

Jörg Stadelbauer

**INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND REGIONAL
PLANNING IN RURAL AREAS**

Йорг Штаделбауер

**ИНТЕГРИРОВАННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ РЕЧНЫМИ
БАССЕЙНАМИ И РЕГИОНАЛЬНОГО ПЛАНИРОВАНИЯ В СЕЛЬСКИХ
МЕСТНОСТЯХ**

Йорг Штаделбауер

**ДАРЫЯ АЛАБЫН ИНТЕГРАЛДЫК БАШКАРУУ ЖАНА АЙЫЛ ЖЕРЛЕРИНДЕ
РЕГИОНАЛДЫК ПЛАНДАШТЫРУУ**

УДК: 911.5/.9

The paper compares the concept of Integrated Rural Development (IRD) with the concept of Integrated Watershed Management (IWSM). IRD shows a more intensive approach of regional planning in rural areas because it includes the analysis of regional structures, of strengths and of weaknesses and is based on intensive interaction and communication between stakeholders and population.

Key words: *integrated Watershed Management, Integrated Rural Development, communication, governance, regional planning, Germany.*

В статье сравнивается концепции комплексного развития сельских районов с концепцией интегрированного управления речного бассейна. IRD показывает более интенсивную подход регионального планирования в сельских районах, потому что она включает в себя анализ региональных структур, сильных и слабых сторон и на основе интенсивного взаимодействия и общения между заинтересованными сторонами и населением.

Ключевые слова: *интегрированное управление речными бассейнами, комплексного развития сельских районов, связи, управления, регионального планирования, Германия.*

Макалада айыл жерлеринин комплекстүү өнүгүү концепциясы дарыя алабын комплекстүү башкаруу концепциясы менен салыштырылып каралат. Айыл жерлеринин комплекстүү өнүгүү концепциясы айыл жерлериндеги регионалдык пландаштырууда интенсивдүү ыкма экендигин көрсөтүп турат. Себеби ал өзүнө регионалдык түзүлүштүн анализин, күчтүү жана алсыз тараптарды жана кызыкдар тарап менен калктын ортосундагы интенсивдүү байланыш жана пикир алмашуусун камтыйт.

Негизги сөздөр: *дарыя алабын комплекстүү башкаруу, айыл жерлеринин комплекстүү өнүгүүсү, байланыш, башкаруу, регионалдык пландаштыруу, Германия.*

Introduction: Integrated Watershed Management and Integrated Rural Development.

Integrated Watershed Management is understood as a resource-oriented approach to regional development. The concept has mainly been used as a tool in arid or less developed countries where the complex approach of integrated rural development seems to be less appropriate (Ffolliott et al. 2003). In the centre of Integrated Watershed Management stands the coordinated and sustainable use of natural resources like water, soil, vegetation within an area which is

delimited by watersheds and, thus, presents itself as a spatial unit. The leading idea is that all planning measures should consider this spatial unit as basis for interactions between political, social and economic actors because the natural resources can be seen in systemic interrelationship of the natural spheres with the social and economic sphere. The sustainable use of water is the main driving force, above all in regions where agriculture is based on irrigation. Therefore IWM has also been the fundamental idea for the study of resource use in Central Asia, namely in the Ükök catchment area of the Kochkor rayon of Central Kyrgyzstan (Rost 2014).

In Central Europe, where irrigation plays a minor role, the planning concept of integrated rural development (IRD) is comparable, but it also shows significant differences. It is the aim of the paper to introduce this concept and to compare it in some points to the concept of Integrated Watershed Management.

Integrated Rural Development.

Let me first explain the main principles of integrated rural development. They include (Grabski-Kieron 2011: 835)

- in the **sphere of objectives**: strategic concepts and the formulation of leading aims which ask for certain measures and therefore are organised in projects with participation of all actors;
- in the **factual sphere** a preparation by an analysis of strengths and weaknesses for all regional potentials like labour market, economy, culture, environment followed by sector-based planning efforts;
- in the **spatial context** a concrete delimitation of the area concerned for which an analysis of supply and demand must be undertaken;
- in the **sphere of interaction and communication** a high degree of participation of the population as well as coordination and cooperation of public and private actors;
- in a **methodological sphere** instruments like steering, dialog, management of financing and realisation, continuous monitoring and feedback by the control of success;

- in regard to the **sphere of time** a continuous adjustment of measures and a rapid implementation of measures for the realisation of projects;

- and finally, in a **political sphere** a permanent coordination between stakeholders about priorities and planning instruments to be used.

