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Executive summary

The present report constitutes part of the Danish contribution to the European research project New Modes of Governance for Sustainable Forests in Europe (GoFOR). It builds on the conceptual framework developed during the GoFOR project and is structured according to the corresponding Terms of Reference.

The National Park Pilot Process (NPP) was to identify options for establishing national parks in Denmark. The expected output was a non-binding input to policy formulation.

The Minister of Environment (MoE) enquired counties and municipalities of six areas whether they were interested in hosting a pilot project. The Outdoor Council, an umbrella NGO for outdoor and environmental NGOs, entered the political arena, adding 2 ½ million Euro to the project and entered into an agreement with the Minister of Environment regarding how to implement the pilot projects, and it was decided to support pilot projects in seven areas.

In the following phase, the MoE initiated the process by sketching out rough guidelines for the organisation of the pilot projects to the counties and municipalities. The pilot projects were to elaborate a report with recommendations on how to organise a prospective National park. Locally, the pilot projects were led by steering committees headed by (in most cases) mayors from the municipality assisted by the local state forest districts and with representatives from a broad range of organisations. At the national level a national advisory group was set up with members representing different Ministries, NGOs and the chairmen of the seven steering committees. The purpose of this committee was to assist in carrying out relevant investigations and to compile the reports from the seven pilot projects elaborating one final report to be submitted to the MoE. So far the process has resulted in the elaboration of a draft proposal for a National Park Act.

From the initiation and onwards, the Government rhetoric was dominated by wanting a voluntary approach, extensive participation by landowners and other local stakeholders, and an inter-sectoral solution. Along with a participatory approach, expert knowledge was attributed a significant role.

Participation

The NPP was initiated and framed ‘from above’, and can best be characterised as a governance process induced and embraced by Government. The identification and appointment of the pilot project areas was a bilateral communication between the MoE and the mayors of the municipalities. If a municipality did not want to join, that area was omitted. From a local perspective this may be fair insofar as the mayors are elected representatives of the local population. But it also meant that possible areas of national interests were omitted without national stakeholders having a say in it.

Within this government induced process, the pilot projects took a bottom-up approach. In pilot project ‘Kongernes Nordsjælland’ the steering committee initiated the establishing of thematic groups which prepared a number of proposals which were brought up at a citizen summit for (what was intended as a socio-demographically representative) deliberating dialogue and voting procedure. There was a high degree of transparency and information, tending towards information overflow in the pilot projects.

The process managed to involve new stakeholders, notably the local mayors, who traditionally have not been involved in nature policy, since nature and agriculture was beyond the jurisdiction of the municipalities, until the Structural Reform in 2007. But the organisers of the process, the Forest and Nature Agency found it difficult to mobilise the ‘ordinary citizens’ despite active efforts.
Experiences from pilot project ‘Kongernes Nordsjælland’ indicated that the NPP had problems dealing with minority viewpoints: The one main conflict was that Agriculture wanted to restrict the national park area to already publicly owned areas, whereas the proposal that evolved from the steering committee included corridors on privately owned land. The Agricultural organisations played a hesitant role in the process and left at the end, proposing their own suggestion for demarcation.

**Intersectoral coordination**

There is tradition for involving interest groups from different sectors in decision-making in Denmark, yet the ISC was more formalised and deliberately emphasised in this process than formerly, and as a new thing, the local level was involved. Prior to the Structural Reform 2007, nature policies related to the national and county level, and agricultural policies entirely to EU and the national level. By establishing a discussion at local level too, the ‘column-like’ character of the nature and agricultural sectors was partly dissolved.

**Multilevel governance**

The degree of Multi-level governance varies with the phase we look at. Seen as a whole, the NPP was a top-down governed process. The pilot project phase was bottom-up with active involvement of local levels, but the pilot projects were evaluated by the national advisory group, and the parliamentary statement and draft Act on National parks was prepared by the National Forest and Nature Agency for the Minister of Environment.

It appears the decision-making power lies with the MoE, the National Forest and Nature Agency and the Outdoor Council.

**Expertise**

There was a focus on the need to investigate specified topics, defined by the MoE/NFNA. Many experts participated from various research institutions, consultancy firms, counties and NFNA. In principle there was rich opportunity for contesting viewpoints. In practice, it was division of work within strictly limited time. The final expert reports were not included in the discussions for time reasons. Still, the new thing was that experts got closer to the public, i.e. experts were asked to report on their methods towards the broad public, possibly strengthening accountability.

A report about biodiversity came up in the middle of the process, showing that the chosen pilot projects were not optimal from a (insect) biodiversity perspective. This information was deliberately set aside by most stakeholders, even the Danish Society of Nature Conservation.

**Adaptive and iterative planning**

The aim of the process was to decide if and how National parks should be established. In that sense the process was part of and adaptive, iterative planning process, because this question was addressed at national, local and then again national level. There was a great degree of complexity and uncertainty, as during the pilot project phase it was uncertain if pilot projects would ever be implemented.
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1 “GoFOR project”: the case study research context

Research on the case study The national park pilot process introducing new forms of governance in Danish nature politics that is presented in this report was conducted in the course of the project “New Modes of Governance for Sustainable Forestry in Europe (GoFOR)”, which was funded by the European Commission under the Sixth EU Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. This chapter briefly outlines the overall approach of the GoFOR project to describe the context in which the research work for this report was conducted. It outlines the major project objectives and briefly describes the research approaches that were employed.

1.1 Objectives
The main objective of the GoFOR project was to study and evaluate evolving practices of new modes of governance in the field of forest policy and in adjacent policy domains (like nature conservation policy, rural development policy etc.). More concretely, GoFOR aimed to evaluate new practices of governance by:

- analyzing programmatic policy statements to learn about the role that governance and its elements play in the repertoire of different policy actors,
- investigating current and evolving practices of governance to find out whether they are applied in a substantive way or whether they are merely symbolic rhetoric,
- exploring the broader political context to see how far effective governance is contingent on environmental, social, political, and economic factors, and
- carrying out cross-sectoral comparisons of governance processes in ten countries to search for common patterns in governance arrangements and to learn about factors that either facilitate or hamper effective governance.

1.2 Conceptual framework and methodology
“Governance” is a multi-faceted concept. At times governance has been used as a normatively-laden catchword of political language. In other cases it is used as an analytical term in the fields of political science and economics where it particularly describes those types of political processes in which non-hierarchical modes of guidance, such as persuasion and negotiation, are employed, and public as well as private actors are engaged in policy formulation and implementation.

When setting up the general conceptual framework in the GoFOR project, the first and foremost challenge was to operationalise the concept of “governance”. Even though governance and new modes of governance have been in frequent use in both politics and science, a coherent governance theory and clear definitions that are close to being empirically applicable are still lacking. Since prevailing concepts of governance are too vague to productively guide empirical analysis, GoFOR operationalised governance by five, more concrete procedural elements: Participation, inter-sectoral coordination, multi-level co-ordination, adaptive and iterative approaches and the use of democratic and accountable expertise. These elements can be found both in political documents, such as the White Paper on European Governance, and in theoretical-conceptual discussions on new forms of policy making.

In focusing on these five elements the conceptual framework of GoFOR followed three distinct but interrelated lines of inquiry: First, the analysis of programmatic policy statements sought to
assess the salience of new modes of governance and its constituting elements on the basis of the strategic and programmatic role they play in the repertoire of political institutions and policy actors. Empirically those roles were determined by investigating programmatic policy statements such as White Papers and other strategy documents, position papers, general procedural guidelines for governance processes, but also the more programmatic parts of legislative texts, subsidy schemes and the like. Analysis of the “rhetoric” of governance was expected to provide a straightforward image of the current political compromises on the meaning and materialization of new modes of governance in a given policy arena. Second, GoFOR also (and primarily) assessed current and evolving practices of governance. The term “practice” refers, on the one hand, to policy processes (e.g., the formulation and implementation of national forest programmes or biodiversity strategies, the planning of a national park), but also to the outputs of those processes (such as new policy programmes or procedural and institutional reforms). Third, the operationalisation of new modes of governance was not only based on empirical evidence, but the potential of new governance was also assessed in the light of theoretical approaches and concepts.

Figure 1 shows the overall conceptual framework of the GoFOR project, presenting the main analytical concepts addressed in the cases studies and the three research steps described above (arrows).
In its empirical research work, GoFOR was structured into three distinct phases (Figure 2):

(i) **A pre-assessment phase** in which a set of criteria that operationalise the concept of governance was developed and translated into a common research protocol (ToR); this common research protocol was, then, tested with an enlarged set of pilot studies,

(ii) **a main assessment phase** in which a reduced set of governance case studies was analysed in detail, and finally

(iii) **a synthesis phase** of cross-case comparison, searching for general patterns of governance arrangements.

This research report is a result of phase II, the main assessment stage. Together with 18 other case studies it was input to phase III, the comparative synthesis report of GoFOR (Hogl et al., 2008)

### 1.3 The GoFOR case studies

The GoFOR project applied a multiple case study research design. GoFOR case studies are not “country reports” or “sector reports”, but rather analyses of concrete policy processes in which new modes of governance or certain elements thereof were applied. Hence, the GoFOR project can also be seen as an attempt to further clarify the manifestation of governance practices in forest policy and in adjacent policy domains.

Cases were selected in a three-step approach: First, potential cases were classified along a list of criteria (such as the respective policy field, the scope and time-span of the processes and their respective stage of implementation, the territorial levels involved, and the role of those governance elements that stood central to the GoFOR project design). In an exploratory phase, this broader range of possible cases was empirically probed and case selection was coordinated among the partner countries in order to get a well-balanced, analytically fruitful set of case studies. Second, and based on the exploratory phase, 24 cases were selected for pre-assessment. The pre-assessment was intended to give deeper insights into the cases as a basis for the final selection. Terms of Reference (ToR) were developed to provide a common list of research questions and guidance as regards the methods of data collection and documentation. Third and
finally, based on the pre-assessments results, 19 governance processes (cases) were selected for the main assessment. Table 1 provides a brief characterisation of these cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case title</th>
<th>Brief characterisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy for the Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
<td>national strategy process mainly driven by international obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austrian Forest Dialogue</td>
<td>participatory and sector-integrated national strategy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Implementation of the Habitats Directive</td>
<td>national implementation of EU policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Park Pilot Projects</td>
<td>participatory planning processes at the regional level as non-binding input to policy formulation at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Territorial Forest Charters</td>
<td>participatory and sector-integrated strategic planning approach at the regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relief Plan for Forests in France</td>
<td><em>ad hoc</em> governmental assistance programme in the aftermath of devastating storms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Development policies (with three embedded sub-cases):</td>
<td>integration of new policy approach (regional governance) in three programmes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− LEADER+</td>
<td>− EU pilot programme for sustainable rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− REGIONEN AKTIV</td>
<td>− national pilot programme for sustainable rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Joint Task “Improvement of Agricultural Structures and Coastal Protection”</td>
<td>− mainstream funding instrument of agricultural policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Restructuring of management agencies for protected areas</td>
<td>reorganisation of the administration and management of protected areas mainly driven by EU policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>National Forest Programme Hungary</td>
<td>participatory and sector-integrated national strategy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian Living Forests Project</td>
<td>participatory and sector-integrated strategy process initiated and promoted by private actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>“Nature for People, People for Nature” programme (NL-NPPN)</td>
<td>formulation and implementation of strategic policy document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature policy in the Groene Woud area</td>
<td>long-term policy development around nature conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature policy in the Utrechtse Heuvelrug area</td>
<td>same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Anti-corruption policies</td>
<td>policy formulation and implementation driven by international obligations and pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of Acquis Communautaire in Nature Protection Policies</td>
<td>national implementation of EU policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Forest Policy General Plan of Catalonia</td>
<td>participatory and sector-integrated regional strategy process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cases analysed in GoFOR (main assessment)
Overall these case studies relate to three broad thematic fields: first, biodiversity and nature conservation, including processes engaged in the implementation of the EU Habitat Directive (92/43/EEC); second, forest policy; and third, rural development policy processes. One out of these 19 case studies is presented in this report: The national park pilot process introducing new forms of governance in Danish nature politics.
2 Context factors

The context of the case is briefly outlined to possibly better understand the specific governance processes in our case. It may facilitate cross-case comparisons and allow some judgement as regards the transferability of findings across different contexts.

2.1 Economic and Social Factors

2.1.1 Geographical context factors

Denmark is the country in Europe where the largest percentage of land is used for agricultural production i.e. 66% of the land area. Hence, agriculture is the main land use; then forest and nature types; artificial surfaces such as cities, roads etc.; and wetlands, lakes and streams cover least of the land. Wetlands have diminished because of extensive drainage during the last century to increase the production value of lands (Agger et al 2005; Danmarks Statistik 2007).

Danish agriculture is intensive and there is a development towards fewer, larger and more specialised farms (Danmarks Statistik 2007). The focus on the environmental impact of agriculture has grown significantly and so has the number of rules that regulate the impact. One possible result is that there has been a marked increase in the number of organics farms. The total productive area has steadily decreased the last decades (Dansk Landbrug 2006).

Whereas the forest area in quantitative terms has been preserved and increased through afforestation from a forest cover of 3% in 1805 to a cover of 14% in 2006 (Skov & Landskab 2006), the biodiversity content, health and stability of the Danish, temperate forest ecosystems continue to be challenged (Larsen and Madsen 2001).

Nature protection in Denmark happens according to a number of schemes: §3 areas (Act on Nature protection), conservation of individual areas, Natura 2000 areas, nature and game reserves, and zones of protection e.g. it is generally not allowed to build closer than 300 meter from the coastlines. Natura 2000 areas constitute 8,3% of the terrestrial area and §3 areas constitute 9,3%. However, some of these areas are identical (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2005a).

2.1.2 Ownership structure

There are approximately 42,000 farms in Denmark, a number that has been decreasing markedly from 102,000 in 1982. However; the number of large farms have increased, and since 2000 the number of very small farms have increased as well. The latter is owned by people with small scale agriculture as a hobby (Danmarks Statistik 2007).

