-10 focused on thematic issues corresponding to important changes in the global context with significant territorial impacts. As the need for integrated approaches remains an essential principle of sustainable territorial development policies, activities are taking into account the requirements for integrated approaches raised by these thematic issues.

On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of CEMAT, the conclusions of the CEMAT seminars and symposia held during these last 10 years are presented.

The CEMAT website was updated in order to present CEMAT activities and those of the member states of the Council of Europe: www.coe.int/CEMAT.

I. Thematic issues of the working programme of the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

The Council of Europe aims at promoting human rights, the rule of law and democracy. Territorial development policies, although being based on

a legal and institutional framework, have, in addition, a softer character. The actions proposed and implemented in this context generally go further than the minimum standards required by regulations. CEMAT's doctrine could be considered as the promotion of "The right of European citizens to a sustainable territory".

The main purpose of CEMAT is the generation and transfer of ideas. Inspired by research outputs and foresight studies, CEMAT identifies, confronts and compares the concrete experiences of the member countries, and opens the door to transfers of know-how and of efficient solutions.

The work programme proposed by the Russian presidency of CEMAT comprised a series of thematic issues chosen according to their relevance for the coming decade in relation to the emergence of new territorial challenges.

a. Demography, migrations and their territorial impacts

Most countries of Europe are confronted with a trend of population ageing and the growing pressure of immigration, resulting in substantial challenges for cities and regions. Intra-European migration flows also play a significant part, for instance between east and west, but also within individual countries. Major impacts are expected on regional labour markets, with a shortage of qualified manpower, on housing needs in metropolitan areas where younger population groups and immigrants concentrate, on the maintenance of public and private services in regions with strongly declining populations, on tensions related to sociocultural integration of immigrants in cities, etc. CEMAT efforts concentrate on the highlighting of emerging problems as well as on the joint development of strategies aiming at alleviating the problems and at drawing benefits from emerging opportunities such as those resulting from replacement immigration or from the development of the residential economy in specific regions.

Key issues:

- population ageing in relation to the supply of services, regional labour markets, depopulation;
- immigration and internal migrations in relation to regional labour markets, supply of housing and services;
- regional opportunities generated by the residential economy.

b. Territorial impacts in Europe of the new energy paradigm (energy supply, conservation and security, new geography of energy systems)

The significant increase in energy prices resulting from a sustained imbalance between supply and demand on a global scale has generated the emergence of a new energy paradigm, especially in Europe, aiming at reducing the external dependence on energy supplies. The new paradigm includes energy-saving measures, the development of renewable energy sources and of other innovative energy supply technologies (such as hydrogen technology), and a more rational use of conventional energy sources available in Europe (such as oil, gas and coal). The territorial aspects of the new energy paradigm are being investigated by CEMAT are related to the highlighting of a new geography of energy supply in Europe (showing fossil energy reserves, main energy transport axes, the areas best suited for the production of renewable energy, etc.), and to changes likely to occur in transport and mobility patterns, in settlements, in rural areas, in the location of productive activities, etc.

Key issues:

- territorial impacts of high energy prices, of saving measures and of possible scarcity on mobility;
- regional productive systems and settlement systems;
- territorial and environmental impacts of the exploitation of renewable energy sources and of the emergence of new energy technologies;
- new geography of energy supply in Europe.

c. Territorial impacts of the accelerating globalisation process

The globalisation process is ongoing and has fundamental impacts for Europe. Its evolution permanently affects new segments of the economy and therefore different types of regions. The globalisation process has many forms of expression and concretisation, such as increasing global competition with products and, recently with services, relocation of enterprises and activities, a growing number of mergers and acquisitions and related changes in the property of enterprises at intercontinental level, pressure on wages and salaries, acceleration of technological development, etc. In this respect, it is important to also pay attention to foresight aspects, because the future evolution of the globalisation process may differ substantially from the effects already

observed up until now, with competition moving more and more from low-wage production segments to technology-intensive products. An additional dimension of the globalisation process is the development of the information society which generates numerous new activities. CEMAT concentrates its activities on those aspects of the globalisation process which have the most important impacts on the European territory, especially on the development of regional labour markets, on the evolution of metropolitan and rural areas, etc.

Key issues:

- impacts of the globalisation process on regional productive systems, regional labour markets and settlement systems (“metropolisation”);
- requirements in terms of territorial clustering and networking for increasing the critical mass and for ensuring enhanced competitiveness;
- search of compatibility between the enhancement of competitiveness and the maintenance of spatially related values;
- opportunities provided by the information society for organising territorial competitiveness and maintaining territorial balance in a context of growing competition.

d. Creation of new transport and trading corridors and Europe-wide sustainable integration. Access to essential services

The main aspect of this thematic issue is related to the impacts of the development of major transport infrastructures on territorial integration and regional development. Territorial integration within the area covered by the member countries of the Council of Europe still has to achieve significant progress in the future, in order to overcome its present fragmentation. At a lower level, modernisation of transport infrastructure and services is needed to improve the accessibility of landlocked regions and has to contribute to the maintaining of access to essential services. In this field, CEMAT first concentrates its activities on the identification and investigation of major corridors in development across Europe and on the requirements for sustainable territorial development related to them. A second field of activity is the investigation of conditions for improving the accessibility of landlocked regions in a sustainable way. Finally, CEMAT also pays attention to strategies likely to ensure the maintenance and improvement of access to essential services.

Key issues:

- sustainable territorial development related to the promotion of major corridors throughout the European continent: impacts on settlement systems and regional development; containment of environmental pressure and promotion of environmentally friendly transport modes;
- improvement of the accessibility of landlocked areas in order to ensure and promote their development potentialities;
- maintain and improve access to essential services in less-favoured areas.

e. Territorial impacts of climate change; adaptation, management and prevention measures, especially in relation to natural hazards

The acceleration of climate change is presently considered as a major factor with considerable impact in the coming decades in a wide range of fields. Territorial development policies can hardly influence the intensity of climate change, but they can significantly modify the impacts of climate change on the territory, especially through adaptation and prevention measures. In this respect, CEMAT investigates the most important impacts likely to be generated by climate change on the European territory, especially those on ecosystems (flora and fauna), production structures and services (agriculture and forestry, tourism, etc.), on residential location and settlements, etc. A differentiation is made between impacts with structural character (like drought in southern Europe which lastingly affects large stretches of the territory) and impacts with more local and temporary character (like floods and other natural hazards), which may occasionally generate considerable damages, but on limited parts of the territory. CEMAT efforts also concentrate on the types of territorial development measures most appropriate to limit the negative impacts of climate change and the damages related to natural hazards. Adequate measures are also needed to optimise a number of opportunities which may emerge from the changing climatic situation.

Key issues:

- territorial impacts of climate change (negative as well as positive) on settlements, infrastructures, ecosystems, employment and regional productive systems;

- prevention, management and adaptation measures to counteract the negative impacts of climate change, especially the damages likely to be caused by natural hazards and to enhance the positive impacts.

f. The role of spatial development policies for environmental sustainability and landscape protection and enhancement

Environmental protection is high on the agenda in most European countries. Not only have the damages caused to ecosystems and to human health in the past generated a wide awareness of the need to improve the environmental situation, but the more recent recognition of the relationships between the emissions of greenhouse gas and climate change have reinforced this awareness. Due to their horizontal and cross-thematic character, spatial development policies have the possibility and the obligation to intervene in a variety of fields and to promote coherence in order to reach a higher degree of sustainability. CEMAT will deepen the resolutions adopted at the Ljubljana conference and elaborate joint proposals for a more substantial contribution of spatial development policies to environmental sustainability in Europe, including recommendations regarding transport, agriculture and forestry, tourism, energy, the development of settlements, etc. CEMAT will also investigate the possibilities for spatial development policies to contribute to the conservation and enhancement of landscapes, and therefore to the implementation of the principles contained in the European Landscape Convention.

Key issues:

- long-term character of territorial development policies, making possible structural activities in favour of the environment;
- cross-thematic character of territorial development policies, contributing to ensure coherence and to contain conflicts and shortcomings with damaging impacts for the environment;
- contribution of territorial development policies to the protection and enhancement of landscapes.

g. Transfrontier interactions and territorial integration in Europe

Although cross-border co-operation has a long tradition in Europe, territorial fragmentation along national borders still exists along a number of national borders, especially those of eastern and south-eastern Europe, resulting

from their shorter practice and experience in integration and co-operation policies. A number of areas with specific problems, such as the enclave of Kaliningrad, should be considered with particular attention. In this field, the task of CEMAT is to identify the border areas where territorial fragmentation is still significant and where transfrontier interactions are not harmoniously developed. Proposals and recommendations are elaborated regarding the role of territorial development policies for enhancing territorial integration and cohesion along national borders.

Key issues:

- identification of areas along national borders with significant territorial fragmentation and incoherent territorial development, requiring strengthened cross-border co-operation;
- elaboration of principles and methods for coherent territorial development policies in transfrontier regions.

II. Retrospective of the conclusions of the CSO-CEMAT seminars and symposia 2000-10

1. International CEMAT Seminar on Integration of the Greater European Spaces



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Greek Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works within the framework of CEMAT activities.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 65, 2003)

Venue: Thessaloníki, Greece

Date: 25-26 June 2001

Objectives

The Thessaloníki Seminar dealt with the following topics:

- spatial organisation and the integrated planning of greater European areas;

- experiments of transnational, transfrontier and inter-regional co-operation in spatial planning;
- role of towns in integrating greater European areas;
- role of trans-European networks (transport, communication and energy) in integrating greater European areas;
- approach for a sustainable spatial planning policy.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

1. During the 1990s there were significant attempts in which various co-operation frameworks were established, aiming at European spatial integration. They were related to different spatial levels in, for example: the Atlantic macro-region, the Baltic Sea, the region of Cadses (Central, Adriatic, Danubian and South-Eastern European Space), the South-East European region, the region of European Space and Territorial Integration Alternatives (ESTIA), the Mediterranean region, the North Sea, northern Europe, etc. Besides many positive experiences, the partnerships within these frameworks also showed some inherent difficulties. Among them, problems of co-ordination, competition and organisation were reported. The most valuable contribution of these partnerships has probably been in overcoming national and ethnic borders in dealing with spatial development, spatial planning or environmental issues. On the other hand, they underlined the importance of knowledge of different spatial planning systems in European countries and the role of different actors within them for understanding various aspects of the process of spatial integration.

2. The wider importance of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, May 1999, has been acknowledged, but at the same time it was pointed out that within and mainly outside of the European Union there are many other “European” spaces. Thus, spatial planning has to resolve the issues of spatial integration of the European continent, that is, not only with regard to the space of the European Union or the European Monetary Union, but also with regard to the countries of the Council of Europe.

3. Spatial planning in Europe has been through various stages. It has evolved from the narrow perception of physical planning and the administrative approach of spatial planning to a wider developmental rationale that seeks to combine the objectives of sustainable development, protection of the environment and spatial integration. Initially, the environmental component (for example, environmental impact assessment) and recently the spatial component (for example, spatial impact assessment of actions) are important elements that have been introduced in the development process. Spatial planning and the environment should always be considered as integral dimensions in the formulation and planning of each sectoral policy (transportation, networks, industrial development, rural development, development of areas in crisis, etc.). Spatial planning is one of the most important regulatory policies, a prerequisite for achieving the spatial integration and coping with the forces of the enlarging and unifying European market.

4. However, it should be taken into account that the forces shaping the European territory are in many ways incompatible with the European spatial planning objectives. Spatial development is fragmented and unequal and the centre-periphery polarisation is aggravated. Research in many European regions has showed that the pre-existing inequalities are intensified. In spite of policy statements, which are different, the new inequalities create new exclusions and marginal social groupings with challenging dimensions: long-term unemployment, new poor, homeless people, and immigrants. New “grey” zones and new “black holes” are created in the wider European socio-economic space. Unfortunately, examples such as Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo are not quite unique. At the same time, new barriers have been created. Xenophobia, racism, nationalism and social exclusion have re-emerged through new forms in several parts of Europe. These problems are intensified by the needs of immigration flows, which are created in many European regions in crisis. CEMAT within the Council of Europe should seek its role in overcoming these serious issues.

5. European spatial planning has to move further and go beyond the level of outlining generally acceptable objectives, which might be reduced to “wishful thinking” if not followed by clear priorities and supported by the introduction of appropriate operational tools, which are as yet lacking. These should be used for the implementation of specific policies for the mitigation of geographic inequalities, aiming at spatial development convergence and integration. The

efforts undertaken so far to diffuse and share the relevant spatial information, to compare and agree upon the appropriateness of the spatial planning methods, should therefore be continued and the necessary specialised knowledge about the ongoing spatial changes should be developed.

6. The new system of territorial governance is related to the issues of macro-regions. The macro-regional approach overcomes the “ethnocentric” planning approach and requires planning processes involving institutions other than national ones (for example, those of regions, cross-border areas, etc.). It also allows for greater engagement of endogenous economic and human resources and a macro-region’s institutional capacity to create co-operation networks based upon mutual trust. The macro-regions’ spatial integration and sustainable development should be set up as the main long-term goal for the whole of Europe, although this is not an easy task within the Council of Europe with its 47 member states. CEMAT does not have the financial tools for the promotion of spatial cohesion policies. However, it would be very useful if finance for essential pilot activities, for example studies and know-how, in order to understand the problems and the diversities of the “European space” as a whole, could be provided.

7. One of the most important actions related to the future development of CEMAT should be the dissemination of the guiding principles, not only in the member states of the Council of Europe but also in other international organisations and national authorities. It should include the international organisations that implement and/or support European spatial development policies, for example, the European Union, the World Bank, OECD, EBRD, etc. It was noted that due to the importance the reports and other presentations at the CEMAT seminars have for regional and local spatial planning and development policies, the participation of representatives of regional and local authorities at the seminars is highly desirable. Regional and local authorities have an important role in the implementation of the guiding principles.

8. Therefore, ways and means should be developed in order to:
- enhance the active participation of local and regional representatives at CEMAT seminars;
 - develop the dialogue with local and regional representatives within the member states of the Council of Europe in order to facilitate their role in the implementation of the guiding principles;

- intensify the dialogue with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, with particular attention paid to the implementation of those decisions of the Congress that support the implementation of the guiding principles at regional and local level.

9. The conclusions of the Thessaloníki Seminar and the following ones should be considered in the preparation of the 13th Ministers' Session of CEMAT in Ljubljana in September 2003. In this regard it is desirable to give greater responsibilities for the implementation of the guiding principles to regions and municipalities.

10. CEMAT seminars contribute to realising a synergy of various European schemes and programmes of transnational, cross-border and inter-regional co-operation. It would be neither economical, nor efficient, if the Council of Europe countries, particularly those which at the same time are members of the European Union, participated in overlapping activities. Therefore, the possibility should be considered for seminars to include a session, conceived as a colloquium of the EU member states together with those of the Council of Europe, and when appropriate including other (that is, non-European) countries as well, thus paving the road for future spatial planning and development co-operation, extended over any borders still existing in Europe today.

2. International CEMAT Seminar on Landscape Heritage, Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 66, 2003)

Venue: Lisbon, Portugal

Date: 26-27 November 2001

Objectives

The seminar's aim was to contribute to the implementation of the "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent"

and to the preparation of the next CEMAT session, which will take place in Ljubljana on 16 and 17 September 2003 on “Implementation of strategies and perspectives for the sustainable territorial development of the European continent”. The objectives were in this respect:

- to identify spatial planning issues through the landscape dimension;
- to find concrete solutions to the problems, taking account of the characteristics of each landscape; and
- to make proposals in order to integrate the landscape dimension into spatial planning policies.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

It was the second seminar held since the adoption of the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”, at the 12th CEMAT Session, in Hanover, Germany, on 8 September 2000.

The guiding principles take special account of the issue of landscape and consider that “spatial development policy can contribute to protecting, managing and enhancing landscapes by adopting appropriate measures, in particular by organising better interactions between various sectoral policies with regard to their territorial impacts”. They list a series of appropriate measures.

The European Landscape Convention was, moreover, opened for signature on 20 October 2000, at a ministerial conference of the Council of Europe in Florence, Italy. The convention’s aims are to promote protection, management and planning, and to organise European co-operation on landscape issues. It is the first international treaty exclusively concerned with protection, management and planning of European landscape.

As a key element of individual and community well-being and quality of life, landscape plays an important part in human fulfilment and in the reinforcement of European identity. It significantly shapes general interest economically, culturally, ecologically, environmentally and socially. However, changes in agricultural, forestry, industrial and mining technology, together with practices in planning, urban development, transport, network building of various kinds,

tourism and recreation and, at a more general level, changes in the world economy are in many cases accelerating the transformation of landscapes.

It is undisputed that some landscapes of outstanding beauty need special protection. Landscapes are not, however, only a heritage to be protected, they are at the same time resources, which need appropriate management so that they evolve without loss of quality, and even increase their quality. In this respect, the natural resource role – particularly in agriculture and forestry – will have to be granted future advantage, without, of course, diminishing the responsibility of any economic operator for prudent, sustained and respectful exploitation of landscapes. Finally, economic and social changes may create the need for the development of new landscapes, as for instance the construction of new transport infrastructures. These developments must be conceived and carried out in such a way as to produce a better quality of the ensuing landscapes.

No goals can justify deterioration of the quality of landscapes through adverse effects of settlement and economic operations. Controlled and intense use of urban land, particularly the promotion of endogenous growth of cities, can reduce the natural or semi-natural landscape transformation to building land. And where this is inevitable, an adequate standard of conservation should still be applied in order to allow reciprocal enhancement of urbanised space and green areas.

Agriculture and forestry should not be seen only as economic activities and land uses. They are indispensable tools for landscape management. Their operation methods should be held in line with the goals of prudent and rational land use and sustainable spatial development. Agricultural market uncertainties could on a greater scale be encountered by adaptive patterns of production for market niches, which increase in variety and extent along with economic and social development of our societies.

The landscapes of today reflect the population, and economic, social and cultural history of regions. They require profound knowledge and complex and efficient planning and management instruments. In-depth studies of landscapes indissociable from their territories, development possibilities, opportunities and constraints, potentials and capacities of spaces, vulnerabilities, cultures, public opinions and social values, and a thorough study of change, are very important scientific tools for efficient landscape planning. Comprehensive spatial planning

with a territorial impact assessment is essential, including a long-term strategic environmental impact assessment of larger scale and detailed environmental impact assessment of any envisaged change of land use during the administrative procedures needed to allow such change.

Identification and assessment of landscapes and their systemisation according to their outstanding characteristics facilitate not only their protection, planning and management, but also render them more comprehensible, as well as encouraging the building of favourable public opinion on their importance. Development of guidelines and common principles, as well as granting continuous access to developing good practices, would support sustainable landscape planning and management, ranging from controlling land use of great intensity and scale to the most vigorous conservation of the most valuable landscape heritage.

Landscape management is an integral part of spatial planning, but it should be borne in mind that the latter is much more than producing and adopting the spatial and detailed plans. Its main objective and its most important component are the implementation of planning decisions through a number of measures that have to be undertaken to achieve this. These comprise a variety of policies: financial, economic, spatial, agricultural, social, cultural and others.

In pursuing the public good, these policies should not ignore the fact that managing landscapes involves important questions, which are derived from their asset, property or real estate attributes. The “normal” fiscal and other financial tools often used to regulate urban development in pursuing public needs might not work in landscape management.

In many cases the protective regulation and management of landscapes will thus require economic and financial stimulation for landowners in order to be feasible. Landscapes have a value of such importance that they could be a reason for necessary exemptions in otherwise very restrictive European economic stimulation policies in this respect.

The European Landscape Convention represents a new and important tool. But it will take further efforts to develop efficient instruments for its implementation, whereby the messages conveyed by the Lisbon Seminar will have to be considered. New methods will have to be invented as the existing ones do not seem to be sufficient.

Moreover, the role of local and regional authorities in the field of landscape management must still be developed. It has been stressed at the seminar that the competence for landscape planning and management should be brought to that level of government which is closest to the people's concerns. It could be added that this refers not only to legal competence, but implies direct involvement of people through their participation in decision processes. This should increase efforts in the search for better means of co-operation between various levels of government, and is a challenge in itself for the future work of CEMAT.

