PREFACE

The decision to convene the seminar in the implementation of the European Landscape Convention (ELC), is closely aligned with the grounds of the Landscape Research Group (LRG) to stimulate interest in research and debate on all aspects of landscape. Paul and I chose the theme because we recognised it was a timely opportunity to review progress of the Convention and to examine how it has been implemented in landscape policies and practices in our home countries. We asked them to structure their paper as follows:

1. Describe actions your country has undertaken, or is planning to take, to implement the provisions of the ELC, focusing particularly on Articles 5 and 6.
2. Highlight key challenges / issues relating to the planning, management and protection of landscapes in your country today.
3. Outline the main international initiatives in your country that have been learned from the Convention and provide a brief history of ELC and the European Landscape Charter or Convention.
4. Discuss your country's experience of and reasons why delays in signing / ratification might have occurred.
5. Provide an overview of the landscapes of your country (remembering the broad ELC definition of landscape).
6. Confirm your country's position regarding success of signing and ratifying the ELC and give some selective facts and figures.
7. Highlight the importance of the ELC for landscape planning and management and especially so, if the landscape is a major asset for all Europeans, as well as all the rural, marine, coastal and terrestrial; the ordinary and the degraded as well as the remarkable.
8. Describe your country's experience of and reasons why delays in signing / ratification might have occurred.
9. Discuss your country's experience of and reasons why delays in signing / ratification might have occurred.
10. Highlight key challenges / issues relating to the planning, management and protection of landscapes in your country today.

Tentative Taking Stock: Taking Opportunities

Michael Dower

Preamble

I start by saluting the Landscape Research Group, through two of its Trustees, Gareth Roberts and Paul Selman, who have organised this event.

The Landscape Research Group was a co-organiser – with the Countryside Commission, the European Federation of National and Nature Parks (now called Europarc), and ECOVAST – of the idea of a Convention for the Protection of Europe's Rural Landscapes, as a sequel to the National Trust's seminar 'Europe Preserved for Europe', held in 1990.

That led to the Convention on 'Landscapes in a New Europe of Unity and Diversity', held at Blois in October 1992, on the joint initiative of the government of France and the French organisation Paysage et Amenagement, where Administrations set the reasons for, and the possible scope of, such a Convention.

Adrian (in his IUCN capacity) and I (having succeeded Paul as Chair of the Countryside Commission) then pressed the Council of Europe to take it up, and the Convention for the Protection of Europe's Rural Landscapes was one of the earliest initiatives that coincided with a separate initiative from Spain, France and Italy to create a Mediterranean Landscape Charter. The outcome of these two approaches was the setting up in 1995, by the Convention's legal drafting team of a Working Group to prepare a European Landscape Charter or Convention. I have the privilege to be an Expert Adviser to the Group; and, with Yves Lugonbuhl, to prepare the first non-legalese draft of the Convention. I salute the Working Group, and particularly my good friend Riccardo Priore, Secretary of the Group, who is with us at this Seminar.

You are all aware of the outcome, namely the Convention’s adoption at Florence in October 2000; and the subsequent events – the regular reviews of the Convention, and the ratifications to the point at which the Convention came into force on 1 January 2004; the steady growth in number of the states who have signed; and, the Conferences and Workshops organised by the Secretariat. These Workshops are lively occasions, with a rich cast of characters. The Group has met on such occasions to have a well-focused informal debate. For that reason, I welcome the Expert Seminars and the chance to probe more deeply into the implementation of the Convention is progressing.

I am asked to speak briefly on the theme ‘Taking Stock: Taking Opportunities’.

Taking Stock

What have we achieved so far?

We do have a Convention:

- It recognises the landscapes of Europe, in all their diversity, as assets for asset appreciation, and as the setting of people’s lives, as the integrating force and the multiple values that they provide.
- It relates to all the landscapes of Europe – urban, peri-urban and rural; marine, coastal and terrestrial; the ordinary and the degraded as well as the remarkable.
- It recognises that landscapes matter to all people, and calls for public awareness and popular involvement in caring for them.
- It demands the recognition of landscapes in law and in all relevant public policies.
- It calls for the strengthening of professional capabilities in the field of landscape, and for research and research and the kinds of skills that occupy many people.
- It provides for cooperation, mutual assistance and exchange between the nations.

Today, of the 47 member states of the Council of Europe:

- 28 have signed and ratified the Convention
- 7 have signed but not yet ratified
- 12 have neither signed nor ratified
- 7 have signed but not yet ratified
- 28 have signed and ratified the Convention

Paying and Ratifying

What does it mean for those who ratify? What does the refusal to ratify mean to the states concerned? What is the whole effort in Europe?

I use three countries to illustrate this point.

Greece was one of the earliest to ratify; saw the Convention as a chance to show its desire to be European. The result, so far, is minimal action.

Germany signed it during the consultation on the Convention, and made plain that it regarded it as already burdened by too many EU Directives and Council of Europe Charters or Conventions, and that the responsibility for landscape lies with the Länder; but in fact it is doing a good deal of what the Convention seeks, and should certainly not be excluded from international cooperation.

The United Kingdom took 6 years to sign and then ratify, despite the fact that it already had a number of Acts of what the Convention demands: our attitude is that we won’t sign up to an international Agreement unless we intend to honour it: our Ministers were bound to insist that we would sign up to an international Agreement.

What is even more striking - in terms of ‘Taking Stock’ – is the very high variation, from one country to another, of what the national perception of, or attitudes to, the Convention is. The basis of national law related to landscape regulations varies widely in name and structure, and so is delegation to local level in some. The basis of national law related to landscape regulations varies widely and in name and structure, and there is a very weak or non-government organisations in this field.

When, at this seminar, we compare...
experience, and particularly when we discuss the harmonisation of processes related to landscape, we should look at the diversity, which is as much a part of the charm of Europe as it is its rich cultural and territorial diversity.

Taking opportunities
So, with nearly two-thirds of the countries in the wider Europe signed up to the Convention and the remaining minority which are direct neighbours to each other, what opportunities do we have, in order to realise the aspirations behind the Convention? The task is in fact demanding, because the challenges are many and multi-faceted, and must be sustained over long years ahead. It calls upon the energy, the multi-in fact demanding, ubiquitous and order to realise the aspirations of the next two verbs. The first three verbs provide an assessment of landscapes, in terms of change and the impact of that change upon the character of the landscapes and upon the achievement or not of the stated objectives.

These seven verbs are, for me, the heart of the matter. They are an integral package, in that:

- the objectives for landscape quality must be based upon the sound identification and assessment of landscapes
- in turn, the objectives form the base for the action to protect, manage and plan: most landscapes in Europe need some action within all three of these verbs.
- monitoring is vital, in order to judge the results of action within all the preceding verbs and to provide a basis for sharpening policy and action wherever that is needed.
- I regret the lack of emphasis in the Convention upon monitoring within the member states, and I believe that we are only at the beginning of the monitoring process in most countries. I regret also what I perceive as the inadequacy of the mechanisms for monitoring at the European level.

The next two verbs provide an essential supportive context.

10. To promote education and training

These tasks that I have just described are indeed demanding. Landscapes, and the processes that affect them, are so diverse and complex, so linked to the cycles of nature and the demands of people, so subject to change as policies and human actions evolve, that the understanding of them is a major inter-disciplinary challenge. It is a great opportunity for the universities, professions and schools of Europe.

11. To raise public awareness and understanding

This is a great task for both public bodies – at all geographic levels – and for NGOs and the world of education. It is a vital task for those who organise actions to enhance, restore and create the landscapes, and it is to be a key component of Regional Planning (CEMAT), Cultural Heritage (CDPAT) and Biological and Landscape Diversity (CO-DBP) – each of which has a central focus on its own main concern. Clearly, landscape concerns should have strong links to each of these three subjects: but one may question whether a major

land, and facing the potentially massive impact of climate change, the challenge is rather to guide the change rather than to resist it. For me this great asset of Europe retains its distinctiveness and achieves new levels of quality throughout the continent. That is the great opportunity for all of us: it also makes possible the implementation of the European Landscape Convention.

European Landscape Convention as ‘Interface’
Kenneth R. Framvik

An interface is a place ‘at which independent systems meet and act upon or communicate with each other,’ to quote the theme from the September 2006 meetings of the Permanent Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape. The idea that the European Landscape Convention (ELC) provides just such an interface was the premise for a workshop at this meeting. The point of departure for the roundtable, which I organised, was the premise that the European Landscape Convention is a framework, in that it:...
application of the provisions of the respective treaties." Explanatory reports, however, do not constitute the "authoritative interpretation" of a treaty's provisions (Europe n.d.). The explanatory report should thus be read more as an interface within the convention rather than the official authoritative interpretation of the text. The Convention itself is the outcome of the interaction between representatives to the Council of Europe and its staff—people with a political and diplomatic background, as informed by the views of individuals affected or concerned with the subject at hand, in this case landscape and nature management for experts, on the other hand, researchers, and those involved in the explanatory report, and this means that there is an interaction interface between people with a general concern with the subject of landscape and a group of external commentators defined as experts.

Insider inhabitants vs. outside experts Landscape, according to the Convention, is not an object sustained in time: it is "an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or cultural factors" (Europe 2000b, art. 1). Landscape is thus more than an area, it also expresses the perceived identity of a region or area that is shared, valued and used by people. The Convention likewise states that it has been conceived as a response to the public wish to enjoy high landscape qualities and to play an active part in the development, promotion and interpretation of landscape (Europe 2000a, preamble) For this reason, as Kenneth Olwig notes: "Official landscape activities can no longer be allowed to be an exclusive field of activity monopolised by specialist scientific technical and artistic circles" (Europe 2000b, II, §32: 23).

Given the explanatory report’s apparent opposition to monopolisation by specialists, it is interesting to note the subtle way in which the experts behind the report view landscape: "Landscape" seems to open up a broader spectrum of formal definitions of landscape more in line with Lioniella Scassozzi’s finding that "The meaning of the term ‘landscape’ has become broader than that of a view or panorama of natural scenery" (Scassozzi 2004: 337).

Landscape management The Convention’s ‘landscape quality objective’ requires the formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the inhabitants (Europe 2000a, art. 1 § E & C). One way that public authorities can deal with the ‘diversity of... human factors,’ the Convention proper writes that landscape is ‘an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or cultural factors,’ the explanatory report thus calls for ‘multidisciplinary training programmes in landscape policy, protection, management and planning, for professionals in the private and public sectors and for associations concerned in this capacity’ (Europe 2000a, art. 6, § B). Questions involving people’s cultural and natural heritage are thus identified as the foundation of their identity would inevitably form part of regional planning, the management of the environment or heritage, as well as the multidisciplinary processes described here, with regard to these ‘multidisciplinary programmes’, simply concludes that: ‘The aim here is to improve the technical expertise of bodies with landscape responsibilities. Examples of such programmes include training for organisations concerned with regional planning, the management of the core of landscape, in the natural heritage, as well as the implementation of the Convention.’