The Danish forest area covers 11% (486,000 ha) of the land area, but it is fragmented both in terms of geography and ownership, and is shared among 26,000 owners. Approximately 72% of the forest area is privately owned (46% private individual owners, 26% foundations and companies), 28% is owned by the state the municipalities (Larsen and Johannsen 2002).

2.2 Political-Institutional Framework

The Danish counties and municipalities have a high degree of regional autonomy: for example, they have their own elections and regional administrations. January 2007 a municipal reform took place, adopted by the current liberal government with support from the Danish Peoples Party. The 14 counties were replaced by 5 state regions, and the 271 municipalities were reduced
to 98 municipalities. Some of the counties’ tasks were handed over to the regions, some to the state, and some again to the municipalities. The counties previously administered the Nature Conservation Act. This was transferred to the municipalities, except the implementation of large nature restoration/conservation projects, as they were transferred to the state.

2.3 Political culture

In general Danish policy making is characterised by a consensus culture, that is, a negotiation culture where issues are left open for interpretation during the process, and where multiple solution options to multiple problems pave the way for negotiating combinations of solutions that will provide the most benefits and cause the least harm to most stakeholders involved. This consensus culture is closely linked to a tradition of corporate involvement. Consequently in forestry public influence can be exercised through the commercial sectors (agriculture, forestry, industry), through the environmental NGOs and associations that are represented in a number of national and local boards and councils who provide advice on forest and countryside policy formulation and regulation. Furthermore, the Danish Planning Act demands public hearings for county and municipal planning. The Forest Act does not demand public participation beyond the national Forest Council, but following the tradition of the Planning Act it has been common for state forest planning to invite affected municipalities, interest groups, and also the user councils, to comment on the state forest plan proposals. As a follow-up to the 1998 Aarhus Convention a departmental order from 2000 prescribe public involvement in relation to public afforestation projects and other major nature management projects (Boon 2000).

2.4 Policies relating to the areas in question

Natural resources are regulated through an array of interlinked, conventions, EU directives, acts and appurtenant departmental orders and guidelines. The international influence has been significant in the latest decades, however; all international agreements leave some room for national interpretation. The European court of justice determines the allowable extent of national adaptations of EU legislation.
3 Case description

3.1 Defining the case study
The present report constitutes part of the Danish contribution to the European research project New Modes of Governance for Sustainable Forests in Europe (GoFOR). It builds on the conceptual framework developed during the GoFOR project and is structured according to the corresponding Terms of Reference. See http://www.boku.ac.at/gofor/index.htm for more information on the project. The empirical study was conducted 2005- June 2007.

In 2000 a nature committee, the Wilhjelm Committee, suggested to establish national park in Denmark. This initiated a process to investigate the options for national parks by establishing 7 pilot projects. This process is the object of study in the present report.

The national park pilot process (NPP) pursues the idea of conserving larger, contiguous nature areas in Denmark. The Government rhetoric was dominated by wanting a voluntary approach, extensive participation by landowners and other local stakeholders, and an intersectoral solution, where nature, recreation, tourism, agriculture and rural development were considered. The process was non-legally binding, and the Government did not oblige itself to any final implementation, but the intention was to form the legal foundation for establishing national parks, during 2007. In this sense it is a case in point of new modes of governance.

The process involved seven pilot projects and furthermore three investigation areas initiated independent of Government. We focus on one of the pilot projects: Kgs. Nordsjælland because: (1) of the seven Kgs. Nordsjælland is situated in the most densely populated area, and there is a significant proportion of privately owned land in the proposed area as well as many natural and cultural values. This makes it a project with potentially strong conflicts of interests; (2) the participation methods applied in Kgs. Nordsjælland were new and not formerly used in natural resources management in Denmark.

The six other pilot projects will only be dealt with at a general level by means of informants from the National Advisory Group (NAG) consisting of the convenors from the seven pilot projects, representatives from a number of interest organisations as well as public authorities. We will not consider the investigation projects any further. Even though their organisational structure is similar to the pilot projects, the initiations process has been different, the financing was different and the institutional anchorage was different; i.e. they were not evaluated by the NAG and the secretariats were local municipalities or in one case a local museum instead of the National Forest and Nature Agency (NFNA).

3.2 Introduction: four phases of the national park pilot projects
We divide the national park process into four phases.

Phase 1 started in March 2000, with the Danish government’s appointment of the Wilhjelm Committee. This phase ended August 23rd 2001, when the Committee submitted its main report recommending, among other things, that the Danish Government should establish national nature areas in Denmark.

Phase 2 started out late 2001 by the decision of the government to investigate the options for establishing national parks in Denmark. This phase ended with the decision to start national park
pilot projects in seven selected areas. The process of selection took place mainly between November 2001 and April 2003.

**Phase 3**, which was the actual implementation of the seven national park pilot projects, started off by the Minister of Environment (MoE) sending letters to the seven selected pilot projects (April-November 2003). This phase ended March 1st 2006 when the National Advisory Group (NAG) submitted its final report to the MoE.

**Phase 4** started May 19th 2006 with the MoE making a Statement in the Danish Parliament. Following this, the Minister elaborated an act based on the NAG’s recommendations and circulated it. The act is still pending (May 2007).

We focus on the process from when the Minister of Environment (MoE) initiated the process by contacting counties and municipalities November 2002 and until the end of 2006 when the first hearing phase ended regarding the act proposal for national parks (phases 2-4). In the following sections, each of the phases will be introduced in more detail.

### 3.3 Phase 1: the Wilhjelm Committee (March 2000 - August 2001)

In 1999 OECD called attention to a number of serious shortcomings in Danish nature protection, and recommended the Danish Government to take action. One of the specific recommendations was for the government to investigate options for establishing national parks (OECD 1999). Following the OECD report, and forming part of the Government’s preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Rio 2002, the MoE (Svend Auken) set up a Committee chaired by, and later named after the former Minister of Industry, Niels Wilhjelm (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2000).

The main task of the Committee was to write a report proposing objectives and means for future prioritised efforts for biological diversity and nature protection in Denmark. This should happen within the framework of OECD’s recommendations, UN’s Convention on Biological diversity from 1992, EU’s Habitats directive from 1992, and EU’s Birds directive from 1979, and § 6 in the Amsterdam Treaty about integration of environmental concerns in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. The committee should evaluate the state of nature in Denmark and examine the degree to which the Government of Denmark fulfilled its international obligations (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2000).

The Committee comprised of 35 members representing farmers’, fishermen’s and forest associations, non-governmental organisations, research institutions, ministries and local government associations (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). A complete list of organisations represented in Wilhjelm Committee is attached as *annex 1*. The National Forest and Nature Agency (NFNA) served as Secretariat to the Committee (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001).

During the first phase, the Danish government was headed by the Social Democrats together with the Social Liberal Party. National elections, which were held November 1st 2001, resulted in a change of government. The new minority government was headed by Denmark’s Liberal Party together with the Conservative People’s Party and depended on support by the Danish People’s Party.
3.4 Phase 2: Decision to investigate options for national parks
(November 2001 – April 2003)

When the new Government came to power in 2001, it cut the budgets for the Ministry of Environment. A range of corporate advisory boards in relation to a range of policy areas were cancelled, including the highly profiled Nature Council, comprised by ‘wise men’, i.e. professors and other experts related to nature policy causing some criticism.

In September 2002, the MoE sent letters to 16 counties and municipalities in the six areas proposed by the Wilhjelm Committee. The aim was to investigate whether they were interested in joining the process. In the letters, the Minister emphasised that the projects were voluntary and participatory, and that no single project would be implemented if there was significant local resistance against them. In October 2002, the Government, the Danish People’s Party, and the Christian Democrats agreed to earmark 20 million DKK on the State Budget for 2-3 national park pilot projects. By 2003, most of the areas had responded positively to the idea. In South Funen, however, the County reacted against the national park plans: The County wanted to await a clarification of the Habitat Directive and the European Water Framework Directive before they could collaborate about national nature areas. As only some of the municipalities supported the idea, South Funen ended up rejecting the idea (Agerskov and Schmidt 2003; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

In January 2003, the Outdoor Council entered the arena. This Council, which organises a number of Danish nature and outdoor life NGOs and which is funded by receipts from the state football polls, contacted the MoE and proposed 16 specific areas as having potential for becoming national parks. The Outdoor Council offered to add 20 million DKK to the pilot projects on the condition that the pilot projects would be as balanced and comprehensive as possible.

In February 2003 the Minister and the Outdoor Council entered a written agreement. The stated purpose of the agreement was to initiate national park pilot projects with a view to produce a thorough and balanced knowledge basis for deciding whether there should be national parks in Denmark, and if so, where they should be, how they should be managed, etc. It was stated, moreover, that the process had to take place in close dialogue and collaboration with the local population, local interest organisations, local authorities, and relevant state authorities, with the aim to integrate environmental, social and cultural, commercial and recreational interests in a joint solution. The Ministry of Environment and the Outdoor Council would each contribute 20 million DKK (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Schmidt 2003a; 2003d; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

The two parties had different opinions on which areas should be included in the project (Interview 21, NFNA), but in the end it was decided to select the five areas where the counties and municipalities had already expressed their interests as well as two new areas: Vadehavet and Læsø. Later on the Outdoor council decided to support additional areas of investigation independent of government in three more areas: Skjern Å, Åmosen, and Roskilde Fiord (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006), so called ‘investigation areas’. This ‘parallel project’ was financed only by the receipts from the State football and numbers game pools (‘Tips- og lottomidler’) that the Outdoor Council administers, and with staff support from the involved municipalities and counties. Throughout the process, the Outdoor Council profiled the three alternative projects as equal to the official national park process. This is the case in the introductory folder http://www.friluftsraadet.dk/files/pdf/Nationalparker_FINAL.pdf).

In May 2005, The Outdoor Council requested the MoE to make the NAG take these three projects into account in the final evaluation and reporting of the overall national park process. Their request was declined, but the MoE proposed that the NAG could be inspired by the lessons
learnt from the three projects when they developed the recommendations on Danish models for national parks (http://www.friluftsraadet.dk/files/pdf/Spm_96_min-svar_underskrevet.pdf).

The location of the pilot projects can be seen from the map below. The smaller, blue circles mark the investigation projects. From west: Skjern Å, Åmosen and Roskilde Fjord.

Læsø: Marine areas of varying depths from shallow-water areas with shoals and islets, limestone columns and stone reefs, to deeper areas with habitats for Norway lobsters.

Vadehavet: An unique highly dynamic tidal ecosystem of global importance consisting of dunes, beaches, estuaries, bays, salt marshes, sands and tidal flats, tidal channels and barrier islands.

Kgs. Nordsjælland: Second largest cohesive forested area in Denmark including (deciduous) forest and lake.

Thy: Sub-atlantic coastal dune heath.

Lille Vildmose: Large raised peat bog (spaghnum).

Mols Bjerge: Open woodland and dry grassland in undulating terrain, including heritage elements.

Mon: Coastal chalk cliff landscape with beech forest and grassland on chalk and coastal shallow marine areas with migratory bird species.

Figure 3-1: National pilot project and investigation project areas

3.5 Phase 3: Implementation of the pilot projects (April 2003 – March 2006)

The MoE initiated the seven national park pilot projects by sending out letters to the counties and municipalities. The first letters were sent in April 2003, the last ones in February 2004. The letters contained rough guidelines on how to organise the projects. At the local level, ad hoc steering committees (SCs) would be responsible for the process. One SC would be set up for each project, which reported to the NAG.

3.5.1 The process at the national level

To coordinate efforts the NAG was set up in February 2004. The main task of this committee was to follow and evaluate the local processes and come up with a report with recommendations on how to possibly establish national parks in Denmark based on the experiences from the seven pilot projects (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006). The NAG could, moreover, initiate investigations and use the results for its final report.

The NAG comprised the convenors of each of the seven local projects (all were local or regional politicians), a broad range of nature, outdoor recreation and agriculture related stakeholders, as well as representatives of Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Ministry of Transport and Energy, Ministry of Cultural Heritage, and Ministry of the Environment. The NFNA served as the secretariat of the NAG (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a; 2006b).

3.5.2 The process at the local level

The seven pilot projects were steered by a local SC that acted as the ‘heads’ of the projects. The convenors of the SCs were appointed by the MoE and the other members were locally appointed and represented the local interests. The local state forest districts (local antennas of the NFNA) would attend as secretariats. The main task of the SC was to produce a report with visions, ideas for the contents of, and a plan for a possible national park in their area. The committee was obliged to carry out investigations, and could set up any number of thematic working groups. Public participation was a key word. The final report had to be based on the results from the investigations, the thematic group work and the local debates, and finally submitted to the NAG.

According to the initiation letter the SCs should include representatives of trade, nature, cultural environment, recreation and tourism interests as well as representatives of local landowners and citizens. All of the pilot projects had different working groups (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Schmidt 2003b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a; 2006b; 2006f). See figure 2.4 below.

There were very few demands or expectations as regards the definition of a national park, some of the SCs talked about “the blank paper” leaving them uncertain about what to do and how to approach the task, however; there were the initiation letters, which were similar for all seven pilot projects. The tasks of the SC were formulated as follows:

“It is emphasised that the pilot projects point to solutions which significantly strengthen nature and its possibilities to develop, which strengthen the values regarding cultural heritage and which furthers the possibilities of the population to experience nature...It is the task of the steering committee in dialogue with the local population to make a report, describing the visions for, content of and the delimitation of a possible national park... The report must describe different alternatives and possibilities for development etc. The steering committee should consider that the development of a national park takes place during a time span of 20-30 years and that the development in all essentials is based on voluntariness and local support....It is the responsibility of the steering committee that in order to create a vision and a plan for the area, investigations are undertaken addressing – at least – the following: The present and potential natural values including the possibilities to establish coherence between nature areas; the values concerning the cultural heritage; the present and potential possibilities of outdoor recreation and a socio-economic and business-economic analysis of the consequences of establishing a national park... It is recommended that investigations are undertaken in cooperation with the county and relevant research institutions. Private consultant companies can also contribute to such tasks. Investigations regarding the cultural heritage can be done in cooperation with the regional council of cultural environment ...” (Schmidt 2003b).

The investigations should form the foundation for the work in the pilot projects as well as for a possible decision of actually creating a national park which would be internationally convincing. The processes were all evaluated including the participatory processes undertaken.