3. International CEMAT Seminar on the Role of Local and Regional Authorities in Transnational Co-operation in the Field of Regional/Spatial Development



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the German *Land* of Saxony, with the support of the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, in the framework of CEMAT.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 67, 2003)

Venue: Dresden, Germany

Date: 15-16 May 2002

Objectives

The seminar aimed at examining the projects hereafter:

- practical experiences in the implementation of the guiding principles at the local and regional levels;
- examples of good practice in transnational co-operation in the field of spatial development in European regions and municipalities, for example in projects concerning the European transport corridors, cultural routes and landscapes;
- examples of pilot projects that receive international financial support, such as the INTERREG III B, PHARE, TACIS, MEDA and CARD programmes;

- the transnational co-operation support programmes which have an impact on local and regional authorities, such as the EU financial instruments or those of the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), and the work done under the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan and by the OECD, particularly concerning central and east European countries;
- the Model Regions of CEMAT projects conducted in the oblasts of Moscow and Leningrad.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

The participants have adopted the following conclusions:

1. European spatial development policies must be designed to support sustainable development conducive to enhanced economic and social cohesion and greater consideration for the natural, cultural and landscape heritage, with a view to EU enlargement and, more generally, to European integration;
2. the quality of co-operation is closely linked to the quality of information available on territorial development, and efforts should be made to improve this;
3. more active use should be made of the two basic documents: the Council of Europe's "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent" (GPSSDEC-CEMAT) and the European Union's "European Spatial Development Perspective" (ESDP), particularly when implementing European and international programmes to finance spatial development and transnational co-operation;
4. the effective implementation of the principles set out in these documents should be monitored and evaluated at regular intervals. Such evaluation could take the form of national contributions to general reports prepared for CEMAT sessions, reviewing the implementation of earlier decisions and subsequently presented to the political bodies of the Council of Europe (Committee of Ministers, Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress);

5. the guiding principles should also be applied by the regions and local authorities as they often play a central role in this field. The Congress should be invited to contribute to the evaluation process set up by CEMAT;
6. the evaluation process mentioned above should lead to increased co-operation in Europe between local and regional authorities; the pilot projects identified on this occasion could be organised into networks to foster exchanges of good practice;
7. the implementation of the guiding principles should be encouraged in model regions of CEMAT (regions of innovation), where these principles can be best put into practice;
8. it is recommended that the European Union, the European and international financial institutions (including the CEB), the member states and local and regional authorities contribute, as a matter of priority, to the active implementation of development programmes and projects that require transfrontier, transnational or inter-territorial (inter-regional) co-operation;
9. it is also recommended that in the context of its future enlargement, the European Union should continue to make the necessary funds available for spatial planning and transnational co-operation and provide for improved co-ordination of these funds, in the interest of its future member states and also of the other countries of central and east Europe, particularly those along the future borders of the European Union, as well as the countries concerned by the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe;
10. it was noted with satisfaction that the Stability Pact has made transfrontier co-operation and the euroregions one of its priority areas for future action, which will have a beneficial impact on border regions and euroregions in that part of Europe;
11. partnerships of all kinds (transfer of know-how, training of national and local government staff, exchanges of experience and public servants or elected representatives, practical co-operation at local level, etc.) between states, but also between their respective regional and local authorities, should be strongly encouraged;
12. transnational co-operation should also be developed in Europe's larger regions, such as the Baltic, the Mediterranean, central and South-East Europe,

the Atlantic Arc, the Carpathians-Danube and the Black Sea areas, again with due regard for the guiding principles. This co-operation provides an overall vision of the areas concerned, making it possible to address spatial planning and sustainable development issues in a broader perspective;

13. special attention should be given here to the development of the requisite transport infrastructure in the framework of a network of trans-European corridors covering all the Council of Europe's member states, with due regard to the environmental and landscape dimensions of sustainable development;

14. this co-operation between the regions of Europe is essential for the sustainable development of the areas concerned at a time when the effects of globalisation are an increasing threat to the environment and the balanced development of regions;

15. while taking into consideration the decisive role which states play in spatial planning, it is also important to encourage more consultation of local and regional elected representatives. The principles of subsidiarity, proximity and partnership enshrined in the European Charter of Local Self-Government, and the principle of reciprocity laid down in the guiding principles, take on their full meaning here.

4. International CEMAT Seminar on Spatial Planning for the Sustainable Development of Particular Types of European Areas: Mountains, Coastal Zones, Rural Zones, Flood Plains and Alluvial Valleys



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works of Bulgaria, with the support of the Integrated Project of the Council of Europe Making Democratic Institutions Work.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 68, 2003)

Venue: Sofia, Bulgaria

Date: 23-24 October 2002

Objectives

The seminar aimed at promoting the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to the member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, in view of the preparation of the 13th CEMAT to be held in Ljubljana, Slovenia (16-17 September 2003).

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

The CEMAT seminar in Sofia highlighted some of the themes faced by present-day spatial planning and development policies and projects. It pinpointed a variety of issues facing these large areas, presenting good examples of how to deal with them, and tried to propose holistic methods of solving them.

It was clear from many of the contributions – from the reports and during the discussions – that spatial planning is the tool for managing large areas and that it should play a key role, and that the solution to the problems facing these areas lies in measures to implement spatial planning, namely in spatial development policies.

Considerable progress has already been achieved through recent activities in the member states and as a result of European integration. Charters, guiding principles, conventions, framework conventions, model acts, national legislation and policies, regional and local initiatives, and transnational cooperation and projects all form an important framework for further progress with efficient spatial planning and spatial development in the form of a number of strategies applicable in various member states and regions.

Of particular importance are democratic policy-making and decision-making procedures and public participation in spatial planning. The role of the latter must be enhanced and fostered, as the point has been made that only spatial planning for the people can produce viable results. It should not be forgotten that sustainable spatial development is part of a future in which the young people and children of today will take over the current roles of their parents. It should also be borne in mind that the Brundtland definition of sustainability has to do with future generations. Young people and children should therefore have a special role in these democratic processes.

Some problem areas presented at the seminar still require broader evaluation, although there is already a wide-ranging consensus not only as to their gravity, but also as to possible solutions. One should not rely too much on generally accepted values; however prevalent they seem and undisputed they are, monitoring is preferable to blind trust, and constant questioning of convention is a pillar of the scientific approach.

However ambiguous this might seem, the consensus surrounding the prevailing values could even be a constraint when the management of large zones is incorporated into spatial planning. The latter affects and seeks to reconcile a number of opposing interests and arguments, and ultimately it largely determines how property is managed.

It should not be forgotten that spatial planning serves no purpose unless it is feasible and unless plans are implemented. In economic and fiscal terms, the implementation of spatial planning may allow land to be used profitably or bring net public benefits, or it may impose a cost on the public, which must be sustainable so that it can be borne by the taxpayer if it is financial or by the public in general if it is an inconvenience or a burden of some other kind.

The most important methodological problem to be overcome in the spatial planning of any sensitive area is the “equal balance” approach; that is an approach that weighs up development, on the one hand, and the need to conserve and protect specific areas on the other, in which it is assumed that one side can gain only as much as the other side loses. There is only one hypothesis to which the equal balance approach can lead. It is well known and is not always very productive: either we choose development at the expense of conservation, or we choose protection at the expense of development.

Instead of equal balance, a “mutual added value” approach should be the basis of spatial planning for a sustainable future. This requires a holistic approach to problems, but also a shift in attitudes. In seeking solutions which will lead to a general, long-term net increase in benefits or a net decrease in cost, inconvenience and other burdens, we should make more use of interdisciplinary methods and set up a multidisciplinary system for the evaluation of spatial phenomena.

To sum up, economic policies require social and environmental assessment, while environmental protection needs economic and social assessment, just as social measures need economic and environmental assessment. All these

assessments should be integrated in spatial planning methods and procedures in accordance with the various countries' legislation and be part of a territorial impact assessment of spatial phenomena, that is, of situations, problems and measures to deal with them.

A specific (economic, environmental, social and spatial) cost-benefit analysis should thus be the basis for the evaluation of any model, policy or measure with spatial development consequences, regardless of the scale of the territory it is to be applied to. Not only the model policy or measure itself but also its collateral implications should be assessed. Last but not least, such an analysis would help to enhance the holistic approach, which is still missing from spatial planning and spatial development.

5. International CEMAT Seminar on Sustainable Spatial Development: Strengthening Intersectoral Relations



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), in co-operation with the National Spatial Development Office of the Prime Minister's Office of the Republic of Hungary and the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe in Budapest.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 69, 2003)

Venue: Budapest, Hungary

Date: 26-27 March 2003

Objectives

The aims of the seminar were to promote the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent (GPSSDEC-CEMAT) and the resolutions adopted at the 12th CEMAT Session, assist the preparation of proposals for the 13th CEMAT Session, contribute to the implementation of actions identified by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg and enhance the integrated approach to spatial development planning.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

The seminar focused on strengthening interrelations, and interdisciplinary and intersectoral co-operation and partnerships in the spatial planning field. The issues discussed at the seminar reflected the special emphasis in the guiding principles on promoting horizontal and vertical co-operation and interrelationships, and in particular intersectoral co-operation designed to “create a regionally balanced and sustainable Europe”, all of which are concerned with the common goal of sustainable development, including regional balance.

One of the reasons for strengthening horizontal and vertical co-operation and intersectoral relations has been the fragmentation of current planning practices: in European countries the sectoral/functional planning function, with its primarily economic content, has been traditionally separated from territorial planning focused on the development of the physical environment. The more fragmented the various approaches have become, the greater the need for integration, which is not an easy objective. There are noticeable differences between sectoral and spatial planning, with different theoretical roots and methods and divergent rationales, which complicates the process of integrating approaches and sometimes impedes co-operation between the sectors.

The seminar once again showed that spatial planning represents the most appropriate institutional, technical and policy context for managing the territorial dimension of sustainability. Thus, sustainability is the main goal of spatial planning and spatial planning is the main tool for achieving sustainability. Sustainable development in itself is a comprehensive goal. Firstly, the fragmentation of decision-making powers in modern societies calls for vertical and horizontal co-operation between different sectors and tiers of authority. Secondly, problems and concerns within specific geographical areas increasingly require complex and multidimensional responses. Together they create a need for an integrated strategy of territorial sustainability, including territorial quality, identity and efficiency, and an integrated planning approach to settlements, infrastructure, environment and landscape.

Nevertheless the question arises as to whether spatial planning is the most appropriate arena for co-ordinating intersectoral relations or whether there are

better frameworks for this, and also whether spatial planners are equipped to deal with the complex issues involved, spatial planning agencies can become overall co-ordinators and so on. Increasingly distinctive sectors have specific views of their problems and potential solutions, which makes co-ordination difficult, and there do not appear to be any generally acknowledged tools for reconciling distinctive standpoints. However, if it is to fulfil its integrative role, spatial planning should almost certainly not attempt to act as a sector itself, but should provide:

- a framework for analysis and debate where agreement can be reached on sustainable policies;
- legally binding rules and standards, to ensure that agreed measures are implemented.

Modern integrated spatial planning should be founded on increased capacity for evaluation, genuine public participation, greater (vertical and horizontal) co-operation and new decision-making tools, and rely more on intersectoral co-operation, and contractual and consensual relations than on government authority and enforcement. Such planning requires not only clearer objectives but also better organisation and greater commitment and professional input from the relevant stakeholders. It must be based on properly scheduled and complex research. As good practical experience has already shown, integrated spatial planning of such a kind is feasible.

The most important tools for intersectoral co-operation seem to be contractualisation, the establishment of co-ordinating bodies and a matrix organisation of planning processes and bodies, and constant evaluation and assessment of the trans-sectoral territorial effects of sectoral measures. Although the environmental dimension of sustainability is undisputed and growing importance is ascribed to the role of biodiversity, territorial evaluation and assessment is taken to mean not the – normally final – environmental impact assessment but a guidance tool, particularly for identifying the best available variant or alternative solutions. Good territorial governance is necessary at all levels, but particularly at the local one. The same applies to a proper examination of public intervention in property rights and markets, and measures to promote equity and efficiency in land use, which are a limited resource but of great public importance.

An intersectoral approach would improve spatial planning without in any way diminishing the role of sectors. Improved sectoral participation would improve the outcome of planning and facilitate the search for sustainability. Intersectoral co-operation helps to achieve synergy. Every sector retains its own responsibility for achieving its goals, but is also responsible for ensuring that they are in accordance with other sectors' goals, as co-ordinated and agreed in the spatial planning process.

Integrated, that is intersectoral, spatial planning should pay greater attention to certain major challenges to sustainable spatial development in Europe. A number of existing spatial patterns and trends pose threats to Europe's balanced development and to the political goals of its economic, social and territorial cohesion, creating a need for spatial policies that are more vertically effective and coherent (at European, national, regional and local levels) and more horizontally integrated (coherence and integration of sectoral and spatial policies).

Universal access to essential services constitutes one of the objectives of territorial and social cohesion. Essential commodities and services are not only those which are indispensable for maintaining human lives, but also those necessary for preserving human dignity. They include, *inter alia*, food, clothing, housing, energy, medicines, communications, mass media, health care, education, culture and so on. Physical access (availability) and economic access (affordability) to basic essential commodities and services should be granted to all, including those who cannot afford to pay the full price for them.

There should be no discrimination regarding this human right, meaning that social correctives should be applied to a much wider range of public services than is generally the case now. Solidarity and social correctives are not only applicable to services provided by the public sector. There is known to be a variety of efficient organisational and financial arrangements for providing public services, and local communities have a key role in this sector, which is particularly suitable for setting up public-private partnerships. These often provide more efficient, better and hence more sustainable services, but require specific forms of organisation and management.

Public-private partnerships are not simply a recent phenomenon. They began well back in the 19th century when they were particularly associated

with the development of public transport and production, and distribution of electricity. Modern public-private partnership schemes have become very sophisticated. Normally, the initiators and principal stakeholders of projects managed in public-private partnerships are public operators, mostly at local and regional level. If they are to work properly, such schemes require specialist training, specific skills and appropriate operational tools, including particular forms of negotiation and agreements, control systems and public-private contractual obligations to ensure that a reliable and high standard of essential services takes precedence over other interests. These tools cannot simply be copied from standard business practice.

Using public-private partnerships to achieve access to essential services calls for a new training approach both with and for local authorities, their staff and users. It is important to encourage such training initiatives.

The necessity to evaluate their territorial impact and to ensure their integration into intersectoral spatial policy aiming at sustainability of development applies to projects, equally to public-private partnerships and purely public initiatives. The public and private sectors are not separable. A two-speed development of the two sectors is impossible, so it is logical for them to provide services in partnership rather than in competition. However, the crucial issue revolves around what tariffs or charges to impose.

Public participation and the role of non-governmental organisations are of vital importance for sustainability through spatial planning and development. Participation in public decision making should be treated as a fundamental collective and individual right in modern environmental and planning law, as confirmed, *inter alia*, in the Aarhus Convention and the European Landscape Convention. To ensure that this is an effective, rather than purely formal, process, it is necessary to identify the appropriate stages of the decision-making process where participation is necessary.

There is a long-established tradition of participation in local planning matters in nearly every European country, although the effectiveness of this participation has varied, ranging from a purely formal process to effective shared decision making. But ensuring participation at national level has been a more difficult issue. It has been regulated in different ways, but has

generally been informal and vague. It remains unclear how far it has allowed genuine public attitudes and community needs to be represented, as opposed to narrower and selective group interests. Depending on particular societies' culture and traditions, there have been varying degrees of administrative resistance to combining representative and participative democracy. But this difficult task, which requires education, opinion-forming activities, training and help for communities to enable them to fulfil their planning tasks accountably, is essential for integrated spatial planning for sustainable development.

Vertical co-operation between various levels of government has been one of the main threads of various reports and discussions. There were also discussions on the inclusion of the European level in vertical co-ordination, which would require a strengthening of the territorial component when European institutions' policies are revised, combined with national horizontal co-ordination of the standpoints of individual states in sectoral negotiations on new European policies, in order to enhance the territorial component's role at national level. An intersectoral approach at national level is a precondition for its European equivalent.

On the other hand, it has been widely acknowledged that central governments alone cannot direct Europe's regional and spatial development and that in this field an important part has to be played by local and regional authorities. The latter openly call for an appropriate place in European decision making, with responsibility shared by all tiers of government. Local and regional authorities can make a substantial contribution to national sustainable spatial development policies and offer good governance in their communities, and are key partners in implementing the "CEMAT Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent".

The main message of the Budapest Seminar can be summarised with reference to its most frequently quoted and meaningful key terms: sustainable development, spatial planning, horizontal and vertical co-operation, intersectoral approach, co-ordination, access to essential services, public-private partnership, participation, local and regional authorities and training. These should also be the key terms used at future CEMAT gatherings.

6. International CEMAT Seminar on Natural Disasters and Sustainable Spatial Development: Prevention of Floods



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Polish Government’s Centre for Strategic Studies and the City of Wrocław.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European regional planning, No. 70, 2003)

Venue: Wrocław, Poland

Date: 30 June 2003

Objectives

The aims of the seminar were to analyse the reasons for major disasters and the possibilities of the prevention of floods, to promote the implementation of the Committee of Ministers Recommendation Rec(2002)1 on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent (GPSSDEC-CEMAT) and resolutions adopted at the 12th CEMAT Session in Hanover in 2000, to assist the preparation of proposals for the 13th CEMAT Session, to contribute to the implementation of actions identified in 2002 by the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg and to enhance the integrated approach of spatial development planning and good governance.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe expert

Although the seminar did not leave the other natural disasters aside, it concentrated mainly on the problem of floods. Floods are a natural phenomenon imposing a risk to people which is greater in the areas where the flood zones are located. They are rare events, limited to restricted areas, and this fact has often led to a lack of awareness of the risk and damage that they cause. But recent flood events have raised public and political awareness of the fact that Europe is exposed to floods as natural disasters, that there is no absolute safety from floods, and that technical measures, however sophisticated and extensive they might be, do not provide complete safety.

Throughout history, rivers attracted human settlement, mainly as resources of water and food and as axes of transport. Therefore, considerable cultural heritage is concentrated along rivers, which make it particularly sensitive to floods and in need of special protection. In the 19th century most European large rivers and many smaller ones were channelled in order to gain land for development, flood protection, shipping and reduction of wetlands and diseases related to them. Extensive construction works of this kind were carried out throughout Europe until the 1990s and they have significantly reduced the natural areas for harmless inundation in flood conditions.

People have been building channels, dykes and dams and regulating the natural river flow to prevent floods, following the simplistic idea of washing the flood waves downstream from the protected areas as swiftly as possible. This in turn caused accelerated river flows and increased flooding with much greater damages, particularly in the unprotected areas, both up and downstream from such works. Paradoxically, this led to the construction of even higher dykes and dams and not to sustainable river and flood risk management.

The main causes of floods are natural water cycles, hydrological regimes, and topographical and geological conditions influencing river morphology, nowadays possibly influenced by changes in meteorology due to global warming. Rivers are dynamic systems and above all they need sufficient space to allow all the water they catch from their basins to seep away, not only in normal hydrological conditions, but at times of extreme precipitation as well, when the order of magnitude of their discharges multiplies.

Alluvial plains have primary importance in river management and flood prevention. They are large areas where permeability of soil and retaining capacity of the land profile significantly reduce the height and velocity of flood waves. But at the same time, as various examples in Europe show, they support economically sustainable forestry, grazing, tourism and other compatible activities.

Development has significantly reduced natural flood plains and increased water run-off due to decreased permeability and water retention, which enhances the flood risk. But local flooding can appear well before the peak flow of rivers is reached, due to inadequate drainage infrastructure. Increased run-off of surface water at times of the extensive precipitation further increases the peak flow of rivers that are rapidly flowing downstream, increasing flood risk in unprotected areas.

A flood risk is inevitable but it can be managed and reduced. It has been widely agreed that flood prevention requires an integrated approach. In an integrated approach not only the areas directly affected by floods, but also the entire river basin must be considered.

River basin and flood risk management, together with flood damage mitigation strategies, must be based on serious scientific research. The properties of entire ecosystems of rivers, alluvial plains and the remaining river catchment areas must be analysed. The relationships between the natural and man-made processes in areas adjacent to rivers, and the peripheral ones upstream and downstream, should be investigated in depth. Above all, meteorological and climatic patterns must be studied in depth. A scientific approach requires observation, quantification, forecasting and modelling, essentially on the basis of natural science, which should be undertaken on an adequate scale. Important tasks remain in the field of information and data management. Above all, a standardised information system for these purposes is needed.

Just as it is impossible to eliminate floods altogether so is it impossible to completely avoid damages caused by them. Thus, new approaches to river and flood risk management tend to allow more frequent flooding in areas where they cause least damage. This is economically sustainable as it is less costly to pay occasional damages – predominantly on agricultural land or in forests – than to invest in extensive water construction works or to cover much higher damages in the built environment.

This approach can be implemented either through the preservation and the enlargement of existing natural water retention areas or through the restoration of natural river morphology and opening new retention areas. Both are ecologically sustainable. Rivers must have a much larger space to expand, which can be achieved through making the flood plains broader and if possible deeper. Working with and not against natural processes should also include measures for the rehabilitation of the absorption capacity of the soil. But it should be remembered that such measures require a lot of time once they are agreed and adopted.

Spatial planning, including both of its more detailed specialised components, namely landscape and urban planning, has a crucial role in sustainable river basin management and flood prevention. The primary task of spatial planning is to direct human settlement and sensitive land uses away from natural retention

areas and zones with enhanced flood risk, and thus prevent the greatest damage when floods occur. This strategy should be applied wherever it is possible in historic settlements that cannot be changed or improved at reasonable cost.

Landscape planning should allow for the preservation and restoration of natural river beds and water retention areas – wet and dry. It should also prevent the reduction of water absorption capacity throughout river catchment areas, regardless of whether it is caused by human activity or natural change, for example by the use of sustainable drainage systems that control water as near to its source as possible. Urban planning should allow for sufficient space for rivers in cities, enabling room for flood waves in enlarged river beds, and should provide safe design of coastlines in coastal cities. The priority for urban development should be given to areas at least risk. These too are not short-term measures and therefore other actions are equally important.

It has been suggested that development proposals should be accompanied by a flood-risk and drainage assessment, appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and the risks involved. The largely uncertain and possibly increasing risk of flood requires a precautionary approach. The principles of sustainable development require that flood risk be avoided where possible and managed elsewhere.

The role of environmental, planning, water and construction law cannot be overestimated. It must provide legal instruments at European, national, regional and local levels that will facilitate the management of natural disasters and effectively enforce the agreed and adopted measures. The sustainability of spatial development cannot be achieved without mitigation and management of risk, caused by floods and other natural disasters.