The making of the Greek landscape and the present situation at the turn of the 21st century, continuous and unchecked human intervention has been identified as one of the deadest threats to Greek landscape, a rich context of human life. Perhaps the most significant value of the Greek landscape is its depth of historicity, as evidenced by a variety of real, imaginary and mythological data, threatened by factors related to multiple contemporary facets of ‘development’. Today, the Greek landscape represents an enormous asset in tourism general place promotion, aiming at local development, the population retention and increased employment opportunities. Manifold dangers and problems surround the contemporary Greek landscape, such as land use change and subdivision, lack of comprehensive planning, partial documentation and historical restoration, unchecked urban development, intensification of agriculture, loss or degradation of its natural, aesthetic and cultural character, desertion of remote and marginal rural landscapes through abandonment of agricultural and recreational activities. Contemporary trends include the delimitation of Greek landscape or its overwhelming dependence on state or individual economic and political initiatives, despite the fact that the landscape represents an enormous asset in tourism general place promotion, aiming at local development, the population retention and increased employment opportunities. Greece and landscape: an unfilled relationship Thaon Terkenli The argument Greece has not yet ratified the European Landscape Convention. On the contrary, it does not even host a Landscape department or directorate at ministerial level, nor even at the regional or local level. Greece’s lack of attention to the protection of archeological spaces as well as in legislation concerning traditional settlements, forests and national parks. It is not implicitly or explicitly dealt with in environmental legislation as ‘areas of high biological, ecological, aesthetic or geomorphological value’. Two categories of protected natural landscapes have so far been characterized in Greece: ‘natural forests’ and ‘landscapes of natural beauty’, but their existence plays a minimal role in forestry planning. Besides international organizations active in the protection of landscapes and biodiversity (WWF, etc.), the most significant actors in landscape policy-making and implementation also remain the Archeological Service of Greece, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment and Energy Planning and Public Works, NGOs, local authorities and other stakeholders—factors and some civic societies. Moreover, landscape science, research and practice have been slowly gaining ground in Greece in very recent years. In the 1990s, landscape science underwent a shift from the fragmentary, peripheral and haphazard preoccupation of the so-called design sciences (architecture, landscape architecture, urban and regional planning) with practical landscape issues—as they developed out of related design and planning initiatives and spatial interventions—to a more concerted, focused and systematic landscape approach by several disciplines and practitioners. This was mainly a gradual and delicate shift, chronic by its very limited extent and impact on actual landscape problems and issues (Europe Greece 1999). Generally speaking, systematic physical planning interventions have been largely restricted to metropolitan and urbanized areas, especially in the inland areas pertaining to the agricultural landscape in Greece has only recently been ratified by the European Union legislation and the Convention is yet to be introduced (CAP) that enforce rural landscape protection and preservation. The lack of any substantial action or service holding a prime role, Local interests and input are normally ignored in decision-making concerning the landscape. The Greek landscape’s existence is legally acknowledged in various environmental laws, master plans and regulatory statutes concerning traditional settlements, forests and national parks. It is not implicitly or explicitly dealt with in environmental legislation as ‘areas of high biological, ecological, aesthetic or geomorphological value’. Two categories of protected natural landscapes have so far been characterized in Greece: ‘natural forests’ and ‘landscapes of natural beauty’, but their existence plays a minimal role in forestry planning. Besides international organizations active in the protection of landscapes and biodiversity (WWF, etc.), the most significant actors in landscape policy-making and implementation also remain the Archeological Service of Greece, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment and Energy Planning and Public Works, NGOs, local authorities and other stakeholders—factors and some civic societies. Moreover, landscape science, research and practice have been slowly gaining ground in Greece in very recent years. In the 1990s, landscape science underwent a shift from the fragmentary, peripheral and haphazard preoccupation of the so-called design sciences (architecture, landscape architecture, urban and regional planning) with practical landscape issues—as they developed out of related design and planning initiatives and spatial interventions—to a more concerted, focused and systematic landscape approach by several disciplines and practitioners. This was mainly a gradual and delicate shift, chronic by its very limited extent and impact on actual landscape problems and issues (Europe Greece 1999). Generally speaking, systematic physical planning interventions have been largely restricted to metropolitan and urbanized areas, especially in the inland areas pertaining to the agricultural landscape in Greece has only recently been ratified by the European Union legislation and the Convention is yet to be introduced (CAP) that enforce rural landscape protection and preservation. The lack of any substantial action or service holding a prime role, Local interests and input are normally ignored in decision-making concerning the landscape. The Greek landscape’s existence is legally acknowledged in various environmental laws, master plans and regulatory statutes concerning traditional settlements, forests and national parks. It is not implicitly or explicitly dealt with in environmental legislation as ‘areas of high biological, ecological, aesthetic or geomorphological value’. Two categories of protected natural landscapes have so far been characterized in Greece: ‘natural forests’ and ‘landscapes of natural beauty’, but their existence plays a minimal role in forestry planning. Besides international organizations active in the protection of landscapes and biodiversity (WWF, etc.), the most significant actors in landscape policy-making and implementation also remain the Archeological Service of Greece, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment and Energy Planning and Public Works, NGOs, local authorities and other stakeholders—factors and some civic societies. Moreover, landscape science, research and practice have been slowly gaining ground in Greece in very recent years. In the 1990s, landscape science underwent a shift from the fragmentary, peripheral and haphazard preoccupation of the so-called design sciences (architecture, landscape architecture, urban and regional planning) with practical landscape issues—as they developed out of related design and planning initiatives and spatial interventions—to a more concerted, focused and systematic landscape approach by several disciplines and practitioners. This was mainly a gradual and delicate shift, chronic by its very limited extent and impact on actual landscape problems and issues (Europe Greece 1999). Generally speaking, systematic physical planning interventions have been largely restricted to metropolitan and urbanized areas, especially in the inland areas pertaining to the agricultural landscape in Greece has only recently been ratified by the European Union legislation and the Convention is yet to be introduced (CAP) that enforce rural landscape protection and preservation. The lack of any substantial action or service holding a prime role, Local interests and input are normally ignored in decision-making concerning the landscape. The Greek landscape’s existence is legally acknowledged in various environmental laws, master plans and regulatory statutes concerning traditional settlements, forests and national parks. It is not implicitly or explicitly dealt with in environmental legislation as ‘areas of high biological, ecological, aesthetic or geomorphological value’.
geographical and socio-cultural interpretation. Landscape is decidedly an ordering of reality from the late 18th century (McNeill 1978). The characteristics of modern European landscapes were already established by the 17th century, imbuing the definition of the landscape with notions of vistas, picturesque views of natural monuments which have accompanied the development of European landscapes until today. For instance, prospect implies directional and intentional looking across both space and time; it captures the experience of intervention techniques of landscape spatialities established in early modern times (Cotgreave 1998). Renaissance central-point landscape perspective created an imputed sense of place identity from the top down, by adjusting the human landscape or its representation to certain scientific principles. On the other hand, North European mapmakers and artists persisted in conceiving a landscape picture as a surface on which to set forth or infer the world rather than as a stage for significant human action (Muncy 2001) — a bottom-up organic landscape ideal and figurative form of thought articulated on a community and inscribed by local culture.

Greece never went through any of these stages. It simply adopted aspects of modernity in certain realms of life, implanting and overlaying them on pre-existing cultural particularities and local ways of life. Greek landscape ideals and forms of representation most characteristic of this cultural realm emerged from Byzantine traditions, in the form of the two-dimensionality of flat perspective, of ecclesiastical art, as exhibited in Orthodox iconography, El Greco’s manner of landscape painting, and perhaps was the closest Greek art came to westernise these parts of the world. Greece figures as part of the valiant attempt to westernise these parts of the world. Greece's national style in painting — the transliteration of its French word ‘peinture’, ‘landscape’ — is its setting that seems astonishing here architecturally speaking to non-Greeks. There are no such indifference towards the landscape and the laying out of public space in general but

Theodoros Stamos, a British princess, granddaughter to Queen Victoria, so it is perfectly understandable that she had her garden made properly. She also liked to wear stylised versions of the traditional costume of a cheeky peasant in the same way, as the style of her villa in Balchik is a very fine piece of the neo-Romanian national style in architecture. Although the Queen was thus attempting to bridge the gap between “imported” garden and landscape culture and local (Southeast-European) traditions for nature as aesthetic object, the development of an indigenous non-colonial disposal of garbage in the immediate vicinity of the perfectly charming buildings in Balchik makes the point.

One might be tempted to blame half a century of state-barbarism for the worsening of this situation. However, another example taken from the Balkans indicates the source of such indifference towards the landscape and the laying out of public space in general must be
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Romaia — a Cultural Landscape
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The most famous piece of Romanian folk literature, by Alecu Russo and published in 1852, is the tale of an enchanted ewe-lamb called Miorita. She warns her shepherd that his weighing machines are plotting to murder him at sunset. At this the boy, instead of preparing to fight or to flee, gives the sheep quite poetic directions on how to organise his imminent death and what to say when casting the news of his death to the flock and to his ageing mother if she comes seeking him. The setting imagined is the pasture for his passing which involves mountains, the sun and the moon, the waters with its singing birds. One would say today that he is describing a ravishing alpine landscape, except that the fatalistic story of the ballad is born inside Arcadian milieu and does not contemplate it as scenery.

The idea of landscape was imported to the Romanian provinces by members of the elite who started studying in Western universities during the early nineteenth century, as part of the valiant attempt to westernise parts of the world. Even the Romanian word for landscape — peisaj — is the transliteration of its French counterpart.

One example is the garden made around the summer residence of Queen Maria of Romania in Balchik, now on the Bulgarian shore of the Black Sea, which was part of greater Romania between 1912 and 1940. During that period it was a favourite summer resort of the Romanian aristocracy. Queen Maria was born a British princess, granddaughter to Queen Victoria, so it is perfectly understandable that she had her garden made properly. She also liked to wear stylised versions of the traditional costume of a cheeky peasant in the same way, as the style of her villa in Balchik is a very fine piece of the neo-Romanian national style in architecture. Although the Queen was thus attempting to bridge the gap between “imported” garden and landscape culture and local (Southeast-European) traditions for nature as aesthetic object, the development of an indigenous non-colonial disposal of garbage in the immediate vicinity of the perfectly charming buildings in Balchik makes the point.

One might be tempted to blame half a century of state-barbarism for the worsening of this situation. However, another example taken from the Balkans indicates the source of such indifference towards the landscape and the laying out of public space in general must be
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regime) like the surface mining area in Valea Crişului could have been closed. However, the sudden and incomplete change of regime, the place has become an anti-landscape. The 35 metres deep void extended across 95.4 hectares is almost irretrievable, unless a gigantic financial effort is directed towards its improvement. There are signs recently that the matter will be decided at least on the theoretical level.

A state-commissioned study proposes turning the former mine into a man-made lake. This is too little in comparison with the environmental calamity at hand, and although the tiny lake, small as it can be found throughout the country.

Ratification of the Convention Romania’s Parliament ratified the European Landscape Convention in 2002. Yet the specific legislation is still to be articulated; hence, there is no central and regional institutional framework in place which could coordinate the work of different public and private initiatives. The concept is also not well understood, but perhaps understandable if one recalls the central need for a Romanian transformation after the fall of Communism to re-establish the protection of the building heritage. It is vital, that the team in charge of preparing the new law for landscape preservation last summer and a new team leader is still to be appointed.

Even, once a ‘landscape act’ has passed, there is still a long way to go until institutional apparatus and individual initiative meet in order to make the whole system functional.

Up to now, the one major success relates to the current blocking by the ministry of Environment of the planned gold mine in the region of Rosia Montana. The achievement is the result of gathering of non-governmental forces with significant support from environmentalists from abroad and a vocal protest of a large civil audience, which in the end convinced Government that a mining extension from 1945 to 1991 was mentally and spiritually hard and the landscape remained largely unaffected. Thus nature and landscape became a priority of cultural heritage. Politically imposed collective farm management, the authorities helped to preserve nature against urbanization, by contrast destroyed historically developed land estates where families had lived for many generations.

At the end of 1980's collective farming began to disintegrate and land users had the opportunity to farm independently. By the beginning of the 1990's a privatization process was in train, that gave rise to many ways people their landowner status. The restoration date was set at 1940. The privatization act implied a new land reform process, that is still going on. Many people got back land, but didn't really know what to do with them. They were mostly abandoned. Those owners with an eye for profit transform their holdings into building land — so widening the urbanization process.

In the last 5 years this new ‘house- and village-building-process’ emerged as a building boom, because not all new municipalities have the a developed planning process. This has made for a rather disastrous hazard urban landscape development, hard to halt and difficult to analyse.

At present there are 527 municipalities that have made a landscape development plan, 92 municipalities have not and 88 municipalities abdicated. We have differences in our landscape related practices and values.

Plans for implementation of ELC Since 1991 Latvia's Landscape Policy has been included in official documents. However, the implementation process has been slow and only a few municipalities have been able to make a real start. The current landscape policy is the result of the earlier efforts by the Ministry of Regional Development, and the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Agriculture and Water Management. The new policy is focused on three main areas: (1) landscape protection, planning and management; (2) landscape education; (3) landscape development.

The basic document ‘Guidelines of Landscape Policy in Latvia’ is still valid. The implementation stage is at its very beginning. It will contain projected goals, possibilities and results, indicators of performance, action directions, future activities, overview preparation as well as various means of evaluation. For now Latvians do not recognize, that the core problems are:

- We have differences in our understanding of the idea of landscape;
- There is a lack of cooperation between urban, rural and nature landscapes and those who are charged with preserving its quality;
- Our planning process coordination is defective.

Key challenges today

- The lack of cooperation between urban, rural and nature landscapes and those who are charged with preserving its quality;
- The lack of cooperation between urban, rural and nature landscapes and those who are charged with preserving its quality;
- The lack of cooperation between urban, rural and nature landscapes and those who are charged with preserving its quality;
Monitoring the Rural Landscape in Tuscany
Mauro Agnolatti

A major programme has been under way in Tuscany to monitor the past history and current trends of the rural landscape of Tuscany. This programme has sampled the Tuscan landscape at 14 sites through the whole period, each of about 2000 hectares and totalling two per cent of the provincial area. Land use data have been collected for three periods, 1832, 1954, and 2000.