Although the pilot projects had common traits, they did to a certain extent develop differently. Common for many of the projects was that the farmers and owners of private land, the users of the nature, and the conservationists had conflicting interests. The projects varied, however, with regard to number and themes of the working groups, intensity of public participation, and level of conflict and support. One project, Lille Vildmose, was characterised by a rather closed process...
of invited experts, whereas the others had various forms of open, public participation. And at Læsø, there was much resistance against the idea of having a national park. Following a popular

**Figure 3-2: Organisation of the process**

referendum where a majority of voting inhabitants on the island favoured a proposal to stop the plans, the pilot project was closed down on the 27th of September 2005. The rest of the projects continued to the end of the project period, and all of them, including Læsø, submitted their final reports to the NAG in 2005.
### Table 3-1: Timeline of the national park process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Aug.</td>
<td>Wilhelms committee report recommends the establishment of nature reserves in order to protect nature and stop the decline in biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Sep.</td>
<td>The Danish government initiates a process aiming to get national parks in Denmark. The MoE writes to the municipalities and counties in the areas the Wilhelms Committee proposed as nature parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Jan.</td>
<td>The Outdoor Council proposes 16 areas as potential pilot projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Feb.</td>
<td>Financial agreement between the Government and The Outdoor Council each setting aside 20 million DKr for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Apr.</td>
<td>3 pilot projects are initiated (Lille Vildmose, Mols Bjerge and Møn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Aug.</td>
<td>Thy pilot project is initiated after a longer process, where Thy first declined the offer because the agricultural interest organisation was opposing the project. However after a geographical delimitation of the area the agricultural organisation were persuaded to at least start some investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Dec.</td>
<td>Pilot project Vadehavet is initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Feb.</td>
<td>Læsø pilot project is initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Sep.</td>
<td>Local referendum at Læsø on the 27th of September where a 58 % majority voted against having a national park. 42 % voted in favour. 71% of the entitled voted. The SC finished their report but withdrew from the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Oct</td>
<td>The last three pilot projects (Vadehavet, Læsø and Lille Vildmose) hand in their final reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 May</td>
<td>The report from the NAG and a statement on national parks by the MoE, Connie Hedegaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Sep.</td>
<td>Proposal for act sent out in public hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a; 2006b

#### 3.5.2.1 The national park pilot project in Kgs. Nordsjælland

The area proposed for the pilot project “Kgs. Nordsjælland” is located approximately 35 km from Copenhagen and in a quite densely populated area.

There are approximately 205,000 citizens living in the municipalities which are located in the area. The area includes one of Denmark’s largest forests as well as two of the largest lakes. The area proposed for national park consists of 39,447 hectares of which nearly half is privately owned; three core areas (I, II and III on the map) and four corridors (1, 2, 3 and 4 on the green parts of the map). There are many valuable nature areas; 60 % of the core areas are designated as protected areas already according to the Natura 2000 directives (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

In September 2002, the MoE sent a letter to the counties and municipalities\(^1\) in Kgs. Nordsjælland enquiring whether they were in support of the idea of having a national park. The answers were mainly positive but the municipalities and the local farmers were concerned about the extent of private property included in the early proposals and the possible future limitations on existing farming practices (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

---

\(^1\) Helsingør, Græsted-Gilleleje, Helsingør, Fredensborg-Humlebæk, Frederiksværk and Hillerød. Later the municipality of Skævinge also joined the process
The task was to carry out a pilot project which included Grib forest, ESUM Lake and several other state owned areas and corridors to bind these nature areas together. In winter 2002, the MoE invited the Frederiksborg State Forest District to send a pilot project proposal to the MoE. This proposal was prepared together with Frederiksborg County and sent in 15\textsuperscript{th} January 2003. The five involved municipalities found that the proposed geographical demarcation was too wide-ranging, but they could support a pilot project based on state owned areas and eventually involving adjoining areas, so this was discussed in the following months.

The local authorities (the five municipalities, two state forest districts and Frederiksborg County) presented a revised proposal at public meeting at 21\textsuperscript{st} May 2003. The general attitude among the public was positive, but the association of farmers in Northern Zealand remained sceptical. Following this, the local state forest district held a special meeting with the farmers, but they did not arrive at a solution and because of this disagreement, the area was not selected in the first round.

In summer 2003, the agricultural association prepared a letter to the MoE, proposing that the state owned core area Grisbiskov and ESUM So would be selected as pilot project area, and ecological corridors to bind together the core areas were also mentioned as a topic but not specified. The state forest districts wanted a specification of the corridors. The county council and two municipalities (Helsingør and Græsted-Gilleleje) decided to co-sign the letter together the agricultural association, even if it did not include the specifications about corridors requested by the state forest districts.

On the 20\textsuperscript{th} November 2003, the MoE invited the farmers, the municipalities, the local representatives of the Outdoor Council, and the local branch of the Danish Society for Nature Conservation for yet another meeting. In the end all the parties agreed to support the pilot project and the MoE decided to initiate the pilot project Kvistgaard Consult 2005a; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

The MoE and the Outdoor Council granted 3.8 million DKK to this specific project. The budgets and accounts appear from table 1-2. The funds could be used for conducting participatory processes and to buy expert advice and analyses relevant to the project.
The Minister appointed the Mayor of Helsingør as chairman for the SC. After some debate the remaining members of the committee were decided upon and they were invited (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e). In total, the SC had 19 members representing the county, five municipalities, two state forest districts, two farmers associations, three green NGOs, culture, four outdoor NGOs and one representing dissemination/PR. The Committee held its first meeting on the 12th of May 2004. In this meeting, the Committee agreed on the rules of procedure, and set up an executive committee comprising of the chairman, the deputy chairman and the daily secretariat (figure 2-4). The Danish Board of Technology2 presented a proposal for how to conduct the process of public participation, and the local State Forest District presented some proposals concerning which investigations to carry out and how to evaluate the process of public participation. Finally, the chairman presented the overall budget. The SC held regular meetings every third month during which they organised the participation process, and selected the investigation projects to be carried out. A regional development strategy for agriculture in Northern Zealand was debated, supported by the SC and initiated by the agricultural organisations, however; due to sickness among the initiators the project never came up and running. Furthermore, practical details regarding meetings and participation efforts were discussed. Otherwise the members of the SC were informed on progress in the thematic groups and the investigations through the secretariat and presentations from the groups and the researchers; and of the meetings in the NAG (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2005b; 2005d; 2005e; 2005f).

The involvement of the public was organised in four stages: The first stage included three meetings open to the public: The introductory meeting held in May, an information meeting and a “café seminar,” and excursions. On the background of these meetings, the SC and the secretariat formed ten thematic working groups and a group of families with young parents, each group with a chair and vice chair. Each thematic group had a staff member from the secretariat attached as a resource person, to provide necessary information and to ensure contact between the different thematic groups. During the second stage, the thematic working groups met 5-7 times formulating ideas and specific proposals in preparation of a large “citizens summit.” This summit constituted the third stage and was held 26th February 2005. The fourth stage consisted of a two day workshop where the SC together with representatives from the thematic working groups elaborated different scenarios for the national park. During the process, there were

---

2 The Danish Board of Technology is an independent body established by the Danish Parliament (the Folketing) in 1995 and is the successor of the Technology Board, which was set up as a statutory body in 1986. Every year, after a specific stipulation in the nation's "Finance Law", the Danish Board of Technology receives an annual subsidy of around 13 million DKK. The Ministry of Research is the supervising authority for the Board and the Parliament's Research Committee is the Board's steady liaison to the Parliament.
additional activities such as exhibitions and field trips. The SC handed over its final report to the NAG on June 2005 (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

As the members of the SC discussed the final proposals for a prospective national park and in particular the geographical delimitation, disagreements between the two agricultural organisations and the remaining members of the SC became prevalent. The agricultural organisations were worried of possible limitations in the agricultural management of the landowners and did not trust the guarantees of compensation. The disagreements could not be bridged despite of extra meetings between the executive committee and the local agricultural organisations and a national agricultural representative. As a result the agricultural organisations withdrew from the SC and handed in their own proposal for a national park (Interview 12; Interview 18; Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005c; 2005g).

Table 3-3: Timeline of the pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 Sep.</td>
<td>The MoE send out letters to the county and the municipalities around Grib forest and Esrum lake in order to find out if they are interested in a national park in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Jan.</td>
<td>The county of Frederiksborg and Frederiksborg state forest district suggest a vision for a future national park in Northern Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 spring</td>
<td>The suggestion for a national park made by the county and the state forest district is discussed with Kronborg state forest district and the affected municipalities, who think the suggestion is too far-reaching. A new proposal is negotiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 May</td>
<td>On the 21st of May a public meeting is held where the proposal for a national park negotiated by the municipalities, the county and the state forest district is introduced to the public. There is generally a positive attitude towards the project apart from the Northern Zealand Farmers Association which is very sceptical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Nov.</td>
<td>The 20th of November there is a meeting at Esrum convent where the MoE invited the municipalities, the county, the state forest districts, Northern Zealand Farmers Association, Danish Family Farmers, The Outdoor council’s local representative and the local committee of Danish Society for Nature Conservation. After the meeting the Minister decides to initiate a pilot project for Kgs. Nordsjælland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Feb.</td>
<td>Mayor of Helsingør municipality, Per Tørsbøl, is appointed chairman of the SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 April</td>
<td>Agreement has been reached as to whom to invite to be a part of the SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 May</td>
<td>The first meeting in the SC. Introduction, rules of procedure, outline of participatory process, general budget, considerations regarding the technical investigations to be undertaken and the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 June</td>
<td>Vision seminar for members of the SC held by the institute of democracy and nature management, Roskilde University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Aug.</td>
<td>The second meeting of the SC, where progress with the thematic groups were discussed. Personnel from the extended secretariat should function as resource persons and ensure contact between the groups if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Nov.</td>
<td>The third meeting of the SC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Feb.</td>
<td>The fourth meeting of the SC on the 10th. On the 26th a citizen summit was held with 529 randomly chosen citizens voted and prioritised among suggestions for projects in a prospective national park derived from the ten thematic working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Mar.</td>
<td>The fifth meeting of the SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Apr.</td>
<td>The sixth meeting of the SC the 6th. Meeting at the agricultural organisations regarding corridors in the landscape with participation from the SC convenor, Per Tørsbøl on the 14th. Later the same day.: Workshop for the members of the SC for developing scenarios for the national park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 May</td>
<td>2nd scenario workshop for the SC where the vision and geographical delimitation of the national park were to be agreed upon. A majority voted in favour of the proposal; the two agricultural organisations voted against. The municipalities of Græsted-Gilleleje, Helsingør and Hillerød were concerned of the time frame, in terms of having sufficient time to discuss the proposal in the city councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 June</td>
<td>Seventh and eighth meeting in the SC on the 1st and 22nd respectively. The publicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
efforts of the hand-over of the final report were discussed. The report regarding procurement was handed in and criticised by the member of the SC from the Outdoor Council, who handed in his own supplementary report. The further procurement strategy was discussed. The socio-economic analysis and the evaluation of the participation were discussed.

On the 10th of June the agricultural organisations held a meeting with the executive committee where an alternative proposal of the agricultural organisation had been discussed. The agricultural representatives would not support the proposal of the majority of the SC. They wanted to postpone the final report 3 month to have an extra hearing phase of the landowners. This was denied. The agricultural organisations withdrew from the SC.

On the 30th of June the final report of the SC was handed over to the vice director of the Ministry of Environment, Niels Østergaard. The agricultural organisations handed over their separate proposal for a national park at the same occasion.

3.5.3 Organisation

**Steering Committee**
*Frederiksborg County:* Philip Heimburger
*The Municipalities:*
- Helsingør: Mayor Per Tærnbøl (Chairman)
- Helsingør: Deputy Mayor Flemming Møller
- Hillerød: Mayou Nick Hækkerup
- Frederiksberg-Humlebæk: City Councillor Egon Frandsen
- Græsted_Gilleleje: Lau Jensen
- Frederiksværk: Mayor Helge Friis

**State forest districts:**
- Frederiksborg: Jens Bjerregård Christensen
- Kronborg: Henrik Vinter

**Agriculture:**
- Northern Zealand Farmers Association: Poul Jensen
- Danish Family Farmers: Arne Winther Madsen

**Nature:**
- Danish Society for Nature Conservation: Peter Skat Nielsen
- Nepenthes: Martin Scneekloth
- Bird Life Denmark: Johannes Bang

**Culture:**
- Council for Cultural Environment of Frederiksborg County: Jette Baagøe

**Outdoor life:**
- The Outdoor Council: Poul Erik Pedersen
- Danish Hunters Association: Steen W. Jensen
- Contact Group Esrum Lake: Bruno Hartvig Petersen
- Danish Sports Federation: Jørn Mathisen

**Dissemination:**
- The Foundation of Esrum Convent and Mill farm: Lone Johnsen

**Executive Committee**
*Chairman Per Tærnsbøl*
*Deputy Chairman:* Flemming Møller
*Daily secreatariat*

**Daily secretariat**
*Frederiksborg State Forest District (forest superintendent, projectkoordinator, a few employees)*

**Extended secretariat**
*Public administrators from Frederiksborg County and the five municipalities*

**Thematic groups, open groups for public representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic group 1</th>
<th>Thematic group 2</th>
<th>Thematic group 3</th>
<th>Thematic group 4</th>
<th>Thematic group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman: Kirsten Kragh</td>
<td>Chairman: Alex Helm</td>
<td>Chairman: Poul Erik Pedersen and Stig Englund</td>
<td>Chairman: O.A.K. Nielsen</td>
<td>Chairman: Søren Fløe Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group worked with the possibilities of establishing corridors between nature areas in the northern part of the prospective national park.</td>
<td>The group worked with the possibilities of establishing corridors between nature areas in the southern part of the prospective national park.</td>
<td>The group worked with the possibilities of establishing corridors between nature areas in the western part of the prospective national park.</td>
<td>The group worked with the possibilities of establishing corridors between nature areas in the eastern part of the prospective national park.</td>
<td>The group worked with the future natural values in the prospective national park. What should be done to further nature in the future?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic group 6</th>
<th>Thematic group 7</th>
<th>Thematic group 8</th>
<th>Thematic group 9</th>
<th>Thematic group 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman: Christian Fris</td>
<td>Chairman: Hanne Gürtler</td>
<td>Chairman: Carl-Johan Rosenberg</td>
<td>Chairman: Peter Milan Petersen</td>
<td>Chairman: Nanna Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group was generating ideas how to strengthen the cultural heritage in the prospective national park</td>
<td>The group worked with the theme: the Frederiksberg horse and how this old horse race fit into the prospective national park</td>
<td>The group was generating ideas regarding the possibilities of outdoor life in the prospective national park</td>
<td>The group worked on the future infrastructure in the prospective national park. Traffic, foot, riding and biking paths.</td>
<td>The group considered the future development of the local communities in relation to a prospective national park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3-4: Organisation of pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland**
3.6 Phase 4 Governmental statement and draft act (May 2006 – May 2007)

On May 19th 2006, the MoE assisted by the NFNA made a Statement in the Danish Parliament about the national park pilot project, summing up the pilot process and announcing a coming Act on National Parks. The act was elaborated and was circulated for public consideration during the autumn 2006 (Miljøministeriet 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c). The act is still pending. The future process will follow the traditional procedure in the Danish Parliament of presenting the act to the political parties in first, second and third reading. Subsequently the act will be discussed in its entirety and finally put to the vote.