The regional and local authorities have a crucial role and primary responsibility for flood management and spatial planning policy within their areas; the respective planning authorities with assistance from central governments should steer development in such a way that the risk in areas vulnerable to flooding will be reduced.

That does not mean that we should stop all development on flood plains. This would be an unrealistic aspiration and unsustainable in every aspect too. Equally unrealistic would be the expectation that we could relocate flood-endangered development. Too much has already been constructed there and

lot of it is reasonably flood-protected. But wherever new development, or redevelopment is to take place in areas of high risk, it should be managed appropriately, which should not only be the case for flood protection but as well for prevention of hazards caused by other natural disasters, particularly earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, landslides, avalanches and fires.

River basins and floods, when they happen, extend beyond any administrative borders. Flood prevention and protection thus require inter-regional, transborder and international co-operation in order to be efficient and sustainable. The recent floods in Europe have broadened this awareness under which new structures of successful co-operation have been set up, whilst noting that some of them already existed.

The major issues of European co-operation in the field of flood prevention and protection are the questions of solidarity and sustainability, which cannot be separated. Solidarity of people in the river basin means that everybody must be aware that one's flood protection should not be at the expense of the other's flood risk. Sustainability of flood protection should not at all be seen only in terms of environmental sustainability. More than in many other instances, there are components of social and economic sustainability due to the fact that it is very expensive and not obviously a win-win activity, with benefits for everybody and no cost for anybody.

But there is another, extremely important aspect of solidarity and social sustainability of flood protection and particularly of flood damage relief, which absolutely must not be lost sight of – which may happen if attention is only focused on ecological sustainability. The damages suffered by the less developed regions of Europe and the poorer inhabitants of our continent when struck by floods are much more difficult to mend than in the developed parts, due to a lack of financial, material and human resources. As a rule, natural disasters in such areas increase, not decrease, development disparities. In such cases the solidarity of the well-off Europeans with those less fortunate is crucial. The social aspect should therefore be at the forefront of integrated flood management, along with the primary concern of protecting human lives.

From various points of view – including a social one – considerable attention in flood management should be given to the basins of rivers flowing across borders, particularly those connecting regions with considerable development imbalances. Three types of European borders should be specially mentioned:

the external borders of the peripheral member states of the Council of Europe, the new outer borders of the enlarged European Union and the borders between the old and the new members of the European Union.

The Wrocław Seminar called for consistent pan-European action in the field of integrated flood management. Because of the role of spatial development policy in this respect, CEMAT is the most appropriate framework to set up such action. Therefore, the ministers at their 13th Session should consider taking the appropriate initiative.

7. International CEMAT Seminar on Spatial Development Governance: Institutional Co-operation Network



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 73, 2004)

Venue: Yerevan, Armenia

Date: 28-29 October 2004

Objectives

The seminar aimed at promoting the implementation of Recommendation Rec(2002)1 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to the member states on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, in view of preparing the 14th CEMAT Session in Lisbon (26-27 October 2006) on “Networks for the sustainable spatial development of the European continent: bridges over Europe”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Claude Rougeau, Council of Europe expert, representative of the International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP) and of the NGO Liaison Committee of the Council of Europe

The following conclusions were reached during the seminar.

1. Armenia is a country with an exceptionally rich heritage. Wide valleys, plateaux, mountains, ravines and gorges alternate with lakes and rivers over an area of 29 800 square kilometres. This dramatic and extremely beautiful scenery is brought to life by the rich biodiversity of the natural environment, the setting of an inestimable historical and cultural heritage.

The intangible heritage of customs, traditions, age-old knowledge and know-how has also contributed to shaping a unique landscape.

2. Being a country in transition, Armenia still has to cope with economic difficulties, resulting in a form of territorial development that must be controlled and monitored in order not to jeopardise this heritage.

It is therefore necessary to take care to avoid any disappearance of, or damage to, parts of the national heritage as well as any alteration of the landscape that would result in it being degraded or even losing its distinctive character.

3. Having signed the European Landscape Convention, the Armenian Government have expressed their intention to comply with its principles and ratify it soon.⁵

4. It will therefore be necessary to ensure that all the provisions are introduced that will help to ensure the convention's proper implementation as regards both the distribution of responsibilities and the legal, scientific and technical aspects (Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the convention).

5. The convention provides in particular that each state party shall undertake to include the landscape in regional planning policies. This approach could be facilitated through the work of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT. The landscape is to be seen in a wider territorial development context.

During its last session, on 17 September 2003, the ministerial conference adopted the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development. It details the numerous challenges shaping our future in Europe, including the transformation and disappearance of landscapes, and provides that states will in future have to submit reports (based on indicators) on how they implement the "Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent".

5. Armenia ratified the convention on 23 March 2004.

In connection to this, various countries have drawn up national regional planning strategies. Such a step could be taken in Armenia, which would thus make it easier to establish a national umbrella instrument to give landscape policies a stronger basis. This strategy could be accompanied by the passing or appropriate implementation of the necessary legislation.

It should be remembered that landscape is one of the key aspects of the Committee of Ministers Recommendation Rec(2002)1 on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development (GPSSDEC-CEMAT).

The recommendation underlines the importance of four methodological principles that need to be highlighted with respect to the European Landscape Convention:

- horizontal co-operation: it is necessary to encourage interministerial co-operation on the landscape and to set up, for example, a national landscape council;
- vertical co-operation: co-operation needs to be encouraged between national, regional and local levels;
- public participation: the European Landscape Convention underlines the importance of such participation and explicitly refers to the Aarhus Convention;
- the partnership of associations and NGOs.

Land must henceforth be seen as a limited and precious asset that must be developed with care and moderation, that is used sparingly instead of being developed in a detrimental manner.

Assets (biological diversity, cultural heritage, intangible assets) must henceforth be seen as an opportunity, as a source of enrichment and as a factor and driving force for development.

A few key phrases used during the seminar should be called to mind: appointment of development officials; establishment of links with grass-roots organisations, professional bodies and administrative authorities; contractual and consensual approach; taking account of the mythical and mystical value of specific sites; and role of the collective imagination.

Moreover, on a more practical level, concrete action needs to be pursued at certain pilot sites (Lake Savan, the River Hrazdan and the Yerevan master

plan were mentioned in this connection), perhaps through the CEMAT regions of innovation project. The “European rural heritage observation guide – CEMAT” also needs to be adapted to the situation in Armenia.

Finally, it is necessary to implement the provisions of the Ljubljana Declaration, which:

- calls on the European Union and the Council of Europe to enhance their co-operation on territorial development; and
- asks the European Commission to define tools that, on the basis of the experience of the INTERREG, PHARE, TACIS, CARDS and MEDA programmes, would facilitate co-operation between European and neighbouring countries in the field of spatial development in order to prevent divisions caused by unbalanced development.

6. Finally, the exhibition on the landscape seen through the eyes of children in Armenia – a pilot scheme developed in Armenia in connection with the implementation of Article 6 of the European Landscape Convention – should be presented at the 2nd meeting of the Workshops for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention to be held in Strasbourg on 27 and 28 November 2003.

8. International CEMAT Seminar on the Role of Training in the Implementation of the Policy of Sustainable Spatial Development at Local and Regional Levels in Europe



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the European Network of Training Organisations for Local and Regional Authorities (ENTO), the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, CEMAT and the Federation of European Union Local Authority Chief Executive Officers (UDITE).

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 76, 2004)

Date: Strasbourg, France

Venue: 15 March 2004

Objectives

The aim of the seminar was to discuss and highlight practical ways for the implementation of Resolution No. 2 on the training of authorities responsible for sustainable spatial development, adopted at the 14th Session of CEMAT, in Lisbon (26-27 October 2006).

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Maria José Festas, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

1. First of all, the issue of sustainable spatial development and spatial planning must be placed on the agenda of the 3rd Summit of Council of Europe Heads of State and Government to be held in Warsaw (Poland) on 16 and 17 May 2005. In this connection, particular emphasis must be placed on the “territorial dimension of sustainable development” as underlined in the September 2003 Ljubljana Declaration.
2. Secondly, the members of the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of CEMAT should join together with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe and ENTO in considering arrangements for enhanced co-operation.
3. At the same time, there are some difficulties with the implementation of the provisions of Resolution No. 2 adopted at CEMAT’s 13th Session in Ljubljana in 2003.

While we are already working on the list of training centres active in the field of sustainable spatial development, we must not forget that the list needs to be constantly updated. Sustainable spatial development is a dynamic process, where research and practice are producing new know-how which must be used and new skills which need to be taken into account through appropriate, up-to-date training.

9. International CEMAT Seminar on Networking for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation within the framework of the activities of CEMAT.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 79, 2005)

Date: 26 September 2005

Venue: Moscow, Russian Federation

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Mr Günter Mudrich, First Secretary of the Chamber of Regions of the 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 projects, 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 citizens 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 for Regional Development and Mrs Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Director General of DGIV, Council of Europe, were presented.

The Russian minister welcomed this seminar as a first experience of an 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, and 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 an 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 have to be applied when defining and implementing planning policies. The European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter 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 well as in a vertical dimension. The European 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 to 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 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 were presented by the delegates from different countries. When trying to structure these contributions it was possible to identify five types of networks with a 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;
- 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 Carpathians 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 European Network of Ombudsmen described by Chryssi Hatzi as an example. The problems and management of recent populations migration developments are analysed in 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 European Landscape 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, Leningrad, Kaliningrad and Moscow *oblasts*. 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 introduced into our work in this field. Strategic territorial planning is necessary to go beyond the balanced regional development with a view to achieving a 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 involvement of the territories of eastern and central Russia with 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 equipment and satellite technologies are at the disposal of governments and should be used. In particular, 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 levels – should be further exploited.

It is true that the member countries of the European Union have started work on a territorial development concept. However, this approach seems to be limited to central and 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” also needs a new regional planning strategy, which would take into consideration the urban and industrial dynamics of the Russian Federation, Ukraine and neighbouring countries so as to bring appropriate new tools and objectives into European regional planning.

However, this new geographical grouping brings includes a new category of disadvantaged regions. These are the ultra-peripheral 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 also show the need for closer co-operation networks in specific areas, such as combating the large forest fires in the Mediterranean countries or the water and flood disasters in central Europe. Regional planning can indicate means to reduce these ecological disasters and accidents which have become in recent years stronger and more dangerous. Pan-European co-operation networks should be set up in order to develop preventive policies and mutual assistance programmes.

Network building is therefore of the utmost importance in our society and the Council of Europe has been supporting this for many years. Network building, in addition to working with and in networks, is important for the creation of synergies and for working better with institutions at national and European level.

Much substantial work has been done in European regional/spatial 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 knowledge. It has done so over the past 25 years, but it should also continue to do so in the 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.

10. International CEMAT Seminar on Urban Management in Networking Europe



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Republic of Slovenia and the European Council of Spatial Planners (ECTP).

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 80, 2005)

Venue: Ljubljana/Bled, Slovenia

Date: 17-18 November 2005

Objective

The seminar aimed at promoting both an integrated approach of spatial planning and good governance, and to making proposals in view of the preparation of the 15th CEMAT Session to be held in the Russian Federation

on “Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Elias Beriatos, President, Greek Planners’ Association (SEPOX), Vice-Chair, International Society of City and Regional Planners (IsoCarp)

As conclusions can never be truly final, we shall attempt here to set out some remarks, observations and comments prompted by what has been said and discussed during the seminar and which we regard as essential and useful to potential users of the proceedings of this interesting academic event.

First of all, by way of a quantitative assessment of the seminar, we can start by giving some figures relating to the papers presented and the speakers present as well as to the ordinary participants, whose presence has greatly facilitated dialogue and contributed to a real debate on the issues forming the subject of the seminar. This active participation was in fact very representative and very varied in both geographical and cultural terms. Not including the opening addresses given by the organisers at the start of the seminar, there have been 26 speakers from over 22 different countries in Europe (in other words, nearly 50% of the Council of Europe member states). Some 150 people were registered on the list of participants.

Moving to a qualitative evaluation and the thematic structure of the seminar, the following points may be stressed. The central theme, “Urban management in networking Europe”, is a highly topical and important issue. Indeed, with the rampant computerisation of society, networks of towns and cities today constitute a reality/factor which strongly influences all aspects of planning and urban development. More specifically, one of the key aims of the seminar was to highlight the various aspects of modern urban management not only from a theoretical but also from a political and practical standpoint. These aspects correspond to the three sessions of the seminar around which the presentations and discussion were focused.

The first session, of a more or less theoretical nature, dealt with the well-known concept of polycentrism (a concept prevalent in Europe, in the last decade), combined with the relationship between the two ends of the spatial scale: the global and the local, as embodied in the term glocal (from global-local). The second and third sessions concerned, respectively, “visions” and

“implementation projects and governance”. Case studies were presented at the sessions, showing good examples of urban projects in various cities, regions and countries. Via these examples, it was possible not only to consider what means and mechanisms are used today for implementing policies, but also to learn from the mistakes of others. We should also note the great importance of the concept of governance, used in the last session, because it ultimately constitutes an innovative mechanism, a social innovation analogous to those introduced in other fields (technology, etc.)

Documents

It should also be mentioned that the speakers at the seminar used many reference documents. These are documents which play an important role in the planning process. They are basic documents which are regarded virtually as gospel by all decision makers (politicians and civil servants at all levels of government) as well as by the planners involved in the town and country planning process in Europe:

- the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP);
- the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”;
- the Council of Europe’s Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development;
- the Council of Europe’s European Landscape Convention;
- the Athens Charter of the European Council of Town Planners;
- the European Urban Charter (of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe).

Since it is impossible to comment on each of the presentations individually, we shall now look at the main issues and themes raised by the speakers during the three sessions.

First, however, it should be stressed that all the presentations were interesting, and even excellent, whether they were case studies or presentations of a more theoretical nature. They brought out the somewhat different perspectives and sometimes contrasting issues emerging today in the different countries of Europe or within the same country. One example of this is the Netherlands,

where extremely varied attitudes and spatial policies can be seen within a relatively small national territory. Furthermore, the statements and ensuing discussions not only enriched the debate but also revealed a common denominator in policies – some hidden aspects concerning concepts – and in the underlying ideologies with their successes and failures.

Concepts (ends and means)

First of all, the main concept in the theme of the seminar, the “urban network”, is a novelty in the field of urban policy because, basically, it is a new approach in a Europe in which 80% of the population lives in urban areas. However, the number of human beings living within the boundaries of cities or regions is not a real problem. It is the way people use these areas – the “functioning” of space in the wider sense of the term – which engenders difficulties (and this applies to all levels, from the local to the continental and the global). This is the real challenge for today’s urban planners, who would genuinely like to help urban societies to improve their spatial management by laying the emphasis on quality rather than quantity.

The most extensively analysed concept during the seminar was that of polycentrism, but particular attention was also focused on similar and complementary concepts such as “spatial equilibrium” and “territorial cohesion”, which reflect the objectives of spatial planning in Europe over the last few years. It is these concepts that we shall be commenting on below.

To judge from the first session’s presentations, polycentrism – advocated by some, contested by others – remains a vague and even ambiguous concept, whose scientific definition is neither clear nor really complete. It means “different things to different people and at different levels” (Robert Kragt). Despite all that, this concept is considered useful and even operational (Peter Mehlbye). It is therefore pointless to look for absolute definitions because, ultimately, it is better to be approximately right than to be precisely wrong. It is not the first time in the history of terminology and knowledge that a concept with an unclear scientific definition is “exploited” – in the positive sense – as a guiding principle. It is a concept which must provide support for spatial planning policy. Every policy comprises elements and aspects that are not scientific and, to some extent, becomes a true “art”, which, according to the great author T. S. Eliot, is the solution to problems which cannot be formulated clearly before they have been solved.

Polycentrism also reminds us of, and suggests a comparison with, another concept, that of “decentralisation”, which was overused in the 1970s and 1980s but is somewhat neglected today. However, the difference between polycentrism and decentralisation lies in the fact that the latter always presupposes a “centre”, a powerful “pole” which must be broken up into several pieces or multiplied (to ensure an appropriate distribution of development over a given territory), whereas polycentrism indicates a dynamic process whereby it is impossible to bring about the emergence of new centres, in line with a “bottom-up”, not a “top-down” model. In other words, it is a question of method, a different way of seeing things, in the sense that it is possible to have a polycentric spatial structure without first going through a centralised structure.

Turning now to the means and process of planning, a distinction is drawn between two (ideologically opposed) types of concepts which serve as working tools for planners and developers. On the one hand, there is “competition”, “competitiveness” and “urban marketing” and, on the other, “governance”, “three-way partnership”, “synergy”, “solidarity”, inter-regional or transnational “co-operation”, etc., which are the key words for the development and implementation of a spatial development policy. Some more specific terms may also be mentioned, such as “gateway cities” or “brain ports”. These are new terms from a body of literature – both political and scientific – which has grown up over the last few years and which might at a stretch be regarded as a form of “useful verbalism”, or a certain tendency to embellish reality when, in practice, it is difficult to change it.

However that may be, the problem is to reconcile the two “paths”, the two methodological processes towards sustainable development, something which is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Consequently, the question we have considered above constitutes, in our view, the fundamental contradiction of the seminar, and one that is in fact very fertile and rich in results because the real issues are always contradictory. The proof of this is the lively debate that took place during this seminar.

Policies

The “eternal” problem of planning in all its forms is how to turn scientific theory into a politically feasible vision. Hence, one of the questions asked very frequently by the speakers was the following: Where do we stand, where spatial management in Europe is concerned, in these early years of the 21st century?

(Kalle). A few years ago the European Union launched the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) programme, which is an excellent tool for obtaining knowledge needed to intervene and carry out rational spatial planning. But what was, and what is, its impact? Similarly, what is the future of spatial planning at the European Union level (Frank d'Hondt)? Will a new (2nd) ESDP be drawn up? Answering this pressing question, Peter Mehlbye of the ESPON co-ordination unit says: "The question does not arise for the time being. We shall see in 2007 when ESPON has produced visible results." But then, where planning is concerned, virtually the whole first decade of the 21st century will have been wasted! It really seems that after the efforts made in the 1990s (drawing up of the ESDP), and especially after the year 2000, a silence or a kind of inertia prevails in the upper echelons of the European Union, which is unjustifiable when you consider the experience gained in the 1990s. Instead of speeding up, we have seen a slowing down. Let us hope that, between now and 2007, there will be something new to report (that is, political action, and not merely monitoring) in the European Union.

On this point (the continuation of planning projects at inter-regional or transnational level), the presentations by some speakers (Walther Stoeckl, Inge Brors, Miran Gajsek) showed that much remains to be done in certain language expanses ("macro-regions") of the wider Europe, from the Azores to the Urals and Cyprus. In our view, the drawing up of spatial development plans in the different macro-regions, that is regionalisation of the ESDP, is the best way of continuing spatial planning in Europe in this decade.

Here is a promising way of taking the history of the ESDP a little further. The real motive behind the planning of large spatial units is to be found in what might be called the "third way" of European spatial policy. This is a cautious position between two extremes: on the one hand, spatial planning carried out and run by Brussels (bureaucratic, therefore) and, on the other, co-ordination of national spatial planning policies. In this connection, attention should be drawn to the Council of Europe's constructive role and the major contribution made by CEMAT, which has launched several campaigns on planning and the environment, organising conferences, seminars and other gatherings.

Dialectics

On the question of territorial scales, we may refer to the process mentioned by Ann Bogan, which is summed up in the slogan "A national spatial

strategy with regional guidelines”, which means that planning is not a one-way process. One can and must always work in both directions: from the local to the regional and national/supranational and vice versa. A strategy and overview must be promoted at the higher levels, together with sound management at the lower levels, by a dialectical and stepwise process. As classical Greek philosophy teaches us, the way to approach a problem is always: thesis, antithesis, synthesis.

Dialectic logic is also present with regard to mobility and transport, the role of which is vital to the territorial cohesion and urban growth of the large European regions and the different spatial levels. Whether at regional or city level, vehicle traffic raises problems which lead to a real vicious circle: the building of new road infrastructures – especially intra-urban – leads to new traffic congestion. More road traffic leads to the building of new roads. The more you open the “tap”, the more the water runs, and so on. Here again, the dialectic approach can be applied.

Furthermore, the transport system influences and modifies the accessibility of remote and disadvantaged regions, but not always in a positive way. Its effect is often negative because, between weak and strong, it is strong which prevails, centripetal forces over centrifugal forces. Experience has shown us that transport infrastructures always lead to concentration if there are no other policies aimed at restoring equilibrium. Here, we can see the important role of spatial planning as a public interest policy.

Boundaries

Urban planning and development often come up against problems concerning boundaries of all kinds: geographical, cultural, racial, religious, administrative, legal, etc. Fernando Tapia and Markella Hadjida referred to cases of cities which are near or even on borders and therefore strongly influenced by them. San Sebastian (Spanish city opposite Biarritz in France), Nicosia (capital of Cyprus), Jerusalem (Israel), Berlin (Germany), Belfast (Northern Ireland) and less well-known cases such as Gorizia (border town between Italy and Slovenia) are typical examples of towns and cities close to, or divided by, borders, which require specific and more elaborate spatial planning and management. Not to mention, of course, the often insuperable barriers that exist in our towns and cities in the form of social exclusion, poverty, etc., which it is absolutely essential to remove by means of integrated policies.