Data from 1832 has come from the General Land Survey of Tuscany, and archival documents, for 1954 there are road photographs, as well as oral and written sources. For the most recent period these are supported by field work. All this is put together for analysis using a GIS system, and the entire methodology, known as the HCEA (Historical and Cultural Evaluation Approach) is discussed in detail in Agnolatti M. ed. 2006, The Conservation of Cultural Landscape, CAB International, Wallingford.

The trends of main land use changes in the Tuscan landscape 1832-2000 are the substantial losses in pastures, the continuing great increase in woodland, with arable land now decreasing again after a halt in the 1950s. There is an overall loss of 45% in landscape diversity, measured by the types of habitats, for land uses are also “habitats” even if made by humans. This represents an increase of monocultures, and a decrease of mixed cultivations of about two-thirds.

In Italy as a whole about 13 million hectares of cultivated land and pastures have been abandoned since 1930, and statistically these were the most interesting areas for traditional landscape practices and features. Forest has increased across great areas of abandoned land, which the ecologists have not regretted, but significantly reducing landscape diversity. Climate change, in this area largely urbanisation, has been a major influence in this process which is almost entirely due to socioeconomic changes. The estimated warming of the climate in the next century of 3.4°C is not forecast to cause changes of the same intensity and quality.

In Cardoso, a typical area, the landscape quality figures are as tabled below. To these figures it might also be noted that three-quarters of the land so occupied on abandoned terraces.

The main reasons for the degradation of traditional landscapes and the loss of diversity have been the abandonment of many rural areas, with the consequent reduction of traditional farming activities, alongside the rapid development of industrial agriculture. Despite the great rise in forest use, there has also been a major reduction of traditional forest activities as a consequence of the development of industrial forestry.

This abandonment has not been assisted by the operation of policies emanating from the national government and from the European Union, which are quite inappropriate for rural areas.

The changes in the landscape are there for all to see:

- An increase of forest cover following both from abandonment and from new forest plantations
- An extension of monocultures
- A consequent reduction of mixed cultivation, including crop rotations, hedges and rows of trees, shelter belts.
- The diffusion of agro-systems
- A reduction of wooded pastures, previously a common landscape type and habitat
- The almost complete disappearance of certain types of forest, for example orchards of sweet chestnut, and shrublands, pollard trees (aerial coppices)

One of the current projects is to create the rural landscape park of Monte Amiata (5000 ha). This is the first landscape park of Tuscany and the project has been carried out in combination with farmers in the district and their local administrative authorities. The official present action in the park is one of easing the local administration to extend the park area to 6000 ha. Its goal is to increase landscape diversity through the restoration of traditional landscapes (reducing the forests, while increasing meadows and cultivated land). As such it attempts to put into practice the Vienna Resolution of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forest in Europe (www.mcpfe.org), intended to preserve and enhance the natural forest landscapes of sustainable forest management in Europe. (www.forestlandscapes.unifr.it)

Landscape planning and territorial and urban planning. Experiences in Italy
Lionella Scassozzi

Axiom is to improve the competitiveness of the rural areas, accepting that landscape is a major factor in providing a good quality of life, and addressing the identity of local places.

Museums of landscape, introduces the methodologies steps in art. 6 C of the ECL (knowledge, landscape planning, qualitative and cultural instruments aimed at protecting, managing, planning landscape), requires policies for landscape directed to the entire territory (outstanding, ordinary, degraded landscapes all to be considered).

In the new legislation that became regional and national law in 1985 the Regions could define an regional landscape plan. Only few Regions used this solution. The new Code obliges the Regions to elaborate specific plans for the implementation of their landscape instruments and today each region has to comply. The Code requires also that all the other administration levels (Provinces, Municipalities) either prepare their specific landscape plans or introduce the landscape Plans as a way of view into their territorial plans.

The role of the State is important: the Code requires that State and localised administrative levels co-operate in preparing these instruments (“cico-pianificazione”).

The characters of the landscape plans under the ECL landscape plans were sometimes simply a list and a mapping of the rural areas; sometimes they were more complex. In 2004 Italy introduced a law called “Cod for cultural heritage and for landscape” (“Codice dei beni culturali e del paesaggio”). As for landscape, this Code gives a configuration of the previous laws and regulations, and adds new elements taken from the ELC (if with some differences): in particular it uses a similar definition and regulations.
written descriptions like the Atlases) and its aim is to have landscape data to enable them to monitor landscape dynamics in coming years. There is no systematic definition of the landscape units. It has also produced an analysis showing the specific problems and risks that the landscape throughout its territory, describing from specified viewpoints, the environment and of the formal and functional quality of the settlements. It also deals specifically with particular peri-urban areas, and linear conurbations. It is setting general norms about particular areas (for example, the big lakes, Como, Garda, Maggiore, etc.) and the problems and risks which menace landscape quality.

Sardinia has concluded its work which it prepared in co-planning with the Ministry and Superintendencies: a detailed description with photos, maps, written text was produced by the Region and a detailed norm for a good strategy of the transformation of landscape quality. Tourism is one of the most important economic quality. Tourism is one of the examples, the big lakes, Como, Garda, Maggiore, etc.) and the problems and risks which menace landscape quality.

There are, however, some problems which I explain below:

1. Relations between landscape planning and territorial planning

Urban and territorial planning, in this period, in Italy, is focused on defining strategies, actions, priorities and programs for a good socio-economic development: there is an under way a very important change in the characters of the territorial planning, at the different administrative levels (Regional, Provincial, Municipal), with new regional laws and new plans being processed. On the contrary, landscape planning needs a management of all the territory and of all the problems and aspects of the territory. For example: landscape planning must include also ordinary landscape, degraded areas, agricultural areas, marginal areas, scattered settlements, and so on.

If the landscape plan is strictly connected with the territorial plan, Regions may have difficulty in defining good landscape policies: the landscape aspects are subordinated to the main objects and aims of the territorial plan and, for example, the re-qualification problems of scattered settlements are not considered. In other cases normal planning and landscape planning do not combine and it is difficult to link and integrate the two. Landscapes evolve over time and social and economic conditions change: the point in time when an updated plan may differ from the updating time for the landscape plan.

2. Relations between different levels of the administration of the landscape in the landscape planning

In Italy we have problems between Regions and the central administration, the state because, currently, a lot of Regions want to become more autonomous. On the other side, a lot of Regions have concluded its process, within a common general framework.

It is important that we define more precisely, the integration and administrative incapacity.

Today, there is no common idea how landscape is planned or changed in Estonia. Different societal groups perceive landscape differently and they have specific preferences. Estonia is one of the rest countries that has not signed the European Landscape Convention up till now. Within other countries, such as Germany, the problem seems to be legal one, in our case it seems to be terminological as well as administrative incapacity. Currently, there is a lack of international landscape protection. This paper focuses on how policy departments view, approach, handle and manage landscape in their actions.

What landscape means to us

The word landscape itself is rather young; it first appeared in the Estonian language only in 1906, and of course in connection with painting. Since geographers took the term over in 1919, there has always been a desire to give it a concrete meaning, to anchor a landscape so that from being a view it turns into an "objective reality". The concept of landscape has mainly been influenced by Russian and German schools of geographical thought. In the beginning of the 20th century it was seen as a region that encompassed both nature and the results of human activity. During the Soviet period the natural science based approach became dominant, as the human agent was erased from the landscape and one of the most important agendas was to delimit landscape regions as precisely as possible using the most suitable phenomena of nature. Human sciences such as archaeology, sociology, social and cultural geography were neglected. Archaeologists, folklorists and ethnologists based their work on material culture; oral heritage was dealt as long it was safe. Historians and archaeologists few of whom had any obvious regard for the physical environment, and also artists and geographers, dealt with the human experience of landscape.

The breakdown of the Soviet Union somehow brought along an influx of fresh ideas which also extended to landscape studies. Geographers discovered current ecological, landscape and population theories and so on.

We argue there are two main problems behind it: confusion in terminology and administrative incapacity.

Today, there is no common idea how landscape is planned or changed in Estonia. Different societal groups perceive landscape differently and they have specific preferences. Estonia is one of the rest countries that has not signed the European Landscape Convention up till now. Within other countries, such as Germany, the problem seems to be legal one, in our case it seems to be terminological as well as administrative incapacity.

Today, there is no common idea how landscape is planned or changed in Estonia. Different societal groups perceive landscape differently and they have specific preferences. Estonia is one of the rest countries that has not signed the European Landscape Convention up till now. Within other countries, such as Germany, the problem seems to be legal one, in our case it seems to be terminological as well as administrative incapacity.
hidden agenda of nationalistic humanism in landscape protection turned much more towards nature, forgetting landscape.

**Landscape in everyday use**

Previous landscape concepts have revealed the complicated nature of the word landscape and that it is related to nature have led to a vagueness of responsibility for management of landscape matters within and between ministries. Environment, Territorial Affairs, Agriculture, Culture all impinge on landscape issues and all are reluctant to take the lead signing up the Convention. Hitherto, protection policies for countryside, nature and cultural heritage have been mostly overlooked in Estonia. Nature protection deals with landscapes primarily in the landscape protection areas and national parks. Landscapes are mentioned in cultural heritage protection, and sustainable development. Several development areas (of second homes), particularly along the coast. Forested landscape is also expanding, but there is simultaneously a problem of delimiting the landscapes. Cultural heritage protection and environment protection are usually closely intertwined. Today, the databases have been synchronized, so the department could see the limitations and restrictions established by another department. We hope in this way to make progress.

**Conclusion/Confusion**

The ELC defines landscape as an area as perceived by people; in everyday spoken language the Estonian word "landscape" refers mostly to nature and much less to people or perception. Moreover, both scientific and nature conservation landscape discourses have tried to get rid of the vague understanding of landscape as scenery and handle it as a geomorphologically founded and defined unit. Those advances "traditionally running landscape business" have found few links between the Convention and their usual approach. On the one hand, landscape discourses are clear about what a landscape is rather abstract, hence not suitable to offer guidance in management or protection. When these two approaches find a balance, work on signing and then applying the Convention may resume.

**HP**

Spain moving to the Convention

Pascual Rigosescou-

**Choueca**

The landscape background

Several comprehensive descriptions of Spanish landscapes have been developed, among them, the Atlas of the Spanish Landscape -- completed in 2003 and published in 2004 -- sponsored by the Ministry of the Environment. It contains cartography, and an analysis and valuation of Spanish landscapes, thus supplying a framework for landscape studies, both at the local and regional scale. A complementary raster based analysis is provided by the Corine land-cover initiative, whose results are ready for the Spanish Project for Landscape and Territory, in Taormina, Italy in 1993.

Other events heralding the Spanish Government’s commitment to the goals of the ELC are listed below.

- In April 2000, the Environment Ministry organized in La Granja, with the help of the CoE, the European Seminar ‘Awareness to the landscape, from perception to protection’. At the opening ceremony, the Minister of Environment claimed landscape to be a key instrument of sustainable development, and the General Secretary of the Environment mentioned that the ELC would become the paramount reference for landscape protection in Spain.
- In April 2005 the Environment Ministry (General Secretariat for Land Issues and Biodiversity, SGCYB) elaborated a special strategy on landscape, with the participation of all the autonomous communities of Spain. The Strategy was a joint initiative by the CoE and the Observatory of Sustainability.
- In June 2006, Parliament voted to promote ratification. Later that year, the SGCYB organized, in Gerona (along with the CoE and the Regional Government of Catalonia) the Fifth Landscape Workshop, including a session concerning Spanish initiatives to promote the Convention at national, regional and municipal levels. Spanish landscape policy is defined by a constitution whereby regions are vested with full responsibility in matters concerning territorial policy. However, the Ministry plays a role in providing assistance in global issues.
- In July 2004, the Autonomous Community of Valencia passed an Act for Land Planning and Landscape Protection, inspired by the principles and proposals of the ELC, and providing several planning and management tools for their implementation.

Congratulations to the Organizing Committee for the excellent organization of the 2006 Workshop, and Lionella Scassozzi in discussion with Peter Howard at the evening reception.
Lessons learned from the process
There is a clear trend toward chaptering landscapes; and multiple steps are being taken both by the nation and the regions. Very rapid economic growth has given rise to acute deterioration of traditional landscapes, and there is an urgent need to reverse this tendency. The dynamic forms of landscape must be identified in detail.

Spain does not have sufficient experience concerning the management of the very mundane landscapes. There is also a lack of tools for coping with extremely disturbed landscapes (mining areas, quarries, old infrastructures, urban sprawl). These adaptation processes not only need a wider understanding of the landscape, but also a change from protection to management and regulation. This is the main challenge in the formulation of landscape policies.

Dealing with an extremely decentralized territorial policy will be a tough challenge for the implementation of a strategic, and early initiative is needed from the central Government in order to harmonize the process.

