



The Need for a Sustainability Strategy for Regional Development Programmes – Using the Example of the Podravje Region in Slovenia

Ana VOVK KORŽE, Ph.D.

Department of Geography, Faculty of Arts, University Maribor, Koroška c. 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia

Abstract. According to statistics, the Podravje region has a critical groundwater balance, polluted soil, agriculture as the predominant activity plays no role within the region. The priorities set in the Regional development programme (RDP) for the Podravje region for the period from 2007 to 2013 relate to economic development, which does not show any liveliness. To determine the sustainable approach of the programme the links between the economic, social, environmental and human capital were explored with the help of the four-capital method and the sustainability flower method. If the priorities that arise from the programme do not fit the situation in the region and if the capitals are not linked to one another, such a document cannot work. This was proven by the analysis of the regional programme for the Podravje region that showed that movement towards a sustainability strategy is hardly noticeable.

Keywords: biodiversity, environmental approach, sustainability strategy, Podravje region, 4-capital method;

1. Introduction

In the beginning of the 21st century the human society struggles with economic, social and environmental problems on a global, regional and local scale. Until now these kinds of problems were not known to such an extent, nor with such unpredictability and such impacts. For many years the anthropogenic starting point was the predominant factor within the relationship between human and nature. Human intervention in nature in such a selfish manner is reflected in the degradation, devastation and shrinking of the natural environment. To prevent such future procedures and to enhance the survival chances of humankind, plants and animals the main attention when planning activities

should be shifted from humankind to nature. Such a perspective requires a change of mindset, because it is necessary to withdraw some of the previous practices and introduce new ones that are different, more reasonable and in compliance with the surrounding nature. According to Jax (2008) the sustainability studies on scientific levels are not based on practice.

Classical development models are based on linear and quality-oriented economic growth and cannot be applied on local, regional or global scale because it is proven that they do not contribute to the prosperity of mankind nor to the maintenance of balance in nature. Quite the contrary, during the crisis the classical development model failed as well because it is not even able to ensure a onesided increase of material welfare and because it only partially considers environmental and social issues. We daily receive warnings about climate changes and how we should immediately start with the adaptation of regional and local programmes and measures. Krotscheck (2007) displayed the importance of links between different issues in regions and the significance of integral studies in regions.

The important question today is if regional development plans are aimed towards sustainability. At first the research question was: how to measure sustainability in programmes? For valuing the quality of measures we used two methods: the 4-capital method and the sustainability flower method. We presumed that the sustainability strategy for regional development plans should connect different levels of sustainability (social, economic and environmental level). With the help of quantitative analysis of the capitals (also human capital) sustainability should be integrated into regional development plans from the start.

2. Methodology

The method is very simple. It was proposed by the green English economist Paul Ekins (2003) and is based on the well-known technique of environmental impact assessment and the later advanced method of strategic environmental testing

which is already a part of the common acquis of the European Community. The method proposes the division of development problems and measures into four groups: those that include the economic capital, the social capital, the human capital and the nature capital. Each type of capital is described with two (or three) indicators that are typical for the region. Afterwards we will evaluate the implementation of measures from the Regional Development Plan (RDP) based on how they meet the set criteria. In addition, the presentation of the 4-capital method by Radej (2009) was adopted.

The economic capital is defined with the gross domestic product per capita and the investment indicator. The social capital is defined with the unemployment and the migration indicator. The human capital is measured with the student index (number of students compared with the total population) and the ageing index of the population. The nature capital is defined by the dynamic of the environmental expenditure and the biodiversity instead of the dynamic of connections to the municipal waste treatment facilities (Dunphy, Spellman, 2009). Because of the pollution biodiversity is most endangered. The connection to municipal facilities is funded by the EU and is not the real environmental concern. The selection of indicators was based on the project SRDTOOLS (Radej, 2000). For the evaluation of the sustainable development the selection of some ideal indicators (input-information) is not that important, more important is the simultaneous application of several different indicators, such as the economic, social and other indicators.