Of course, all these spheres are connected to each other.

Some remarks to these different spheres; the construction of a road may serve illustrative example:

Objectives: It is trivial that you cannot plan anything without having an idea of the consequences of the planning and the probable future of the region in which you are planning. As it is nearly impossible to work in a holistic way and to foresee all needed measures and all consequences of their implementation at once, plans are formulated in different projects. An example: The general objective of fair accessibility of all settlements will result in a regional traffic plan which at first ranks the roads according to their inner- and interregional significance, the economic demand for exchange of enterprises in the area, the number of inhabitants in the settlements and other criteria. Afterwards, the traffic plan proposes separate projects of road construction which can be realized one after the other according to the means disposable at that time.

This planning has to consider different **facts:** strengths and weaknesses of the region can be analyzed by a SWOT-analysis which also regards opportunities (like already existing routes or the demand for cash crops on a larger market) and threats (like a high risk of avalanches and mudflows or changes in the international commodity markets). It also considers the real need for roads and the best routes. If sustainability is among the general aims, the factual planning will not try to connect each settlement with all others in the planning region, but work with a hierarchy of ways according to the significance of different connections and settlements.

Spatial level: Regional planning is always undertaken for a certain **area** which should be delimited clearly. This can be – like in Integrated Watershed Management – a river catchment area or an administrative unit like a *rayon* or a group of settlements or places like the basin of the Song köl. Of course, the planning has to consider the connections to the neighbouring regions. There can be no doubt that in many cases the delimitation of the region concerned is a political issue. The administrative delimitation is based on the distribution of population and settlements, but the allocation of a settlement to an administrative unit is also the result of political discussions. The watershed principle offers a kind of delimitation which seems to avoid political backgrounds, but it normally is suitable only for the secondary and tertiary network of roads in the subdivision of larger regions.

Interaction and communication: The concept of IRD is a bottom-up approach. It follows the principles of participation of the population involved, organizes group discussions and allows the formulation of diverging

opinions. It is more suggesting than regulating. From the side of planning institutions, details of the planning purposes and the planning process are published in adequate time so that everybody is informed and can form his or her opinion. Information, participation and cooperation are fundamental aspects of IRD. And I lay stress on the gender aspects: Interaction and communication are not restricted to the men or the *aqsaqal*, but include women with equal rights in decision-making processes. Interaction and communication is also necessary between public and private actors. In the context of a liberal economy public-private partnership is a suitable model for many projects, also in the sphere of traffic. So, a big enterprise can take over the costs for the construction of a road and levies a small road toll from other vehicles – but only with an amount which does not hinder the general use of the road.

The planning of IRD needs a large set of **planning methods**. They include moderation and mediation in the preliminary stages, during group discussions and in the consensus finding process. The dialogue between all stakeholders and the people concerned is the basis of mutual confidence and acceptance. But this is only on step on the way to the realization of a project. Others are the management of financing, the control of the implementation of all measures and a continuous monitoring of the effects. The planning of roads includes determination of a suitable route, discussions with the people affected, coordination with other planning sectors like water and waste water management, landscape protection, then the organization of construction work, the opening of the new road, but also continuous monitoring for in-time repair works.

It becomes obvious that the use of such planning methods must consider the **time** to have a certain ranking and order of measures. When a decision is made the realization should follow within a short period of time. Unfortunately there are imponderables which hinder such an ideal operation: If the attempted construction of a road affects private land property expropriation is possible but in Germany it needs a juridical process. Therefore in the daily reality even small projects need years until they come to an end.

There fore a significant part of planning is **politics**. It includes all levels of decision-making and realization from the inhabitant to the law-maker in the parliament. Every inhabitant is respected as *zoon politikon* or as actor, but he has also to acknowledge the decision of majorities. Every elected representative in the regional and local parliaments or assemblies is responsible in respect to the facts, to the laws, but also to his or her electorate. This makes planning to a very complicated process of mutual negotiation between political actors.