Key challenges
In Spain, changes are extremely rapid in different landscapes, especially the coastal, chilly, mountainous areas, high mountains with new recreational uses, uninhabited rural areas. The present situation of economic and consumption growth, together with mobility of people and goods, require solutions from the public sector, which till now have been insufficient.

The impending ratification of the ELC is a welcome step, as Spain was one of the initial signing parties in Florence in October 2000. This initial commitment and the rapid evolution of the landscapes, with a clear decrease in environmental and scenic quality, require early action and sufficient political involvement to reverse the current negative tendencies.

Ratification of the ELC should lead to the development of tools guaranteeing the implementation of the Convention throughout Spain, as well as the development of recognized landscapes guaranteeing some priority areas, favouring high-quality life, protecting singular landscapes, crafting appropriate tools for trans-boundary landscapes. The actions of the regions regarding landscapes finding a valuable starting point in the pioneering steps of Catalonia and Valencea, which will no doubt influence others. A welcome step will be the organization of inter-institutional events (sectoral committees, technical meetings, online meetings), exchange of information and experiences.

Coping with geographical and socio-economic diversity is one of the most complex challenges ahead. Being able to promote a positive comprehension of landscapes by politicians and the general public will be necessary in order to in the preparation of the European Landscape Convention (ELC) since the 1990s. With the help of its authors, national authors developed and tested a method to identify landscapes through their characteristics. This approach proved to be appropriate as character being a holistic phenomenon, requiring the thorough mapping in the best way the requirements of the holistic nature of landscape. Furthermore, the tool is characterised both by its simplicity and by its scientific method. Finally, it is designed to involve interested citizens in order to enrich the process of the landscapes with the landscapes in which they live. At the same time, the need for guidance from someone experienced in the method. The method and its application are presented in the publication ECOVAST Landscape Identification, a Guide to Good Practice. In the sense of the ELC ECOVAST is focusing on helping to achieve at least the following three main goals:

- to identify all landscapes on the whole territory of every European country;
- to involve the public (the civil society) and raise public awareness in all matters concerning landscapes.

The essence of the method
The technique, illustrated with examples, is essentially an exercise in applied geography, based on intense observation of the visible or tangible features of a landscape, by reference to a matrix of types of features which contribute to its character. These features are:
- the underlying rock;
- the climate;
- the form of the land;
- the soil;
- the pattern of land cover;
- the pattern of farming and other helpful means, as may be (historical) literature;
- houses and settlements;
- other man-made features;
- historic features;
- feelings and associations.

The Guide explains these terms, provides a format for recording what has been observed, and suggests how the survey may be done. Of special value in this sense is the method for carrying out the identification. ECOVAST does not pretend that this is the only method of studying landscapes. In its present form, it may be better suited to rural than to urban or peri-urban landscapes, because ECOVAST’s own focus is on the well-being of landscapes, but we are happy to offer it, for you to use if you wish. We believe that it may have value in three types of context:

- It enables citizens to study the character of their own landscape, and can thus make an active contribution of raising public awareness of landscapes;
- It can be used by local authorities or in broader-scale appreciation of landscapes, as shown by the map of landscape units (Kuba2) throughout Austria — prepared by the Austrian Association of ECOVAST on the basis of a map elaborated by the Austrian Association/ Mühlakurz; Parks;
- It may also be used by governments if they do not have the resources for a more detailed approach for a first simple identification of the national landscape.

How to work with the ECOVAST method
There are ten steps that should be followed, but if you wish. We believe that it may have value in three types of context:

1. The team has to agree on the landscape units (Kuba2). The technique is based on observation of the visible or tangible features of a landscape, by reference to a matrix of types of features which contribute to its character. These features are:
   - the soil;
   - the underlying rock;
   - the climate;
   - the form of the landscape;
   - historic features;
   - feelings and associations.

The ECOVAST team has to agree on the landscape units (the official scale of landscapes and desolation is used in the landscape below the table of the matrix by the use of the resulting matrix, and if need be, add the necessary comments. Complete the task of identifying a landscape with the filled-in matrix and text) on the issues of the landscape’s character (see the Guide).

Final remarks
The ECOVAST method has successfully been tested to identify landscapes in European countries and regions at a scale of 1:50,000–1:500,000. This was under the auspices of the ‘national landscape identification’ (compare England’s Countryside Character or the Slovenian ‘Typological Landscape Classification’ and it is the basis of the ‘Austrian Landscape Register’, work still in progress).

The ECOVAST Method of Landscape Identification is free to be downloaded from www.ecovast.org.

Sweden is often referred to as a small country in Europe, and indeed this accurately accounts for both the geographical context and the number of inhabitants, but certainly not for the size of the territory, which is equivalent to the size of Spain. Hence, Sweden is one of most sparsely populated countries in Europe. Its nine million people are just enough to cover the territory with some 21 people/sq km. In comparison, the corresponding figure for Spain is 97 people/sq km (Eurostat 2007).

Sweden has a lot of landscape per capita, and it is both an asset and a curse in terms of planning, management and protection of landscapes. This concept of vast spaces and desolation is an important part of the national brand of the Swedish landscape. The
advertising business and the tourist industry carefully cultivate exotic images of true wilderness, vast forests, archipelagos and the Nordic light, fully aware of its economic potential.

The abundant supply of landscape has also been a basic condition for the establishment and upkeep of customs such as the allemansrätten (right to roam the landscape regardless of property rights, is a conception as deeply rooted in the Swedish common consciousness as freedom of speech in the North American).

But vast space also has its disadvantages. It is very much an un-erotic fact that almost half of the Swedish municipalities are facing a situation with a rapidly decreasing population. This may not be an uncontested right to freedom, supported by the Convention in Sweden is a bit bearing this in mind, the approach that almost half of the Swedish individual and social well-being? The current status within the coming years.

One of the experiences from the Swedish work is that it is possible slow and deliberate terms used. The meaning of the word ‘landscape’ has changed since we started, but of course it helps that Swedish is a comparably small language. The problem has also come to the conclusion that it might be more sensible slowly to fill the old and familiar terms with new meaning. They can change totally over time.

The landscape has undergone a great change over the past 50 years. Of course, landscape has changed rapidly over the past 8,000 years in Scandinavia — when the first crops were introduced, when all the trees were used for the iron and glass production. In the 1960s, when the wet lands were drained. A great change over the past 50 years. That seems to be short when it comes to current landscape qualities within specific regions. Figure 1 shows the kind of detail that is given, in this case for the valleys and fjordside areas in western Norway.

A change in mindset - The ELC and our everyday life as public servants Birgitta Elfsnron

The ecological approach — we all want to have a harmonious and almost religious fervour in planning and dealing with landscape. So why do we not succeed? Of course we have our laws, our departments and other defenders of fragmentation. But legislation is made by humans, and can be both interpreted in different ways and changed altogether. Practice most certainly is changed all the time. Politics change, especially once the election is won. In Sweden, the division between ‘nature’ and ‘culture’ has been debated for about 1500 years. Yet we still deal with the two entities. Why haven’t we changed?

Because we don’t want to. Perhaps we are the obstacles to the holistic approach. Pluralism is difficult to manage in real life; it complicates the process and threatens the consensus. To agree to disagree is a much better basis on which to build a long-term relationship, more pretending that we have consensus.

There is no such thing as a single truth; we all know that, and with landscape we tend to respect underlying values in order to make my own values clearly understood and respected. It is difficult to change attitudes, but it is necessary if you want a change, and if we are to meet the changes around us. Cooperation means holding ourselves back a bit. This is how I can serve the public— and landscape of course.
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BE Experiences of implementation of the ELC in Norway Audun Mortlag

The landscape setting

Norway we experience a wide variety of climatic zones and landscapes, we have land within the Arctic Circle, including agricultural lands and builtup areas; vegetation; agricultural land and builtup areas; and technical constructions. The six components then make up an overall characteristic description of the region. This method of spatial analysis makes use of cross-disciplinary understanding and overall assessments to a greater extent than traditional cartographic techniques.

The Norwegian Forest and Landscape Institute is elaborating the reference system as a tool that enables analysis of the landscape qualities within specific regions. Figure 1 shows the kind of detail that is given, in this case for the valleys and fjordside areas in western Norway.

The site and background

The European Landscape Convention was signed by Norway on the 20th October 2000 in Florence and entered into force on the 1st March 2004. During the preceding work in the Council of Europe, the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and the environmental and engineering service decided to meet with the six key areas and stakeholders on the Swedish landscape management with comprehensive concepts.
the ministries and government agencies concerned, and funded within their annual budget allowances. As it was in keeping with present legislation and regulations, the decision to sign was not put forward to the government cabinet. Nor did the approval of the convention require ratification by the Parliament. For these reasons, the convention was merely adopted by an administrative decision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Ministry of the Environment is responsible for the implementation of the Convention, with other ministries and government bodies. A co-ordination group was set up with representatives from the Ministry and underlying directorates. The group has also meant to become the core of a countrywide implementation network. The experiences of the Convention itself and the seminars and workshops attached to it are entirely positive. Much has been learnt and much contributed. Fulfilling our obligations according to the specific articles, however, has proved rather more difficult.

What follows The convention gives new meaning to our notion of landscapes – everybody has a landscape of their childhood! Meeting people on a personal level in this way, and for these reasons, does not divide them into experts and non experts with different validity, and values. They all have an equal say. Furthermore, the convention does not put forward to the government. And finally, we need to learn from this experience in order to improve landscape analysis.

In the actual implementation of the Convention, we face problems of disciplines and professions. The fact that activities and enterprises are to be integrated and funded within the annual budget allowances poses a problem for no preparations were made to facilitate an integration process, and there is clear priority to do so.

Our obligations in implementing the Convention are rather vague. It is not obvious how they should be integrated into the present activities. And, being so lofty, landscape arguments often lose in debates about priorities. It is therefore hard to release human resources and financial means for capacity building and specific activities on the ELC.

Norway has, despite these overall difficulties introduced some significant changes. These include activities related to: Information and awareness raising; legislation; national sector policies; training and education; local and regional planning; landscape development and landscape policies and plans.

Information and awareness raising The convention text is translated into Norwegian and Sami. Currently, we are preparing an information folder about its relevance for municipal policies and community development. We are also working on the concept of a DVD film, visualising the notion and perception of landscapes, and what it means to humans well being, physical and mental health.

Legislation and regulations The Norwegian Planning and Building Act is being revised. Landscape concerns are included, according to the ELC definition. Further to the regulations on impact assessments of plans and programmes, we are elaborating guidelines for how the impacts on landscape should be assessed.


Training and education A number of new or follow training in landscape related subjects and landscape analysis. Additionally, the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB) has carried out a study on accessibility for disabled persons as part of the landscape analysis.

Implementation in local and regional planning In Norway, 12% of the national territory is controlled by central government (national parks and other protected areas). Land use in the remaining 88%, is controlled by the municipalities through the Planning and Building Act. This implies:

- that landscape quality objectives must be included in planning and community development with the municipality and across municipal borders.
- that local and regional authorities themselves are responsible for developing and implementing policies and plans.
- that central government sectors must achieve the national goals by local and regional planning.
- in this context, we have initiated pilots projects on methodology in two counties. Nordland: Landscape in municipal planning, supported by landscape experts at regional level. Telemark: Landscape as development strategy and settlement and business development in the historical part of the Telemark Canal (regional park).

European co-operation The Nordic countries are building a network between professionals in the Nordic countries, to form a basis for joint Nordic action. In September 2007, Norway hosted a seminar on implementing the ELC by local and regional planning. Sweden was hosting a second seminar in September 2007, this time on landscape in change. These seminars were funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

Issues and challenges While the high landscape quality objectives that remain some major issues and challenges for all countries. We have to elaborate the national strategy for implementation – in close cooperation with all relevant government bodies and NGOs. The strategy should identify ways of applying the Convention to our national needs, in particular Articles 4, 5, 6, and 7, which cover the corresponding division of work.

In our opinion, awareness raising is the very key to implementation. Everyone in a position making position must recognise:

- that the whole territory is made up of landscapes, where the everyday landscapes, in which people live and work should receive the most attention.
- that landscape experiences are not limited to visual aesthetics alone, they are perceived by all our senses, giving rise to emotional associations and personal identities.

We also need to see landscape as a development strategy. The landscape has a great impact on human well being and landscape, sustainable community development and local enterprise.

However, this fact works both ways – the landscape may also develop in a detrimental way. Most landscape changes are caused by human actions. By applying the ELC in the planning and decision making processes, we must reinforce people’s perception of landscapes and reduce or eliminate the negative forces. Focus should be on the areas most prone to change, such as urban development threats: urban and rural settlements, the fjord and coastland landscape and mountain areas.