Until now a number of different measuring techniques for measuring changes and assessing the situation of different capitals have been suggested. The theoretical basis for this has been established by Solow, Markandy, Pearce and Atkinson. The World Bank suggested a method for stock assessment (funds) of the capital and a method/indicator for the assessment of changes of long-term funds (stock) of capital (Hartwick, Hamilton), also known under the name real Sparindex, which is regularly published in the UNDP reports about world development (The World Development Indicators). These valuation methods provide the most conclusive results expressed in monetary changes (or in

percentage of the GDP). The problem is that not everything is convertible into money, because valuable information about the non-monetary sides of the occurrences are lost or are even deliberately ignored. On the other hand there are capital changes that cannot be determined with monetary units and cannot be merged, for example indicators of water quality, unemployment, public debt; that is why the results of such evaluations are often very scattered and it is very hard to draw synthesis conclusion, on which developers and planners can rely (Ekins, Medhurst, 2003). The middle path among the methods, which enable a total (economic) comparability but leave out many other aspects, and techniques, which do not provide comparable results, are “Quality”-valuation techniques. They are particularly appropriate for the research of occurrences that are defined by quality, for example sustainable development or quality of living - when the usual quantitative instruments do not operate (Rozman, 2008).

Methodologists who are aware of the advantages and disadvantages of different techniques mostly prefer “qualitative” assessments, where the occurrences are not measured but characterised, for example: impacts (impacts on capitals) are described as positive or negative - like environmental risk assessments or strategic risk assessments. Ekins (2003) established his model on the base of these methodologies, which are already used in the field of green economics. Each specific measures of the Regional Development Plan (RDP) can have a positive, negative, mixed or neutral impact on each of the four capitals.

The impacts of the implementation of each measure are defined with the help of evaluations carried out by experts, but can also be acquired with studies (for example: Cost-benefit-method, impact assessment - e.g. UVP) or within a deeper participative procedure, where development partner cooperate or maybe even involve the public with a survey. How to acquire the evaluation of impacts depends on the resources that are available for this kind of assessment. An important step towards cohesion within the programme would be reached if the stakeholders brought such fast self-assessments closer together (at a moderated workshop organised for this purpose).

First we will present the synthesis results of the RDP priority structure, then a matrix by all four capitals. At the end the results of the RDP evaluation by capitals are analysed, which helps us to answer the question if the RDP meets the regional needs that are defined in the programme.

All mentioned impacts from the tables are totalised by rows, which means that for each minus or +/- a plus is withdrawn from the further summing and at the end the pluses are added up as following: e.g. for three pluses within the matrix body a plus in the marginal totals is awarded, which means: a "*weak positive impact*" of the specific measure on the sustainable development in the region; for four pluses two pluses are awarded (which means: a "*positive impact*" of the specific measure on the sustainable development in the region) and for five or more pluses three pluses are awarded (which means: a "*strong positive impact*" on the sustainable development in the region). This way the rows are totalised. The columns have to be totalised in a different way, this depends on the total number of measures - priorities with more measures have to be evaluated positively in more cases to gain the same number of pluses by column than priorities with fewer measures.

The impacts of the implementation of each measure on the individual capital are listed in their columns totals and are an average value for the evaluation of measure impacts on two previous chosen criteria or indicators that illustrate the main problem areas of the regional development of each capital.

3. Results

3.1 Analysis of the Regional Development Plan (RDP) for the Podravje region

The municipalities are not cooperating well when it comes to planning activities within the Mariborska razvojna agencija - MRA (Agency for development of the city Maribor). The starting point of the planned activities is the allotted sum of money for the individual communities and the interests of the mayor or a small circle of people. Therefore the planning of activities is limited to a 4-year mandate and to externally visible results (bigger sewage treatment plants with no regards to the economic viability and roads as proof for the local development).

What are missing are overriding contents which would connect different municipalities with similar interests and problems.

The Regional Development Plan (RDP) for the Podravje region for the period from 2007 to 2013 is based on 3 priorities, 14 programmes and 44 measures. The programme creator was the Mariborska razvojna agencija - MRA (Agency for development of the city Maribor) with its associates. The programme was prepared in 2007. We will introduce the three priorities that are supposed to ensure the progress in the region by 2013 (the previous RDP for 2004-2007 was not realized, the situation in the region regarding environment, population and economic circumstances worsened). That is why a sustainable approach is the key issue for the RDP from 2007 to 2013.

The RDP development priorities for the Podravje region for the period from 2007 to 2013 are the following: (P – Priority):

P1 Coherent, successful and visible region

P2 Entrepreneurship, competitiveness and knowledge for a faster development

P3 Consistent and sustainable development

When evaluating the RDP for the Podravje region the 4-capital method, which is described in the methodological chapter, was used. The first RDP priority refers to the cohesion, success and visibility of the region that can be reached with local policies and with the following measures: promotion of regional partnerships, strengthening of NGOs and active involvement of local population.