Practical application

As already mentioned, there is often a gulf between theory and implementation, between policy and its practical application. In fact, there is a great discrepancy between action plans and programmes from one country or region to another and, depending on the political and administrative system, within the same country, something to which Robert Kragt refers. It is the fundamental antinomy of planning which reduces its effectiveness. For example, there is much talk today about environmental protection and quality of life, but we see that rapid, uncontrolled urban development leads to destruction of the landscape and the natural and cultural heritage. The representatives of the political systems of the countries of democratic Europe, and those they represent, lack the means to resolve these problems.

In this context, social participation is essential to planning provided it is carried out in a creative and inventive, and not mechanical, way. Participation as a social and political process is often regarded as a process totally at odds with efficiency, but this is not always the case in practice. It is often said that more democracy means less efficiency, and vice versa. Exponents of the other viewpoint say “no cities without citizens”. If we accept this principle, the process of participatory democracy and conviviality is therefore a necessary stage in planning in a market economy system, a one-way process.

It is no coincidence that the example of the BTC project in Slovenia (an “international” architectural complex, according to its critics) prompted a very lively discussion by the seminar participants. Despite its positive economic aspects for the city and the region, this project was regarded by some participants as a product of non-participatory planning not integrated with local conditions. But social participation in these early years of the 21st century presupposes the use of new technology, and from this point of view the PICT programme is a good example of how citizens and residents can be provided with information today. Mechanisms and means of communication are essential tools for modern planning when they are properly used.

By way of a final conclusion, we may say that the debate stimulated by the seminar has shown that if we are not capable of solving a problem, it is always possible to try to learn from the mistakes and successes of others. Criticism is no doubt necessary, but action is even more essential. We must act, therefore, at the risk of failing. Ultimately, the fairest and most impartial judge is the history of each city, region and country.

11. International CEMAT Seminar on Sharing Responsibility for our Region: Redefining the Public Interest for Territorial Development

Organised by the United Nations Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the authorities of the Slovak Republic.

Venue: Bratislava, Slovak Republic

Date: 22-23 May 2006

Conclusions

Theme I: The city as a living environment and a driving-force development

A. General trends

Cities in the UNECE region are facing challenges which are specific to each country; however, there are common trends, which are influenced by the last three decades of neo-liberal approaches. These include a reduced role for government combined with fewer rules and regulations for private-sector activities in the market. This approach has affected the physical and spatial metamorphosis of cities to various degrees; some cities declined despite their historic value, while others have prospered.

Since the Second World War, governments in the UNECE region have been involved in various forms of housing delivery and urban planning, either through statutory planning instruments or subsidies taking up most responsibilities in the sector. Nowadays, the effects of the minimalist role of the state in housing and urban planning, which is predominant in most countries, are also visible in the former socialist countries.

The neo-liberal approach has influenced planning and management tools. Policies moved towards releasing “energies” of the private sector through enabling strategies. However, difficult questions arise as to who really benefits from these strategies, without taking into account equity and sustainability goals. The “rolling back” of the state in the neo-liberal economic agenda has led to a physical and social polarisation and/or fragmentation of the cities. This is evident not only in transitional countries but also in the most advanced economies.

Related to countries in transition, significant trends influencing the national economies as well as the economic conditions of individual inhabitants, their lifestyles, preferences and the like had major impacts on the social and urban pattern of cities.

The following are some changes that have seriously affected cities' development:

- The closure of unprofitable plants was catastrophic for cities which relied totally on those industries, as inhabitants started to abandon cities and towns, or stayed behind without any chances of employment.
- The privatisation of productive plants created a need for new skills and newly trained and educated staff, provoking a change in the social structure and wealth of society. On the other hand, poverty started to increase in absolute and relative figures, and often a small group of individuals become rich.
- Land privatisation and restitution became the most important “planning instrument”, resulting in mass distribution of land by municipalities. This is due to the fact that land property was restored without limitations or restrictions on its use. Cities became denser, but without long-term plans or short-term control.

Due to political or economic decisions, some cities started to lose attractiveness and therefore population. These effects were more visible in the new towns and cities dependent on one industry. Even some cities with a longer history were, due to their geographical location, left in the periphery of development. On the other hand, cities with strategic locations became points of attraction, whether because of their tourist potential, or because they were close to main roads, borders or harbours, or because they were capital cities or engaged in some specific economic activity.

The urban sphere also suffered from: physical problems, such as uncontrolled spreading of human activities or urban sprawl, insufficient physical infrastructure, decayed housing stock, changing transport patterns, waste management, etc; environmental problems, such as the disappearance of natural areas and biodiversity; and socio-economic ones, such as lack of job opportunities, unemployment and the resulting deepening social inequality, increased criminality, weakening of social contacts, limited societal services related to areas such as education, health, and cultural activities resulting in problematic disparities in the socio-economic structure of the population.

B. New planning – Different approaches

Interrelationship between the city and its surroundings

When considering the sustainability of city systems, focus should be put on the interrelationship between a city, and its environment and environs. The perception of city development in close connection with overall human problems brings new challenges inherent to all those interrelationships.

During the discussion, a clear differentiation of approaches was highlighted among countries. The concept of network building and attributing functions to each city in a network drew the particular attention of participants.

These networks are defined as entities of larger and smaller cities including the adjacent land in-between them. Cities and centres comprising such networks complement and reinforce each other's strengths, so that they have more to offer together than they would as individual cities. The partnerships between the local and regional governments within the networks are seen as voluntary, flexible and pragmatic. National government expects municipalities to draw up agreements on how to shape the concentration policy in consultation with provinces and urban regions. Within each of these urban networks the national government designates a number of areas where urbanisation will be concentrated.

In countries in transition, efforts seem to concentrate on legislation, planning and effective mechanisms to implement planning documents, as was clearly spelled out in most of the response papers. However, new metropolitan poles are emerging in these countries. Even though they are not officially recognised as such by legislation – an issue stressed by most participating countries – they are playing a very important role in changing the system, that is, their development brings changes not only within their own limits but also influences the system of surrounding settlements as part of a larger network. Participants discussed the important role that cities could play in connection with the regional, national and international systems. In order to facilitate their role, institutional and governmental structures should be in place.

Governance

Over the past two decades, the general focus of international institutions and national governments regarding urban strategies has shifted from a concern

within the spatial and physical dimensions towards the growing importance of governance and institutional aspects.

The concept of governance re-emerged with new connotations as it was reassessed in a context characterised by significant transformations, including the dominance of neo-liberal policies, the withdrawal of the welfare state, economic globalisation and the emergence of multinational corporations as agents with supranational powers.

More involvement of the government through legislation, cross-sectoral co-operation and long-term planning is required in order to guarantee the redistribution of public investments, and to balance the regional disparities and physical and social polarisation.

A “society-centred” approach primarily concerned with the role of civil society in the governance process has emerged in many countries of the region. For participatory planning and flexible governance, it is also indispensable to create an integrated organisational and institutional structure dealing with all stages of urban planning from preparation to implementation. In other words, there is a need for structure, a mechanism that guarantees the involvement of all stakeholders.

Decentralisation is another trend in the UNECE region: in countries in transition, municipalities used to be tightly led in their development, but have now won greater autonomy since the decentralisation of political powers. But their financial means are often too limited to give them enough real power. They have been obliged to make alliances at the local level and to create new entities composed of several municipalities. This situation is also reflected in the lack of strategic documents and planning mechanisms needed to guide local development, such as city development strategies, general urban plans, master plans and so on.

C. Cities as a driving force for development

Cities are generally considered as a driving force for political and economic integration in the process of globalisation, “nodes” for international co-ordination and for servicing of dynamic economies.

Cultural and natural attributes of cities increase their attractiveness by enhancing the public realm, urban design and regeneration and new approaches

to governance, and by mobilising efforts to stem and control urban sprawl. Polycentric and network-based development of cities are particular forms of development.

Participants reiterated some of the key concepts related to the driving forces influencing urban planning and spatial development such as the image of a city including urban identity, the quality of the environment, energy use and social trends, such as labour costs, levels of education, safe and healthy community life, human resources, and gender and generational cohesion, which influence the growth and decline of cities and their important role in the economy.

However, there were no answers to the basic question highlighted in the topic “How to find a balance between economically based urban development and healthy living conditions?”. This area will need more research on current attempts to implement such policies. The UNECE Strategy for a Sustainable Quality of Life in Human Settlements in the Twenty-First Century is a useful framework to that end.

Some countries mentioned the importance of data collection and the establishment of a set of indicators to evaluate current trends and monitor change. The sustainable development approach could be based on identification of concrete targets. Local authorities should incorporate the results of the analyses resulting from evaluation by means of urban sustainability indicators in strategic development plans and programmes. Public involvement through opinion pools or other more creative means of participation is also important during assessment and policy elaboration.

Other countries expressed the need to emphasise human safety issues during redevelopment and reconstruction activities, in order to minimise risks from potential floods, landslides, fires and earthquakes.

Urban design

To make cities liveable, several strategies came up during the discussion, mainly relating to urban design. However, when designing a complex entity such as a city, seeking to integrate parts thereof or carrying out urban renewal programmes, it is important to consider both physical and non-physical aspects of the structure of urban networks.

Urban design should be conceived not only as small-scale design, but also as a new spatial order for larger portions of a city and where spatial and functional co-ordination takes place between elements which are joined up into a planned and later implemented entity.

The seminar focused largely on urban sprawl and its dimensions. Sprawl is not only about suburbanisation and redistribution of the population, but is closely related to movement patterns (transportation) and job opportunities. This stresses again the importance of considering both the physical and social dimensions of planning, avoiding segregation and its negative repercussions.

Theme II: How can polycentric territorial development improve functional integration?

A. The polycentric concept

The concept of polycentric urban development is not new, but its recent introduction to spatial policy has given it new meaning. The seminar findings show that new definitions and understanding of the concept of polycentrism are far from clear or consensual. This acknowledges the fact that the meaning of polycentrism is context-dependent (for example, different territorial and demographic characteristics of countries; their urban development patterns, institutional organisation, etc.). Polycentrism is mainly applied to the meso-level of urban agglomeration focusing on intra-urban patterns. It is also used at the macro-level at the inter-urban scale. At the mega-level, at the intra-European scale, polycentrism is used in policies to reconcile the conflicting aims of a competitive economy and socio-spatial cohesion.

Participants noted that: (a) polycentrism offers the possibility of combining the effect of cities and urban areas in supporting competition, innovation and growth with a more balanced model of spatial development; (b) polycentrism can improve co-operation, co-ordination and complementarity and reduce inappropriate competition between cities; and (c) it can help to create synergies by strengthening networks and co-operation between cities and their hinterland, while being able to participate in the provision of the functional complexity of urban systems.

Recent research suggested that polycentric national urban systems do not necessarily reduce regional disparities. Conversely, in certain circumstances

more monocentric urban systems are characterised by less regional disparities. This holds particularly for the former EU-15 countries. However, in some cases, monocentric development has produced more negative impacts than positive ones. More research analysing these scenarios and the impact of different approaches should be undertaken.

Pan-European scale

Polycentrism tackles the problem of uneven access to services for all citizens while reducing the diseconomy of spatial disparities. Despite policy efforts at the highest European level, the “Pentagon” (the area encompassing London, Paris, the Randstad, Brussels and western Germany down to Milan with the greatest concentration of innovative and competitive production and services) prevails, not least because it alone is considered capable of competing in the global economy.

Polycentrism figures widely in supranational policies. Spatial development requires interdisciplinary integration, co-operation between the relevant political bodies and authorities, and wider participation. Polycentrism may favour the developed parts of Europe, and the “core” can offer greater potential for spatial integration. In some countries, national capitals may not evolve as equal partners even in the long run, although the market privileges them against their own national hinterlands.

Diverse scenarios imply different costs and benefits, and social, economic and environmental consequences. In practice, different scenarios may suit particular regions. Many factors influence the real shape of polycentrism, like the prices of energy, political stability, etc. Therefore, it is not only the decisions made by governments that are shaping polycentrism. However, the impacts of government policies should be looked at in more depth.

National level

The inertia of physical and economic structures, institutional set-up and cultural behavioural patterns will continue to play an important role in the polycentric approach. The diversity of national and regional settlement patterns can be evaluated as part of national or regional identity, and a sort of common pan-European heritage. Besides national capitals being unrivalled prime centres, a network of secondary centres usually exists, with prospects for strengthening competitiveness.

The level and nature of polycentrism vary within the UNECE region. Countries of the EU-15 introduced spatial policies related to core urban areas and along major transport axes. Urban networks with small and medium-sized cities reinforcing each other are expected to optimise the use of scarce spaces and to form a new tier of governance by means of voluntary partnerships with central government designating where further urbanisation should concentrate.

The effort to orientate cities in southern and eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia towards a European polycentric network may have detrimental effects on the human and economic potential of the rest of these countries, unless major infrastructure investments by European interests are complemented by adequate improvements in network infrastructures at national and regional levels.

Regional and local level

Polycentric urban regions are most widespread in north-western Europe. In more remote areas, the pattern of dominant centres and rural hinterlands is more frequent. In many cases, regions are weak when faced with increased mobility of people, capital and economic activities, especially where there is a lack of regional identity. European polycentric policy which might create an illusion of balanced development, whilst presiding over, or even exacerbating, polarisation on a more localised scale may be avoided when more is known of the spatial trends and policies at lower levels.

The gap gets wider between rural territories which benefit from urban influence through geographical proximity or transport links and those that do not. The latter lack accessibility, but the benefits from introducing supra-regional transport infrastructure in peripheral areas may pass them by. An alternative model of development is an integrated multipolar rural territory which encompasses small towns and the hinterland.

B. Implementing polycentric development

There is considerable territorial as well as social diversity in the UNECE region. The question is how to benefit from existing diversity for the economic and social well-being of societies in the region. The free movements facilitated by the European Union have no doubt contributed to some convergence. However, globalisation and worldwide mobility have brought about new diversity with

increased ethnic, racial, religious and class divides. They have given rise to incompatibilities, friction, rivalries and even open conflicts. They provoked defensive responses expressed in gated communities, no-go areas as well as the temptation of fortress Europe. It could thus be argued that polycentrism embedded in co-operation and solidarity does not come naturally to human societies. Concerted human action is required to implement polycentrism. What research attempts to assist is how to get from the actual state to the desired state expected from polycentrism.

The EU has adopted economic measures, in particular capital investment in transportation infrastructure, to create greater territorial balance and social inclusion. Research shows that these measures can have perverse effects – for example, bypass peripheral areas instead of incorporating them into a balanced territorial economy. Similarly, expanding the road network in the Dutch Randstad, the original model of polycentrism, is increasing congestion. It thus reduces both accessibility for all and equal opportunities, two stated aims of polycentrism.

Economic efficiency is often detrimental to socio-spatial equity. In the case of high-quality infrastructures, gaps emerge between running and maintenance costs and their limited usage, especially in less attractive territories with population and economic decline. It is difficult for countries in transition to find post hoc solutions for the contradictions of their uncontrolled spatial development.

More than economic and physical measures are needed to fulfil the objectives of polycentrism. Changes in human behaviour and attitudes are required, such as a change from competitive ethos to a new humanism to reduce polarisation and achieve greater integration.

At the very least it has a number of prerequisites. Implementing polycentrism depends on people who are willing to pool and share their “common wealth” and build institutions which facilitate the development of a more equitable society. They need the co-operation of the business community as well as other interest groups.

Institutional prerequisites

Governance is considered the key to implementing polycentrism. “Good governance” is meant to encompass the rule of law, accountability, a sense

of co-responsibility and transparency, consensus-building, inclusiveness, responsiveness and public participation. Governance alone does not suffice, though, and other tools of implementation are required, such as organisational capacity, institutional innovation and partnerships to overcome contradictions between competitiveness and co-operation, complementarity and co-ordination.

Polycentrism requires different administrative and organisational structures with decision-making legitimacy. Even in the context of ongoing deregulation and privatisation, governments and other public bodies can still influence the decision-making process of the business community. Any governmental decision to actively manage spatial change implies steady and continuous political leadership, long-term co-operation and a shared concept of development.

Partnerships are a prevalent form of modern governance. The very concept of partnership has many different interpretations, encompassing different types of partners with varying roles. It is essential to match the appropriate kind of partnership to specific circumstances of place, time and objectives. Where the public sector is being increasingly handled like the private sector, partnerships and outsourcing are gaining in significance. The transformation from hierarchy and tax-based public service provision to entrepreneurial government with a focus on enabling and contractual responsibility has institutional consequences.

Partnerships can take many different forms of co-operation and sharing: public-public as well as public-private, private-private and a combination of private, public and voluntary sectors. In order to prevent institutional fragmentation, it is crucial to identify the common interests of key stakeholders in the development of polycentric systems. In return, business, which operates in high-risk economic and social environments, expects public-sector spatial policy to be consistent, comprehensive, stable and transparent at all levels.

Networks should be considered as an instrument to facilitate the transition from competition to co-operation. Reciprocal relations of spatial units in existing spatial networks are based on sharing. Individuals or agents can have more than one identity in a spatial network. Spatial networks make meaningless the concept of boundary. The three cities visited during the study tour illustrated the diversity of partnerships available to planning as a means of translating socio-economic aims into space.

The implementation of polycentric networks at the regional and/or local level will demand institutional capacity-building in those regions and municipalities which have less-developed administrative and cultural traditions in creating partnerships and coalitions. In highly centralised nation states this will constitute an added challenge and emphasise the link between the development of governance mechanisms and polycentric spatial development models.

No matter how desirable the aims of polycentrism, its implementation is bound to change power relations. It requires the empowerment of those who are most actively involved in implementation by granting them political will to legitimise their actions to achieve polycentrism. As research has shown, the regional level is best suited to implement polycentrism. The intermediary level of governance between the nation state and the local level needs strengthening. Moreover, the level in charge of implementation should be empowered to raise the necessary means through taxation and charges. The chances are slim of anyone wanting to give up power. In real life, short-term gain eclipses long-term sustainability. A serious change of cultural and behavioural attitudes would be required to implement polycentrism and overcome the paradox between competitiveness and co-operation, complementarity and co-ordination.

Co-operation based on proximity is important, especially for co-operation within a regional and cross-border context. Functional specialisation and influence are more decisive aspects when considering options for transnational co-operation. Complementarity is a driving force of polycentrism. Whether complementarity can be achieved in a climate of short-term gains remains to be seen.

Polycentrism requires multiple governmental units to cope with it. Thus, intergovernmental co-ordination and partnership – horizontal as well as vertical – seems to be necessary but the examples even from countries that have gone a long way with polycentrism (Netherlands) have difficulties in co-ordination and co-operation at the local level. It was clear that size matters – not only that of the spatial levels of polycentrism but also the size of the units in which the processes take place.

Polycentric strategies should be compatible with the sustainability concept. Incremental planning from small starts to more complex projects including institutional development could assist implementation. The examples of expected or estimated effects of polycentrism on sustainable development

vary. It can provide socially sustainable access to urban infrastructures and services. At the local level (functional urban area), it can increase social segregation through socially unsustainable residential suburbanisation and sprawl. It can also help to get new economically sustainable investment and jobs to remote areas.

Polycentric development is a process complementary to centralisation. Both processes can have positive and negative effects on society, the economy and the environment. It is a matter of political processes to agree on objectives and priorities, and the role of governments to develop policies to enhance positive and minimise negative aspects of the process. Thus the states and other levels of governments have their roles to play in polycentric development.

C. Key policy issues

The response papers and the conference discussions raised a number of policy issues. Research presented at the seminar categorised them either as analysis of spatial and socio-economic change and their relevance to polycentrism, or as policy reactions to ongoing urban developments and how they are being handled.

Analytical research

Not clearly defined, polycentrism embodies different conceptual elements and may have acted as an umbrella for different conceptual debates. Nevertheless, participants managed to reach consensus on the fact that some sort of polycentric development is taking place. Polycentrism itself is directly linked to consensus-building, which is embedded in its aims.

The visibility of polycentric development initiatives varies. Transport-related projects seem to be the most prominent. Scale also plays a key role in terms of visibility. Maps showed polycentric developments throughout Europe but some examples were raised of “forgotten” polycentric regions (for example, the Veneto region in Italy). Additionally, cross-border co-operation was presented as an implementation tool of polycentric development. Yet the maps included in the vast majority of presentations failed to present any development initiatives beyond country borders.

Research on polycentrism is evolving steadily. A number of comprehensive studies (for example, ESPON) are under way to diagnose ongoing development trends.

Policy and implementation research

Here researchers presented their findings on responses to urban development processes and political preparedness to deal with them. There was no consensus on how to best reach the goal of polycentric development. There was no clear evidence on whether top-down or bottom-up approaches are better. There may not be a single right way to address this issue. It was suggested that rural areas could be a good laboratory for a better understanding of such interaction.

Working towards polycentric development implies a premium on enhanced institutional capacity. Institutional and organisational capacity-building is recognised to be a slow and incremental process. The regional scale was the example used to illustrate this point. Further research which would collate, synthesise and disseminate available information about ongoing capacity-building processes could initiate the development of institutional innovation methodologies, particularly on the role of regional development agencies. Research could show how such institutions could go beyond a solely bureaucratic role and adopt an enabling, mediating stance. Another research issue was the extent to which polycentric development was having an effect on national administrative structures.

Functional complementarity was observed as the cornerstone of sustainable polycentric areas and should be taken into consideration in future policy development.