There are also problems of training and education. In their decisions and actions local authorities are often not aware of landscape assessment and their potential for local development. However, they do need to know how to enhance or just degrade the landscapes. This raises a series of issues:

- How should knowledge compiled at national level be disseminated and applied in local community development issues?
- How should local authorities involve experts in their landscape analyses?
- How should the landscape experiences are perceived by all our senses, giving rise to emotional associations and personal identities.

In order to implement the ELC, the landscape committee has identified a number of key arguments for the work:

1. Awareness raising
2. Integration of landscape values in existing planning and decision-making processes.

This in turn raises the major challenge of the Convention regarding participation. Landscape quality objectives must be recognised by all players within the community. Otherwise they are going to act in different directions. Reaching common understanding and mutual agreement however, requires active participation, so:

- How should local authorities organise cross sectoral training for everybody preparing or deciding actions within the community?
- How should they create educational materials for the local primary and secondary schools?

This seminar in July 2007 raised the major challenge of the Convention regarding participation. Landscape quality objectives must be recognised by all players within the community. Otherwise they are going to act in different directions. Reaching common understanding and mutual agreement however, requires active participation, so:

- How should local authorities organise cross sectoral training for everybody preparing or deciding actions within the community?
- How should they create educational materials for the local primary and secondary schools?

This seminar in September 2007, this time on landscape in change. These seminars were funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers.

Issues and challenges While the high landscape quality objectives are indeed there remain some major issues and challenges for all countries. We have to elaborate the national strategy for implementation – in close cooperation with all relevant government bodies and NGOs. The strategy should identify ways of applying the Convention to our national needs, in particular Articles 4, 5, 6, and 7, which cover the corresponding division of work.

In our opinion, awareness raising is the very key to implementation. Everyone in a position making position must recognise:

- that the whole territory is made up of landscapes, where the everyday landscapes, in which people live and work should receive the most attention.
- that landscape experiences are not limited to visual aesthetics alone, they are perceived by all our senses, giving rise to emotional associations and personal identities.

We also need to see landscape as a development strategy. The landscape has a great impact on human well being and landscape, sustainable community development and local enterprise.

However, this fact works both ways – the landscape may also develop in a detrimental way. Most landscape changes are caused by human actions. By applying the ELC in the planning and decision making processes, we must reinforce people’s perception of landscapes and reduce or eliminate the negative forces. Focus should be on the areas most prone to change, such as urban development threats: urban and rural settlements, the fjord and coastland landscape and mountain areas.

There are also problems of training and education. In their decisions and actions local authorities are often not aware of landscape assessment and their potential for local development. However, they do need to know how to enhance or just degrade the landscapes. This raises a series of issues:

- How should knowledge compiled at national level be disseminated and applied in local community development issues?
- How should local authorities involve experts in their landscape analyses?
- How should they organise cross sectoral training for everybody preparing or deciding actions within the community?
- How should they create educational materials for the local primary and secondary schools?

This in turn raises the major challenge of the Convention regarding participation. Landscape quality objectives must be recognised by all players within the community. Otherwise they are going to act in different directions. Reaching common understanding and mutual agreement however, requires active participation, so:

- How should local authorities organise cross sectoral training for everybody preparing or deciding actions within the community?
- How should they create educational materials for the local primary and secondary schools?

This in turn raises the major challenge of the Convention regarding participation. Landscape quality objectives must be recognised by all players within the community. Otherwise they are going to act in different directions. Reaching common understanding and mutual agreement however, requires active participation, so:

- How should local authorities organise cross sectoral training for everybody preparing or deciding actions within the community?
- How should they create educational materials for the local primary and secondary schools?

This in turn raises the major challenge of the Convention regarding participation. Landscape quality objectives must be recognised by all players within the community. Otherwise they are going to act in different directions. Reaching common understanding and mutual agreement however, requires active participation, so:
Slovakia and the European Landscape Convention

The programme of work for 2006 – 2007 includes:
- designing The National Implementation Programme
- activities within the CoE, EC, international co-operation
- networking on the national level
- opening-up new themes
- educating experts and municipalities
- publishing articles, leaflets, posters
- presentations at home and abroad

The Convention, and its team based in Bratislava, has been perceived, particularly by Bos Pedrosi, as at the centre of three circles or networks.

Cooperation to provide exchange of experience, national and international co-operation

Professional support to identify landscape types, typical landscape character, significant landscape elements and landscape quality objectives

At the moment two important questions are emerging out of this. In the protected nature landscapes, we need to overcome the problem of the isolated nature islands. In the countryside, we need to understand how to support people’s livelihood in order to continue landscape management.

Article 5 of the Convention demands several responses. One of these is the recognition of landscapes in law. Slovakia is responding with an Act on land-use planning, using a landscape plan (LANDEP) as a background document. There is a whole network of acts each act relevant here: an act on the preservation of historic monuments, the nature and landscape protection; one on soil, water and forests; and another on the environment.

The establishment of landscape policies involves us in awareness raising; training and education, identification and assessment, and deciding on landscape quality objectives, and implementation. We are also required to develop procedures for the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of landscape policies.

One Slovak project has been the Village Renewal Programme, including the Villages of the Year Award. This is based on assessing the competitor villages according to a series of criteria, such as:
- the village as manager of land within its boundaries;
- village as a painted frame (by a set of viewpoints)
- how well the village manages its function and builds its community spirit

The major challenges we face in dealing with the landscape can perhaps be divided into those with a science orientation and those oriented on practice. I list these below. Those involved in expert scientific assessment include:
- the development of landscape models
- methods of achieving biological and landscape diversity
- studying ecological networks in landscape
- landscape fragmentation
- studying land use changes and landscape history
- developing integrated assessment
- the social dimension of landscape

Challenges in practice include:
- Making landscape management plans
- Environmental impact assessment
- Air- and- environmental schemes
- Sustainable management of landscape
- River restoration

Landscape really matters! The Swedish people are literally dealing with landscape every day, but are we taking it for granted? Nils Holgersson overlooking the landscape of Scania on a Swedish twenty kronor bill.

Ireland and the European Landscape Convention

Ireland signed and ratified the European Landscape Convention in 2002—one of the early signatory nations despite the fact that it had a low level of involvement with the development of the Convention. However, it has been my experience that at Government level there was no great appetite for the Convention. I believe the responsible ministers had a poor science understanding of the importance of landscape and saw it as more of an enemy than an ally.

Ireland, Landscape and the European Landscape Convention

Landscape only figured as a scenic asset for the red-tiled tourism industry and it was limited to a small number of highly scenic areas such as Glendalough, Gougane Barra, Glengarriff, Killarney, Connemara and Donegal. You could map it by the Automobile Association guide to Irish Hotels. The tourism industry began to take off in the 1960s and at the same time the efforts of a few visionaries began to change the protected and undervalued landscape sector and its economic structure. These included the establishment of state manufacturing companies to Ireland. So a range of forces for change and the landscape were emerging. By the late 1960s the climate began to change to their advantage.

This emerging scenario gave rise to the first attempt to regularise planning and development in Ireland as embodied in the 1963 Planning and Development Act. Prior to 1963 we had a range of different pieces of legislation mainly dealing with the protection of landscapes, derived in large part from English legislation. There was no specific provision for legislation in the 1963 Act, but it did set out an organised framework for the planning that should have benefited landscape management.

A note: The landscape planning process in Ireland is laid down over a very variable period. perception of landscape in any country cannot. We have not treated our landscape in positive terms, but I would have wished to describe the ‘landscape perspective’ which is that after the Great Famine 1846 - 47 when it is estimated 800,000 died of starvation. The ultimate landscape impact of Ireland is that Ireland has gained its freedom to control its own affairs, but that it has its own sense of place and time and it found it difficult to relate to a colonized landscape and the associated era. Instead we cast the national mindset back 850 years and more to our Golden Age. We put national blinkers on as far as the landscape heritage of the intervening 850 years is concerned. We wanted our landscape back for its functional exploitation, but that was very different to how we felt about the landscape.
Of greater landscape significance around the same time was the important integrated measure involved in setting up An Foras Forbartha — the Development Institute. The Foras carried out valuable research which supported the then Minister of Environment, Pádraig Flynn in 1987, an ill-considered and irresponsible act, disastrous for the Irish landscape and environment. Whilst we subsequently had the Environmental Protection Agency, established in 1992 that assumed some of its responsibilities, Ireland was already in full consultation with other government organisations such as Landscape Protection and Environment. Whilst we had the Environmental Protection Agency, established in 1992 that assumed some of its responsibilities, landscape region 23. Rural districts in western Norway Israel, probably the fastest developing state in the world, has been a Development Institute to guide and inform its development planning process.

A new Planning & Development Act emerged in 2000, and this contains improved provisions for landscape protection and management, but still fails to recognise landscape in the integrated manner called for by the ELC. The authorities were in the midst of preparing the new bill at the same time as the ELC was being finalised. It might have been expected that the bill would have reflected all the landscape energy contained in the ELC. This was not the case and Ireland signed and ratified the Convention without any wide-ranging consultation. We only consulted other government departments and decided that Ireland was already in full compliance with the requirements of the convention and that it would pose no problems for our development-led economy.

Most local authorities in Ireland have undertaken landscape character assessment exercises in some format, but these have been produced in the absence of a national framework. Other measures of relevance include Local Area Action Plans—a very recent development. Local authorities have also produced a range of landscape relevant guidelines such as the Cork Rural Design Guide (2003) published by Cork County Council. But the actions undertaken by government at national and local level in Ireland have been uncoordinated, limited and ensure that the convention would have become more deeply embedded in the administrative structures.

Undoubtedly Ireland at government level has followed the general trends in Europe in taking somewhat greater cognisance of landscape and engaging in a certain degree in study and analysis over the past ten to fifteen years. It is very difficult to assess whether the Convention accelerated this process or instigated it or whether it would have happened anyway. The evidence would suggest that the convention had very little influence at government level. The lessons that might be learned from the Irish experience would be:

1. All states should engage in a wide ranging consultation process prior to the signing and ratifying. States should mount a campaign of consultation and education, so that there is a broad-based knowledge and understanding of the convention, throughout the administrative structure and amongst all the players and stakeholders involved in landscape intervention and planning.

The planning and environmental management instruments only came into effect in the early 1990s. Today, population density on the Maltese Islands is highest amongst all European Union member states (at 1,274 inhabitants/km², compared to an EU average of 113 inhabitants/km²). Inhabitants/km² of land, this is the substantial pressure of an additional tourist population. The most marked net result has been intensive urbanization, with an urban footprint of circa 23% (compared to an EU average of 8%). Furthermore, rapid and unplanned growth has resulted in several environmental problems ranging from pollution and exhaustion of groundwater resources, to poor air quality (with resultant public health impacts), to widespread habitat destruction. The Maltese landscape is therefore a resource under threat from many fronts. On one hand, it is a unique product of nature, history and culture, both distinctive and irreplaceable, and upon which depends one of the Maltese Islands’ most important contributors, namely tourism. On the other hand, it is a resource under threat from fragmented, short-term and globalized development.

The following discussion evaluates the current situation in the light of the Convention requirements. There are two points on which Malta’s implementation to date appears to fare rather weakly. One is the definition of landscape as “an area, as perceived by people”. This definition has been fully acknowledged in the Landscape Assessment Study of the Maltese Islands, which was issued in 2004. However, the extent to which the perceptual element has been integrated into landscape planning appears to be limited. Landscape character areas were defined on the basis of typology, predominant landscape elements, and zones of visual influence. The stakeholder component was limited to consultation concerning a derived Landscape Assessment Model outlining landscape sensitivity in the Maltese Islands. There is a relatively weak history of public participation in decision-making.

There is reason for some optimism as the current government, elected in June 2007, have included a landscape strategy for Ireland in their programme and this hopefully will lead to early ratification of the ELC. The responsible Minister is a member of the Green Party and only just in office. There is now a queue at the door of the minister from various representative organisations and institutions to influence the shape and objectives of the proposed strategy. Landscape Alliance Ireland’s position is to seek the full in EEC involvement in the Convention and its integration into all of the administrative processes of the state.

Irish ELC Lessons

As will be obvious there have been a number of players involved in the ‘implementation’ of the Convention in Ireland. The body that should have been most involved—the responsible government department has yet to take more than a rudimentary interest. But organisations such as Landscape Alliance Ireland and the Heritage Council have made significant progress on a number of fronts.

In retrospect it would have been preferable if a much more inclusive and rigorous process of examining the implications of the European Landscape Convention had taken place before we signed and ratified, as we believe this might have changed. There must be a national policy or strategy with regard to landscape from the beginning of the process as this would appear to be vital to ensure that the Convention is fully implemented across all of its articles, bearing in mind that it is a very comprehensive and integrated convention.