Four-level philosophy behind.

The different spheres forming together the IRD may also be seen as a five level context. It comprises

- the leading ideas (“model of sustainable development”, “higher competitiveness of the region in favour of the welfare of its population”) and politics

- the concrete planning idea (“functionally adequate road network”) and policy of realization
- discussing, negotiating, deliberating (“decision-making for single projects”)
- action (“construction work”)
- ideas in practical use and corrections (“establish better traffic connections”)

Furthermore, one should always have in mind that the planning of some roads is only one sector of an integrated rural planning and development process.

Integrated Rural Development in the context of territorial planning in Germany.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, IRD belongs to the action field of territorial planning which developed fifty years ago after first initiatives going back to the 1920ies (cf. Blotevogel 2011). In 1965, the first federal law for territorial planning (“Bundes raumordnungs gesetz” – BROG; Federal Spatial Planning Act) came into existence as a framework law. Due to the federal system of Germany, every state can formulate its own planning law, but because there are general tasks for the whole territory of the Federation like energy supply, far distance transportation, defence etc., framework legislation has to care for the compatibility of the legislation of the states. I do not want to trace the history of territorial planning in detail. The framework law has been altered several times, the leading principles changed from the accentuation of equivalent living conditions to sustainable development. After a period of functional thinking in the 1960ies and 1970ies, some fundamental ideas of territorial planning lost their significance in the 1980ies. They experienced a certain revival after the German reunification in 1990, but the turn from top-down to bottom-up planning forced the implementation of participatory planning methods, the integration of larger numbers of stakeholders and an emphasis on public-private partnership.

Today, recommendation instead of regulation, governance instead of government, participation instead of authoritative decision-making is the dominating principle. Not rarely, it is spoken of informal planning; this does not mean a planning without taking into consideration the legal foundations of planning, but it is a process were communication and interaction between

public and private partners plays a predominant role. In the discussions concepts of regional development normally have the meaning of proposals without liability, sometimes even without clear delimitation of the area for which these proposals are made. It is only in the projects where the spatial aspect has to be considered.

Conclusion.

It is obvious that IRD is a concept of territorial planning which does not contrast with integrated watershed management. Whereas IWM starts from a sustainable use of natural resources, IRD offers a set of conceptual and methodological instruments. However, IRD is more flexible and includes the rural population by participation. It lays special stress of intense communication between all people involved in the planning and development process. Hopefully, the planned road can be built when the financing problem is solved and all local residents agree to better transport links.

References

1. Blotevogel, H. H., B. Schelhaas (2011): Geschichte der Raumordnung. – In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung [ed.]: Grundriss der Raumordnung und Raumentwicklung. Hannover, pp. 75-201
2. Ffolliott, P. F., M.B. Baker Jr., A. Tecele, D. G. Neary (2003): A Watershed Management Approach to Land Stewardship. – In: Journal of the Arizona-Nevada Academy of Science 35 (1), pp. 1-4
3. Goppel, K. (2011): Programme, Pläne und Verfahren der Raumplanung. – In: Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung [Hg.]: Grundriss der Raumordnung und Raumentwicklung. Hannover, pp. 435-498
4. Grabski-Kieron, U. (2011): Geographie und Planung ländlicher Räume in Mitteleuropa. – In: Gebhardt, H., R. Glaser, U. Radtke, P. Reuber [eds.]: Geographie: Physische Geographie und Humangeographie, 2. Aufl., Heidelberg, pp. 820-837
5. Rost, T. (2014): Einrichtung von Masterstudiengängen als Capacity Building-Maßnahme für eine nachhaltige Wasser- und Naturressourcennutzung in Zentralasien. – In: Schmidt, M. [ed.]: Aktuelle Forschungen zu den Mensch-Umwelt-Verhältnissen in Kirgistan. Berlin (Hannoversche Geographische Arbeiten; 62), pp. 62-66

Рецензент: **Dr.rer.nat. Asykulov T.**