To evaluate the impact of a specific measure on a specific capital the following **legend** was used:

+ positive impact

- negative impact

+/- mixed impact

0 neutral impact

The overall evaluation by rows: the +/- points are totalised by row and for each -, 0 or +/-, a + will be withdrawn. For:

- a) 3 plus points an **overall + will be awarded**, which means: **overall weak positive impact** of a specific measure on the sustainable development in the region
- b) 4 plus points **two ++ will be awarded**, which mean: **overall positive impact** of a specific measure on the sustainable development in the region
- c) 5 or more plus points **three +++ will be awarded** and that means: that the specific measure has a **strong positive impact** on the sustainable development in the region.

Evaluation by columns (Table 1): depends on the number of measures, the priorities with more measures have to be positively assessed more times to have the same number of positive points by column than priorities with a smaller impact range.

Such an evaluation procedure is of help when evaluating occurrences which content is little known and their exact impact can not well measurable.

Tab. 1. Evaluation of sustainable impacts of the first GDP priority. P1 Coherent, successful and visible region

Priority	Measure	Economic	capital	Human	capital	Social	capital	Nature	capital	Total
P1		GDP growth /per capita	Invest.-growth	Students/Pop.	Ageing index	% unemployed	Migration index	Environm. expenditure	Biodiversity	
	Promotion of development partnerships	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+
	Strengthening of NGOs	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+/0
	Active involvement of local population	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	++
	Total	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	
Total		+		+		0		+		+

The first measure for a coherent, successful and visible region (promotion of development partnerships) would have a positive impact on the GDP growth/per capita, because the associated companies could produce more. Consequently, this would lead to an investment growth, which would mean an increased number of students and a positive impact on the number of elderly people (the number would decrease). An increased number of young people would increase the need for employment. The impact on the unemployed would be mixed, the need of jobs that the region does not offer would increase. Emigration would be intensified because there would not be enough jobs for everyone in the native region. Development partnerships would probably increase the environmental expenditure but this would have a negative impact on the biodiversity. From the viewpoint of sustainable regional development the implementation of the first RDP priority would have a weak positive impact in total. Among the three listed measures the promotion and involvement of the local population has the best effect, a positive impact in total. The strengthening of NGOs is of no particular importance for a more successful and visible region. This means that coherent, visible and successful regions cannot only be built on specific measures and measures that have a positive impact on the social and human capital are needed.

The second RDP priority is entrepreneurship, competitiveness and knowledge for a faster development (Table 2). We will present the evaluation of priorities regarding the proposed measures which aim is to connect capitals to reach sustainability.

Tab. 2. Evaluation of sustainable impacts of the second RDP priority - P2
Entrepreneurship, competitiveness and knowledge for a faster development

Priorities	Measures	Economic	capital	Human	capital	Social	capital	Nature	capital	Total
P2		GDP- growth/per capita	Invest. growth	Students/ popul.	Ageing index	% unemployed	Migration index	Environm.expe nditure	Biodiversity	
	Development of a supporting environment for new and young entrepreneurs	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	-	+0
	Supporting companies	+	0	+/-	0	+	+/-	0	-	0/-
	Implementation of supporting services for competitiveness	+	0	0	0	+/-	+	-	-	0/-
	Strengthening of the human capital	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	-	0
	Equipping properties for zones and investments	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	0
	Excellent achievements in research and studies	+/-	0	+	0	+	-	0	0	0/-
	Higher competitiveness of companies	+	+	0	+	+	-	-	-	+0
	Promotion of investments in human resources	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
	Promotion for employed	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0
	Equalizing the quality of supply and demand on the market	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
	Promotion of integration of young people in the job market	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
	Creating new jobs	+/-	0	-/+	0	+	+	0	-	0
	Development of tourist locations	+	+	0	0	+	+	-	-	0
	Development of aggregate tourism products	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
	Promotion of high-quality tourism and sports infrastructure	0	+	+	+	0	+	-	-	0
	Modernisation of agriculture and forestry	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0/-
	Upgrading and renewal of basic infrastructure	0	0	+/-	0	0	+/-	-	-	0/-
	Promotion of entrepreneurship in agricultural areas	+	0	0	+	+	+	-	-	0
	Further training	0	0	0	+	+	-/+	+	+	0
	Promotion of environmentally friendly agriculture	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0
	Overall marketing strategy	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	0	0/+	+/-	-	-	0
		0		0	0	0/+		-		0

The evaluation of measures for the sustainability attainment shows a weak connection between different capitals because the measures are very sectoral. Measures for promotion of social entrepreneurship, development of public transportation, revitalisation of town and village centres, expansion of cultural events and development and revitalisation of urban centres are higher ranked because they have a very positive impact on the sustainability of the region (Table 4). The overall evaluation is poor because of the other measures.