We have to move from the rather unsophisticated reasoning that it must always be ‘pollution in, landscape and progress and move to the more mature and responsible position of incorporating landscape management into all decisions with a broad strategy of preservation, recycling, redesign/ design, enhancement and maintenance.

There are two points on which Malta fares weakly is that of public participation. The second point on which Malta appears to fail is the definition of landscape as “an area, as perceived by people”. This definition has been fully acknowledged in the Landscape Assessment Study of the Maltese Islands, which was issued in 2004. However, the extent to which the perceptual element has been integrated into landscape planning appears to be limited. Landscape character areas were defined on the basis of typology, predominant landscape elements, and zones of visual influence. The stakeholder component was limited to consultation concerning a derived Landscape Assessment Model outlining landscape sensitivity in the Maltese Islands. There is a relatively weak history of public participation in decision-making.

The eight Local Plans which have been issued address a variety of landscape areas through a variety of measures, including local area action plans, site-specific policies, provisions for embodiment, guidelines, draft plans and the like. There is, however, certainly scope for expanding considerations of degraded areas to include rehabilitation, management and ecological restoration. At present, such measures are largely limited to
disused quarry sites. Overall, Malta appears to have made significant progress in terms of implementation of the requirements to integrate landscape into regional and town planning policies, and in cultural, social, economic and other policies.

Chapter II of the Convention outlines national implementation. It discusses division of responsibilities. In Malta, there are two levels of government: national and local. The national government and 67 local councils. Given Malta's small land area, landscape planning has been implemented at a national scale whilst local authorities have been limited to small-scale sites, which nevertheless can also cumulatively contribute to the enhancement of broader-scale landscapes. In terms of general measures, Malta appears to satisfy, to some degree, the requirement to recognize landscapes in law.

Participation in landscape policy measures in Malta has been limited to essentially two events: (i) the involvement of stakeholders in order to validate a landscape assessment model developed in 2004; and (ii) a public consultation relating to the issue of the Landscape Assessment Study of the Maltese Islands. There are presently no mechanisms for the ongoing involvement of stakeholders in decision-making where landscape is concerned. Involvement of stakeholders is largely limited to other planning processes which indirectly impact upon landscapes.

A general perception of landscape as a resource and asset is still largely lacking. Training for students and professionals is also inadequate and landscape is a peripheral, rather than central, concern in education. A landscape characterization exercise was carried out as part of the Landscape Assessment Study of the Maltese Islands, and this also included an extensive consultation of authorities and trends. However, there is a critical shortcoming in implementation to date, namely the inadequate consideration of social and cultural dimensions. Chapter II of the ELC notes the assessments of public opinion could take "into account the particular values assigned to them by interested parties and the population concerned." It is doubtful whether this is indeed the case with regard to the Landscape Assessment Study.

Article 6E of the ELC discusses the need to introduce instruments aimed at protecting, managing and designing landscapes. To date, the predominant mechanism utilized in Malta is scheduling of land under the Development Planning Act, 1992, particularly as Areas of High Landscape Value. Several areas of High Landscape Value have been identified at regional levels through the Local Plans. Within these areas, land uses and activities are restricted; however, these areas are not actively managed. At the level of the individual development, landscape assessment has been increasingly utilized as a tool in Environmental Impact Assessment. Initially, the focus of such assessments tended to be almost exclusively visual, but the Malta Environment and Planning Authority, is now emphasizing the need for an assessment of visual and non-visual aspects of landscape.

Chapter III of the ELC discusses European co-operation, addressing points such as international policies and programmes, mutual assistance and exchange of information and transboundary landscapes. The proposals of Chapter III have particular relevance for Malta at Mediterranean rather than European-wide scale. The landscapes of the Mediterranean region have several common traits, emanating from a history that unifies the region, both in nature and anthropogenic terms. This is particularly the case if one considers landscape in its broadest sense, to also incorporate the sea. It is thus possible to talk of a Mediterranean identity; indeed, the term "Mediterraneanism" has been defined with respect to several landscape aspects, including vegetation, geomorphology and land use. The need for pan-Mediterranean collaboration is, however, more than merely an abiding concern by culture. Several threats to landscape extend across the region. One issue which dramatically illustrates this factor is the issue of illegal immigration from the poorer North African shore to the more affluent countries of Southern Europe. In the case of Malta, a significant threat indicated by an immigrant population are substantial, and are likely to manifest themselves in sustained urbanization and demand for resources.

The way forward

An assessment of status quo serves to establish trajectories for action. A number of aspects emerge. One of these is the way in which landscape is understood and interpreted. We argue for the need to expand the understanding of landscape beyond the conventional visual domain, to include all senses (Phillips, 2005), as well as intangible and cultural expression values. As Pedróli and Adolfini (2002) note, the European Landscape Convention is revolutionary precisely in that it argues for common guidelines for a diversified management of European landscapes, bringing together base target for understanding landscape as a relation in relation to natural processes, the right to landscape in the local cultural context, and the real landscape on the basis of coordinated public action. To date, Malta’s focus appears to have been primarily on the true landscape, and more attention needs to be paid to right and real landscapes.

Chapter III of the ELC discusses European co-operation, addressing points such as international policies and programmes, mutual assistance and exchange of information and transboundary landscapes. The proposals of Chapter III have particular relevance for Malta at Mediterranean rather than European-wide scale. The landscapes of the Mediterranean region have several common traits, emanating from a history that unifies the region, both in nature and anthropogenic terms. This is particularly the case if one considers landscape in its broadest sense, to also incorporate the sea. It is thus possible to talk of a Mediterranean identity; indeed, the term "Mediterraneanism" has been defined with respect to several landscape aspects, including vegetation, geomorphology and land use. The need for pan-Mediterranean collaboration is, however, more than merely a matter of history and culture. Several threats to landscape extend across the region. One issue which dramatically illustrates this factor is the issue of illegal immigration from the poorer North African shore to the more affluent countries of Southern Europe. In the case of Malta, a significant threat indicated by an immigrant population are substantial, and are likely to manifest themselves in sustained urbanization and demand for resources.

The way forward

An assessment of status quo serves to establish trajectories for future action. A number of aspects emerge. One of these is the way in which landscape is understood and interpreted. We argue for the need to expand the understanding of landscape beyond the conventional visual domain, to include all senses (Phillips, 2005), as well as intangible and cultural expression values. As Pedróli and Adolfini (2002) note, the European Landscape Convention is revolutionary precisely in that it argues for common guidelines for a diversified management of European landscapes, bringing together base target for understanding landscape as a relation in relation to natural processes, the right to landscape in the local cultural context, and the real landscape on the basis of coordinated public action. To date, Malta’s focus appears to have been primarily on the true landscape, and more attention needs to be paid to right and real landscapes.

WHEREAS past vernacular history was often interwoven with a variety of landscape aspects, and increasingly consumerist lifestyle has diminished the attachment to place, and the sense of self and identity is no longer closely linked to regional landscapes. Landscape planning may need explore ways to re-establish linkages between people and land, in the latter case sometimes as a source of environmental balance, of satisfying their own material needs, and requires organisation. Without the co-operation of national, regional and local authorities, and also education institutions and NGOs, the liquid in landscape could remain in the form of an environmental convention, where it could be put on display by a small number of particularly proud, inspired or zealous civil servants. Yet this liquid is no magic potion, but simply a form of sap which, if it is not bred, can become a resource accessible to all. Based on the subsidiarity principle, it must inspire finding an essential source of environmental balance, public health, cultural identity, sustainable development.

The Convention pays particular attention to local and regional authorities, by referring explicitly to the subsidiarity principle and the European Charter of Local Self-Government; committing states to establishing procedures and regional authorities’ participations in defining and implementing landscape policies; requiring full local and regional authority involvement in designing and assessing landscapes.

Taken together, these provisions provide local and regional authorities with a strong legal incentive to exercise their institutional landscape responsibilities. In most European countries direct responsibility for everyday landscape matters rests with regional or local authorities, in the case of Malta sometimes as a regionally delegated responsibility. However, when taking part in European conferences related to the ELC, one can hardly detect proposals put forward by or referring to local and regional authorities. They are dramatically absent from the debates regularly organised and promoted by the Council of Europe with regard to the Malta Convention. But if the Convention is to be properly and fully applied, cooperation between local and regional authorities is badly needed and requires organization—hence the need to have intergovernmental systems around the Convention, able to promote co-operation between public authorities.
universities, and NGOs as well as professionals and experts.

The European Network of Local and Regional Authorities for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention, ENELC

Aware of the necessity of the Council of Europe’s Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, the body at the heart of the European Convention on Human Rights Resolution 178 (2004) encouraged decentralised authorities all over Europe to set up a cooperation body able to support them in the implementation of the Convention. In order to reply to the Congress recommendation, and further to the initiative of the Commission of the Regions, two local and regional authorities in 2006 constituted ENELC—the European Network of Local and Regional Authorities for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention.

ENELC today has 37 members, its permanent headquarters is in Brussels, and the chair is currently William Careggi. This European network offers local and regional authorities the possibility of exchanging assistance and technical support in carrying out their landscape policies in accordance with ELCP principles. It helps to improve their decision-making capacities particularly in the areas of planning and authorisation procedures. ENELC also assists in preparing documents on the technical, assistance and technical support in carrying out their landscape policies in accordance with ELCP principles. It helps to improve their decision-making capacities particularly in the areas of planning and authorisation procedures. ENELC also assists in preparing documents on the technical, assistance and technical support in carrying out their landscape policies in accordance with ELCP principles.

The European NGOs Platform for the implementation of the ELC, CIVILSCAPE

Aims of the Network are: to produce a landscape policy platform that includes all national NGOs, to establish a more harmonious landscape policies in all member states of the Council of Europe by the co-operation of local, regional and national NGOs. By co-operation of NGOs and governmental organisations striving to improve the quality of landscape as being made also with NGOs involved in the creation of the ELC. CIVILSCAPE is a network of NGOs who work on landscape and environmental issues. These networks are established between the Council of Europe’s Convention on the ELC implementation process. In order to make this process even stronger, it would be important that direct links are established between the Council of Europe’s Convention on the ELC and the networks. This would allow to the construction of an informal pan-European cross-sectoral/multilevel supportive co-operation system dedicated to the Convention. The creation of such a system appears necessary and urgent if the political process sought by the Convention is not to remain a paper one, no agreement on landscape matters.

The European NGOs Platform for the implementation of the ELC, CIVILSCAPE

Similar contracts are being made also with NGOs involved in the creation of the ELC. CIVILSCAPE is to function as an educational and training institution, to establish a more harmonious landscape policies in all member states of the Council of Europe by the co-operation of local, regional and national NGOs. By co-operation of NGOs and governmental organisations striving to improve the quality of landscape as being made also with NGOs involved in the creation of the ELC. CIVILSCAPE is a network of NGOs who work on landscape and environmental issues. These networks are established between the Council of Europe’s Convention on the ELC implementation process. In order to make this process even stronger, it would be important that direct links are established between the Council of Europe’s Convention on the ELC and the networks. This would allow to the construction of an informal pan-European cross-sectoral/multilevel supportive co-operation system dedicated to the Convention. The creation of such a system appears necessary and urgent if the political process sought by the Convention is not to remain a paper one, no agreement on landscape matters.

Summing Up and Closing Thoughts

Adrian Phillips

We have arrived at a remarkable amount in just over 24 hours. So much ground has been covered in such a short time that it is a tribute to the organisation of this event, and the skill of the conference organisers. I have found it very difficult to get your heads around the paper presented by Professor Roberts, but I was pleased that there were of a range of different views expressed about landscape, and that there are many and varied other perspectives on landscape which we can argue about for many centuries, but not something about landscape which it is easy to reach agreement. We are now able to reach a consensus, and to promote the exchange of landscape perspectives.

Michael Dower described his achievement of getting agreement among different people about what it is and what is valuable about the landscape. He pointed out that it is a difficult task to get the landscape and the environment of the convention. This is a huge and complex challenge, and several speakers referred to it as a ‘powerlessness among European citizens about the changes taking place in the world around them. We have to open up new ways in which people can engage with landscape, by contributing their knowledge of it, their views on landscape, and their expertise in finding and compelling evidence about landscape issues. We have to address the difficult issue of governance. Who does what and at what level in relation to landscape? Where does the power lie? What mechanisms are available to get landscape integrated into sectors like transport and energy?

Carys Swanwick summarised these very clearly this morning and I will only pick out a few points which struck me as especially important.

We have to address the difficult issue of governance. Who does what and at what level in relation to landscape? Where does the power lie? What mechanisms are available to get landscape integrated into sectors like transport and energy?