There was common agreement that there are no “one size fits all” development solutions. Local contexts matter and should be given top importance in any spatial development strategy. Research should take diversity of local contexts into consideration. There was an interesting variety of approaches to territorial identity. Some presentations referred to the difficulty of creating new territorial identities. Others alluded to strengthening existing territory “personalities” as an essential motor of development.

There was no clear agreement on the possibility of separating the urban from the rural.

Economic development was addressed in the majority of presentations. Yet several questions remain unanswered. For instance, who leads economic

“development”? Are the market forces the engines and the public sector the follower or the opposite, or is no unique pattern identifiable?

More generally, there was a call for research which would provide less arguable outcomes. Information dissemination and communication is understood to be of great importance in this context and should not be overlooked.

Some issues raised in the initial seminar discussion paper remained unaddressed. No presentation proposed alternative development perspectives. The role of governments in implementing polycentric development strategies was somehow set aside. So was the debate concerning the political issues that may arise from the territorial administrative changes this development model seems to catalyse. Lastly, there was no clarification of the link between polycentric development and social-spatial cohesion.

The debate and response papers and the UNECE Conference on Sharing Responsibility for our Region reconfirmed that urban polycentrism offers the possibility of combining the powerful influence of cities and urban areas in promoting competitiveness, innovation and growth with more balanced models of spatial development. Polycentrism may enhance co-operation, co-ordination and complementarity instead of detrimental competition between cities. It may create synergy by fostering networks of co-operation and pooling complementary functions even across hierarchic levels and discontinuous space. However, polycentrism should not be seen as a panacea for solving problems generated by lack of territorial and social cohesion and growing territorial and economic disparity. Alternative concepts of redressing spatial disparities and extracting value from existing and potential urban assets are worth exploring. Reappraising perceptions of market forces and developing new attitudes toward territorial governance and management of urban change could be promising initiatives.

12. International CEMAT Symposium on the Accessibility and Attractiveness of Rural and Landlocked Areas: Sustainable Transport and Services of General Interest



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban and Spatial Planning of the Principality of Andorra.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 87, 2008)

Venue: Andorra la Vella, Andorra

Date: 25-26 October 2007

Objectives

The aim of the symposium was to promote an integrated approach to regional planning and good governance, and to make proposals regarding the preparation of the 15th CEMAT Session on the theme “Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world”, to be held in Russia in 2010.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Mr Jacques Robert, Council of Europe expert

The Pyrenees were one of the test beds of European integration, largely thanks to the Council of Europe. Anyone who remembers the Council of Europe conferences of the late 1970s and early 1980s (Pau, Oloron, Jaca) knows that they led to the setting up of the Working Community of the Pyrenees. Within that community, Andorra has always demonstrated a very high level of commitment.

The symposium now drawing to an end has dealt with several different issues at once. The one thing that these issues have in common is that the areas concerned are rather neglected, and have their own specific problems. Inaccessibility and a lack of services of public interest and sustainable transport solutions jeopardise the attractiveness of some of the areas concerned, the quality of life there and even their survival.

The work that has been done at this symposium has been worthwhile, for we have dealt not only with old problems, such as the disadvantages of a landlocked position, already deplored for several decades, but also with issues connected with a new context, encompassing new values such as sustainable development and an interest in landscapes, as well as new constraints such as those surrounding energy and new challenges presented by, for instance, the potential of rural areas in terms of what we might term the “residential economy” (*l'économie résidentielle*, economic activity generated by population groups which are not productive in the locality) and the production of renewable energy supplies.

On the subject of accessibility, and in the face of the very wide range of definitions of this concept, I should like to draw attention to the importance of relative accessibility. With competition between areas increasing in the context of globalisation, it is the difference in accessibility between one area and another that creates an advantage.

Next, it has to be pointed out that transport networks have, for decades now, been evolving into systems which favour the major links in the chain, to the detriment of the smaller ones. This has happened not only because of technological progress, as in the case of high-speed trains, but also, and above all, as a result of profitability issues, with the infrastructure being very costly. Given that it is transport movements between major cities which are most numerous, and constantly increasing, the law of profitability quite naturally favours rapid inter-city links, which are of little benefit to the less-developed areas through which they run, or to the more peripheral areas devoid of cities. The problem of secondary networks, with far more interlinking routes, is thus crucial to cohesion between areas, if we wish to avoid a disproportionate increase in the accessibility differential. The role of local and regional authorities in developing such networks has been mentioned several times, but it is one that can be played effectively only if the authorities concerned have sufficient resources. This is frequently the case in western Europe, but is far less likely in the countries of central and eastern Europe. Even those among them which are members of the European Union see Structural Fund resources concentrated on developing major corridors, and local and regional authorities can hardly bear the whole financial burden of improving secondary networks.

Another point which has to be mentioned in relation to accessibility is its relationship with economic development. It has been pointed out that the

correlation between the two is not an absolute one, and that there are plenty of factors other than accessibility to explain areas' economic performance or failure to perform. Nor should we restrict our study of the correlation to periods that are too short. Over the longer term, a lasting positive accessibility differential does usually seem to translate into a positive differential in terms of economic development.

And lastly, it is a good thing to remember that accessibility extends beyond infrastructure to encompass transport and also telecommunications services. Just a few years ago, it was feared that a significant gulf between areas would develop where telecommunications networks and services were concerned. While it cannot be denied today that such differences exist, they seem to be shrinking more rapidly than differences in terms of transport infrastructure. High-speed Internet access is expanding faster in Europe than high-speed trains or even motorways, to the extent that in the near future paradoxical situations might arise in which the potential of telecommunications networks and services might not be able to be fully exploited, because of shortcomings in the physical transport infrastructure. To round off the subject of accessibility, mention must also be made of the vital role of territorial integration and related policies, especially in border regions. The connecting up of transport systems long designed in a purely national context may, even through sometimes modest investments, give rise to considerable gains in accessibility for the areas concerned.

Turning to the subject of goods transport in rural areas, the forthcoming production of biomass in large quantities is going to raise the permanent problem of its carriage to processing units (biofuels production plants). It will be important to locate such units with a view to concentrating biomass transport by rail, waterway or sea, keeping road haulage to a minimum.

There are three factors affecting development where the maintenance of services of public interest in rural areas (and also in some urban areas) is concerned. The first is the liberalisation and privatisation of services, which has a worse effect on the less-developed areas with low population densities, where services are less profitable, or even loss-making. The second is the ageing of the population and reduction of population density and, conversely, the third is the changing system of values, with access to products and services of public interest now regarded as a right, similar to other fundamental rights.

There are now several countries which provide practical examples of the institutionalisation of this right, and it is desirable that all European countries should follow suit. In parallel with the institutionalisation of this right, the practice of supplying, in conditions acceptable both to the community and to the population groups concerned, goods and services of public interest (water, electricity, telephone and Internet access, media and other sources of information, basic commodities, etc.) already highlights a number of methods applicable on a large scale in many rural regions (appropriate pricing, guaranteed supply minima, area grouping of services, etc.). Where the rural areas most demographically and economically depressed are concerned, it seems that solutions involving the grouping of services at particular centres (small and medium-sized towns) are inevitable in order to protect such areas from the loss of much of their lifeblood.

Whether it is transport services or other personal services that are at issue, it is also important to take account of a number of new opportunities presenting themselves to many rural areas, such as the chance to develop their “residential economy” by accommodating retired persons moving in from their cities. The general ageing of the population in Europe will, in the years ahead, extend this kind of possibility, of which appropriate advantage will be able to be taken only if highly specific services are available, whether transport, health or cultural services. If the “residential economy” is to develop, an integrated approach must be taken to services, possibly also including on-demand transport services.

Where many rural parts of central and eastern Europe are concerned, the large numbers of country dwellers and the major changes occurring in agricultural and rural activities will result in an inexorable and lasting continuation of the release of labour. The crucial problem is where alternative jobs will be located. Will medium-sized towns be capable of giving expression to sustainable forms of development? Or, on the other hand, will longer migratory movements to major cities (mainly national capitals), and even emigration to other countries, continue? It seems an appropriate strategy for medium-sized towns to offer an integrated range of services, encompassing both personal services and services for businesses.

It nevertheless has to be said that there are many different situations in rural areas, and that the solutions worked out for some of them cannot

necessarily be applied, in exactly the same form, to others. Rural areas close to major cities tend to have very different socio-economic and cultural characteristics from those that prevail in peripheral and remote rural areas. General problems in highly contrasting specific contexts inevitably require differentiated solutions.

In conclusion, it is vital to promote a political priority. The current period is a pivotal one for the countryside and for rural areas. At European level (and particularly within the European Union), long-term policies are going to be introduced in the years ahead on which the future of the rural world depends. In the current context of intensifying globalisation, a rush to be competitive and rivalry between areas, the political balance of power between city and countryside is very much to the latter's disadvantage. There is thus no small risk of the disappearance, or at least severe curtailment, of a number of policies which have hitherto helped to maintain the vitality of rural areas. It is more necessary than ever before to organise a European rural lobby, for a real choice of society needs to be made. The fatal two-way split between European areas which would result from a lack of a rural development policy would, in the long term, entail high social costs (deterioration of human settlements and infrastructure, deterioration of cultural landscapes, the leaving fallow of agricultural land and pastures, etc.). If it is to be effective, a modern rural lobby must raise awareness not only among rural populations, but also among urban populations and their political representatives. In the current context, certain opportunities must be grasped, and in particular the wide media coverage of certain subjects affecting rural areas, such as the possibility of producing biomass and other renewable energies as substitutes for oil-based products, the development of accommodation for retired persons in rural areas and the impact of climate change. The rural lobby must base itself on these new opportunities and new risks, which are both real and objective. In future, it will be less a matter of asking for subsidies than one of demonstrating that rural areas have potential which can lead to development and balance for Europe as a whole.

13. International CEMAT Symposium on Challenges and Strategies for Metropolises and Metropolitan Regions, in a Context of Growing Globalisation with Regard to Economic, Social, Environmental and Cultural Development



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 90, 2010)

Venue: St Petersburg, Russian Federation

Date: 26-27 June 2008

Objectives

The aim of the symposium was to contribute to the discussions on the following:

- the development of competitive metropolitan functions: what are they? Who influences them? What are the possibilities of public policies? Which forms of co-operation and networking between metropolitan regions can complement the climate of strong competition?
- basic patterns and changes in the distribution and positioning of metropolitan regions on the European continent (benchmarking, catching up of metropolitan areas of central and eastern Europe);
- impacts of globalisation, privatisation and demographic change on the social structures and the situation and development in large cities. Strategies and tools for maintaining social cohesion;
- the qualitative evolution of metropolitan regions: enhancement of the cultural heritage, changes in urban landscapes, development of environmentally friendly transport and energy systems, urban-rural relationships;
- the management of metropolitan areas: global and territorial governance, strategic planning, public participation, public-private partnerships.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Konstantin Ananichev, Council of Europe expert

The first session devoted to the future of metropolises and large cities included a comprehensive panorama of the current state of spatial planning in the Russian Federation (Mr Dmitry Aratsky, Deputy Minister for Regional Development) and, in particular, in the city of St Petersburg (Mrs Ekaterina Goloulina). Several important documents of pan-European importance were presented at the session, namely: the European Urban Charter (Mr Carlos Alberto Pinto), Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Mr Welf Selke), New Charter of Athens (Mr Luc Emile Bouche-Florin), and the European Landscape Convention (Mrs Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons). All reports emphasised the beginning of a new qualitative stage in spatial and urban planning.

The second session, formulated as “A holistic approach: cities for people”, consisted of presentations of local positive experience gained in Moscow *Oblast*, Russian Federation (Mr Alexander Frolov), St Petersburg, Russian Federation (Mrs Ekaterina Goloulina), Alicante-Elche, Spain (Mr Vincente Domenech Gregori), and Bratislava, Slovak Republic (Mr Peter Benuska). The session was followed by two parallel round tables for free discussions concerning: (1) major trends in the development of metropolises and metropolitan regions, and (2) major challenges for providing good quality of life for the population in metropolises. The main results and conclusions of the first two sessions were summarised by Mrs Maria José Festas.

The theme of the third session was formulated as “Cities for tomorrow”. The reports were dedicated to large investment projects and issues of public-private partnership (Mr Roman Golovanov), activities under the ESPON programme, in particular, in transfrontier metropolitan regions (Mrs Margarita Jancic), the programme for cities participating in the International Federation for Housing (Mrs Alexandra Litchman), and symbiosis of different cultures, experience of Izhevsk, Udmurt Republic, Russian Federation (Mrs Nadezhda Utkina).

Concluding the symposium, I would like to emphasise a few remarkable moments of this meeting.

1. No city is an island. Let us thank Mrs Festas for this paraphrase. The development of a big city inevitably becomes a regional, national and finally all-European issue. Globalisation of economic processes and the end of political confrontation in Europe have resulted in transfrontier co-operation and even in physical amalgamation of metropolises. Today, we face new problems, requiring more global approaches and universal solutions. However, international co-operation must be based on comprehension of the unique character of the nature and manifestation of problems facing each individual city. In relation to this, it is expedient to mention new urban planning documents, presented at the symposium.

2. Solutions can be complex only. There are no more opportunities for “pure” urban planning. Any spatial project influences all aspects of urban life. At the same time, any problem arising from city development exerts a certain impact on the territory. Urban planners have to take into consideration not only the problems of construction and housing, but the issues of the environment, natural and cultural heritage, and the multiplicity of nations and cultures. They have a very limited set of tools and have to operate within an extremely limited space. A trivial but convincing analogy could be drawn with chess; a good position held by a chess-piece can mean more than its nominal value.

3. Investment is just a tool. Some six years ago, at the time of the CEMAT Symposium in Dresden, delegates could be divided into two groups: westerners reporting on successful spatial development projects accomplished on the basis of large-scale investment, and easterners reporting on their plans and looking for appropriate investment. Today, the situation has changed. Here, we are a uniform group of spatial planners aware of insufficiency of investment for a “proper” urban development. Investment has to be aligned with the interests of society. As society consists of different groups with different cultural, material, aesthetic and ethical demands, our search for consensus will not be an easy one. But if we return to the primitive scenario “project plus investor is implementation” we will not go further. Instead of a new city for people there will be the same old city growing along with its growing problems. Such a process is called growth without development.

4. It is vital to pay more and more attention to ethics. I know that morality and ethics are not the duties of spatial planners. As we represent states, regions and communities with different levels of economy, different landscapes,

different traditions and ways of life, we are not able to draw plans here of an ideal city. Nevertheless, we can discuss its criteria and the criteria of a city for people. The city of the future will be based on human values including ethics and aesthetics.

Generally speaking, the symposium was a long-expected fruitful exchange of opinions. The main conclusion should be optimistic: spatial planning remains one of the most efficient tools for metropolitan development. The drawbacks result from improper use and lack of co-operation with society and other sectors.

14. International CEMAT Symposium on the Spatial Dimension of Human Rights: For a New Culture of Territory



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban Development of Armenia.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe European series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 91, 2010)

Venue: Yerevan, Armenia

Date: 13-14 October 2008

Objectives

The aim of the symposium was to consider the relation between human beings and the territory and examine how spatial planning is a key instrument for sustainable development and effective governance. Its objective is to achieve at the same time: balanced socio-economic development of the regions; improvement of the quality of life; responsible management of landscape and of natural and cultural values; protection of the environment; and rational use of land.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Luc-Emile Bouche-Florin, representative of the European Council of Spatial Planners (ECPT)

Bearing in mind that conclusions have been drawn, to a greater or lesser extent, from each session, I shall not sum up each address again, but take the

role of an active outside observer. This is in fact my role as representative to CEMAT of the European Council of Spatial Planners, but it is also the role of planners in general, who are duty-bound, as multidisciplinary professionals, to take an overall approach and to give enough attention to what others have to say, so as to endeavour to single out ideas that are shared and to encourage the emergence of new ideas, sometimes with a politically incorrect dimension.

It has been pointed out that a nation's heritage encompasses not just objects and immovable property, but also spaces, known generically as landscape, although Mrs Christina Storelli quite rightly pointed out that it is within the landscape that the key to almost all of our concerns in terms of human rights is to be found. I have given a lot of thought to her comment, and it occurred to me that, while the landscape may hold everything within it, this is because landscape, whether urban or rural, the landscape of all our multicultural and borderless territories, in practice holds within it the identity of the populations living there. If we look back at the origins of the very word "heritage" (and *patrimoine* in French), we find the same concept of what our ancestors have passed on to us.

These thought-provoking perceptions were very clearly illustrated by Mrs Linda Mavian, when she spoke about Venice. It is from multicultural identity that the major ideas flow that we call the pillars of sustainable development. But should we not, in fact, ask ourselves whether that feature of the landscape that is cultural identity – the heritage in the broadest sense – is not the very basis of sustainable development, so far more than an additional pillar and an intersecting element, as described in detail by Mr Jean-François Seguin.

When we turn to the preservation of landscapes and of the cultural identity that they contain, we therefore have to raise the question of first the recognition and then the appropriation of that cultural identity by human beings that makes recognition possible. Recognise – *recognoscere* in Latin – is a word thought by some to be related to the Latin verb *nascere*, meaning "be born", so perhaps to recognise something is to gain a new awareness of it or to regard it as "newborn". Etymology sometimes plays tricks with words, and in this case the "birth" dimension is etymologically incorrect, but it helps to confirm the truth of the "recognition", or "rebirth", of the perception of our landscapes.

When we explored central Armenia on Sunday, one thing which struck me was that, of the two monasteries that we visited, the first, whilst archaeologically

magnificent, seemed to have been totally given over to the admiration of tourists, whereas the second, in contrast, having been brought back into use for worship, with a strong dimension of identity (an impression shared by the local population), gave us a very different feeling. This does not exclude associated economic use, needing to be approached with great caution, as revealed by Mr Niek Hazendonk, and we also saw the positive aspects of such use highlighted by Mr Jean-Claude Rouard.

Thus, the question obviously arises, in respect of the landscape heritage, of its protection, its consistency and its reappropriation policy, which may even extend to an economic logic, which is the only way of making such an approach sustainable and justifying preservation, if we ask ourselves what will happen now that “the party’s over”.

Over the course of human history, the creation that has come down to us can, here at the foot of Mount Ararat, only be regarded as divine; in a peaceful land, human beings have been entrusted with the peopling and domestication of nature and with the shaping of their environment in a way which can both respect it and safeguard the survival of humankind. Until very recently, generations of peasants, nature’s gardeners, had for over twelve thousand years been developing ingenious ways, not of fighting against this nature, but of living in harmony with it. Then the time came, barely a hundred years ago, when the human race began to consider that it had the right to take whatever it needed from the vast resources of nature, which it considered to be both freely available and inexhaustible.

This same nature is now obliging us to show greater respect and to embark on a “reconsideration”, a “recognition”, a “rebirth”, which in practice needs to become the new way forward so that we remain within the confines of the freedom given to us: using our human genius to adapt our civilisations to their environment. Thus, human know-how becomes part culture, part heritage, in the same way as nature itself, and in harmony with it: the creation of landscapes derives from these processes, and as Niek Hazendonk pointed out, there is danger in failing to give thought to our responsibility as “consumers of landscapes”.

The point was also made that the idea of using and shaping the urban or rural landscape very soon refers us to a visual perception. In this visual perception, I can also see a knowledge of the identity of a space. Hence, I

feel that there is a vital need for planners responsible for spatial planning to foster this openness, encourage quality uses and make possible a concerted juxtaposition of public-private sequences in a move towards a new consistency. It is this concerted and civic approach that we must take.

The subject of our symposium, the “spatial dimension of human rights”, must effectively, as a matter of urgency, be made the new focus of the attention of spatial planners, and a precondition for this is a reconciliation with our landscapes, a recognition made possible through rediscovered identity. Only then can we adopt planning policies.

This wide-ranging endeavour may become easier, less Utopian, than we think, and this world in which we live, by which I mean the world of this very day, Tuesday 14 October 2008, may rather chaotically create the opportunity for a more appropriate and fairer reconstruction.

I am amazed that we have not, during this symposium, mentioned the huge global financial crisis currently sweeping away what we thought were the solid foundations of our economic development models, and it has to be said that the human dimension certainly has disappeared from these models, within which terms such as networking and competitiveness underpinned our vocabulary.

Now we come back to this nagging question of what happens now that “the party’s over”. That time has come, or at least we face some searching questions, so there are two options open to us. The first reflects the fears expressed by the World Conservation Congress, which draws to a close this very day in Barcelona, and which senses a risk of the financial crisis causing collateral damage to the environment, a fear which is legitimate in the light of the financial mountains moved in order to save banks: the sums spent would have been sufficient to put an end to poverty in the countries of the South for several decades. The other is to reconcile human beings with their environment in an economic context which is certainly very different, and may even be built on new foundations. A lot of concepts need either to be given new thought or to be invented. As Mrs Ruzan Alaverdyan said, we need to rediscover true harmony between humankind and nature. The time has perhaps come, as pointed out by Mr Marc Pallemmaerts, to get back to the fundamentals of the four objectives covering the dimensions of sustainable development, which in practice extend to human rights, not

forgetting the rights of future generations. Mr Suren Ohanyan told us quite rightly that human beings need to be creative, and raised the real issues of whether what we regard as progress is positive or not, and whether nature should adapt to us or we should adapt to nature. These are real issues that it is important to reconsider as we seek ways of making the urban landscape a human landscape, as suggested by Cristina Storelli.