Tab. 4. Overall evaluation of all three priorities in regard to the links between the capitals (subsystems)

Priorities	Measures	Economic capital		Human capital		Social capital		Nature capital		Total
		GDP-growth./per capita	Invest.-growth	Students/Pop.	Ageing index	% unemployed	Migration index	Environ. expenditure	Biodiversity	
P1	<i>Total</i>	0	0	0	0	0/+	+/-	-	-	0
P2	<i>Total</i>	0	0	0	0	0/+	+/-	-	-	0
P3	<i>Total</i>	0	0/+	0	0	0	0	0	+/0	0
	<i>Total</i>	0	0/+	0	0	0	+/0	0	0	0

The evaluation results show a bad situation, the priorities do not connect the different types of capitals. The measures have a negligible effect on the sustainable development in the region. The result zero means that the measures are very sectoral and not well connected to the other measures in the region.

The whole RDP for the Podravje region has no effect on the sustainable development of the region. This is the result of sectoral-oriented measures which are not linked to one another. Such measures satisfy the direct interests and that is why their multiplicative strength for the region is non-existent. These connections and compliances are measured with the 4-capital method. When looking at the effect of the results we can see (vertical columns) that the RDP for Podravje has no effect on the sustainable development of the Podravje region.

Obviously the RDP's aim is not to change the long-lasting negative trends in the region.

Projects that produce more jobs with relatively low investments would have the precedence in sustainable planned programmes. It must be taken into account that the Podravje region does not own the programme, staffing and organisational strength to even elaborate an ambitious development programme for human capital within one or two years. For example, education is treated separately without any connection to the other components (Green, 2012). Many sections, like quality of life, are not even contained in the programme.

Evaluation of the RDP sustainability plan using the sustainability flower method

To review the RDP sustainability plan from a different angle we will use the sustainability flower method. The measures and their impact on economy, environment, society and social matters and ethical issues are evaluated based on the criteria of this method. Measures related to quality represent a special category. The method is described in the "Methodology" chapter.

Legend:

- 1 measure has a negative impact
- 0 measure has no impact
- +1 measure has a positive impact

The overall evaluation of each measure is the count of plus and minus points within the individual criteria (Table 5). The result shows the individual impact (rows) and the total impact (columns) of each measure on the chosen criteria (economy, environment, society and social matters, ethical ratio).

Tab. 5. Evaluation criteria for the measures set in the RDP for Podravje based on the sustainability flower

	CRITERIA			
1	Economy – measures	-1	0	+1
1.1	Support regional economic flow		+	
1.2	Promote high-quality jobs	+		
1.3	Promote co-operational processes in companies and social quality	+		
1.4	Focus on innovative products and procedures	+		
1.5	Promote attractiveness and innovative environment	+		
1.6	Contribute to the consumption reduction of rare natural sources	+		
1.7	Improve the financial situation of public and private economic activities (firms)	+		
1.8	Minimize the material flow	+		
	Total of minus and plus points - 6	7	1	0

2.	Environment - measures	-1	0	+1
2.1	Promote natural and near-natural elements in settlements		+	
2.2	Reduce space consumption or land settlement		+	
2.3	Reduce pollutants in air, water and soil	+		
2.4	Reduce noise	+		
2.5	Reduce consumption of non-renewable energy sources	+		
2.6	Reduce consumption of non-renewable resources, boosting the material flow	+		
2.7	Promote biodiversity in the biosphere	+		
2.8	Promote eco-friendly means of transport and reduction of excessive mobility		+	
	Total of minus and plus points - 5	5	3	0

3.	Society and social matters - measures	-1	0	+1
3.1	Ensure material security	+		
3.2	Ensure communication and cooperation of people			+
3.3	Promote quality of living and life		+	