Several speakers referred to it as a ‘powerlessness among European citizens about the changes taking place in the world around them. We have to open up new ways in which people can engage with landscape, by contributing their knowledge of it, their views on landscape, and their expertise in finding and compelling evidence about landscape issues. We have to address the difficult issue of governance. Who does what and at what level in relation to landscape? Where does the power lie? What mechanisms are available to get landscape integrated into sectors like transport and energy?

Several speakers referred to it as a ‘powerlessness among European citizens about the changes taking place in the world around them. We have to open up new ways in which people can engage with landscape, by contributing their knowledge of it, their views on landscape, and their expertise in finding and compelling evidence about landscape issues. We have to address the difficult issue of governance. Who does what and at what level in relation to landscape? Where does the power lie? What mechanisms are available to get landscape integrated into sectors like transport and energy?

Several speakers referred to it as a ‘powerlessness among European citizens about the changes taking place in the world around them. We have to open up new ways in which people can engage with landscape, by contributing their knowledge of it, their views on landscape, and their expertise in finding and compelling evidence about landscape issues. We have to address the difficult issue of governance. Who does what and at what level in relation to landscape? Where does the power lie? What mechanisms are available to get landscape integrated into sectors like transport and energy?
We have to win the argument that landscape is a medium or context through which to guide development. We have to change public understanding every bit as much as a resource to be protected, managed and created. If we can do that, there seems to be a lot of potential: roads, power plants and new homes will become landscape to be created as a landscape as we get to the right development outcome, not just as an obstacle to their ambitions.

At the same time, we need to build alliances between landscape and areas that command high political and public attention: health, education, biodiversity protection and coping with the effects of climate change and recognizing the potential to address, at least over to a low carbon economy. We have to show how better understanding of landscape will help achieve these broad societal goals.

Another lesson that we have learnt from this morning, with the example from Terry O’Reagan is the importance of asking ourselves at the outset whether we are doing?, or monitoring -- in Michael Dower’s words of last night. Developing broad societal goals for this would be invaluable.

Finally we should look at the success of efforts, for example in Slovenia, and the UK. Have there been any significant national strategy, programme, plan or framework to implement the convention? Has it now become a ceiling to our aspirations. Let me explain why.

I have been involved in several international conventions, notably the Ramsar (wetlands) Convention, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the World Heritage Convention. It is clear to me that a successful convention requires three things: a periodic Conference of the Parties; a fund; a dedicated secretariat.

The ELC has none of these things. It is indeed serious constrained by Article 10.1, which assigns responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the convention to three existing committees of experts who report to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. This arrangement means that the level of political drive behind the convention and the high aspirations that is engendered is very limited – one might cruelly liken this to a tanker driven by an outboard motor.

What can be done about this?

There are three options:

- Develop a new convention or a protocol to amend the existing one. That means going back to the drawing board, as even an amendment to the existing convention would have to be treated in law as if it were a new convention. Years of negotiation could follow, with no guarantee of success, and the governments who ensured the weakness of the convention by striking off proposals for a conference of parties, a fund and a dedicated secretariat would probably still oppose these again.
- Develop an EU directive. While this might seem attractive it is likely to be strongly resisted by many EU Member States who would see it as an unwelcome European intrusion (probably Austria and the UK for a start). And it is surely questionable if the top-down, rather dirigiste mechanism of the EU is a suitable instrument for the slippery notion of landscape. (This does not mean that the existing ways in which the EU could help and support implementation of the ELC through a funded programme of activities on landscape).
- Build supportive systems around the convention. This option recognises that implementation of the convention cannot be left to the Council of Europe. But it would also work to complement the formal inter-governmental mechanisms of the ELC with supportive networks and activities. It is evident that this is exactly what was missing from this approach as the way forward.

Riccardo Priore has told us of two emerging European networks in support of the ELC. There is the EURNECL for local and regional governments and UNESCO and UNISCE for universities, about whom we have already just spoken too. A third is CIVISPACE that has been created by the ELC itself with supportive networks and activities. It is evident that this is exactly what was missing from this approach as the way forward.

To conclude we have come a remarkably long way since 2000, but let us not forget the historical context and the momentum that was built up in the early years of the ELC. The momentum must not be lost. If it cannot be maintained through the Council of Europe alone, then now is the time to begin the process of building a network of networks and activities. This will help to make sure that the convention doesn’t become a reality across the diverse landscapes, and among the diverse communities, of Europe.

AP

The WORKSHOP SESSIONS

Workshop 1: Policy: raising ‘landscape’ on the political agendas in Europe

Chair: Paul Selman, Rapporteur Peter Howard.

The agenda

Landscape has often been an afterthought (eg the land left over after development) or has been a negative constraint (preventing development in scenic areas). How can we change attitudes so that influential people see landscape in a positive way, supporting sustainable development?

- An economic driver – underpinning tourism; creating semi-natural landscapes; investing in underpinning natural resource productivity; enabling value to be added to farm produce through regional branding etc.
- A social driver – creating a ‘sense of place’ in which people have pride, providing outdoor opportunities for improving health and fitness; providing a shared cultural heritage across Europe.
- An environmental driver – integrating a wide range of environmental functions and services (not just visual ones); providing a green infrastructure for climate change; enabling a positive way, supporting sustainable landscape development across Europe.

How can we promote landscape as an important topic in its own right? What tools are available, and how can we deliver integrated benefits across sectors (health, culture, planning, agriculture etc.)

The discussion

This workshop debated the group of questions raised – changing attitudes; how do we go, we should know where we are – a careful review of existing policy documents was necessary, sometimes revising the language to take account of the ELC and the definitions used therein; and the political agendas in Europe.

A thread running through all the debate was the limits of subsidiarity. Clearly national conventions, organisations or initiatives are the appropriate arena for action was the state (e.g. UK) or the nation (e.g. Wales) but the appropriate distribution of policies all the way from the ELC and the Council of Europe to the state was necessary. Some considered that it was not possible to use landscape as an economic driver; others pointed out that it was all about, in the words of the ELC -- ‘to make an international Scandinavian identity.

There was some debate about the origin of policy. How are governments influenced? There were two main influences – only very crudely expressed by the phrases ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’. The ‘top-down’ influences included the ELC being seen as an effective and reminder to national governments of the need to promote and support their policies; some thought the EU a more potent force than the Convention; another possibility was that ELC was a way to put landscape issues into the constitution, which is happening in Sweden.

The opposite influence is by influencing voters, taking the Convention’s requirements of participation, subsidiarity, and recognition explicitly linking the landscape agenda with the climate change agenda which has been a very potent force. Some countries, e.g. Sweden, said that they had the political agenda was being pushed through engagement with people at all levels of government, providing funding to local NGOs, bringing landscape and nature protection were easily confused. The English approach of giving effective planning, and even the landscape in a European context.

The involvement of communities was certainly seen as a big issue, but it was important that some notice was taken of their plans and aspirations.

Participation – one significant issue was timing, and an example was given of a local community who worked very hard to research all the issues, but simply were not given sufficient time to make a valid case. Some people pointed that before we could go forward, we should know where we are – a careful review of existing policy documents was necessary, sometimes revising the language to take account of the ELC and the definitions used therein; and the political agendas in Europe.

Workshop 2: Implementation: overcoming challenges and seizing opportunities

Chair: Rapporteur Assistant

The agenda

How useful are ‘toolkits’ in landscape protection, management and planning (e.g. Landscape Character Assessment, capacity analysis)? Do they need further development? Are there some ‘tools’ missing from the ‘kit’?

Is there a tendency to treat landscape as a sectoral activity for one government department? How can we break out of these silos? How is the ELC being implemented through the initiative of the Mediterranean, national parks, regional programmes? Is this still sufficient? Are new statutes, mechanisms necessary?

Are there examples of new
landscape measures or funds which definitely would not have happened without the ELC?

**The discussion**

The principle question addressed was to discuss whether the available tools are really what is needed in order to work with what they work? The question is hampered, of course, by the huge variety of applications and the patchy country coverage and the huge range of possible toolkits from visualisation to websites to the use of the internet.

There was a real need for landscape to become dominated by public concerns as one of the major проблем of the use of landscape and vocabulary in landscape tools when dealing with the public, exhilarated by the fact that many words are in daily use, but without the precision used by specialists.

At the outset of any project clearly defined objectives need to be laid down, and there are several oppositional situations to be addressed. These include whether to use reactive approaches with the public, or the much less used proactive tools. In both cases there is a tendency for the voice of the ‘usual suspects’ to dominate, and majority voices can remain hidden. There is a need for public ownership at every opportunity.

**Promoting landscape as a good**

Cultural change is an issue may help us to move out of disciplinary silos, helping us to move from nebulous ideas to practical realities. Research will need to inform practice, landscape is to become a political good in politicians’ agendas and pragmatic subsidiarity is needed in order to share responsibilities. But there are inevitably some programmes where policy cannot be top down in other sectors that impact positively upon landscape.

RELECTIONS ON THE ELC WORKSHOP

Professor Carys Swanwick

This is a personal overview of the main points arising from the presentations at the workshop. It does not claim to be a summary of what was said but rather seeks to offer a personal reflection on some of the key themes that emerged.

The diversity of Europe’s landscapes and its institutions and approaches was a major theme of the discussions. It was widely recognised as both a strength and a weakness when it comes to finding a common approach to implementing the ELC. We need to approach the common legacies that bind us but also to protect fervently the diversity and distinctiveness that is the core of Europe. The idea of ‘pragmatic subsidiarity’ in decision making perhaps best sums this up.

People and place and the relationship between them is widely recognised as the concept of a landscape that underpins the convention. But which people? It was particularly recognised that urban and rural populations will probably have a very different view of landscape issues and that attitudes will also vary from country to country. Perhaps the clearest message from all the presentations was the need to actively engage different ‘people of landscape’, but we heard relatively little about how to best to achieve this. There is a need for both landscape practitioners and for greater exposure of landscape in the media.

**Politics**

Politics is everywhere playing a part in responses to the ELC and there was a clear sense that many governments are signing and ratifying the convention in the hope or even the belief that they can get away with doing nothing. It is, though all too easy to be pessimistic and we have to remind ourselves that they are that has been made in focusing attention on landscapes in the last twenty years. Despite that there is now a need for a step change in Hong Kong especially, in terms of levels. There is an important role for ‘landscape champions’ who are needed in every government department, every agency and every regional and local authority. But such champions also need to have a common voice and to come together to share their experiences – landscape forums in some countries provide good examples of how to achieve this.

Legislation has an important role in playing in the achieving the aims of the convention. The fragmentation and tends to be rather out of date – still concentrating on protecting the ‘best of’ our landscapes rather than looking after the rest’. While legislation may not be the best way to achieve the aims of the convention there are interesting examples from around the world, such as the relatively new ‘Landscape Law’ which is being introduced in Denmark with a small number of local communities. Thought needs to be given to whether we accept the aims of the convention and thought also to what other mechanisms might encourage regional and local authorities to act.

Expert or public was a key theme in discussions about work to identify and describe landscapes and determine objectives, but of course it does not necessarily have to be one or the other. Ideally there should be a bringing together of both so that each can learn from the other and the sum can be greater than the parts. A new breed of landscape facilitator might be needed to achieve this but there might be an opportunity. Training is needed but this is a highly multidisciplinary area involving many formidable tools and disciplines. So who do we train and how, who trains the trainers; and what nation we persuade people that they need training in the first place?

Finally - the future. Everyone talked of pressures for change in European landscapes and people may respond to change. Most of us are conservative in our views – we want the landscape to stay the way it is now. Landscapes will, however, always change; climatic variation and many other modern drivers of change may be forcing change to happen dramatically in the next 50 years. However, what is needed to move these new landscapes given that is has been said to take at least a generation to develop and then change. We also should not accept that new legislation is the only way to work hard, through the Convention and our various national tools and methods. We also should look to the future landscapes that we want and don’t look with regret to what we have lost.
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Graham Fairclough works for the English Heritage (EH). He is currently head of the EH Characterisation Team responsible for the national Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme and urban equivalents. He has published widely on historic landscape heritage management and ELC issues.

Dr Andrew Gallagher is Chair of the Firth of Clyde Forum and Chair of SSOEI Clyde Pilot Project. She was a landscape architect for many years, first in Glasgow, then in the Scottish Council for National Parks and member of the Loch Lomond and The Trossachs Interim Committee.

Dr. Liz Hughes A geographer by training, Liz’s background has been in both academic and professional areas, variously as a researcher, teacher, development practitioner, university teacher, consultant, and project manager. All of this is related in some way to landscape planning, management or governance, whether in the UK or internationally.

SPEAKER

Margaret McLeanaghan works for the Natural and Renewable Resources Division of the Department of the Environment in Northern Ireland. She is the lead officer of environmental policy and planning for the Department. She has developed expertise in management of natural heritage and has recently been asked to monitor implementation of the ELC in Northern Ireland.