The act has ten objectives. Four are directly concerned with creating nature and maintaining the values of nature. The six other objectives concern (5) culture, (6) support research and teaching in the values of nature (7) increased possibilities for the population to use and experience the nature, (8) improved communication about nature and culture values, (9) support to local development, (10) and public participation in the establishment and development of the national park. The act states that it is the MoE who decides whether an area can become a national park or not, but that a proposal for a national park must be circulated for consideration before the MoE takes the final decision.

With regard to the model for managing the national park, it is stated that the MoE set up a national park foundation for each national park. The Foundation is “an independent institution within the State” financed mainly by the State. The MoE will set up a board of directors to be in charge of the foundation. The board will comprise of a convenor and 6-12 members some of whom must represent stakeholder organisations, the state, and the municipalities. The MoE decides the location of the secretariat, and must approve of the procedures proposed by the board. The board of directors appoints the members of a local advisory committee including representatives from stakeholder organisations, and associations, trade and industries, local authorities, and expertise (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

The Foundation must develop a plan for establishing and developing a national park. This plan must be in accordance with Natura 2000, and with planning within the framework of the Planning Act. Before elaborating the plan, the Foundation must inform the public and call for their ideas, proposals etc. The plan must be circulated to the relevant Ministries. The planning period must be adapted to planning for Natura 2000.
4 Participation

In this chapter, we address the following main parameters: what is the rhetoric around participation, what form of participation actually takes place, who participates and on what topics, and what is the motivation for participation or not participation? Based on this, the aim is to answer the two main questions (a) whether and how participation is perceived by different types of actors to affect democratic steering and (b) what are the supporting and impeding factors of participation for different types of actors concerned? (GoFOR 2006).

This chapter focuses on phase three which is most relevant in the perspective of participation.

4.1 Rhetoric on participation – and origin

The rationale for wanting a participatory process was that the formation of a national park should build on ‘sense of local ownership’ and ‘voluntary action’. This was mentioned repeatedly by the Minister of the Environment (Schmidt 2003b; Schmidt 2003c; Schmidt 2003e), as well as in the Governmental nature policy (Miljøministeriet 2002). A main focus seemed to be that the landowners should not be forced into a process against their will.

Participation was considered a constituting element of the whole concept of exploring options for national parks, not only as articulated by the MoE (Schmidt 2003b; Schmidt 2003c; Schmidt 2003e), but also by the nature commission “Wilhjemudvalget’ (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). The MoE at the time when that commission was established was a prominent advancer of participation. He introduced advisory councils in the state forests in 1994 (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 1995), and later on hosted the conference that led to the adoption of the ‘Aarhus Convention’, i.e. the Convention on public access to information, decision-making and appeal rights related to environmental decisions (Miljø- og Energiministeriet 1999). This interpretation of ‘public participation’ clearly referred to the broad public, whereas the interpretation by the new MoE, the one initiating the national park project, referred also specifically to local authorities, business and landowners (Schmidt 2003b; 2003c; 2003e).

There was no legal requirement for the national park pilot project and therefore no requirements as regards the participation process either. The national park process was first mentioned in the Government’s nature policy statement in 2002, with a specific reference to participation:

“Public initiatives and regulation in nature politics should be solidly locally anchored, be based on open and thorough debate, to ensure the necessary co-ownership among local authorities, business as well as the general population” (Regeringen 2002:1)

“The (national park pilot) projects build on voluntariness and local initiative rather than directives and extensive work in boards. Local engagement will be decisive for the contents of the pilot projects. This may be a testing of different co-operation models and discussions about the contents of the nature conservation and utilisation in the (pilot project) area and surrounding areas...” (Regeringen 2002)

In this same document there are several references to participation in nature policy, and the rationale for participation is to ensure local co-ownership and co-responsibility for nature conservation, e.g.:

“...it is (also) the goal of the Government to ensure ‘direct involvement of citizens, associations, local authorities, etc. in the management, conservation and utilisation of the state owned forest and nature areas’” (Regeringen 2002).
“nature political initiatives should be based on clarity, transparency and the rule of law” (Regeringen 2002).

“The Government wants more Danes to enjoy and use nature in their daily life. The nature utilisation efforts will be characterised by open and broad dialogue with local authorities, landowners and business, who will be invited for active contributions” (Regeringen 2002).

When the national park pilot project was launched, the MoE strongly emphasised that the pilot projects should have strong, local support and anchoring:

“At a conference last week I heard researchers say that Danes want more public participation in relation to nature politics...This has already for long been crucial for me, because when I repeatedly hear people ask for local anchoring when I attend meetings around in the country. So when a large pilot project initiative like this is initiated, then this (participation, ed.) has to be included too, of course” (Schmidt 2003c).

4.1.1 Outline of the participation process in pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland

The SC (see figure 2.4) held nine ordinary meetings, a vision seminar at the beginning of the process, and two full-day scenario workshops towards the end of the process. Along with the work of the SC, the participation process was divided into four stages with each their main objective, cf. table 3.1 below. The participation process in Pilot Project Kgs. Nordsjælland was designed with the assistance of the Council of Technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When</strong></td>
<td>26/5 and 12/6 2004</td>
<td>Sept - Dec. 2004</td>
<td>26/2 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How</strong></td>
<td>Introductory meeting Café Seminar + arranged excursions</td>
<td>Ten thematic working groups</td>
<td>Citizen summit Representative sample (15,000) of citizens were invited to discuss and prioritise the proposed actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
<td>Inform about the project, participation opportunities and conditions Generate ideas and proposals about what a national park is. Make visible and discuss the different interests related to the national park area Form thematic working groups</td>
<td>Initiate studies to support the decision process. Propose actions Discuss significant questions among affected stakeholders</td>
<td>Get a qualified response from citizens reflecting their priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
<td>Open for everyone, 110 and 120 citizens showed up, resp.</td>
<td>Open for everyone, 180 participated</td>
<td>A representative sample (15,000) from Frederiksborg county was invited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC (21 representatives from municipalities,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10/9: present final report)
Stage I: An information meeting and a café seminar was held at the beginning of the process. The meetings were publicly announced and 110 and 120 participated, respectively.

Stage II: Based on these two meetings, ten thematic working groups were formed. The working groups were open for everyone and each group held 4-7 meetings. In total, 180 persons participated (out of originally 200 who had signed up). Each thematic group had a convenor and was connected to a person from the extended secretariat to give advice and technical support (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a). In the period September – December 2004, each of the 10 thematic groups prepared a report with ideas and proposal for action related to their specific theme. In total, the groups produced 70 proposals covering 600-700 pages. The thematic working groups handed in their reports to the SC in December 2004. A couple of the thematic groups continued to meet also after this process had ended (Kgs. Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

Parallel to the thematic groups, a group for young families and their children was formed and the involved families took part in a future workshop held September 2004 (Nielsen et al 2005).

Stage III: The SC and secretariat chose ten of the most controversial and visionary proposals to be discussed and prioritised at a citizen summit aimed to be socio-demographically representative. This means, that the proposals drafted by the non-representative thematic groups would be subject to a socio-demographically representative voting. Hereby, the prioritised proposals would gain legitimacy beyond the mere persuasive character of the proposals.

The citizen summit was held in February 2005. The aim was to have a representative sample of 7-800 citizens (18 years or older) from Frederiksborg County to participate. The thematic groups were not invited. Instead, 10,000 people were sampled and invited, but the attendance rate was low, so additionally 5,000 invitations were sent out. Out of 580 who signed up, a total of 529
citizens participated in the citizen summit (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a). With each invitation a ‘newspaper’ was attached with information about the project and the ten proposals to be discussed at the summit (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005a).

The summit was governed by 75 facilitators, 10 SC members and a number of technical assistants. The summit was held in a large room with a stage and a large screen, several tables with 7-8 persons at each table, and an electronic voting system. The ten proposals were presented one at a time on the large screen. For each proposal, different scenarios were presented. Each table then discussed the different scenarios for 20 minutes, and finally there was an electronic voting process, and the voting results were presented on the large screen within a few seconds after the voting had ended. Finally, at the end of the meeting, the citizen summit as a process was evaluated, under the attendance of the MoE (Teknologirådet 2007).

The citizen survey was representative in terms of gender, but not in terms of age, as there was an overrepresentation of people between 46-65 years old, in particular those 56-65 years old. Citizens from all groups of society were represented, - farmers, craftsmen, retired people, people with academic education and students (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a).

Stage IV: In the fourth stage, the SC – assisted by the secretariat - formulated a vision and action plan for a possible, future national park in Northern Zealand. The process was facilitated through two scenario workshops and was based on the output from the thematic working groups, the citizen summit, and technical reports produced by consultants. At the first workshop 14 April 2005, the SC discussed three different scenarios and connected visions, prepared by the extended secretariat. Based on this discussion, the SC’s executive committee asked the extended secretariat to prepare one new scenario and vision. This was then to be discussed and ratified at the second workshop 18th of May 2005 (www2.skovognatur.dk). Prior to this meeting, the two agricultural associations handed in a letter/note to the SC to be discussed at the meeting. In this note, the agricultural associations stated that they could not support any of the scenarios that had been proposed at the first scenario workshop and they required that the geographical demarcation of the national park should be re-scaled to ‘the original point of departure, with Grib Skov and Esrum Sø as the core area’ (Frederiksborg Amts Familierlandbrug and Nordsjællands Landboforening 2005). The final pilot project report was handed in to the MoE on 30 June 2005, and presented to the public on a meeting on 10 September 2005.

Besides the public meetings, the thematic groups and the citizen summit, the public was invited to attend public excursions and exhibitions focused on the proposed national park area.

The project had its own home page where all information related to the process was publicly available (http://www2.skovognatur.dk/frederiksborg/Nationalpark/default.htm). There was also an electronic mail box at the home page where people were invited to hand in comments and ideas.

The project further disseminated information through the local newspapers. The project was occasionally mentioned in the national newspapers and broadcasted in regional television and the radio. Still it is likely that only a minor segment of the general public is aware of the existence of the pilot project (Interview 12). A minor survey among participants at the citizen summit also showed that relatively few knew about the project prior to the invitation to attend the summit (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a).

The Pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland had a total budget of 3.8 million DKK (0.5 mil. Euro). Of this 32 % (1.2 mil. DKK= 0.16 mil. Euro) was spent entirely on the participation process. This covered the costs of conducting the café seminar, the citizen summit, three scenario workshops, involvement of kids, and the consultant fee for outline and implementation of the participation strategy. In addition to this, there was significant work support from the affected county and
4.2 The context of participation in nature related policy making

The involvement efforts of the public administration related to nature policy has evolved over the past 20 years from expert involvement and corporate involvement of key stakeholders at the national level, (e.g. in administration of the Act on Forest and Act on Nature Conservation) and landowners at the local level towards a more participatory involvement also aiming at the local level, and at ‘ordinary’ people (e.g. user councils at state forest districts, public meetings about nature restoration projects). In practice representatives of NGOs, agriculture and forestry remain the main players. The involvement methods have also developed and become more diversified. Traditional methods have been public hearings with opportunities for written response, and public meetings. They remain typical forms of involvement, but they have become supplemented with surveys, and meetings and workshops structured to stimulate a reflected debate among equal partners, eventually aimed at generating new visions or solutions, rather than just commenting on pre-made proposals. Citizens are also increasingly urged to take active part not only in decision making but also in the practical nature management, e.g. cutting down weed or doing invasive species control.

The national park process is only one among a number of ongoing policies related to nature, environmental and agricultural politics. The most significant, ongoing policies are the national implementation of the EU Habitat Directive and EU Water Framework Directive as well as the EU agricultural and rural development policy in Danish legislation. These policies are significant because they directly determine 1) the regulative fundament for nature policy, and how ‘strict’ EU directives are to be interpreted when translated to national legislation, and 2) the allocation of EU funds and national, governmental funds for nature/environment purposes versus other uses, partly agriculture, partly for other sectors of society. This stage of policy making involves not only the sector ministries, but the Minister of Finance as well, and where the battle for funds moves beyond a struggle between agriculture and nature/environment, ‘odd alliances’ are seen: In 2005, Danish Nature Conservation Association and Danish Agriculture joined forces to convince the Government to set aside more funds for Environmentally Friendly Agricultural arrangements (‘MVJ’) (Dansk Landbrug and Danmarks Naturfredningsforening 2005).

Further, a municipal, structural reform was adopted in 2005 and the new, municipal structures were implemented as of January 2007. The counties that used to have a significant role in regional planning and nature management are cancelled and 271 municipalities have merged to 98 municipalities. The responsibilities for nature management and planning are partly decentralised to the municipalities, partly centralised to three regional, governmental centres of environment. It is new for the municipalities to get responsibility for planning and regulating the country side and being responsible for nature management.