Perhaps I may come back to an idea that we looked at during our previous meeting, in St Petersburg, where the thought was expressed that, looking back over history, those civilisations which had disappeared had always done so because they had found it difficult to adapt.

Thus the challenge and the opportunity ahead are those of a new humanism, another “rebirth” also extending to landscapes, which, as Jean-François Seguin reminded us, occupy 100% of our territories: their links with spatial planning urgently need to be reinforced. This is an area to which insufficient attention is given, even at the Council of Europe, although this symposium would seem to demonstrate the opposite: let us hope that this new awareness gives rise to action.

Dealing with what is to happen now that “the party’s over” is certainly an ambitious task, Utopian, but why not? Cristina Storelli issued an invitation to seek a new dimension, and we can all respond to her call. There is surely a mystical dimension, whether or not we are believers, for we can assume, like certain 20th-century philosophers and thinkers, that the spirituality of the 21st century may merely reflect the reconciliation of human beings with the world as it was created, and their rediscovered awareness of their duty to look after the great “theatre of life” to which Mrs Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons referred when she introduced this symposium.

Here, in Yerevan, the strong symbolic presence of Mount Ararat on our doorstep can and must inspire such a desire in us. Our thanks go to Armenia: its cultural tradition over thousands of years has quite clearly inspired our symposium.

Finally, I should like to thank you, Ruzan Alaverdyan, for your hospitality, the memory of which will stay with us as a lasting gift.

15. International CEMAT Symposium on a Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of Ukraine.

(Proceedings published in the Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 92, 2010)

Venue: Kiev, Ukraine

Date: 12 June 2009

Objectives

The aim of the Kiev Symposium was to promote an integrated approach to regional planning, and good governance, and in particular to implement Recommendation Rec(2002)1 on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, adopted on 30 January 2002 by the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers, and make proposals for the preparation of the 15th Session of CEMAT, which will take place in the Russian Federation in 2010 concerning “Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Maciej Borsa, Warsaw School of Economics, representative of Poland to the CEMAT Committee of Senior Officials

The title of our symposium – “A comprehensive approach to sustainable spatial development of the European continent” – reflects our conviction that European citizens have a right to a sustainable territory. We’ve discussed this topic in two thematic sessions: first focused on the challenges we have to react, and the second concentrated on the approaches we have to apply.

The background thesis of these two sessions – as well as the third, summarising, session – was that clever governance, applying the “comprehensive approach”, leads to the desirable “sustainability” of territory. The sustainability to which,

according to our convictions, our citizens have a right. And which we, spatial planners, intend to deliver to them.

But the right to sustainable territory, as with other human rights, also brings obligations. Giving values to citizens, simultaneously expects certain inputs. Can we take assets without making payments? Do our citizens have enough knowledge to fulfil the expectations of sustainable territory, to activate resources and, finally, to use them to their full advantage?

The willingness, readiness and preparation of society to make use of its right to sustainable territory seems to be a key issue of the desirable “comprehensive approach” to spatial planning. Due to the spirit of the age we are trying to avoid putting tight restrictions on our plans and procedures. We focus more on limitations and regulations in this respect. The final locational decisions are out of our control, are uncertain (cannot be precisely foreseen) and mostly based on the coincidence of many partial decisions, undertaken by various individuals. The final spatial result is based on the partial decisions of an unknown number of “small decision makers”. It is hard to say that these decisions are “planned” according to an official or spatial plan. We do not even know whether all these “small decision makers” are aware that they have made a spatially important decision or even that they have participated in the spatial development process. They are unconscious actors in the space.

These reflections lead directly to very simple conclusions – to achieve sustainability of the territory, to implement intelligent governance or to make a planning approach really comprehensive – we have to start with information, awareness-rising of the citizens, firstly, to make them understand that the problem is important. And later on, to teach them the basic ways of achieving positive results. So we, the spatial planners, should educate people, focusing on training and education of spatial behaviours. It also means a new job for us as moderators, facilitators of public discussions. This is quite a different role to that of a GIS specialist. We need more jobs in planning which deal directly with the public, whilst implementing spatial goals in practice. In fact the number of potential posts in this respect is probably much higher than in “pure” planning.

The second session of our symposium dealt with a number of positive examples of social engagement in spatial processes. They prove that participation of citizens in sustainable spatial development is possible. But we have to develop or at least deepen the models of such participation. This

may be a huge task both for individuals and professional organisations: at national and European levels.

The initial step is to define the challenges. This was the topic of a thematic session during our symposium. We have broad experience, from the Council of Europe, individual countries and the European Union. We have our guiding principles, ESDP, and the EU regions 2020 and Barca reports as well as the EU's ongoing discussion on the latest Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. In particular, this latest process has shown that we are still far from a global territorial approach – it is still not very dominant in our policies, especially at the transnational level. Some years ago, it seemed that “territoriality” was a promising pillar of EU policies, in addition to social and economic issues. These factors are relatively better known and stable. However, at present we still have no fixed understanding of the meaning of the term “territorial” – whether it is something “spatial” in the wider sense, or only (as is sometimes perceived) a way of mapping social and economic statistics. We have to define the interpretations of some basic keywords, so that all parties involved are in agreement. This was already underlined in today's discussion.

Another of this keywords is “comprehensive”. Does it concern each sector or whole territory? What is our explanation? Do we agree on a common understanding of such basic terms? We can name many “comprehensive” policies that are fragmented, dedicated to territorial “islands” – isolated parts of a wider territory. Can we accept that comprehensiveness has its levels: that we have highly comprehensive policies along with many others at a lower level? Maybe we should define the minimum requirements and the desirable levels? We should work on it – to focus and operationalise our policies. They should be more efficient and addressed territorially (at the moment we define them in terms of general goals).

The third topic which should be mentioned in this summary is how to reconcile the long-term and short-term objectives of spatial development. Or generally – how to achieve goals and implement best practices in it? One useful reply is through innovative governance. So we are no longer concentrating on “spatial planning”, switching imperceptibly to “spatial governance” or using the term “spatial management”. What is the difference between planning and management of space?

Management and governance are something much wider than planning itself. We can use the classic definitions of management in non-spatial economic

applications: management comprises four elements: planning, organising, motivating and controlling. We can presume that similar general content will apply to spatial management. The main conclusion from this classical definition is that planning is part of management, whilst the converse is not true.

Maybe it is obvious now for all of us. But not so long ago in many eastern European countries, planning was something that was much wider and situated over management and governance. One can say that planning was the dogma, influencing everything else. So, in many of these countries, the transformation of the spatial planning paradigm, which is now occurring in Europe, runs deeper than in other countries. For many planning officers (and simple soldiers), it is hard to understand and accept that planning is only a tool – a tool of governance.

But, on the other hand, people who do not directly participate in spatial development processes associate “spatial planning” with “central planning” in their countries. They perceive planning as an old habit, which has to be eradicated. In these circumstances, spatial planners in the post-soviet countries have an additional task concerning their public awareness activities – to convince people that spatial planning is still relevant – that as we make business plans for companies operating in a market economy, so we have to make spatial plans for market-dependent territories. But of course we have to use proper methods.

It is of great importance for the future that we already have such methods, and are trying to implement them; this was mentioned today in many speeches. The Ukrainian programme for cities, and programmes intended to increase the abilities and skills of spatial planning professionals and many others are worth mentioning in this respect. We need more knowledge and we have to increase professional capacities. Switching from “planning” to “governance” is not easy. It is much easier to make declarations than to implement changes. Even if we know what to do – are we able to do it? Who will support us and who will obstruct us? Are we prepared to construct a coalition for a “new spatial governance” or are we lone fighters who will lose?

That is why we have to talk to a wider audience about the rights and obligations concerning sustainable territory. It is not evident, it is something that can only be achieved through the common sustained effort of innumerable actors. This seems to be the basic rule of the comprehensive approach to planning.

VI. CEMAT spatial development glossary

CEMAT's spatial development glossary was presented at the 14th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning, Lisbon (Portugal), 26-27 October 2006.

The 15th CEMAT took note that the glossary was published in English and French by Council of Europe Publishing (Territory and landscape series, No. 2, 2007), and is available on the CEMAT website (www.coe.int/CEMAT). It has been translated into several languages – Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, Italian, Macedonian, Romanian, Serbian – and that it is being translated into other languages. It also invited those concerned to use the glossary in their national and international activities.

Presentation

In the context of spatial development policies, a number of specific expressions and concepts are frequently used in most European states. Some of them are traditional professional expressions, while others were recently introduced into the professional vocabulary, especially through the elaboration and publication of Recommendation Rec(2002)1 on the guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent (GPSSDEC-CEMAT) and the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP). The objective of the CEMAT spatial development glossary is to provide a definition of such expressions, as well as some explanations about their use and recent evolution.

The glossary is addressed to a wide range of officials, professionals and representatives of civil society involved in territorial development policies and related activities at various levels. It is aimed at clarifying the content of widely used concepts and expressions in this field as well as the distinctions between them.

Each concept or expression presented in the glossary contains a definition, generally followed by comments in italics providing further information on the origin, the context, the evolution or the policy implications of the concept.

In its present form, the glossary cannot be considered the “final” product. Further concepts and expressions can be added in future, according to specific demands and to the evolution of spatial development activities.

List of concepts and expressions contained in the glossary

Accessibility
Administrative level
Brownfield land
Business park
Comprehensive spatial development approach
Connectivity
Conurbation
Cross-border, transnational, inter-regional co-operation
Cultural routes
Derelict area
Disadvantaged regions
Endogenous development
Environmental planning
Environmental impact assessment
Eurocorridor
Functional urban area
Gateway cities
Governmental level
Integrated coastal management
Integrated planning
Land management
Landscape
Landscape planning
Landscape policies
Land-use planning, zoning
Metropolitan region/Metropolitan area
Natural risk/Natural hazard/Natural disaster
Participatory planning
Partnership/Co-operation
Peripheral regions
Peri-urban areas
Physical planning
Polycentric spatial structure/Polycentric spatial development
Public-private partnership
Public services

Region
Regional development/Regional planning
River basin management
Rural area/Countryside
Rural development
Rural development pole
Spatial development, Spatial development policy
Spatial development projects
Spatial planning
Strategic environmental impact assessment
Suburbanisation
Sustainable spatial development
Sustainability assessment
Technological risk/Technological hazard
Technopole/Technology centre/Technology park/Science park
Territorial cohesion
Territorial co-operation
Territorial development
Territorial governance
Territorial potential
Territorial impact assessment
Town and country planning
Urban areas
Urbanisation
Urban development
Urban design
Urban ecosystem
Urban management
Urban planning
Urban renewal/Urban regeneration/Urban revitalisation/Urban rehabilitation/
Urban restoration
Urban-rural partnerships
Urban sprawl
Urban structure/Settlement structure

VII. Programme of the conference

**15th session of the Council of Europe
Conference of Ministers responsible
for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT/CoE)**

*“Future challenges: sustainable spatial development
of the European continent in a changing world”*

and

40th anniversary of CEMAT

Moscow, Russian Federation, 8-9 July 2010

8 July 2010

8.30 a.m.-9.30 a.m. Registration of participants

9.30 a.m.-11.00 a.m. **15th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of
Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning**

Anthem of the Council of Europe and the national
anthem of the Russian Federation

Opening session

9.30 a.m.-9.40 a.m. Welcome address by **Mr Thorbjørn Jagland**,
Secretary General of the Council of Europe

9.40 a.m.-9.50 a.m. *Election of the chair of the conference and adoption
of the agenda of the 15th Session of CEMAT (15
CEMAT(2010)1)*

Welcome address by **Mr Viktor Basargin**, Minister for
Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Welcome greetings on behalf of the President of the
Russian Federation, **Mr Dmitri Medvedev**

*Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for
Regional Development of the Russian Federation*

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Prime Minister of
the Russian Federation, **Mr Vladimir Putin**

Message read by Mr Viktor Basargin, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Address by **Mr Dmitry Kozak**, Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

Welcome greetings on behalf of Chair of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, **Mr Serguey Mironov**

Message read by the Deputy Chair of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Svetlana Orlova

Welcome greetings on behalf of the Chair of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, **Mr Boris Gryzlov**

Message read by the First Deputy Chair of the Committee on the Affairs of the Federation and Regional Policy of the Russian Federation State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Mrs Galina Izotova

Report of **Mr Viktor Basargin**, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

Statement by **Mr Nexhati Jakupi**, representative of the chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe

Statement by **Mr Aleksei Lotman**, representative of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Statement by **Mr Apolonio Ruiz-Ligero**, Vice-Governor of the Council of Europe Development Bank

Statement by **Mrs Anne-Marie Chavanon**, Chair of the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe

11.00 a.m.-11.15 a.m. *Family Group photo*

11.15 a.m.-11.30 a.m. Coffee break

11.30 a.m.-2.00 p.m. Working Session I – General presentation of activities
Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Implementation of: the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent”; the Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development; and the Lisbon Declaration on Networks for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent: Bridges over Europe

National level

National reports (15 CEMAT(2010)2)

Synthesis of national reports (15 CEMAT(2010)3)

International level

CEMAT report of activities (15 CEMAT(2010)4)

CEMAT glossary of sustainable spatial development (15 CEMAT(2010)5)

Transnational, transfrontier and inter-regional level: “the CEMAT Pan-European Model Network (Regions of Innovation)”

Statements by ministers/heads of delegations

- **Ms Dagnija Stake**, Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia
“Sustainable planning for the future”
- **Mr Vardan Vardanyan**, Minister for Urban Development, Armenia
“Spatial planning – The architecture of harmonious human environment”
- **Ms Guri Ulltveit-Moe**, Deputy Director General, Department for Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, Norway
“Spatial planning and landscape in the reform process and priorities of the Council of Europe”

Discussion

2.00 p.m.-3.30 p.m. Luncheon hosted by the representative of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe for the heads of delegations

Luncheon for other participants offered by the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation

3.30 p.m.-5.30 p.m. **Working Session II – Presentation of the declaration, discussion and adoption**

Presentation of the draft Moscow Declaration on Future Challenges: Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent in a Changing World (15 CEMAT(2010)8)

Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Statements by ministers/heads of delegations

- **Mr Neoklis Sylikiotis**, Minister of the Interior, Cyprus
“Sustainable territorial development of Cyprus in a changing world”
- **Mr Roko Žarnić**, Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Slovenia
“Spatial development policy responses for sustainable, balanced and cohesive territorial development of the European continent”
- **Mr Petr Oswald**, Deputy Minister for Regional Development, Czech Republic
- **Mr Arunas Zabulenas**, Deputy Minister, Ministry of the Environment, Republic of Lithuania
- **Mr Péter Szaló**, State Secretary for Regional Development and Construction, Ministry of National Development and the Economy, Hungary
“Preparation of territorial development policy for the new challenges in Hungary”
- **Mr Jarosław Pawłowski**, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development, Poland

- **Ms Maria Kaltsa**, General Secretary for Regional Planning and Urban Development Department, Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change, Greece
“Green energy and development – Prospects for Greece”
- **Mr Harald Dossi**, General Director of the Division for Co-ordination, Federal Chancellery, Austria
“New challenges in sustainable spatial development and their effects on CEMAT”
- **Mr Vitor Manuel Marques Campos**, Director General, Directorate General for Spatial Planning and Urban Development, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Portugal
“Future challenges for sustainable spatial development in a changing world: Portugal’s perspective”
- **Mr Manfred Sinz**, Deputy Director General of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Housing and Urban Affairs, Germany
- **Ms Ulla Koski**, Director of Spatial Planning, Ministry of the Environment, Finland
- **Mr Bart Vink**, Deputy Director, Directorate of Spatial Planning, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands

4.00 p.m.-4.30 p.m. Coffee break

Discussion

- **Mr Jean-François Seguin**, Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention
- **Mr Marco Keiner**, Director of the Environment, Housing and Land Management Division, UNECE
“Future challenges: sustainable spatial development in the UNECE region”
- **Mr Władysław Piskorz**, Head of Unit, DG Regional Policy, European Commission
“Territorial cohesion: a new objective for the European Union”
- **Mr Dinos M. Michaelides**, Chair of the 11th CEMAT

- **Mr Enrico Buergi**, former Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention

Adoption of the declaration

7.00 p.m.-8.00 p.m. Ceremony to celebrate the 40th anniversary of CEMAT

8.00 p.m.-10.00 p.m. Gala dinner for all participants, hosted by the Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

9 July 2010

9.30 a.m.-11.00 a.m. Working Session III – Presentation of Resolutions Nos. 1 and 2 and discussion

Presentation of draft Resolutions Nos. 1 and 2

Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

- **Draft Resolution No. 1** on the contribution of essential services to the sustainable spatial development of the European continent (15 CEMAT(2010)6)
- **Draft Resolution No. 2** on the pan-European charter for the rural heritage: promoting sustainable spatial development (15 CEMAT(2010)7)

Statements by ministers/heads of delegations

- **Mr Ioan Andreica**, Secretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism, Romania
“Access to essential services and territorial cohesion”
- **Mr José Luis Paz**, Counsellor at the Spanish Embassy in Moscow, Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs, Spain
- **Mr Jean-Claude Sinner**, Government Adviser, Department of Spatial Planning, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, Luxembourg

- **Mr Robert Bechina**, Head of Delegation of the European Co-ordination Forum for the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan 2006-2015 (CAHPAH)

“Integration of people with disabilities through appropriate spatial/regional planning”

Discussion

- **Mr Jarosław Pawłowski**, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development, Poland
- **Ms Maria Ulfvarson Östlund**, Head of Section, Ministry of the Environment, Sweden
- **Mr Pierre Dartout**, Interministerial Delegate for Spatial Planning and Territorial Attractiveness (DATAR), Ministry of Rural Areas and Territorial Development (MERAT), France

Presentation of Draft Resolution No. 3 on the organisation of the 16th Session of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (15 CEMAT(2010)9)

Statement by Mr Sergey Yurpalov, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT

Statements by ministers/head of delegations

Discussion

Adoption of the resolutions

11.00 a.m.-11.30 a.m. Coffee break

11.30 a.m.-12.30 p.m. **Closing session**

Closing statement on behalf of **Mr Thorbjørn Jagland**, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Closing statement on behalf of **Mr Viktor Basargin**, Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

12.30 p.m.-1.00 p.m. **Press conference**

1.00 p.m.-2.30 p.m. Luncheon hosted by the Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation

VIII. List of documents

Reference	Title
15 CEMAT(2010)1	Agenda
15 CEMAT(2010)2	National reports
15 CEMAT(2010)3	Synthesis of national reports
15 CEMAT(2010)4	CEMAT report of activities 2006-10
15 CEMAT(2010)5	CEMAT glossary
15 CEMAT(2010)6	Resolution No. 1
15 CEMAT(2010)7	Resolution No. 2
15 CEMAT(2010)8	Declaration
15 CEMAT(2010)9	Resolution No. 3
15 CEMAT(2010)10	Report of the Minister for Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Viktor Basargin, for the 15th CEMAT of the Council of Europe
15 CEMAT(2010)11	40th anniversary report of CEMAT
15 CEMAT(2006)12	List of participants
15 CEMAT(2006)13	List of documents
Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 87, 2008	International CEMAT Symposium on the Accessibility and Attractiveness of Rural and Landlocked Areas: Sustainable Transport and Services of General Interest, organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban and Spatial Planning of the Principality of Andorra, Andorra la Vella, Andorra, 25-26 October 2007
Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 90, 2010	International CEMAT Symposium on Challenges and Strategies for Metropolises and Metropolitan Regions, in a Context of Growing Globalisation with Regard to Economic, Social, Environmental and Cultural Development, organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation, St Petersburg, Russian Federation, 26-27 June 2008

Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 91, 2010	International CEMAT Symposium on the Spatial Dimension of Human Rights: for a New Culture of Territory, organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban Development of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia, 13-14 October 2008
Council of Europe series European spatial planning and landscape, No. 92, 2010	International CEMAT Symposium on a Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent, organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine, 12 June 2009
Council of Europe series Territory and landscape, No. 3, 2010	Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) – Basic texts 1970-2010

IX. List of participants

ARMENIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Vardan VARDANYAN, Minister for Urban Development, Ministry of Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia, 3 Government House, Republic Square, AR – 0010 YEREVAN

Tel: +374 10 589 080 – Fax: +374 10 52 32 00

E-mail: info@mud.am

Mrs Ruzan ALAVERDYAN, Deputy Minister for Urban Development, Ministry of the Republic of Armenia,

3 Government House, Republic Square, AR – 0010 YEREVAN

Tel: +374 10 56 01 45 – Fax: +374 10 52 32 00

E-mail: ruzan_a@yahoo.com

Mr Armen AGANESYAN, Advisor to the Minister for Urban Development of the Republic of Armenia,

3 Government House, Republic Square, AR – 0010 YEREVAN

Tel: +374 10 589 080 – Fax: +374 10 523 200

E-mail: info@mud.am

AUSTRIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Harald DOSSI, Division for Co-ordination, Federal Chancellery, Ballhausplatz 2, A – 1014 VIENNA

Tel: +43 1 53115 2354

E-mail: harald.dossi@bka.gv.at

Mr Dominik DITTRICH, Department of Spatial Planning and Regional Policy, Provincial Government of Lower Austria, Landhausplatz 1, A – 3109 ST POLTEN