Bob N McNeill studied geology at Edinburgh University graduating in 1977. He worked in the Ministry of Agriculture in 1988 as a mining geologist in Central/Southern Africa. He then joined the Government of the European Community, where he worked in Brussels for 19 years on the development of landscape protection in Northern Ireland. As a Government advisor, Bob N McNeill is currently working as the Chair of the European Rural Development Support Team of the European Commission.

Tim Irwin Tim has an honours degree in Civil Engineering. He led the team responsible for producing the Sustainable Development Strategy for Northern Ireland which was published last year.

Jenny Camp specialised in GIS and rural geography at the University of Malta. She spent most of her professional career working on landscape planning and management. She is currently working for the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) as a Landscape Assessment Officer and is leading the CCW LANDMAP (Wales’s landscape assessment programme) and the implementation of the ELC in Wales.

SPEAKER

Hugh Llewelyn. Currently working as Defra Team Leader, Brand and Communication, North and Ireland, and for them leads on Landscape Conservation Policy and the ELC Board, which is responsible for the implementation of the ELC in Sweden.

SPEAKER

Dr Kazem Tamas Kovacs graduated in 1996 from the University of Pecs, Hungary in Urban Planning "Ion Muncu", Bucharest, he now works as a teacher, lecturer and expert in the Informal Working Group of the Ministry of the Environment for coordination and implementation of the ELC in Norway.

SPEAKER

Audun Moflag works at the Ministry of the Environment and trained as an architect. He has been involved in developing work in spatial planning and planning systems. In particular has been part of the Informal Working Group in the Ministry of the Environment for coordination and implementation of the ELC in Norway.

SPEAKER

Pavilina Misikova Graduated from the University of Comenius, Bratislava, Slovakia with a Masters degree in Environmental Science specialising in Environmental planning and management. She has worked within the Department of the Environment of the Slovak Republic in Bratislava, where she is the advisor to the Ministry of Environment. Pavilina also was an independent environmental consultant involved with projects, the design of territorial systems and ecological stability.

Dr Bas Pedrell is employed at the University of Turin and the University Robert Schuman, Strasbourg. He is director of the provisional executive board of UNISCAP, which works European universities on the implementation of the ELC.

Dr Norman Rigava is an associate professor at the University of Seville. He first studied in his native Spain and then at Yale gained a PhD in studies which include technology and landscape management of landscapes. He is interested in the evaluation of the landscape situation in Spain, and spin-off and research lines for the development of the ELC.

Professor Kenneth R. Olwig was educated in the United States and studied in Denmark and the University of Wisconsin. He holds an MSC degree in Landscape Architecture, Planning and Heritage Management at the University of Amsterdam. Bas is a mining geologist in Central/Southern Africa. He joined the European Commission, where he worked in Brussels for 19 years on the development of landscape protection in Northern Ireland. As a Government advisor, Bob N McNeill is currently working as the Chair of the European Rural Development Support Team of the European Commission.

SPEAKER

Professor Kenneth R. Olwig was educated in the United States and studied in Denmark and the University of Wisconsin. He holds an MSC degree in Landscape Architecture, Planning and Heritage Management at the University of Amsterdam. Bas is a mining geologist in Central/Southern Africa. He joined the European Commission, where he worked in Brussels for 19 years on the development of landscape protection in Northern Ireland. As a Government advisor, Bob N McNeill is currently working as the Chair of the European Rural Development Support Team of the European Commission.

SPEAKER

Professor Adrian Phillips CBE is the Professor of Landscape and Resource Management and was a Director at the International Centre for Protected Areas (ICPAs) and currently holds the Chair of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCW). He has conducted extensive work on historic landscape methods to study the idea of landscape representation of any person.

Professor Dr. Bas Pedroli is a landscape architect whose PhD was in Landscape Planning and Management of Landscapes. He has occupied a leading role in the implementation of the ELC. He is a member of the Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park.

Riccardo Priori is a lawyer in an official role to the Council of Europe. After a first degree he again studied law at the Universita Internazionale degli Studi Sociali of Milan, Italy, where his dissertation was "Landscape Law in relation to regional planning and heritage", and he is currently teaching this "towards a European convention on landscape issues", in concert with the ELC drafting committee. He also lectured at the University of Turin and the University Robert Schuman, Strasbourg. He is director of the provisional executive board of UNISCAP, which works European universities on the implementation of the ELC.

SPEAKER

Dr Pascual Riesco-Chueca is an associate professor at the University of Seville. He first studied in his native Spain and then at Yale gained a PhD in studies which include technology and landscape management of landscapes. He is interested in the evaluation of the landscape situation in Spain, and spin-off and research lines for the development of the ELC.

Laura Sabrina Pelissetti is a teacher, lecturer and expert in the European Centre for Documentation History of Art and Landscape using written texts to study the idea of landscape in Europe.

SPEAKER

Professor Adrián Phillips CBE trained as a landscape architect, geographer and provides the extent to which a policy has an impact on different aspects of the environment and public. He has worked extensively in the field of public policy in the field of landscape in Wales and Scotland.

SPEAKER

Ali Scott is a senior lecturer in the School of Geography and Environment at the University of Manchester. He is currently researching the extent to which a policy has an impact on different aspects of the environment and public. He has worked extensively in the field of public policy in the field of landscape in Wales and Scotland.

SPEAKER

Dr Maggie Roe in editor in waiting for Landscape Research and a board member of the Group, is a senior lecturer at Newcastle University which she joined in 1994 following a year of research at the Graduate School of Design, Harvard University. She has experience on building consensus between the public, voluntary and statutory organisations. She has been a Research Policy Office/Executive Director of the Landscape Research Group since 1989, Maggie is a Director of LRG and recently spoke on their behalf at a conference in Strasbourg on a conference on the implementation of the European Landscape Convention. She is also an advisor to the Heritage Environment Programme and IUCN Heritage and Conservation Programme (HLCP) and chair of the Characterisation Committee of the ELC.

Dr Maggie Roe is an art historian, geographer and planner, who has contributed to and has been an active participant in the implementation of the ELC. She is a member of the Board of Directors of the International Landscape Law Program since 2003-2006 and Head of Research and Access and European Affairs. She is a Member of the Landscape Research Group since 1989, Maggie has contributed to LRG conferences and has written several papers and made presentations in the ELC. She has travelled and worked widely in Europe and has particular interest in the Czech Republic.

SECTION CHAIR

As a Director of the Landscape Research Group and an expertiser to the Council of Europe’s working group on the European Landscape Convention, and is currently advising the Ministry of Agriculture in Romania on the setting up of its National Rural Development Network.

Alister Scott is a senior lecturer in the School of Geography and Environment at the University of Manchester. He is currently researching the extent to which a policy has an impact on different aspects of the environment and public. He has worked extensively in the field of public policy in the field of landscape in Wales and Scotland.

SPEAKER

Dr Maggie Roe in editor in waiting for Landscape Research and a board member of the Group, is a senior lecturer at Newcastle University which she joined in 1994 following a year of research at the Graduate School of Design, Harvard University. She has experience on building consensus between the public, voluntary and statutory organisations. She has been a Research Policy Office/Executive Director of the Landscape Research Group since 1989, Maggie is a Director of LRG and recently spoke on their behalf at a conference in Strasbourg on a conference on the implementation of the European Landscape Convention. She is also an advisor to the Heritage Environment Programme and IUCN Heritage and Conservation Programme (HLCP) and chair of the Characterisation Committee of the ELC.

Dr Maggie Roe is an art historian, geographer and planner, who has contributed to and has been an active participant in the implementation of the ELC. She is a member of the Board of Directors of the International Landscape Law Program since 2003-2006 and Head of Research and Access and European Affairs. She is a Member of the Landscape Research Group since 1989, Maggie has contributed to LRG conferences and has written several papers and made presentations in the ELC. She has travelled and worked widely in Europe and has particular interest in the Czech Republic.
Pere Sala Marti has a Master’s in Environmental Impact Audits and Studies. He has worked as Technical Coordinator for the Catalan Landscape Observatory since 2005. His responsibilities include preparing the Catalonia Landscape Catalogues and he is co-author with Joan Nogué of the guides for their implementation. He is co-author with Arnau Queralt and Pere Torres of the document ‘Challenges of the Implementation by the European Region of the Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment’ (Departamento de Medio Ambiente, 2001).

CONFERENCE CO-ORGANISER Professor Paul Selman joined the Department of Landscape at the University of Sheffield as a Professor of Landscape in October 2004 and became Head of Department in 2005. He has conducted research on the implications of the European Landscape Convention, and on the role of community participation in landscape management. He is the author of a recent book ‘Planning at the Landscape Scale’ published by Routledge, 2006.

Arthur Spiegler is senior vice president of the organisation ECOVAST the European Council for the Village and Small Town which has 14 European national groups. He lives in Vienna.

Nancy Stedman is a board member of LRG and has worked in both landscape conservation and the visual arts. Following a period in private practice, she worked for what was then the Countryside Commission, then moved to the post of Landscape Conservation Officer at the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. She has worked on the mapping and definition of the Countryside Character Areas for the Countryside Agency. She now works as Landscape Advisor for the Yorkshire & Humber region of Natural England, also seconded to Pennine Prospects, the rural regeneration company for the South Pennines.

SESSION CHAIR Professor Carys Swanwick, has been head of the Department of Landscape at the University of Sheffield since 1995. Previously she worked for 23 years as an environmental consultant with Landscape Use Consultants (LUC) where she was a Director of the Company. Originally trained in biology and ecological conservation, Carys has played a leading role in the development of approaches to landscape character assessment over the last two decades. She was also responsible for developing the New Map of England for the Countryside Commission. For the last three years she has been involved in the ‘Countryside Quality Counts’ project to develop indicators of change in countryside character and quality.

SPEAKER Theano Terkenli is an associate professor at the University of the Aegean. She began her academic life studying forestry at the University of Thessaloniki and followed this with an Masters degree in landscape architecture and a PhD in Geography both of these in the United States. She has a particular interest in cultural change, cultural landscapes, the concepts of cultural identity, place and home. She is much involved with the study of tourism. Theano has four books to her credit dealing with her main interests. She was the organiser of the PECRL international conference in Greece 2004. She has published papers in Landscape Research 30/2, Landscape and Urban Planning the Geographical Review and tourism journals both in English and Greek.

Daniel Terrasson studied as an agronomist and forest engineer and is now Senior adviser and Chief Engineer for Rural Engineering, Water and Forestry at the Scientific Direction of CEMAGREF. He began his career in the north of France. He then moved to French Polynesia as responsible of the forest program and of rural development in remote islands. He joined Cemagref, a public research institute in 1985. There he was head of the land management research department from 1994 to 1995, then joined the Direction Scientifique. Since 1998, he has been coordinator of the two national research programmes on landscape launched by the Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development. Daniel’s fields of interest are the relations between sciences and public decision making, and the development of interdisciplinarity in research.

SPEAKER Liga Vodopjanova works in Latvia for the Ministry of Regional Development and Local Governance in long term development. She studied at the University of Agriculture, Latvia, specialising in land use planning. She also studied International Rural Innovation and Development at the Drontheim Professional Agricultural University in the Netherlands. She is now desk officer working on questions of territorial and spatial planning at all levels. Liga has experience in producing GIS based cadastral data and the digital mapping.

Dirk Wascher has a masters degree in Landscape Architecture and works with Bas Pedrol and others at Alterra Green Worlds Research in Wageningen. He takes a particular interest in landscape modelling drawing on GIS and cartography. In 2005 he published a typology of European landscape types, with proposals for the use of cartography and indicators for the assessment of sustainable landscapes.

CO EDITOR OF THIS REPORT Professor Peter Howard, a trustee of LRG for which he is International Officer. He is an English geographer, author of ‘Landscapes: the artists’ vision’ (Routledge 1991) and Visiting Professor of Cultural Landscapes at Bournemouth University. He edited a volume of Landscape Research devoted to issues arising from the Convention, and contributed a piece listing some of the major questions still to be addressed. He has taught widely in Europe. He is on the Scientific Committee of the Research Programme ‘Landscape and Sustainable Development’ of the French Ministry of Ecology run by CEMAGREF.

SENIOR EDITOR OF THIS REPORT Bud Young has been on the board of the Landscape Research Group since 1971, and is creative editor of Landscape Research Extra which he launched in 1988. He studied geology at Oxford and soil at Reading University. He is chair of LRG’s Research and Events committee. He now specialises in airphoto interpretation and digital mapping, and has 16 years of involvement in analysing, mapping and exploiting landscape overseas and 20 years of habitat and land use mapping in England and Wales. He takes a great interest in urban land use. He is particularly interested in communication of clever ideas in accessible language.