In this context, the national park process appears as soft policy making, a forum for shaping opinions on a future strategy for nature conservation in Denmark. A continuation of the work done by the Willhjelm Committee, but only focused on one element: national parks, and taking a bottom-up approach.

One way to interpret the coming up and impact of the national park process was that when the new Government came to power in 2001, it cut the budgets for the Ministry of the Environment. A range of corporate advisory boards in relation to a range of policy areas were cancelled, including the highly profiled Nature Council, comprised by ‘wise men’, i.e. professors and other municipalities. All participants contributed on a voluntary (unpaid) basis, including chairmen of thematic working groups.
experts related to nature policy. This caused the opposition and environmental NGOs to accuse the Government for giving too little priority to the environment. Just before the elections, the Wilhjelm Committee had finished a proposal for a future strategy for nature conservation in Denmark (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). The work had involved experts and representatives of NGOs and business (agriculture, forestry) related to nature management in Denmark, and the report can be considered a joint effort of all these different stakeholders. But the work was carried out under the past Government and as such it would not be a high profile topic for the new Government to pursue. On the other hand, it would be unwise by the new Government to totally ignore the efforts of all these stakeholders. In this light, the national park process can be considered a tactics from the new Government to show action on nature management and go against any potential critique from the opposition on this point.

A further interpretation was more specifically that the aim of conducting a national park process was meant to forestall an announced new nature policy agenda by the Social Democrats (Interview 20). The government announced the national park idea as part of a few pages long governmental strategy for nature policy (Regeringen 2002), (prepared and) launched at the end of the week where the main opposition party, the Social Democratic Party, on a monday morning had announced that they were about to launch their own nature policy agenda (Interview 20). Since then, national parks have been specifically mentioned as one of the goals in the Government’s overall program e.g. (Regeringen 2006).

4.3 Who participates?

In the national park case description and the process outline above it is outlined which persons that participated on behalf of which organisations in the NAG and in pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland. Here are some additional comments:

There was broad representation in the NAG as well as local SCs. Some were considered obvious members, like Danish Society for Nature Conservation and The Outdoor Council, whereas others had to motivate the relevance of their presence in the pilot project SCs, like BirdLife Denmark and Nepenthes. The NAG had representatives from different public authorities (Ministry of Traffic, Ministry of Agriculture a.o.) predominantly to make sure that the suggestions of the board was in accordance with existing legislation (Interview 21).

It was difficult to ensure gender equality in the committees and the advisory group. This is a general problem and not specific to the national park process. According to the Act on gender equality, the organisations are to suggest both a man and a woman to participate in the NAG. But when a group/committee is considered very important for the organisation to participate in, they want to appoint someone high in the hierarchy of the organisation; and when it comes to the organisations participating in nature policy, there is often a deficit in the number of women holding top posts in the organisations. Generally this means that the representatives from the organisations are men, and the women represent the public authorities (Interview 21).

The participation process was evaluated in each of the seven pilot projects. These evaluations show that those participating were predominantly well-educated men at the age of 45-50 or more (Niras 2005b). Women, families with small children, etc. participated less frequently.

One informant from the NAG considered the Association of County Councils and the Association of Municipalities to be rather passive, whereas one of the SC convenors (a mayor) explained that the Association of Municipalities had tried to co-ordinate on behalf of the municipalities, but that he considered this to be wrong since the municipalities do not necessarily share interests on this matter (Interview 16).
The chairman of the Outdoor Council at the time was selected by the Minister of the Environment to be the chairman of the NAG. The former chairman of the ‘Wilhjelmudvalget’, Nils Wilhjelm was selected by the Minister as a personal member of the NAG, later he became the deputy chairman. Nils Wilhjelm represented the link back to the work done in the Wilhjelm Committee.

SC convenors were mayors in those municipalities with most land affected by the national park. Informally there was a dialogue on who might be capable of guiding the process through. These convenors played a crucial role, as they were very active and good in giving feedback from the local pilot projects to the NAG (Interview 21).

The Outdoor Council had a special role. It administers the state gaming and numbers pools and decided to spend 20 million DKK of those funds to co-finance the national park process. Moreover, they initiated a parallel process of additionally three pilot projects that had not been included in the formal national park process.

There was a tendency that the project committee, thematic groups and other pilot project bodies in the seven pilot projects were comprised by ‘the same old guard as always’, i.e. representatives of the various NGOs and interest organisations. The broader ‘public’ was mainly invited to public meetings and workshops.

In pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland, the forest supervisor initially had the aim of involving ‘the ordinary citizen’, and considered it a failure in terms of representation if this was not achieved. But he reached the conclusion that “the ordinary citizen does not represent anyone but him-/herself and it would be unfair if his/her voice should count the same as an NGO”. And even when people are socio-demographically representative invited, it still is only the people with a special interest in the topic at hand that show up (Interview 12).

4.4 The rationales and interests related to participation

The Government and MoE’s rationale for wanting a participatory process was that the foundation of a national park should build on ‘sense of local ownership and responsibility’ and ‘voluntary action’, be ‘locally anchored’ (Interview 12; Regeringen 2002; Schmidt 2003e). Further, “nature political initiatives should be based on clarity, transparency and the rule of law” (Regeringen 2002).

The political opponents and some of the environmental NGOs claimed that the participatory process was merely a PR-stunt (Interview 20), a cloak for stalling the process of actually getting nature reserves, that it was an example of the present government disclaiming responsibility and avoiding to make the necessary regulations (Carstensen 2006).

An informant pointed out that extensive participation was needed because otherwise it would be very difficult to get landowners committed to the national park process, because landowners distrusted public authorities, due to past, bad experiences (Interview 9). For instance, the Natura 2000 areas were appointed without any public consultation and landowners were told that it would have no practical consequences for land management, but it turned out to have significant consequences, which resulted in a general lack of trust among landowners.

The forest supervisor in pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland considered participation not only as a means to a specific end, but as a new mode of policy making, where the goal is to achieve consensus, and not just leave decision-making in nature management to the public officials. The forest supervisor argued that is was also out of simple need: (1) The increased complexity of managing for multiple interests makes it necessary to consult other stakeholders, and these
stakeholders may provide solutions that the public manager would not have thought of himself. The basic for decision-making becomes more informed. (2) The structural reform has made municipalities the new, key co-operation partners to the state forest districts. (3) The NFNA used to do nature restoration on state owned land primarily, but they are increasingly becoming facilitators for nature restoration on land owned by other stakeholders (Interview 12).

The forest supervisor pointed at yet another purpose/effect of participation – that local people get actively engaged rather than sitting passively waiting. And the public authority gets a better feeling of what is going on (Interview 12).

The effect (if not a purpose) of the participation process was that it provided legitimacy to the decisions and recommendations the SC made (Interview 24). Particularly the citizen summit provided legitimacy to the process by being based on socio-demographically representatively sampled invitations. As an informant noticed, a local mayor supported the re-introduction of beavers in the local lakes and streams with specific reference to the citizen summit where a majority of participants supported this idea (Interview 24). Similarly, the overall pilot project process provided significant legitimacy to the draft Act on national parks, making it more likely that it will find broad support in the Parliament.

One of the convenors of a thematic group agreed to participate and become convenor because she thought the process looked interesting and because she liked to coordinate. She was disappointed to find that it was not what she had thought. She wanted to discuss the overall aspects of rural development, but the other members wanted to discuss particular things either how to protect farmer interests, or how to avoid horse riding paths (Interview 14).

One informant suggested that maybe the MoE who initiated the process had calculated that there would be so much local disagreement that by demanding broad, local support, the MoE could be sure that nothing would come out of it (Interview 17).

The aim of the tourism representative with participating in the NAG was to reach agreement on a recommendation to have national parks. His point was that the tourism trade has an interest in high quality nature, as that is what tourists demand. All the other interests related to a national park project, e.g. tourism infrastructure, would only be relevant once the overall decision on having national parks was made. The strategy of the tourism representative was therefore to keep a low profile on particular tourism interests in the NAG, but to introduce and coordinate the national park idea among tourism stakeholders (Interview 19). For instance, the network ‘Destination 21’ held a seminar about national parks and tourism development on 21 April 2005. The Destination 21 network further sent two letters to the MoE to inform of their ideas and opinions regarding tourism and national parks (Interview 19).

Danish Agriculture did not welcome the national park project, but participated with the aim to:

“...minimise the damage (to landowners, ed.) and do whatever possible to ensure that eventual management restrictions will be financially compensated and that solutions are made on a voluntary basis” (Interview 6).

The national park pilot project took place before and during the elections for the new municipalities. In some of the pilot projects, this probably affected the rationales of some mayors wanting or not wanting to participate in the pilot project. In project Kgs. Nordsjælland the convenor of the SC was mayor based on a solid majority of votes, so he was less prone to be affected. But in pilot project Læsø the municipal elections ahead of the politicians probably contributed to the destabilising of the SC and the final decision of the mayor to make a referendum about whether to stay in or leave the pilot project, which resulted in leaving. In pilot project Vadehavet, three municipalities were to be merged to one, so the competition between the politicians about less seats was harder than usually.
4.5 The topics dealt with in a participatory manner

The aim of the national park pilot project was through a participatory set-up to discuss and bring forward locally based proposals for national parks in Denmark. The local SCs were only given very general guidelines to their work, in the form of an initiation letter from the MoE. Following the initiation letter, the proposals should:

“...significantly strengthen nature...the values regarding cultural heritage and...the possibilities of the population to experience nature. It is the task of the SC in dialogue with the local population to make a report, describing the visions for, content of and delimitation of a possible national park” (Schmidt 2003b).

The guidelines were criticized for not being specific enough and initially created significant uncertainty about what the tasks of the local SCs were. E.g. as regards nature values, the SCs were only told that they should suggest solutions to significantly improve nature values, - there were no detailed prescriptions, e.g. on forms or criteria of nature management. This caused the SCs to talk about ‘the blank paper’. It was hard to make the participants believe that there was not already a pre-made central solution for the task lying ahead of the pilot projects (Jensen 2006:9).

While presenting an almost ‘blank paper’, the MoE at the same time required that the “…development in all essentials is based on voluntariness and local support” (Schmidt 2003b). This also created uncertainty. How much agreement does it take to not have local support? And whose voice counts the most? Would objections from three farmers mean that a project should be given up? And what if the objections came from the local shopkeeper or school teachers?

The question of local support came up already in the designation of pilot project areas. The Skjern Å area was proposed as a national park area. But the MoE declined the idea with the reasoning that local farmers in the associated area ‘Værnengene’ were against the idea. The question was relevant throughout the process. In pilot project Læsø there had been a petition against the national park project. This was not considered ‘significant resistance’. Only when the municipal council conducted a referendum and got a majority vote against the national park project, the local SC decided to withdraw the project.

The combination of a ‘blank paper’ and the requirement for local support may have affected the dynamics in the pilot projects and how the discussions evolved. If the project discussions pointed at solutions that required restrictions for agriculture (without pointing at ways to compensate them), then the Agriculture would be likely to leave. If, on the other hand, the discussed solutions did not depart from the current situation, then the environmental NGOs might want to leave rather than provide legitimacy to a process with no real, positive impact on nature.

4.5.1 Topics in Pilot Project Kgs. Nordsjælland

The task of the SC in Kgs. Nordsjælland was to come up with a proposal for a national park to bind together the state owned Grib Skov and Esumer Sø with a large number of state owned nature areas through a series of corridors (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e).

After two public meetings, the thematic groups were formed, each dealing with a theme: nature, cultural heritage, outdoor recreation, rural development, the fitting in of the horse race ‘The Frederiksborg Horse’ in a national park context, traffic infrastructure in the park, and then the four groups dealing with corridors North, South, East and West of the core area (see figure 2-4). There was hardly any co-ordination between the thematic groups, besides the two meetings they had together. The thematic groups had support from the extended secretariat. A set of investigations/technical reports were conducted, but not in time for the thematic groups to
benefit from them. The thematic groups ended up with 70 proposals for action, 6-700 pages in total. Ten of the most controversial proposals were selected by the SC/the secretariat to be the topic at the citizen summit.

The ten proposals were about (1) how extensive should a corridor be? (2)-(5) Should there be corridors to the North, East, West and/or South of the core pilot project area? (6) Should areas be fenced to allow for large grazers, eventually introduction of new species? 7) Re-introduction of beavers in Danish waterways? 8) Outdoor recreation and public access in the national park – is zoning needed? 9) Should the drained lake ‘Søborg sø’ and surroundings be restored? 10) Should the speed limits of the traffic in the national park area be lower, and some roads eventually be closed? (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005a).

For each proposal a set of possible scenarios were presented and the participants were asked to choose between them. More than 90 % supported the idea of having broad corridors (i.e. more than just a few metres broad). A majority also supported the establishment of corridors, 86 % said yes to a corridor to the West, 84 % to the East, 58 % to the North and 57 % to the South. The participants were more divided on the idea of fencing areas to be able to have large grazers, as 47 % did not want fencing, 47% could accept a minor fence, and 7 % could accept fencing of the whole Grib skov area. A majority of 77 % supported the re-introduction of beavers in lakes and streams, and 67 % would like to have the lake Søborg Sø restored. And as regards traffic, then a majority of 61 % agreed that the speed limit should be reduced to 51 km/hour whereas another 22 % supported the idea of closing down some roads in the national park area. And finally, the participants largely supported the idea of regulating recreational behaviour, either by zoning (71 %) or even only allowing silent outdoor recreation activities (14 %).

A potential weakness of the procedure was that the participants were not asked to prioritise between ten proposals, neither did they have to consider the costs of implementing the proposals, the financing or the externalities. And finally, it is reasonable to assume that the participants were those particularly interested in nature and outdoor recreation and therefore they might be relatively more positive towards the proposals than the average citizen.

Based on the work of the thematic groups, the results of the citizen summit and the technical reports, the SC prepared the final report. At this stage it became evident that the two agricultural organisations disagreed with the other members of the SC about the geographical delimitation of the proposed national park. The agricultural organisations found that the proposed corridors had come to cover a far too large area – 39.000 ha of which 18.000 ha is privately owned land (Nordsjællands Landboforening and Sjællandske Familielandbrug 2005a; 2005b). Also, they were worried of possible limitations in the agricultural management of the landowners in the potential corridors and they did not trust the guarantees of compensation. The disagreements could not be bridged despite of extra meetings between the executive committee and the local agricultural organisations and a national agricultural representative (Interview 12; Interview 18; 2005a; Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b). As a result the agricultural organisations withdrew from the SC and handed in their own proposal for a national park (Nordsjællands Landboforening and Sjællandske Familielandbrug 2005a).