Tel: +43 2742 9005 14905 Fax: +43 2742 9005 14170

E-mail: dominik.dittrich@noel.gv.at

Mr Michael ROTH, Senior Official, Division IV/4 : Coordination of Spatial Planning and Regional Policy, Federal Chancellery, Ballhausplatz 2, A – 1014 WIEN

Tel: +43 1 531 15 2931 – Fax: +43 1 53109 2931

E-mail: michael.roth@bka.gv.at

BELGIUM

Head of Delegation:

Mr Bert SCHOOF, Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Belgium,
Ul. Malaya Moltchanovka, 7, RU – 121069 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 780 03 34 – Fax: +7 495 780 03 32
E-mail: bert.schoofs@diplobel.fed.be

Mr Guy TROUVEROY, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the
Kingdom of Belgium, Embassy of Belgium, Ul. Malaya Moltchanovka, 7,
RU – 121069 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 780 03 34 – Fax: +7 495 780 03 32

BULGARIA

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Youlia IONEVA, state expert, European Co-ordination of Public Relations
and Analyses, Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works,
17-19 Kiril i Methodii Street, BG – 1202 SOFIA
Tel: +359 2 9405 455 – Fax: +359 2 987 25 17
E-mail: jioneva@mrbg.government.bg

CROATIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Antun HERCEG, Attaché, Embassy of the Republic of Croatia in the
Russian Federation, Korobenikov pereulok 16/10, RU – 119034 MOSCOW

CYPRUS

Head of Delegation:

Mr Neoklis SYLIKIOTIS, Minister of the Interior, Ministry of the Interior,
Demosthenis Severis Avenue, CY – 1453 NICOSIA
Tel: +357 22 86 76 06 – Fax: +357 22 67 67 09
E-mail: mhadjida@tph.moi.gov.cy

Mrs Markella HADJIDA, Planning Officer, Department of Town Planning and
Housing, Ministry of the Interior, Diagorou Avenue 27, CY – 1454 NICOSIA
Tel: +357 22 40 82 00 – Fax: +357 22 40 82 68
E-mail: mhadjida@tph.moi.gov.cy

CZECH REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation:

Mr Petr OSVALD, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of the Czech Republic, Staroměstské nám.6, CZ – 11015 PRAGUE 1

Tel: +420 224 861 111 – Fax: +420 224 861 333

Mrs Hana ZIMOVA, Officer, Spatial Planning Department, Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic, Staroměstské Náměstí 6, CZ – 11015 PRAGUE 1

Tel: +420 224 86 23 82

E-mail: Hana.Zimova@mmr.cz

Mr Petr LEPESKA, Officer, Town and Country Planning Department, Ministry for Regional Development, Staroměstské Náměstí 6, CZ – 11015 PRAGUE 1

Tel: +420 224 862 306

E-mail: petr.lepeska@mmr.cz

DENMARK

Head of Delegation:

Mr Per CARLSEN, Ambassador of Denmark, Embassy of Denmark in the Russian Federation, Prechistsensky Pereulok 9, RU – 119034 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 642 68 00 – Fax: +7 495 775 01 93

E-mail: svetum@um.dk

Mr Jens THOMSEN, Minister-Counsellor, Embassy of Denmark in the Russian Federation, Prechistsensky Pereulok 9, RU – 119034 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 642 68 00 Fax: +7 495 775 01 93

E-mail: svetum@um.dk

Mr Ulrik BIRK-PETERSEN, First-Secretary, Embassy of Denmark in the Russian Federation, Prechistsensky Pereulok 9, RU – 119034 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 642 68 00 – Fax: +7 495 775 01 93

E-mail: svetum@um.dk

ESTONIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Siim KRISPIN, Third Secretary, Embassy of the Republic of Estonia in the Russian Federation, Malyi Kislovski per.5, RU – 125009 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 737 3640 – Fax: +7 495 737 3646
E-mail: siim.krispin@mfa.ee

FINLAND

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Ulla KOSKI, Director, Spatial Planning, Department of Built Environment, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 35, FIN – 00023 GOVERNMENT
Tel: +358-50 300 6358
E-mail: ulla.koski@ymparisto.fi

Mrs Marja KOSKELA, Second Secretary, Embassy of Finland in Moscow, Kropotkinsky Pereulok 15-17, RU – 119034 MOSCOW, Russia
Tel: +7 495 787 4174 – Fax: +7 495 232 5596
E-mail: marja.koskela@formin.fi

Mr Jussi RAUTSI, Counsellor, Department of the Built Environment, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 35, FIN – 00023 GOVERNMENT
Tel: +358-50 3715694 – Fax: + 358 9 16 03 93 65
E-mail: jussi.rautsi@ymparisto.fi

FRANCE

Head of Delegation:

Mr Pierre DARTOUT, Joint Ministerial Representative, Joint Ministerial Task Force for Spatial Planning and Regional Attractiveness (DATAR), Ministry of the Countryside and Spatial Planning (MERAT), 8 rue de Penthièvre, F – 75008 PARIS Cedex
Tel: +33 1 40 65 11 07 – Fax: + 33 1 40 65 12 45
E-mail: pierre.dartout@datar.gouv.fr

Mr Didier MICHAL, Senior Officer, Joint Ministerial Task Force for Spatial Planning and Regional Attractiveness (DATAR), Ministry of the Countryside and Spatial Planning (MERAT), 8 rue de Penthièvre, F – 75008 PARIS Cedex
Tel: + 33 1 40 65 12 75 – Fax: +33 1 40 65 12 19
E-mail: Didier.michal@datar.gouv.fr

GERMANY

Head of Delegation:

Mr Manfred SINZ, Head of Division, Spatial Planning, Urban Development and Housing, Federal Ministry of Transport, Housing and Urban Development, Krausenstrasse 17-20, D – 10117 BERLIN

Tel: +49 30 2008 6020 – Fax: +49 30 2008 6149

E-mail: manfred.sinz@bmvbs.bund.de

Mrs Katharina ERDMENGER, Head of Division, Spatial Planning, Urban Development and Housing, Federal Ministry of Transport, Housing and Urban Development, Krausenstrasse 17-20, D – 10117 BERLIN

Tel: +49 30 2008 6140 – Fax: +49 30 2008 6149

E-mail: katharina.erdmenger@bmvbs.bund.de

GREECE

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Maria KALITSA, General Secretary, Regional Planning and Urban Development Department, Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change, 17, Amaliados Street, GR – 11523 ATHENS

Tel: +30 697 800 698 – Fax: +30 210 64 52 537

Mr Evangelos GOUNTANIS, Town Planner, Directorate of Spatial Planning and Urban Development, Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change, 17, Amaliados Street, GR – 11523 ATHENS

Tel: +30 210 64 42 917 – Fax: +30 210 64 58 690

E-mail: e.gountanis@dxor.minenv.gr

HUNGARY

Head of Delegation:

Mr Péter SZALÓ, State Secretary, State Secretariat for Regional Development and Construction, Ministry of National Development and Economy, Honvéd. U. 13-15, HU – BUDAPEST 1055

Tel: +36 1 795 5011 – Fax: +36 1 79 50 689

E-mail: peter.szalo@nfgm.gov.hu

Mrs Erzsébet MAGO, Head of the Spatial Planning and Urban Management Department, Ministry of National Development and Economy,
Honvéd U. 13-15, HU – BUDAPEST 1055
Tel: +36 1 441 7750 – Fax: +36 1 441 7742
E-mail: erzsebet.mago@nfgm.gov.hu

Mr Geza TOMPAI, Head of Department, Department of Spatial Planning and Urban Management, Ministry for National Development and Economy,
Honvéd U. 13-15, HU – BUDAPEST 1055
Tel: +36 1 795 5026 – Fax: +36 1 795 0690
E-mail: geza.tompai@nfgm.gov.hu

Mr Sekeresh FERENZ, Colonel of Police, 1st Class, Counsellor,
Representative of the Ministry of the Interior, József Attila utca 2-4,
H – 1903 BUDAPEST
Tel/Fax: +36 1 441 1000

IRELAND

Mr Philip M.C. DONAGH, Ambassador, Embassy of Ireland in Moscow,
Grokholski Pereulok 5, RU – 129010 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 93 75 911
E-mail: carol.toolan@gmail.com

ITALY

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Loredana CAPPELLONI, Director, Department of Infrastructure,
Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport, Via Nomentana 2,
IT – 00161 ROMA
Tel: +39 6 4412 6308 – Cell.: +39 3351 253 500
E-mail: loredana.cappelloni@mit.gov.it

Mr Giuseppe IZZO, Official, Department of Infrastructure, Ministry
of Infrastructure and Transport, Via Nomentana, 2, IT – 00161 ROMA
Tel: +39 6 44123479 – Fax: +39 6 44122328
E-mail: giuseppe.izzo@mit.gov.it

LATVIA

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Dagnija STAKE, Minister, Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Lacpleša street 27, LV – 1011 RIGA

Tel: +371 6 77 704 28 – Fax: +371 6 77 704 79

E-mail: linda.tilta@raplm.gov.lv

Mrs Alda NIKODEMUSA, Head of the Regional Planning Division, Spatial Planning Department, Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Lacpbesa Street 27, LV – 1011 RIGA

Tel: +371 6 77 704 23 – Fax: +371 6 77 704 79

E-mail: alda.nikodemusa@raplm.gov.lv

Mrs Inguna URTANE, Departmental Director, Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government of Latvia, Spatial Planning Department, Lacpbesa street 27, LV – 1011 RIGA

Tel: +371 6 77 703 56 – Fax: +371 6 77 704 79

E-mail: Inguna.Urtane@raplm.gov.lv

Mrs Evita VITOLA, Head Minister's Bureau, Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Lacpbesa street 27, LV – 1011 RIGA

Tel: +371 6 77 70402 – Fax: +371 6 77 704 79

E-mail: evita.vitola@raplm.gov.lv

LITHUANIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Arunas Remigijus ZABULENAS, Deputy-Minister, Ministry of the Environment, Jakšto 4/9, LT – 01105 VILNIUS

Tel: +370 52 66 34 86 – Fax: +370 52 66 36 65

E-mail: a.zabulenas@am.lt

Mr Jonas JAKAITIS, Director of the Department of Territorial Planning, Urban Development and Architecture, Ministry of the Environment, Jakšto 4/9, LT – 01105 VILNIUS

Tel: +370 52 66 36 08 – Fax: +370 52 66 36 67

E-mail: j.jakaitis@am.lt

LUXEMBOURG

Head of Delegation:

Mr Jean-Claude SINNER, Government Adviser 1st class, Spatial Planning Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, 1 rue Plébiscite, L – 2341 LUXEMBOURG
Tel: +352 2478 6916 – Fax: +352 24 87 3506
E-mail: jean-claude.sinner@mat.etat.lu

MOLDOVA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Andrei NEGUTSA, Ambassador, Embassy of Moldova in the Russian Federation, Kuznetskii Most Street, 18, RU – 103031 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 095 924 53 53, 924 63 42 – Fax: +7 095 924 95 90
E-mail: moldemb@online.ru; andrei.neguta@mfa.md

NETHERLANDS

Head of Delegation:

Mr Bart VINK, Deputy Director, Directorate of Spatial Planning, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Rijnstraat 8, PO Box 20951, 2500 EZ, The HAGUE
Tel: +31 6 15017850 – Fax: +31 70 339 3087
E-mail: bart.vink@minvrom.nl

Mrs Louisa CRIJNS-TAN, Senior Policy Officer, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Rijnstraat 8, PO Box 20951, 2500 EZ, The HAGUE
Tel: +31 70 3390 221 – Fax: +31 70 3391 306
E-mail: Louisa.Tan@minvrom.nl

NORWAY

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Guri ULLTVEIT-MOE, Deputy Director General, Department of Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., N – 0030 OSLO
Tel: +47 22 24 59 00 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59
E-mail: gmo@md.dep.no

Mr Hans Jacob NEUMANN, Deputy Director General, Section for Spatial Information and Analysis, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., N – 0030 OSLO

Tel: +47 22 24 59 10 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59

E-mail: hjn@md.dep.no

Mr Bjørn Casper HORGEN, Deputy Director General, Department of Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., N – 0030 OSLO

Tel: +47 22 24 59 09 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59

E-mail: bch@md.dep.no

Mr Audun MOFLAG, Senior Adviser, Department for Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., Myntgt. 2, N – 0030 OSLO

Tel: +47 22 24 59 00 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59

E-mail: amo@md.dep.no

POLAND

Head of Delegation:

Mr Olgierd DZIEKONSKI, Head of Delegation, Deputy Minister of Infrastructure of the Republic of Poland,

4/6 Chałubiński Street, PL – 00-928 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 630 10 00

Mr Jarosław PAWŁOWSKI, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Regional Development, Ministry of Regional Development, Wspólna St. 2/4,

PL – 00-926 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 461 33 88

E-mail: magdalena.derlatka@mrr.gov.pl

Mr Piotr ZUBER, Director of the Department of Structural Policy Coordination, Ministry of Regional Development, Wspólna St. 2/4,

PL – 00-926 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 461 39 07 – Fax: +48 22 461 32 63

E-mail: piotr.zuber@mrr.gov.pl

Mrs Elzbieta SZELINSKA, Counsellor, Ministry of Infrastructure, 4/6 Chałubiński Street, PL – 00-928 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 630 10 00

Mrs Emilia MALAK, Senior Specialist, Department of Structural Policy
Co-ordination, Ministry of Regional Development, Wspólna St. 2/4,
PL – 00-926 WARSAW
Tel: +48 22 461 35 91 – Fax: +48 22 461 32 63
E-mail: emilia.malak@mrr.gov.pl

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation:

Mr Vitor Manuel MARQUES CAMPOS, Director General,
Directorate General for Spatial Planning and Urban Development,
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Campo Grande 50,
P – 1749 014 LISBOA
Tel: +351 21 782 50 08/09 – Fax: +351 21 782 50 03
E-mail: dirgeral@dgotdu.pt

Mrs Maria José FESTAS, Former Chair of the CSO-CEMAT, Senior
Adviser, Directorate General for Spatial Planning and Urban Development,
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Campo Grande 50,
P – 1749 014 LISBOA
Tel: +351 21 782 5011 – Fax: +351 21 782 50 03
E-mail: gabdg@dgotdu.pt

ROMANIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Ioan ANDREICA, Secretary of State, Ministry of Regional
Development and Tourism, Str Apolodor 17, Iatura N, sector 5,
RO – 050741 BUCHAREST
Tel: +40 372 114 537 – Fax: +40 372 114 538
E-mail: ioan.andreica@mdrt.ro

Mr Radu NECSULIU, Counsellor, General Directorate for Territorial
Development, Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism,
Str Apolodor 17, Iatura N, sector 5, RO – 050741 BUCHAREST
Tel: +40 372 114 560 – Fax: +40 372 114 560
E-mail: radu.necsuliu@mdrt.ro

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Head of Delegation:

Mr Viktor BASARGIN, Chair of the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT), Minister for Regional Development of Russian Federation, 10/23 Sadovaya Samotechnaya, RU – 127994 MOSCOW

Mr Sergey Yurevich YURPALOV, Chair of the Committee of Senior Officials of CEMAT, Deputy Minister for Regional Development of Russian Federation, building 1, 10/23 Sadovaya Samotechnaya Street, RU – 127994 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 694-11-31; +7 495 980-25-44 ext. 20018 – Fax: +7 495 650-19-90
Mobile: 8-903-296-36-19

E-mail: sergey.yurpalov@minregion.ru; nona.lomiya@minregion.ru;
nonal86@mail.ru

Mr Yury BERESTNEV, Director of the Department for International Relations and Cross-Border Co-operation of the Ministry of regional development of the Russian Federation

Building 2, 8 Stroitelei Street, MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 980-25-47 ext. 35000 – Fax: +7 495 930-23-72

E-mail: yuri.berestnev@minregion.ru; nona.lomiya@minregion.ru ;
nonal86@mail.ru

Mr Mikhail VINOGRADOV, Deputy Director, Department for International Relations and Cross-Border Co-operation, Ministry of Regional Development of Russian Federation, Building 1, 10/23 Sadovo-Samotechnaya Ulitsa, RU – 127994 MOSCOW

E-mail: Mikhail.Vinogradov@minregion.ru

Mrs Elena SADOVNIKOVA, expert of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, ul. Zorge 2, Apt 44, RU – 23308 MOSCOW

Tel/Fax.: +7 499 195 82 65

E-mail: e.sadovnikova@list.ru

Mrs Olga SMIRNOVA, Head of the Departments of Strategic Planning and Regional Development, Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Building 1 10/23 Sadovaya Samotechnaya Street,
RU – 127994 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 980-25-47 – Fax: +7 495 650-13-10
E-mail: Olga.Smirnova@minregion.ru ; 7823091@bk.ru

Mr Igor MOZGO, Head of the Division of Multilateral Inter-regional Co-operation, Liaisons between the Constituent Entities of the Federation with the Council of Europe, the Parliament and Public Organisations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 32/34 Smolenskaya Sennaya Sq.,
RU – MOSCOW
Tel: +796 236 22 774
E-mail: IMozgo@mid.ru

Mrs Nona LOMIYA, leading expert of the Department of Territorial Planning and Regional Development of the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation, Secretary to the delegation. Ministry of Regional Development, Building 1,
10/23 Sadovaya-Samotechnaya Street, , RU – 103051 MOSCOW
Tel: + 7 495 980 25 47 Mobile: +7 926 775-55-55 – Fax: 7 495 650-13-10
E-mail: Nona.Lomiya@minregion.ru; nonal86@mail.ru

SERBIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Srdjan JOVICIC, Head Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Nemanjina 11, RS – 11000 BELGRADE
Tel: +38 111 36 17 717 – Fax: +38 111 36 17 722
E-mail: srdjan.jovicic@ekoplan.gov.rs

Mr Nebojsa JANJIC, Assistant Minister, Department for Urbanization, Spatial Planning and Housing, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Omladinskih brigada 1, RS – 11070 BELGRADE
Tel: +38 111 31 31 355 – Fax: +38 111 31 31 355
E-mail: nebojsa.janjic@ekoplan.gov.rs

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Head of Delegation:

Mr Rastilav MOGTO, Third Secretary of the Slovakian Embassy in Moscow, 17/19, ulitsa Yuliusa Fuchika, RU – 123056 MOSCOW

SLOVENIA

Head of Delegation:

Mr Roko ŽARNIČ, Minister, Cabinet of Ministers, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Dunajska 48, SI – 1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: +386 1 478 7406
E-mail: igor.lakota@gov.si

Mrs Tanja BOGATAJ, Deputy Director General, Spatial Planning Directorate, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Dunajska 48, SI – 1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: +386 1 478 7012
E-mail: majda.lovrencic@gov.si

Mrs Margarita JANČIČ, Former Chair of CSO-CEMAT, Secretary, Spatial Planning Directorate, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Dunajska 21, SI – 1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: +386 1 478 7024 – Fax: +386 1 478 7426
E-mail: margarita.jancic@gov.si

SPAIN

Head of Delegation:

Mr José Luis PAZ, Counsellor at the Spanish Embassy in Moscow, Ministry of the Environment, and Rural and Marine Affairs, Ul. Bolshaya Nikitskaya 50/8, RU – 121069 MOSCOW
Tel: +7 495 956 31 45 – Fax: +7 495 956 63 42
E-mail: consej@co.ru

SWEDEN

Head of Delegation:

Mrs Maria ULFVARSON ÖSTLUND, Head of Section, Ministry of the Environment, SE – 103 33 STOCKHOLM
Tel: +46 8 405 22 74 Mob +46 73 815 2274 Fax: +46 8 14 09 87 –
E-mail: maria.ulfvarson-ostlund@environment.ministry.se

“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA”

Head of Delegation:

Mr Nexhati JAKUPI, Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning,
Ul. Goce Delcev bb- MRTV, MK – 1000 SKOPJE

Mrs Danica PAVLOVSKA, Head of Department, Ministry of the
Environment and Spatial Planning, Bul. Gocedelčev 66, MK – 1000 SKOPJE
Tel: +389 2 3251507 – Fax: +389 2 30 611 52
E-mail: cigipavlovska@yahoo.com; d.pavlovka@moepp.gov.mk

Mr Ognen APOSTOLSKI, General Manager, Spatial Planning Agency,
Plostad Makedonia b.b., MK – 1000 SKOPJE
Tel: +389 2 3227 244 – Fax: +389 2 3227 244
E-mail: o.apostolski@app.gov.mk

Mrs Dusica TRPCEVSKA-ANGJELKOVIK, Head of Department,
Spatial Planning Agency, Plostad Makedonia b.b., MK – 1000 SKOPJE
Tel: +389 2 3227 244 – Fax: +389 2 3227 244
E-mail: d.trpcevska@app.gov.mk

UKRAINE

Head of Delegation:

Mr Yatsiuk VIACHESLAV, Consul Ambassador of the Embassy of Ukraine
in the Russian Federation, Leontievskiy Lane, RU – 103009 MOSCOW
Tel: +7-95-2291079 – Fax: +7-95-9248469
Email:emb_ru@mfa.gov.ua; ukremb@online.ru

Mr Taras KRYVONOS, First Secretary of the Embassy of Ukraine in the
Russian Federation 18, Leontievskiy Lane, RU – 103009 MOSCOW
Tel: +7-95-2291079 – Fax: +7-95-9248469
Email:emb_ru@mfa.gov.ua; ukremb@online.ru