3.4	Promote education and offers for the whole population		+	
3.5	Increase personal sense of responsibility (in terms of sustainability)	+		
3.6	Promote of cultural, social and regional identity		+	
3.7	Ensure health care and promoting healthy living		+	
3.8	Promote of feeling of security	+		
	Total of minus and plus points -2	3	4	1

Ethical basis

1	Group equality	-1	0	+1
1.1	Promote social cohesion		+	
1.2	Promote material equality	+		
1.3	Promote bonding between integrated groups	+		
1.4	Promote gender equality			+
2	Promote equality between regions			
2.1	No support for disadvantaged neighbouring regions			+
2.2	No support for other disadvantaged regions			+
2.3	Support neighbouring regions with changes in structure		+	
2.4	Support neighbouring and poor regions			+
3	Promote generation equality			
3.1	Reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy sources	+		
3.2	Reduce public and private debts	+		
3.3	Consider children		+	
3.4	Discuss about spreading the vision of sustainability	+		
	Total	- 2	5	3

Quality of measures:

1	Forms of partnership	-2		
1.1	Transparent with collaboration opportunity	+		
1.2	Poorly or barely organised interests			+
1.3	Results-oriented and targeted discussion	+		
2	Connection forms	-3		
2.1	Dialog and cooperation between different groups	+		
2.2	Balancing between people and different interests	+		

2.3	Obtainment and replacement of media information	+		
3	Subsidiarity between different levels	-3		
3.1	Clearly defined components on different levels	+		
3.2	Organisational freedom in different fields of activity	+		
3.3	Support of different fields of activity	+		
4	Diversity between different approaches	-3		
4.1	Equality between private and public institutions	+		
4.2	Combination of different procedures	+		
4.3	Combination of different perceptions and cultures	+		
	Total	- 11		

The evaluation of the quality of measures based on the connection form, the subsidiarity between different levels and diversity between different approaches related to the RDP shows a poor image, because the evaluation result is negative. It seems that the quality of the measures is the basis for the implementation possibilities. The quality of the measures can be improved with other programme and measure approaches which should evolve from specific local characteristics and links between measures (Table 6).

Tab. 6. Overall evaluation of the sustainability strategy of the RDP for Podravje.

	Total value of minus and plus points	-1	0	1	
1	Economy – measures	-6	-7	1	0
2	Environment – measures	-5	-5	3	0
3	Society and social matters - measures	-2	-3	4	1
4	Ethical basis	-2	-5	4	3

The Regional Development Programme of the Podravje region is written in a very classical manner without considering sustainability as the basis for the development in the region. There is still a big difference between sustainable development and economy, the economic development is still playing the leading role without considering the environment. From the ecological point of view the RDP for Podravje deals with nature and environment only theoretically, actually the priorities are not based on the sustainability of nature. This is evident from

the measures package that is based on the increase of agricultural production that will result in an even worse groundwater and soil quality. That is why the RDP should be changed.

4. Conclusion

In our opinion this programme is a “classical development programme”, which does not consider the ecological characteristics of nature and environment and will therefore not come to life. Also the occurrences in 2009 are not visible yet, rather the other way around, because the situation worsened heavily in the economic, social and environmental field. The situation in the region is deteriorating, therefore it is legitimate to say that a programme like RDP for the Podravje region needs to be changed immediately and the ecological conceptualised possibilities have to become the priorities. Thereby the development towards sustainability is very important (Train to LA 21, 2008).

For the creation of a sustainability strategy an essential change within the preparation process of the RDP is necessary (Vovk Korže, 2013).

Sustainability concept for the RDP
<p>Stage 1: PROCESS PREPARATION FOR A SUSTAINABILITY CONCEPT FOR THE RDP</p> <p>The RDP for Podravje should be created in cooperation with municipalities, local important people should be involved. The programme should involve associations, local decision makers and interested public.</p> <p>The supporting network consisting of providers, developers, multipliers and sponsors should be developed. The public should be informed about the RDP during the development phase. Organisations like faculties, institutes and public characters should get involved with research programmes and ideas and suggestions of people should be considered at all times.</p> <p>Projects and measures should be adapted to the existing situation and the characteristics of the ecosystem should be considered. It is evident that the Podravje region has mostly agricultural ecosystems, which should be</p>

improved because they are polluted (this is already the case with groundwater protection - it is being improved with bioremediation on a large water protection area. This was not a part of the RDP.). Also attention should be paid to the pollution with nitrogen and pesticides because it causes the groundwater pollution.