### 4.5.2 General aspects

The bottom-up approach does not solve the inherent conflicting interests between nature conservation and agriculture. An official from the national park secretariat concludes that to have landowners participating it is important that it is outlined what the implications of the proposed project to the individual property are and how the landowner will be compensated. But the task
of the pilot project process and the way it was planned created significant uncertainty to this end (Jensen 2006: 11).

- Main conflicts were between nature conservation and utilisation. I.e. agriculture, forestry, user interests and nature interests (Interview 21).
- Another (latent) conflict was in between the green NGOs. Some representatives of the Outdoor Council wanted free, public access everywhere (Interview 9), whereas Birdlife Denmark wanted some habitats untouched by man, to ensure livelihood of protected species, like eagle (Interview 22).
- There were widely differing perceptions about what the objectives of a ‘national park’ are. Among other things, this is reflected in the individual position papers that many stakeholders presented on their web sites, Birdlife Denmark (www.dof.dk), the Social Democrats, Danish Agriculture, etc. Is the aim to improve biodiversity and nature quality and if yes, then how? Is the aim to improve public access to recreation and should access be unrestricted or restricted in some areas due to species protection? Etc.
- There were different perceptions of how national parks should be organised and steered. Each national park individually governed and branded, or all national parks governed and branded as an entity (Interview 12).
- In more pilot projects appeared a conflict between the demand for local control and agenda setting for the potential national park areas versus national control (Jensen 2006:11)
- Taking the bottom-up approach can also be interpreted as a comfortable way for the Government to squeeze down any possible conflicts of interests over different uses of nature and between different geographical regions, to the administrative-political level. The idea would be that these conflicts could then be solved or conflictual case areas be screened out before it entered a Parliamentary, political level.

4.6 The different forms of participation applied

4.6.1 Resources

The 40 million DKK budgeted for the seven pilot projects (5.3 million Euro) were mainly spent on the process, - participation, scientific reports and analyses. Only minor projects in the field (nature restoration or recreation facilities) were carried out.

The Pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland had a total budget of 3.8 million DKK (0.5 million Euro). Of this, 32 % (1.2 million DKK= 0.16 million Euro) was spent entirely on the participation process. This covered the costs of conducting the café seminar, the citizen summit, three scenario workshops, involvement of children, and the consultant fee for outline and implementation of the participation strategy. In addition to this, there was significant work support from the affected county and municipalities. All participants contributed on a voluntary (unpaid) basis, including chairmen of thematic working groups.

4.6.2 Procedural rules

There were only few guidelines to the pilot project process, i.e. those outlined by the MoE in the initiating letter. As also outlined in the case description chapter, the initiation letters were similar for all seven pilot projects. The tasks of the SC were formulated as follows:
“It is emphasised that the pilot projects point to solutions which significantly strengthen nature and its possibilities to develop, which strengthen the values regarding cultural heritage and which furthers the possibilities of the population to experience nature... It is the task of the steering committee in dialogue with the local population to make a report, describing the visions for, content of and the delimitation of a possible national park... The report must describe different alternatives and possibilities for development etc. The steering committee should consider that the development of a national park takes place during a time span of 20-30 years and that the development in all essentials is based on voluntariness and local support.... It is the responsibility of the steering committee that in order to create a vision and a plan for the area investigations are undertaken addressing – at least – the following: The present and potential natural values including the possibilities to establish coherence between nature areas; the values concerning the cultural heritage; the present and potential possibilities of outdoor recreation and a socio-economic and business-economic analysis of the consequences of establishing a national park... It is recommended that investigations are undertaken in cooperation with the county and relevant research institutions. Private consultant companies can also contribute to such tasks. Investigations regarding the cultural heritage can be done in cooperation with the regional council of cultural environment ...” (Schmidt 2003b).

The investigations should form the foundation for the work in the pilot projects as well as for a possible decision of actually creating a national park which is convincing internationally. The processes were all evaluated including the participatory processes undertaken.

Also the local influence was emphasised above national interest at this stage. The MoE appointed the SC chairmen and then “the composition of the SC will be decided by the convenors in co-operation with relevant local politicians from county and municipalities” (Schmidt 2003c).

In August 2004, Mr. Schmidt was replaced by a new MoE, Ms. Connie Hedegaard. She continued to emphasise the need for local support, but also stressed that “…a national park should not only serve local purposes. Rather, the point of departure is the national interest that is related to the nature, landscape and cultural heritage of that area” (Hedegaard 2006).

At the citizen summit at pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland, the discussions were guided by a facilitator at each table, and a set of rules were introduced, like ‘listening to each other’, and ‘respect for other viewpoints’.

4.6.3 Stage of policy process

The participation takes places at the stage of policy formulation, since the national park pilot project are basically input to the drafting of an Act on national parks.

4.6.4 Participation strategies

The major organisations Danish Nature Conservation Association, the Outdoor Council and Danish Agriculture were ‘born members’ of the pilot project SCs due to their sheer size. But Birdlife Denmark with ‘only’ 13,000 members had to demonstrate why it was relevant to also include them in the SC for each of the pilot projects and similarly for, e.g. Nepenthes. As a general approach, BirdLife Denmark gains credibility and influence by being the sole provider of an impressive data set over the occurrence and intensity of birds in Denmark, made on an entirely voluntary basis (Interview 22).
4.6.4.1 Participation of the Outdoor Council

Shortly after the national park process had started, a parallel process with three alternative pilot project areas was initiated by The Outdoor Council and financed with the receipts from the State football (and numbers game) pools (‘Tips- og lottomidler’) that the Outdoor Council administers. This may indicate that the initial selection of pilot project areas was not as participatory/democratic as it appears. Or/and it indicates that the Outdoor Council has a comparative strength because they are privileged with the right to administer the State football (and numbers game) pools (‘Tips- og lottomidler’). Some informants question the legitimacy of letting the Outdoor Council administer these funds and others remark that the Outdoor Council is an umbrella organisation and therefore not expected to act independently of these organisations, but that it appears to have gotten its own life (Interview 22).

4.6.4.2 Participation strategies of the Agricultural organisations

The dilemma for Danish Agriculture as well as local farmer organisations is that they cover a set of differing interests. Some members are large-scale pig farmers, others are organic farmers and yet others are part time farmers. Depending on their status, they may have differing and even conflicting interests in a national park. As a county politician pointed out, then the affected landowners in the pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland would be more likely to benefit than suffer from a national park, insofar as the amenity value of the properties and hence land prices will likely increase within the national park area (Interview 13).

Still the landowners/farmers were represented by the same organisation “Danish Agriculture” at the national level and at the local level by local branches of the organisation. There was internal coordination in the organisation.

In the pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland, representatives from agriculture took active part in the thematic working groups, both the corridor groups and rural development group. It was the impression that the motivation to participate was to minimise damage on landowners and, if possible, block the process rather than developing ideas for national parks.

Danish Agriculture has traditionally been privileged in their influence on agricultural policies (Buhl et al 2004; Daugbjerg 2005). Agriculture has been strongly represented in political parties, at local and national level. This affects decision-making. As a tourism representative noticed: local politicians are caught between the schism of actually wanting the NP on the one hand and then the requirements of the weighty representatives from agriculture, some of them being their local party members who may determine their re-election, on the other hand (Interview 19). An official from Danish Agriculture points out the same relationship but concludes differently. He finds that Agricultural influence on party politics is declining and therefore they gradually have to seek alternative participation strategies: They seek early influence, i.e. affecting the agenda setting, e.g. by contacting the responsible politician, and they seek it at the lowest possible level, trying to avoid media attention, and they lobby with public officials and seeking alliances where possible, e.g. with environmental NGOs. For instance, when there were rumours about the national park process coming up, Danish Agriculture contacted the MoE to inform him of their attitude, and to get some clear directions as to what the intended process would be about and how the potential NP areas would be delimited. This contact resulted in a press announcement from the Minister in the journal ‘Landsbladet’, in which he states some overall guidelines for the process (Interview 6).

According to an informant, an increasing number of interest organisations are being involved, politicians have less time to meet with the single NGO, and the increasing influence of the press on the political agenda means that single issues are becoming more and more important. Danish
Agriculture therefore tries to influence the decisions outside of the political level, i.e. through the administration, to keep issues out of the press. In the national park case; however, they were in a continuous dialogue with the MoE, but not other politicians. The number of politicians in Parliament with an affiliation to agriculture is decreasing; meaning that the level of sympathy with agricultural issues is declining as well (Nørring 2006; Interview 6).

The competition for influence among the NGOs has led to some ‘odd’ alliances between ‘Danish Agriculture’, the Danish Society for Nature Conservation and a few other green NGOs on single issues such as access for the public on private lands; knowing that if they can agree on something it is unlikely that the politicians will later change the agreement. According to an informant, networking is of imperative importance; networking with other NGOs, with public administrators and with politicians. Competition has also made it even more important for NGOs to be factually strong (Interview 11; Nørring 2006; Interview 6).

4.7 Democratic significance of participation?

Locally the aim of the process was to ensure local anchorage and a sense of ownership of the park among the citizens (Schmidt 2003e). According to the informants this was achieved, at least for the citizens actively participating in the process as they became more aware of the values of their local areas which strengthened local identity and furthered enthusiasm about a park. The work in the local working groups created networks which for some of the thematic groups in Kgs. Nordsjælland still exist even though the process has ended and there no longer is a secretariat to support meetings. Most of the informants participating in the process felt that the process had furthered trust building and a mutual understanding among the participants (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 21; Interview 24; Kvistgaard Consult 2005a). At the Citizen summit of the pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland, the participants were asked what they thought of the process. The results showed that they were generally satisfied. See Kvistgaard Consult (2005).

However, not all participants found the process entirely positive. In Kgs. Nordsjælland the representatives from the farmer organisations withdrew from the process as they were not satisfied with the geographical demarcation of the national park area, and they did not trust the guarantees of complete compensation if restrictions were imposed on land use. A representative pointed out, that one of the important lessons he had learned was that when participating in a process such as the national park process, there is a significant difference in the time different participants can spend on preparation for meetings, some participate alongside a full time job, whereas others have more time available. This affects the influence they are able to have in the meetings. He felt that the secretariat had too much influence, also because they were more used to this type of process. For example he would have liked more debate on the content of a national park, in particular the management of the state owned forested areas and possible ways to improve tourism facilities in the forests (Interview 18).

In a letter to the MoE, the local farming organisations labelled the pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland “…a closed process with lack of will to include the viewpoints of the Agriculture and their worries in relation to a coming national park” (Nordsjællands Landboforening and Sjællandske Familielandbrug 2005b).

Members of the secretariat in Kgs. Nordsjælland were disappointed of how difficult it was to involve the ‘ordinary citizens’. Many people did participate, but most were members of an environmental NGO or had an education related to the themes of the national park discussions. Considering the efforts to have local participation, they felt that there were still to high a number
of people who were not aware of the process (Interview 12; Interview 24). The process led to the recognition by the forest superintendent that it is an illusion to be able to involve ‘the ordinary citizen’. They may not be interested or do not want to be involved. Some feel that they have elected the local and national politicians to protect their interests and may feel that this sort of process override the representative democracy and they therefore are forced to spend time and energy on representing themselves (Christensen 2006; Interview 12).

On the positive side, the forest supervisor recognised that involving e.g. an NGO may allow for innovative, low cost solutions with significant, beneficial environmental impact, as they can bring in a very specialised knowledge, the forest managers do not have beforehand (Interview 12).

The process caused some new actors to enter the arena, most notably the mayors of the involved municipalities. In the pilot project areas, the national park process may have given the municipalities an incentive as well as inspiration to take up the new ‘green’ responsibility, the municipalities have acquired with the municipal reform.

At the national level, several of the informants claimed that one of the most important impacts of the process as a whole was to raise awareness among the general public, and particularly among the affected citizens regarding nature conservation in general (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 11; Interview 16; Interview 20; Interview 13; Interview 22; Interview 19). The process has functioned as a lever for a general debate about nature conservation.

One new thing about the national park process was that it took a bottom-up approach. The process was initiated by the MoE, and facilitated by the NFNA, but the structure was still to build it on the recommendations coming from the locally governed pilot projects, each of them chaired by a local mayor. An effect of this – intended or not – has been to ‘open up’ the local countryside to be a legitimate issue for discussion not only by farmers but by all local people. It is considered particularly important that the mayors of the involved communities were active members in the local SCs. As mentioned above, nature management and planning of the countryside used to be beyond the jurisdiction and – therefore – interest of the municipalities. With the new structural reform, this has become the responsibility of the municipalities. With such, the national park discussion may have stimulated the municipal interest in and taking responsibility for these new tasks.

The public administrator felt that it was important to have the local citizens involved instead of them passively awaiting what others decide (Interview 12). A process like the national park process gave public officials an opportunity to see and hear what was important to citizens (Interview 12). The participation of interest organisations and the public gave a better decision basis for the politicians, simply because the issues were dealt with from more perspectives. To involve all stakeholders increases the likelihood of making the right decisions (Interview 21).

In Kgs. Nordsjælland it was the participation efforts that gave the SC the legitimacy to make the decisions they made. It was a real democratic strength that so much was done to give people influence. However, it still remains to be proven how much influence the participation results will have on the final national parks (Interview 24).

A convenor of a local SC felt that the bottom-up approach had been valuable. The fact that the local community was given the opportunity to self-regulate meant that some of the prejudices different actors had about national parks were eliminated. If a park had just been designated from above, these prejudices would still prevail (Interview 16). Furthermore did the bottom-up approach and the local participation strengthen the local identity of the people and give anchorage to the possible future national park (Interview 22).
The participation process in each pilot project may have enhanced a ‘participatory culture’ that will positively affect any future efforts towards establishing a national park in the area, as suggested for the pilot project ‘Kongernes Nordsjælland’ (Niras 2005b). Also, the whole national park process has most likely created more public awareness and dialogue about nature policy and rural development. This has also paved the way for increasing the number and diversity of stakeholders that are considered legitimate to participate in a dialogue about the future of the countryside and agricultural production. A dialogue that formerly was more or less monopolized by agricultural stakeholders.