Mr Vyacheslav TOLKOVANOV, Advisor to the Deputy Prime Minister of
Ukraine for Regional Policy Issues, Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers
(Government) of Ukraine, 5/7 Hrushevskogo Street, UKR – 01001 KIEV
Tel: + 38 044 2567332 – Fax: +38 095 3130279
E-mail: tolkovanov@hotmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM

Head of Delegation:

Mr Damion POTTER, British Embassy of Moscow, 10, Smolenskaya Naberezhnaya, RU – 121099 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 956 74 53 – Fax: +7 495 956 74 80

E-mail: Damion.Potter@fco.gov.uk

OBSERVERS

HOLY SEE

Mr Antonio MENNINI, Apostolic Nuncio, Apostolic Nunciature to the Russian Federation, Vadkovsky per. 7/37, 127055 MOSCOW, Russian Federation

Tel: +7 495 726 59 30 – Fax: +7 495 726 5932

E-mail: nuntius@inbox.ru

Mr Andrey IGNATYEV, Professor, Russian State University for the Humanities, Vadkovsky per. 7/37, 127055 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 726 59 30 – Fax: +7 495 726 5932

E-mail: nuntius@inbox.ru

COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS

Mr Nexhati JAKUPI, Minister for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Ul. Goce Delcev bb- MRTV, MK - 1000 SKOPJE

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (PACE)

Mr Aleksei LOTMAN, Chair Head of the PACE Delegation, Lossiplats 1a, EE – 15165 TALLINN

Tel: +372 631 6393 – Fax: +372 631 6394

E-mail: aleksei.lotman@riigikogu.ee

COUNCIL OF EUROPE DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr Apolonio RUIZ LIGERO, Head of Delegation, Vice Governor, Council of Europe Development Bank, 55 avenue Kléber, F – 75116 PARIS

Tel: +33 1 47 55 55 48 – Fax: +33 1 47 55 37 39

E-mail: chantal.guillet@coebank.org

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Mr Wladyslaw PISKORZ, Head of Unit, DG Regional Policy, European Commission, SM1 4/16, BE – 1049 BRUSSELS

Tel: +32 2 29 88 639

E-mail: wladyslaw.piskorz@ec.europa.eu

Mrs Valentina CHAPLINSKAYA, Project Officer of the EU-Russia Cooperation Department of the Delegation of the European Commission to Russia

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (EBRD)

Mr. Bruno BALVANERA, Head of Regional Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), 6 Gasheka str., Ducat Place III, 2nd floor, RU – 125047 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 787 11 11 – Fax: +7 495 787 11 22

E-mail: BalvaneB@ebrd.com

EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK (EIB)

Mr Philippe SZYMCZAK, Head of Delegation, Head of Division, European Investment Bank, Operations Outside Europe, Europe's Neighbour Lending and Partner Countries Department, 100 boulevard Konrad Adenauer, L – 2950 LUXEMBOURG

Tel: +352 4379 8 6577 – Fax: +352 4379 6 74 95

E-mail: szymczak@eib.org

ECONOMIC COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (UN-ECE)

Mr Marco KEINER, Director, Environment, Land Management and Housing Division, UNECE, Palais des Nations, Office 334, CH – 1211 GENEVA 10

Tel: +41 22 91 72 370

E-mail: marco.keiner@unece.org

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

Mr Alexander GUDYMA, Head of UNEP Moscow Office, 9, Leontyevsky side-Street, RU – 125009 MOSCOW

Tel: +7 495 787 2156/54 – Fax: +7 495 787 7763

E-mail: gudyma.unep@undp.ru

VISION AND STRATEGIES AROUND THE BALTIC SEA (VASAB)

Mr Talis LINKAITS, Head of Secretariat, VASAB – Vision and Strategies Around the Baltic Sea, Elizabetes Str. 19, LV – 1010 RIGA
Tel: +371 67350630 – Fax: +371 67350626
E-mail: info@vasab.org

COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONFERENCE ON THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION

Mr Jean-François SEGUIN, Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention, Landscapes and Publicity Office, Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and Maritime Affairs, Arche sud, F – 92055 LA DEFENSE CEDEX
Tel: +33 1 40 81 34 48
E-mail: Jean-francois.Seguine@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

COUNCIL OF EUROPE, EUROPEAN CO-ORDINATION FORUM FOR THE COE DISABILITY ACTION PLAN 2006-2015 (CAHPAH)

Mr Robert BECHINA, expert, Head of Delegation, European Co-ordination Forum for the CoE Disability Action Plan 2006-2015 (CAHPAH), General Department of Social Cohesion, Agora Building, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: +43 17 11 00 63 21 – Fax: +43 66 48 14 51 83
E-mail: robert.bechina@bmask@gv.at

NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

SUSTAINABLE TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE OF INGOs OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mrs Anne-Marie CHAVANON, Chair of the Sustainable Territorial Development Committee of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe, FIHUAT/COFUAT, 15 rue Falguière, F – 75015 PARIS
Tel: + 33 1 77 49 76 80/ Mob: +33 6 60 76 86 14 – Fax: + 33 1 40 40 70 74
E-mail: amchavanon@yahoo.fr

EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF SPATIAL PLANNERS (ECTP)

Mr Luc-Emile BOUCHE-FLORIN, Honorary President, ECTP-CEU and Expert Delegate to CEMAT and the Council of Europe, European Council of Spatial Planners (CEU), 9, rue de Limoges, F – 78000 VERSAILLES
Tel: +33 1 39 02 35 30 – Fax: +33 1 39 02 73 77
E-mail: boucheflorin@urban-concept.eu

Mr Konstantin ANANITCHEV, ECTP expert, Scherbakovkaya St.32/7 Apt. 288, RU –105318 MOSCOW
E-mail: konstantin-ananichev@yandex.ru

COuNCIL OF EuROPE EXPERTS

Mr Jean-Claude ROUARD, Council of Europe expert, 6 rue d’Auxois, F – 58800 CORBIGNY
Tel: +33 3 86 20 01 67 – Fax: +33 3 86 20 01 67
E-mail: jc.rouard@orange.fr

Mr Henri SMETS, President, Association for the Development of Environmental Law and Economics (ADELE), 59 rue Erlanger, F – 75016 PARIS
Tel: +33 1 46 51 20 96
E-mail: henri.smets@smets.com

GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF THE COuNCIL OF EuROPE

GENERAL SECRETARIAT

Mr Thorbjørn JAGLAND, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

PRIVATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Mr Gérard STOUDEMANN, Special Representative of the Secretary General for Organisational Matters and Reform, Council of Europe

Mr Alexandre GUESSEL, Adviser in the Private Office of the Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General Council of Europe

DG IV - EDUCATION, CULTURE AND HERITAGE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Mrs Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General,
Council of Europe, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: +33 3 88 41 21 72 – Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 50
E-mail: gabriella.battaini-dragoni@coe.int

Mr Robert PALMER, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural
Heritage/Directeur de la Culture et du Patrimoine Culturel et Naturel,
Conseil de l'Europe, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: +33 3 88 41 22 50 – Fax: +33 3 88 41 37 83
E-mail: robert.palmer@coe.int

Mrs Maguelonne DÉJEANT-PONS, Executive Secretary of CEMAT,
Head of the Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division,
Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, Council of
Europe, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: +33 3 88 41 23 98 – Fax: +33 3 88 41 37 51
E-mail: maguelonne.dejeant-pons@coe.int

Mrs Tania BRAULIO, Assistant, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division,
Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, Council of
Europe, F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: + 33 3 88 41 51 55 – Fax: + 33 3 88 41 37 51
E-mail: tania.braulio@coe.int

PROTOCOL

Mrs Isabelle FLECKSTEINER, Protocol Officer, Council of Europe,
F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
Tel: +33 3 88 41 24 46 – Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 73
E-mail: isabelle.flecksteiner@coe.int

INTERPRETERS

Mrs Amanda BEDDOWS-LARIVIÈRE
Mr Grégoire DEVICTOR
Mr Jan KROTKI
Mr André BERNHARD
Mr Ludovic MARTIN

Mrs Raphaela MANNHEIM
Mrs Elena MOKROUSHINA
Mr Mark BERNARDINI
Mr Ghennadi KISSELEV
Mr Boris GORBENKO
Mr Pavel PALAZHCHEENKO

HONORARY GUESTS FOR THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CEMAT

Ms Ruzan ALAVERDYAN, Deputy Minister for Urban Development,
Ministry of the Republic of Armenia, 3 Government House, Republic Square,
AR – 0010 Yerevan
Tel: +374 10 56 01 45 – Fax: +374 10 52 32 00
E-mail: ruzan_a@yahoo.com

Mr Konstantin ANANITCHEV, former member of the CSO-CEMAT
and expert of the Council of Europe, Scherbakovkaya St. 32/7, Apt. 288,
RU – 105318 Moscow
E-mail: konstantin-ananichev@yandex.ru

Mr Elias BERIATOS, former Head of the Greek Delegation to CEMAT,
19 Thassou Street, GR – 11257 Athens
Tel: +30 210 364 2057 – Mobile: +30 697 221 3604
E-mail: beriatos@otenet.gr

Mr Dusan BLAGANJE, former Head of the Slovenian Delegation to
CEMAT and Council of Europe expert, Dunajska, 4, SI – 1000 Ljubljana
E-mail: dusan.blaganje@guest.arnes.si

Mr Ulrich BOHNER, former CEMAT Executive Secretary of the Council
of Europe and Secretary General of the Congress of Local and Regional
Authorities of the Council of Europe, 16, rue de la Nuée Bleue,
F – 67000 Strasbourg
Tel: +33 60 86 207 67
E-mail: u.bohner@orange.fr

Mr Enrico BUERGI, former Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on
the European Landscape Convention, Casa al Ronco, CH – 6654 Cavigliano
Tel: +41 78 792 04 12 – Fax: +41 31 324 75 79
E-mail: enrico.buergi@gmx.ch

Mr Alexander DROZDOV, Professor, Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences, 29 Staromonetny pereulok, RU – 119017 Moscow
Tel./Fax: +7 495 951 90 70 and +7 495 959 00 27 (office);
Tel: +7 495 930 24 49 – Mobile: +7 916 597 35 93
E-mail: drozdov2009@gmail.com; d-a-v-2008@yandex.ru

Mrs Maria José FESTAS, former Chair of the 14th CSO-CEMAT, Senior Adviser, Directorate General for Spatial Planning and Urban Development, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Campo Grande 50, P – 1749 014 Lisbon
Tel: +351 21 782 50 11 – Fax: +351 21 782 50 03
E-mail: gabdg@dgotdu.pt

Mr Alexander FROLOV, former Head of the Russian Delegation to CEMAT, Main Department for Architecture and Urban Planning, Government of Moscow Region, Stolesknikov Lane 7, RU – 103031 Moscow
E-mail: glavvarh1@mail.ru

Mrs Ekaterina GOLOULINA, former Chair of CSO-CEMAT, former Deputy to the Head of the Committee on Industry and the Economy of the Government of St Petersburg, St Petersburg City Administration, RU – 191011 St Petersburg
E-mail: o.rubtsova@cedipt.spb.ru

Ms Margarita JANČIČ, former Chair of the 13th CSO-CEMAT, Secretary, Spatial Planning Directorate, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Dunajska 21, SI – 1000 Ljubljana
Tel: +386 1 478 7024 – Fax: +386 1 478 7426
E-mail: margarita.jancic@gov.si

Mr Petr KALIVODA, former member of CSO-CEMAT, Mazurska 522, CZ – 181 00 Prague
Mobile: +420 731 628 174
E-mail: kalpet@email.cz

Mrs Marina KULESHOVA, CEMAT expert, Head of the Cultural Landscape Management Department, Russian Research Institute for Natural and Cultural Heritage, 2 Kosmonavtov Street, RU – 129366 Moscow
Tel: +7 495 686 1319 – Fax: +7 495 686 1324
E-mail: culturalandscape@mail.ru

Mr Dinos M. MICHAELIDES, Chair of the 11th CEMAT, Emmanuel Rhoidi Street, Kirzis Center, Block D, 3rd Floor, Office D.34, PO Box 54246, CY – 3722 Limassol
Tel: +357 258 711 11 – Fax: +357 253 47 067
E-mail: dinoslaw@spidernet.com.cy

Mr Audun MOFLAG, Senior Adviser, Department for Regional Planning, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., Myntgt. 2, N – 0030 Oslo
Tel: +47 22 24 59 00 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59
E-mail: amo@md.dep.no

Mr Günter MUDRICH, former First CEMAT Executive Secretary, 40, rue Jeanne d’Arc, F – 67000 Strasbourg
Tel: +33 3 88 45 49 73

Mr Hans Jacob NEUMANN, Deputy Director General, Section for Spatial Information and Analysis, Ministry of the Environment, PO Box 8013 Dep., N – 0030 Oslo
Tel: +47 22 24 59 10 – Fax: +47 22 24 27 59
E-mail: hjn@md.dep.no

Mrs Kapka PANTCHEVA, former member of CSO-CEMAT, 14 SV Kiril i Metodii Street, BG – 1202 Sofia
Mobile: +35 9 887969258
E-mail: kapka_p@yahoo.com; k.pancheva@mail.bg; panchevak@abv.bg

Mr Jacques ROBERT, Im Schwarzwäldele 15, D – 77654 Offenbourg
Tel: +49 781 250 7000
E-mail: jacques.robert@tersyn.com

Mr Jean-Claude ROUARD, CEMAT expert, 6 rue d’Auxois, F – 58800 Corbigny
Tel: +33 3 86 20 01 67 – Fax: +33 3 86 20 01 67
E-mail: jc.rouard@orange.fr

Mr Claude ROUGEAU, former representative of FIHUAT to CSO-CEMAT, Council of Europe expert, 39 bld. de la Liberté, F – 59000 Lille
Tel: +33 3 20 54 49 01 – Mobile: +33 660 74 70 92
E-mail: claude-rou@orange.fr

Mrs Elena SADOVNIKOVA, former Chair of CSO-CEMAT and CEMAT expert, adviser, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Zorge Str. 2, Appt 44,
RU – 123308 Moscow
E-mail: e.sadovnikova@list.ru

Mr Jean-François SEGUIN, Chair of the Council of Europe Conference on the European Landscape Convention, Landscapes and Publicity Office, Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and Maritime Affairs, Arche sud, F – 92055 La Défense Cedex
Tel: +33 1 40 81 34 48
E-mail: Jean-francois.Seguin@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Mrs Tamara SEMENOVA, CEMAT expert, Senior Researcher, Russian Research Institute for Natural and Cultural Heritage, 2 Kosmonavtov Street, RU – 129366 Moscow
Tel: +7 495 286 1319 – Fax: +7 495 286 1324
E-mail: tams@online.ru

Mr Henri SMETS, CEMAT expert, President, ADELE, 59 rue Erlanger, F – 75016 Paris
Tel: +33 1 46 51 20 96
E-mail: henri.smets@smets.com

Sales agents for publications of the Council of Europe

Agents de vente des publications du Conseil de l'Europe

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE

La Librairie Européenne -
The European Bookshop
Rue de l'Orme, 1
BE-1040 BRUXELLES
Tel.: +32 (0)2 231 04 35
Fax: +32 (0)2 735 08 60
E-mail: info@libeurop.eu
http://www.libeurop.be

Jean De Lannoy/DL Services
Avenue du Roi 202 Koningslaan
BE-1190 BRUXELLES
Tel.: +32 (0)2 538 43 08
Fax: +32 (0)2 538 08 41
E-mail: jean.de.lannoy@dl-servi.com
http://www.jean-de-lannoy.be

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA/ BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE

Robert's Plus d.o.o.
Marka Marulića 2/V
BA-71000, SARAJEVO
Tel.: + 387 33 640 818
Fax: + 387 33 640 818
E-mail: robertsplus@bih.net.ba

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co. Ltd.
22-1010 Polytek Street
CDN-OTTAWA, ONT K1J 9J1
Tel.: +1 613 745 2665
Fax: +1 613 745 7660
Toll-Free Tel.: (866) 767-6766
E-mail: order.dept@renoufbooks.com
http://www.renoufbooks.com

CROATIA/CROATIE

Robert's Plus d.o.o.
Marasovičeva 67
HR-21000, SPLIT
Tel.: + 385 21 315 800, 801, 802, 803
Fax: + 385 21 315 804
E-mail: robertsplus@robertsplus.hr

CZECH REPUBLIC/ RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE

Suweco CZ, s.r.o.
Klecakova 347
CZ-180 21 PRAHA 9
Tel.: +420 2 424 59 204
Fax: +420 2 848 21 646
E-mail: import@suweco.cz
http://www.suweco.cz

DENMARK/DANEMARK

GAD
Vimmelskæftet 32
DK-1161 KØBENHAVN K
Tel.: +45 77 66 60 00
Fax: +45 77 66 60 01
E-mail: gad@gad.dk
http://www.gad.dk

FINLAND/FINLANDE

Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
PO Box 128
Keskuskatu 1
FI-00100 HELSINKI
Tel.: +358 (0)9 121 4430
Fax: +358 (0)9 121 4242
E-mail: akatilaus@akateeminen.com
http://www.akateeminen.com

FRANCE

La Documentation française
(diffusion/distribution France entière)
124, rue Henri Barbusse
FR-93308 AUBERVILLIERS CEDEX
Tél.: +33 (0)1 40 15 70 00
Fax: +33 (0)1 40 15 68 00
E-mail: commande@ladocumentationfrancaise.fr
http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr

Librairie Kléber
1 rue des Francs Bourgeois
FR-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel.: +33 (0)3 88 15 78 88
Fax: +33 (0)3 88 15 78 80
E-mail: librairie-kleber@coe.int
http://www.librairie-kleber.com

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE
UNO Verlag GmbH
August-Bebel-Allee 6
DE-53175 BONN
Tel.: +49 (0)228 94 90 20
Fax: +49 (0)228 94 90 222
E-mail: bestellung@uno-verlag.de
http://www.uno-verlag.de

GREECE/GRÈCE

Librairie Kauffmann s.a.
Stadiou 28
GR-105 64 ATHINAI
Tel.: +30 210 32 55 321
Fax: +30 210 32 30 320
E-mail: ord@otenet.gr
http://www.kauffmann.gr

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Euro Info Service
Pannónia u. 58.
PF. 1039
HU-1136 BUDAPEST
Tel.: +36 1 329 2170
Fax: +36 1 349 2053
E-mail: euroinfo@euroinfo.hu
http://www.euroinfo.hu

ITALY/ITALIE

Licosa SpA
Via Duca di Calabria, 1/1
IT-50125 FIRENZE
Tel.: +39 0556 483215
Fax: +39 0556 41257
E-mail: licosa@licosa.com
http://www.licosa.com

NORWAY/NORVÈGE

Akademika
Postboks 84 Blindern
NO-0314 OSLO
Tel.: +47 2 218 8100
Fax: +47 2 218 8103
E-mail: support@akademika.no
http://www.akademika.no

POLAND/POLOGNE

Ars Polona JSC
25 Obrocnow Street
PL-03-933 WARSZAWA
Tel.: +48 (0)22 509 86 00
Fax: +48 (0)22 509 86 10
E-mail: arspolona@arspolona.com.pl
http://www.arspolona.com.pl

PORTUGAL

Livraria Portugal
(Dias & Andrade, Lda.)
Rua do Carmo, 70
PT-1200-094 LISBOA
Tel.: +351 21 347 42 82 / 85
Fax: +351 21 347 02 64
E-mail: info@livrariaportugal.pt
http://www.livrariaportugal.pt

RUSSIAN FEDERATION/ FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE

Ves Mir
17b, Butlerova ul.
RU-101000 MOSCOW
Tel.: +7 495 739 0971
Fax: +7 495 739 0971
E-mail: orders@vesmirbooks.ru
http://www.vesmirbooks.ru

SPAIN/ESPAGNE

Diaz de Santos Barcelona
C/ Balmes, 417-419
ES-08022 BARCELONA
Tel.: +34 93 212 86 47
Fax: +34 93 211 49 91
E-mail: david@diazdesantos.es
http://www.diazdesantos.es

Diaz de Santos Madrid
C/Albasanz, 2
ES-28037 MADRID
Tel.: +34 91 743 48 90
Fax: +34 91 743 40 23
E-mail: jpinilla@diazdesantos.es
http://www.diazdesantos.es

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE

Planetis Sàrl
16 chemin des Pins
CH-1273 ARZIER
Tel.: +41 22 366 51 77
Fax: +41 22 366 51 78
E-mail: info@planetis.ch

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

The Stationery Office Ltd
PO Box 29
GB-NORWICH NR3 1GN
Tel.: +44 (0)870 600 5522
Fax: +44 (0)870 600 5533
E-mail: book.enquiries@tso.co.uk
http://www.tsoshop.co.uk

UNITED STATES and CANADA/ ÉTATS-UNIS et CANADA

Manhattan Publishing Co
670 White Plains Road
USA-10583 SCARSDALE, NY
Tel.: +1 914 271 5194
Fax: +1 914 472 4316
E-mail: coe@manhattanpublishing.com
http://www.manhattanpublishing.com

Council of Europe Publishing/Éditions du Conseil de l'Europe

FR-67075 STRASBOURG Cedex

Tel.: +33 (0)3 88 41 25 81 – Fax: +33 (0)3 88 41 39 10 – E-mail: publishing@coe.int – Website: <http://book.coe.int>



COUNCIL CONSEIL
OF EUROPE DE L'EUROPE

The Council of Europe has 47 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.