- The vision should be based on an ecological approach. Therefore it should be professionalised and put into a formal form by interested people from the municipalities within the Podravje region, committed people and like-minded persons in a given timeframe. The circle should constantly be broadened (establishment of a regional organisation), a consensus about the main goals, the joint vision and the fundamental points within the strategy should be reached. The municipalities should cooperate.

This process is now missing, it was never planned nor implemented.

Stage II – PROCESS MAPPING

SUSTAINABLY DESIGNED PROCESS RA21

a) REGIONAL ANALYSIS

Analysis of the regional situation, the potentials and social prerequisites

The aims and activities within the regional strategy should be set on the basis of the analysis of the existing situation and the potentials. The regional situation is presented in RDP for 2007-2013, but will not be considered during the further planning of activities. It is obvious that the Podravje region has big problems with the polluted groundwater and soil and the emigration of predominantly young people. The aims, summarized in the three priorities mentioned above, do not reflect the situation in the region and do not arise from aims that shall improve the situation. Therefore the vision for the Podravje region (to be competitive and visible) is not right. Such pretentious visions do not contribute much.

Therefore the list of priority measures is set sectorally tight, which means that the Podravje RDP is more of a wish list than a document, that was set

up, wished for and implemented by people.

Stage 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF MEASURES AND PROJECTS

This stage should now (end of 2009) be evident in the Podravje RDP, but the projects that are set in the RDP are not being implemented.

Stage 4: PROJECT EVALUATION OF A SUSTAINABLY DESIGNED DEVELOPMENT

If in 2013 an assessment of the results of RDP is made, it will be necessary to pay attention to the points of criticism which, we assume, will be referring to the inconsistency, non-coherency and incorrectly set priorities of the Podravje RDP.

Ensuring the project's sustainability is only possible if this is based on a realistic situation in the Region and if all activities are set to aim towards the same goal - ensuring sustainability.

References

- [1] Ekins, P., Medhurst, J., (2003): The Contribution Of The European Structural Funds to Sustainable Development; presented at the 5th European Conference on Evaluation of Structural funds, Budapest, 26-27.6.2003. Online, available at: URL:http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado_en.htm
- [2] Dunphy, A., Spellman, G. (2009). Geography fieldwork, fieldwork value and learning styles. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education* 18:1, 19-28. DOI:10.1080/10382040802591522.
- [3] Green, M. (2012). Place, Sustainability and Literacy in Environmental Education: Frameworks for Teaching and Learning. *RIGEO Review of International Geographical Education* Online ISBN: 2146-0353, p. 326-346.
- [4] Jax, K. (2008): Possibilities and limitations in the implementation of the Ecosystem Approach: a case study from southern Chile. UFZ-Environmental Research Centre Leipzig-Halle. Department of Conservation Biology, Permoserstr. 15, D-04318 Leipzig, Germany).
- [5] Krotscheck, C. (2007): Politik der Inwertsetzung. 12 Entscheidungen zur Überwindung der Zuvielisation. BVR Verlag, Auersbach, Austria, 104 pp.
- [6] Radej, B. (2009): Drugotni razvoj. Spremná beseda k prevodu dela Serge Latouche, »Preživeti razvoj – Od dekolonizacije ekonomskega imaginarija do gradnje alternativne družbe« (Survivre au développement. De la décolonisation de l'imaginaire économique à la construction d'une société alternative, Editions Mille et une nuits, Pariz, 2004, Založba /cf*, prevedla Katarina Rutar). Ljubljana.
- [7] Radej, B. (2000): Ukradena blaginja, Revija 2000, št. 208-210, maj 2009, Ljubljana, str. 14-33, <http://www.sdeval.si/Objave/Ukradena-blaginja-Komentarji.html>.
- [8] Regionalni razvojni programi statističnih regij (2007): Regionalni razvojni program za Podravsko razvojno regijo 2007 – 2013.
- [9] Rozman, R. (2008): Ekološke sledi kot pomemben element geografskih zasnov za pripravo lokalnega programa varstva okolja. Dela 30, str. 51 – 66.
- [8] Train to LA 21, 2008. Training the Facilitators for Local Agenda 21 Implementation, 2008. Train to LA 21. www.traintola21.org
- [10] Vovk Korže, A. (2013): Innovative approach to education on current environmental problems: some case studies. *Gamtamokslinis ugdymas*, ISSN 1648-939X, 2013, nr. 1 (36), p. 35-40.