Did the mix of agricultural and non-agricultural stakeholders have any impact on policy recommendations? Well, in the project ‘Kongernes Nordsjælland’ the agricultural stakeholders did not support the recommendations from the rest of the group, so in this case they did not find common ground. In the project ‘Lille Vildmose’ they did, but the joint recommendation was also that farmers should not be given any further restrictions on their farming practices due to the National Park. So from a first look, it doesn’t seem like much has changed.

A keyword to the national park project was/is ‘trust’ and ‘trust building’. The Forest supervisor compared the process in Kgs. Nordsjælland with Mols and said that the main difference is that in Mols there have been 30 years of trust building dialogue between the authorities and landowners, whereas the process in Kgs. Nordsjælland is totally new. He would personally have preferred more time for trust building with landowners prior to the national park pilot project (Interview 12).

The political opposition suspected that the national park process was merely a ‘spin-project’ by the Government parties, meant to create a perception of a Government that made an effort to conserve nature as well as being progressive in terms of participation and a more direct democracy, and hereby draw away attention from the critics from the opposition and environmental NGOs after the Government had cut the environmental budgets shortly after the elections; furthermore, the Government parties really just wanted to stall the process of actually designating nature reserves, hoping that the demand of local support combined with the broad interest representation would strangle the national park idea from its birth (Interview 20; Ryding 2006; Interview 17).

Compared to other processes the national park was more transparent in terms of how money was spent, but also that all documents and minutes from meeting were accessible to everyone on the internet (Interview 17).

Since the NFNA took part in all local processes and were the secretariat to the NAG they were able to influence the agenda to a great extent and it became the view on nature values of the NFNA that became dominant (Interview 20). It is a matter of perspective if this is perceived to be a strength or a weakness. From the perspective of the NFNA it is very important to be careful to make clear the national priorities and avoid any doubt of the extent of the local mandate; it is most unfortunate and unprofessional if the State has to change something that was decided locally in order to confirm with existing rules and regulations. The informant felt that the local projects had been left much to themselves, and that they could have been supported more from the NFNA (Interview 15).

The local mandate was not very clear from the onset of the local pilot projects, some of the informants pointed to the initial uncertainty and the so-called ‘blank paper’ as a problem to the process initially, giving the actual work process a slow start (Interview 12; Interview 20). That the MoE emphasised that agreement should be reached if national parks were to become reality, herby giving all participants a sort of veto only added to the initial insecurity of where the process was to go (Interview 20; Interview 22). For the national politicians the set-up of the
process could be considered very convenient; the unpleasant decisions were transferred to someone else, i.e. the SCs and the NAG (Interview 20).

This fostered concerns that people living outside the pilot project areas were not sufficiently taken into consideration, as they were not represented in the local SCs. It is the responsibility of the national, elected politicians to serve the interest of the general public (Interview 19). On the other hand this responsibility can also be ascribed to the public officials who did have a significant influence on the process. The matter of representation was an important point of debate in the process. E.g. how should influence be weighed in terms of interest intensity? It is easy for a large number of people at a citizen summit to vote in favour of large ecological corridors, when it is someone else who must renounce their rights (Interview 9). It is easy for people to vote in favour of traffic limitations on roads they rarely use to the detriment of the daily commuters (Interview 12.)

A major concern for some of the informants was the insecurity of the funds being allocated to national parks when designated. The worst case scenarios were that there would not be sufficient funds set aside for both national parks and simultaneously live up to the demands of various EU directives, or that there would barely be enough for these two efforts leaving nothing for nature protection outside national parks and habitats and hence ‘A’ and ‘B’ nature would be a reality (Interview 16; Interview 20; Interview 22).

A danger following from the broad interest representation in the NAG was that it will be the lowest common denominators the parties can agree upon rendering the result vague and insignificant. According to an informant this was to some extent the case in the evaluations of the individual pilot projects which were descriptive rather than valuating (Interview 20).
5 Intersectoral coordination

This chapter addresses the overarching research question of the extent to which intersectoral coordination (ISC) can be recognised as part of current governance practices in forest policy and related policies. Has ISC occurred or/and been institutionalised in forest policy and related policy fields so far? Has ISC efforts changed over time? What was the relation between rhetoric and practices as regards ISC in the concrete processes under study? (GoFOR 2006). The chapter is mainly concerned with phase three and the process generally.

We consider five elements of ISC: The who of ISC i.e. which actors, which sectors etc.? The what of ISC i.e. what sort of issues, what is at stake, what happened? The how of ISC: the rules (informal and formal) and resources for intersectoral coordination. The how element also refers to the process: how did it go? The why of ISC: what rationales and reasons and intentions can be identified? The why element also refers to rhetoric and practices of ISC. The possible changes as regards ISC in the governance process over time (GoFOR 2006).

One development that might affect the demand for increased coordination between sectors is the development towards an actual ‘nature policy’. Some argue that there is no coherent nature policy, that nature politics are merely a conglomerate of the (un-)intended effects of other policy areas, mainly agriculture (Gade 2006; Interview 20). There never was a ‘Ministry of Nature’, but a Ministry of Environment, which started out as a Ministry of Pollution Control mainly dealing with the effects of industrial pollution on the environment (Miljø- og Energiministeriet 1996). Roughly speaking nature was meant for production; agricultural products, forest products and fishery. However, times changed, and as the costs of production became more obvious, nature conservation and protection entered the agenda. Therefore different measures to pursue effective nature conservation and protection brought different sectors into the discussions regarding how they affect nature and what values nature offer other than traditional production.

In this perspective the Wilhjelm Committee was a first effort to define a national nature policy. National Parks can be considered a second effort. In both cases there was a broad representation of private interest organisations and public authorities.

5.1 Sectors and coordination

The following section investigates how sectors are defined in the case study, if there were explicit intentions of ISC and how this was articulated. Further, we look at what sectors were involved during the process.

The term ‘intersectoral coordination’ is not explicitly mentioned by either informants or in the documents we studied. Nevertheless intersectoral coordination took place and was a priority in the guise of prioritising having a broad representation of interests, and reaching agreement among them.

The initiation letter from the MoE prescribed that a number of sectors were to be involved in the sense that the local SCs and the NAG were to have members representing nature interests, trade interests, the cultural environment, tourism, outdoor recreation as well as the affected public authorities. Furthermore it was emphasised that it was important to reach agreement, or at least avoid significant opposition (Schmidt 2004; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a). The areas of interest thus defined by the Minister constituted the sector definition in our treatment of the case. Hence the sectors were initially defined through the actors and interests rather than thematic policies.
The argument was that all these sectors would be affected by a national park and that all interests should be heard and taken into account in order to achieve local anchorage for the projects. Without local involvement a national park would not be possible in an area. Moreover was the process as such a mean to establish the concept of a national park in a Danish context.

Differing perceptions of what the objectives of a ‘national park’ should be were debated both in the local SCs and the NAG: Was the aim to improve nature quality and biological diversity? Was the aim to improve public access to recreation and should access be unrestricted or restricted in some areas due to species protection? What should be the role of tourism and rural development? Should agriculture and forestry be restricted or continue unchanged? Will designation of a national park require that traffic is regulated and restricted? What is the role of cultural heritage conservation vis-a-vis, e.g. nature conservation? One rationale behind making the process intersectoral was to find some answers to these questions (Interview 9; Interview 12).

The involved sectors were: nature, agriculture, forestry, outdoor activities, tourism, trade, traffic and culture. Some were more active than others. The nature sector consisted of interest organisations working for increased nature protection; those were the Danish Society for Nature Conservation, WWF, Birdlife Denmark, and the local level Nepenthes. The Outdoor Council partly belongs to the nature sector, but mainly represents the ‘outdoor sector’. These organisations were naturally very active working for national parks to be first and foremost about nature conservation. At the national level these organisation coordinated with each other and came with common suggestions to the meetings at the NAG. Some of the other members of the group were annoyed by this and felt that they tried to control the agenda (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 11; Interview 22; Interview 21).

The agricultural sector naturally felt they had to be active since national parks were likely to affect the agricultural production in the areas and some of the farm lands would be included in the parks. The organisations of the agricultural sector in Denmark have traditionally been powerful political players cooperating closely with the Ministry of Agriculture. It was actually not until 1973 when Denmark entered the European Community that the Ministry overtook the administration of the agricultural policies. Until then the agricultural organisations had taken care of that themselves. The political power of the agricultural organisations originates from a close cooperation with the officials at the Ministry of Agriculture and traditionally very close relations to the Liberal Party (Daugbjerg 2005).

However both of these influence channels have diminished in recent years. The number of farmers has decreased considerably meaning that the Liberal Party needs more votes from other segments of society as well. Furthermore the number of politicians with a background in agriculture has decreased (Interview 6). Nonetheless the agricultural sector has still a strong national lobby organisation and is well organised with local branches all over the country. There used to be two large organisations but in 2002 they merged into ‘Danish Agriculture’. Approximately 90 % of Danish farmers are member of this organisation (Dansk Landbrug 2005).

Furthermore the agricultural sector was represented by public officials from the Ministry of Provisions.

The agricultural sector found it important that there were clear delimitations of the national parks and that they would not affect the areas outside and that any restrictions in land use were compensated. They established an internal committee and held many meetings to make the agricultural sector speak with one voice, which is no easy task, as the organisation encompasses a very heterogeneous body of members. They entered into alliance with the private forestry sector which shared the landowner interests and used all the available channels of influence; in the committees and outside (Interview 6).
The outdoor sector was first and foremost embodied by the Outdoor Council, which is an umbrella organisation of all the organisations engaged in outdoor recreation/activities e.g. cross country running, mountain bikers etc. Furthermore the outdoor sector consisted of the Danish Sports Association and at the local level of the affected local sports organisations as well as members of the local branches of the Outdoor Council (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

The Outdoor Council had massive influence as they came up with half the money for the process. The convenor of the NAG retired in the Outdoor Council just before he was appointed convenor. Because of the money the organisation brought into the process the number of pilot projects was doubled and the Outdoor Council was not without influence when selecting the additional projects (Interview 20; Interview 22; Interview 17). Furthermore the Outdoor Council funded three so-called investigation projects independent of the Government that ran parallel to the pilot projects under more or less the same conditions as the pilot projects. Therefore it is as likely that an investigation project is designated to become a national park as a pilot project (Friluftsrådet 2005; Friluftsrådet 2007).

It was the Outdoor Council who wanted the NAG and hence in a sense took the lead on intersectoral coordination at the national level. The argumentation behind the NAG was that since it was national parks that were discussed, some national body should be there to ensure that the pilot projects did not only favour local interests but also national (Interview 9). One might say that this task could have been done by the NFNA; however, it was prioritised that there was a broad representation of interests for this task (Agerskov and Schmidt 2003; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

The NAG also provided a venue for members of the local SCs to meet and exchange experiences. It was pointed out from several of the informants that the local representatives were very important as a group. They were very committed to their local projects and brought in an enthusiasm that gave the NAG a different character from other advisory committees furthering cooperation and the will to reach agreement (Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 21; Interview 10). Furthermore the incentive for all the members to reach agreement in the NAG was, that then no politicians would dare to change the decisions of the group (Interview 9; Interview 21; Interview 19).

The tourism sector was represented by the national tourism association nationally. The tourism sector was interested in national parks because it makes the task of branding the areas as unique, valuable nature areas easier. Locally in the rural areas tourism might be a significant contributor to the regional income. However, the tourism sector does not seem to have been very active. To some extent they shared the interests of the outdoor organisation in terms of ensuring public access in the prospective national parks, and there might not have been a real need to be very active (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 19).

The trade sector did not play a significant part in the process, a part form the agricultural trade. Locally trade interests were connected to tourism. Nationally the traffic sector was represented by a public official from the Ministry of Transportation and Energy, and was not an active member. Locally in Kgs. Nordsjælland there was a thematic working group dealing with traffic and infrastructure in the possible national park (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 21; Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

The culture sector was represented by a public official from the Ministry of Culture. The cultural heritage of an area was one of the things that should be investigated for the individual pilot projects; the rationale being that the cultural heritage of an area is an important national value for
the local population as well as for the procurement of a national park (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

None of the informants missed any sectors or organisations in the process; they all thought that the relevant sectors were represented (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 11; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 21; Interview 19; Interview 6). As there seems to be an increased interest in the beneficial effects of outdoor recreation for human health, it might have been appropriate if the health sector had been involved. One could also imagine that the educational sector could have been involved as forest kindergartens are becoming increasingly popular, and some are concerned if the youth are learning enough about nature in the schools. However; these sectors were not missed by the participants.

At the local level in Kgs. Nordsjælland intersectoral coordination was pursued in the SC. Moreover the ten thematic working groups consisting of local citizens were working on the sector specific themes, and the working groups were open to anyone with an interest. The extended secretariat had a resource person in each of the thematic groups, and some were resource persons in more than one group. This ensured some coordination between the thematic groups.

At the local level in Kgs. Nordsjælland intersectoral coordination was pursued in the SC. Moreover the ten thematic working groups consisting of local citizens were working on the sector specific themes, and the working groups were open to anyone with an interest. The extended secretariat had a resource person in each of the thematic groups, and some were resource persons in more than one group. This ensured some coordination between the thematic groups.

There were four groups working on corridors which inherently involve several sectors as it is a geographical delimitation rather than a thematic. The remaining thematic groups were to discuss how nature, cultural heritage, outdoor recreation, local development and infrastructure/traffic should be dealt with in the prospective national park. The suggestions from the thematic groups were coordinated in the secretariat; some of them were evaluated at the citizen summit. The SC decided on which to include in the final report and was hence the formal venue for local intersectoral coordination (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

There were several issues on the agenda making some sort of intersectoral coordination necessary in order to reach agreement: In general the main conflicts were between nature conservation and utilisation; i.e. utilisation for production e.g. the corridor conflict below, and utilisation for recreation and tourism (Interview 21).

- The most debated issue was corridors to connect habitats and enable species dispersal versus intensive agriculture. Agreement between sectors (nature and agriculture) was not obtained despite efforts from the executive committee and that all parties agreed that landowners should be compensated for additional restrictions on land use resulting from a national park (Interview 12; Interview 18; Interview 10).

- In Kgs. Nordsjælland it was debated if there should be large grazers in the forests. They need fencing which is in conflict with recreational interests and was therefore omitted from the suggestion list of the SC. Generally the outdoor sector wants free access to the public where the greener parts of the nature sector wants refuges with no access to the public (Interview 22; Interview 21).

- Tourism development was an issue in Kgs. Nordsjælland, only as regards procurement strategies. An informant would have liked to discuss tourism and infrastructure more, e.g. hotels at the fringe of the park, etc. But the strategy of the tourism representative was to first of all enhance the establishing of a national park. And as he pointed out - the precondition for tourism is that there is high quality nature (Interview 18; Interview 19).

- In some of the more rural of the pilot projects, the idea of national parks and nature as a vehicle to local and regional economic development and growth was an issue. However in Kgs. Nordsjælland it was judged that a national park would only have limited influence on the
job market as both trade and tourism is well developed and in growth already (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

- Traffic and restrictions on traffic through Kgs. Nordsjælland was discussed in one of the thematic groups and the costs of lowering the speed limits for conservation reasons was calculated, but no recommendations were made by the SC, hence further coordination between traffic and nature was postponed until a national park is actually designated (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).

A sector that is very important is finance. There were no representatives from the Ministry of Finance in any of the committees; and there was considerable insecurity what sort of funding a national park will receive. The NAG made a sub-committee investigating possible and existing subsidy schemes; furthermore an investigation was made regarding the welfare economic consequences of national parks (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

Because financial sector was kept out of the process, the participants could then focus on the contents of a national park and its organisation without letting themselves be restricted by budget concerns. As such the design could be considered to stimulate intersectoral co-ordination (as the budget is allocated according to sectors). The major disadvantage was, however, that financing continues to be the key factor in ensuring the establishment and success of NPs. And potentially financially affected sectors such as agriculture and forestry, had reasons to be more concerned about this matter than other, not directly affected sectors (Interview 9; Interview 20; Interview 18; Interview 6). The environmental NGOs were concerned about future financing as well, as this was underlying the debate on whether a prioritisation of national parks would lead to less priority to and hence funding to other nature management activities (Folketinget 2006; Interview 20; Interview 22; Interview 5).

BirdLife Denmark was also concerned about the future organisation of the parks. They were worried whether an organisation structure with a fund independent from the Ministry of Environment would also incur the risk that the national parks might be claimed a flag ship and ‘success’ of the Ministry of Environment on the one hand while on the other hand be underfinanced in its daily management, as the Ministry will always be able to claim that to be the responsibility of the fund (Interview 22).

During the process the relationship between actors from different sectors changed. During the process both nationally and in particular locally a greater understanding for the perspectives of the others developed, which made coordination easier as the process progressed (Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 21; Interview 24; Interview 14).

In the NAG coordination efforts changed as the role of the group changed. As the pilot projects were ongoing the group should only follow the projects; when they handed in their final reports, the Advisory Group should make recommendations to the national political level. And since agreement was considered very important the members had to adapt to one another (Interview 9; Interview 11; Interview 21; Interview 6).

5.2 Expectations related to ISC in the future process

In the national park process there has been a significant involvement of both private and public actors so far. The question that remains to be answered is, to which extent private actors will be involved when national parks are actually designated? According to the act proposal there are to be some influence from NGOs ad well as the local citizens; however, the act proposal does not include a national body similar to the NAG, where the national values can be pursued, national
interests coordinated and experiences exchanged, such as the NAG recommended (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

Compared to, e.g. the implementation of the habitats directive, an increase in governmental and non-governmental actors has occurred. The national park process was from the onset a flexible and open process where many actors were included to deal with a complex issue.

The national park case does not have any direct linkage to international policy-making, but the allocation to the sub-national level has been considerable in the process so far. The decision-making power regarding where national parks should be situated and how they are to be organised and financed remains entirely at the national level.

5.3 Effects of intersectoral coordination

The effects of intersectoral coordination are mostly related to the impact dimension, i.e. intersectorial coordination has stimulated a behavioural change in some of the actors. Several of the informants said that working in a committee over such a long period of time had given a better understanding of the opinions and motives of the usual adversaries (Interview 16; Interview 24; Interview 14). One of the public officials had realised what can be gained when involving some of the local people with a special interest in e.g. birds. Sometimes only minor changes in management practices can make major differences for biodiversity; but managers need to know that, and this knowledge can be achieved when working together with the people with special interests (Interview 12).

Some of the informants felt that the strict time limits had hampered intersectorial coordination. If the project in Kgs. Nordsjælland had been extended it might have been possible to find a compromise between landowners and the other members of the SC (Interview 18). Furthermore some of the participant felt that the time constraints gave the secretariats and the NFNA more influence than they should have had, as it was not possible for the organisations to make suggestions in response to new information gained during the process and have them approved by their organisation before the next meeting (Interview 9; Interview 18; Interview 14).

Some of the local groups established during the pilot projects continued to meet after the process ended; because they enjoyed working together, and because they hope that their area will be designated as national parks (Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 24; Interview 14).

The increased number of organisations participating in committees such as the NAG and the SCs has changed the conditions for the agricultural organisations in terms of gaining influence on the political decisions affecting the agricultural trade. Now ‘Danish Agriculture’ is one of many organisations and do no longer have the privileges they used to have. Therefore they also seek influence through the political level and their administrative contacts. If ‘Danish Agriculture’ had only pursued their interests in the NAG in the national park case, the outcome would not have been as satisfying to the agricultural sector (Interview 6).

It is considered important that the mayors of the involved communities were active members in the local SCs. Nature management and planning of the countryside used to be beyond the jurisdiction and – therefore – interest of the municipalities. With the new structural reform, this has become the responsibility of the municipalities. As such, the national park discussion may have stimulated the municipal interest in these new tasks and taking responsibility.
6 Multi level governance

6.1 Introduction

This case study takes departure in the conceptualisation of multi-level governance as “dispersion of authoritative decision-making across multiple territorial levels” and in the point of view that in “new” modes of governance, (1) the connection between different tiers is much more fluid than in “old” modes of governance, and (2) the range of actors involved in decision making is much larger, including not only state actors but also “new” non-state actors. Many of the “new” actors are trying to influence decision making at different levels of government. The question whether decision-making takes place within a multi-level system or not is an empirical question, which will be investigated below by help of the research questions stated in TOR (GoFOR 2006). Before proceeding with the case study and the questions, it is worthwhile to take a brief look at what are the relevant territorial levels in the Danish Context.

6.1.1 Coordination at different territorial levels in Denmark

In Denmark at least four territorial levels are of importance in the perspective of multi-level governance: The supranational, the national, the “regional”, and the local.

Supranational: Denmark is a member of EU and other international organisations. The Habitats directive and the Birds directives issued by EU and UN’s International Convention of Biodiversity are examples of supra-national frameworks having a direct impact on nature governance in Denmark and on the national park pilot.

During the implementation of the National Park Pilot Projects, the regional level was constituted by 14 counties. The local level consisted of 271 municipalities. There were local governments at both levels. Recent local government reforms have eliminated the counties, introduced five new regions and reduced the number of municipalities to 98. These reforms came into force January 1 2007. Table 4-1 shows the number of inhabitants in the municipalities in Denmark and in selected European countries.

Table 6-1: Number of inhabitants in the municipalities in selected European countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total number of municipalities</th>
<th>Average population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark 2005</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>19,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark 2007</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36,565</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>34,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8,109</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>31,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Danish Ministry of the Interior http://www.im.dk/publikationer/kommunareformen-kort_fortalt/kap02.htm

In Denmark a range of formal rules and legal frameworks are significant for co-ordination between the three territorial levels of governance. For land use, the most important set of formal rules is the Plan Act. This act divides the responsibility for land use planning between the three
territorial levels. The main aim of the act is to protect nature and environment and to promote sustainable development of society, taking into consideration national, regional as well as local interests. The act states as one of its specific objectives that the public should be included in the planning processes as much as possible (LBK nr.763 2002). A basic principle is that planning for land use at lower levels of government should be in agreement with planning at, and approved by higher levels of government. Correspondingly, planning of land use at higher levels of government must not be carried out without consulting the affected lower levels of government. The law is administered by the NFNA, which is part of the Ministry of Environment (MoE).

When studying multi-level governance in the particular case of the National Park Pilot Projects, it should be kept in mind, moreover, that Denmark is characterised by unusually intensive farming, private ownership, and recreational use of land, and no wilderness (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). Plans for larger areas of land such as national parks will usually include not only State owned land but also private property, and affect a range of different people and interests. Hence, in the Danish context, the concept of national parks should not be associated with, e.g., IUCN’s criteria for national parks, which typically are based on State Property and prohibition or strong restrictions against agriculture, forestry, hunting and fisheries (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001).

This chapter will focus on all the four phases as they are all important to understanding the overarching questions about what level decisions are made.

6.2 First phase: The Wilhjelm Committee (March 2000 – August 2001)

6.2.1 Actors involved at the various territorial levels

The Committee comprised of 35 members representing farmers’, fishermen’s and forest associations, non-governmental organisations, research institutions, ministries and local government associations (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). A complete list of organisations represented in Wilhjelm Committee is attached as annex 1. The National Forest and Nature Agency (NFNA) served as Secretariat to the Committee (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001).

The Committee set up four thematic working groups. The most relevant of these groups worked on “quality and monitoring of nature”. A list of organisations represented in this group is attached as annex 2. It appears that the member organisations reflect part of the main committee.

The working groups held a number of meetings and conferences, consulted experts and interest groups, and elaborated reports, which were finally compiled by the secretariat and approved by the committee. The main report was submitted to the Government on August 23, 2001.

In the final report, the Committee supported the idea of establishing what was referred to as national nature areas. They recommended six specific areas: The heath lands and dunes in northern Jutland - “Thy”, the raised bogs of “Lille Vildmose”, “Mols Bjerge”, The forest areas in northern Zealand together with Esrum lake – “Kgs. Nordsjælland”, the archipelago of south Funen and the white cliff at Møn. The argumentation was that these areas represented areas of national and international significance. The rationale behind the recommendation was that larger, coherent areas of protected nature offer better opportunities for a natural development, improve the dispersal of species, ensure continuity and create better living conditions for a number of species (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001).

In the report it was recommended that the designation of the parks should involve the landowners, the public, and the affected municipalities. For each area, separate plans should be developed regarding nature protection, the development of the areas, and the management of the park (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001).
During the first part of the first phase, the international level represented by OECD played a direct role as catalyst for the process. Moreover, the work of the Wilhjelm Committee was carried out within the framework of international conventions and directives (UN and EU). In this sense, the supra-national level was involved in the process directly as well as indirectly.

At the national level, the government, and in particular the MoE (Svend Auken) played a key role as initiator of the process. Niels Wilhjelm played a key role as chairman of the committee. Both had an interest in support from a broad range of organisations and associations during as well as after the process of elaborating the report to ensure a smooth process. NFNA played a key role attending the process as secretariat, and had the same interest as the Minister to ensure a smooth process and a useful outcome.

Regional/local: The 35 nominated members of the Wilhjelm Committee were recruited from farmers’, fishermen’s and forest associations, non-governmental organisations, research institutions, ministries and local government associations (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). The working group on nature was composed almost solely by representatives from “green” organisations and research institutions, whose interest in multi-level co-ordination is probably restricted to their own support base. Understanding new actors as non-governmental actors, a range of new actors thus entered the political arena in phase I.

The two national associations of counties and municipalities were represented in the committee by one member each, but there were 15 representatives from different interest groups including three conventional farmers, nine representatives from the Ministries and seven representatives from research institutions. This indicates that the committee was composed more out of concern to different interests, to include the right expertise, and to ensure inter-sector coordination than of concern to different territorial levels.

6.2.2 Formal statements and rules related to co-ordination

The key documents for phase 1 were: (a) Terms of reference for the Wilhjelm committee, and (b) The main report of the Wilhjelm committee.

In the terms of reference for the Wilhjelm Committee (2000), the word coordination is mentioned only once, and then not in connection with different territorial levels: “the committee must evaluate the tools applied, and evaluate the need for strengthened coordination and prioritisation of the different activities”.

The Wilhjelm Committee’s main report (2001) is even more specific in its call for government to work within the framework of international directives etc: “A government decision should be made on the establishment of six national nature areas. These should be selected as part of the follow up on the EEC nature protection directives and as a consequence of the importance of the areas for national biodiversity”. Moreover, it is much concerned with how to ensure a “Better interplay between local and national interests in nature” through “dialogue between national and local interests”, and the importance of “involving local authorities” in the process. It is stated that “uniform nature quality planning should be implemented as a part of regional planning”, and it is proposed to set up a national committee under the Danish Nature and Forest Agency to represent different stakeholder organisations and authorities. Still, the report does not explicitly mention the need for coordination between different territorial levels.

6.2.3 Conclusion

In the first phase, the process went on mainly at the supranational and the national levels. The regional and the local levels were represented through national organisations, but interest groups and different sectors played a more important role than did different territorial levels.
Rhetorically, the concept multi-level coordination was not important, but there was much concern about related issues of how to ensure “interplay”, “dialogue”, “involvement” and “representation” of local interests and local authorities in the process.

6.3 Second phase: Selecting the National Park Pilot Project Areas (November 2001 – April 2003)

6.3.1 Actors involved at the various territorial levels

Supra national level: No international actors were involved directly or indirectly in the second phase, but the international commitments were used as sources of legitimisation:

“All the areas that are included in this initiative ... covers very significant national and international nature conservation interests, and all the areas include, for instance, large areas designated under the EU Nature Directives, i.e. EEC habitat areas and EEC Birds Directive protection areas. There are other areas in Denmark with corresponding significant nature conservation interests and hence with a potential for later becoming national parks...” (Schmidt 2003f) (MoE)

In conclusion, the supra-national level was indirectly involved in phase 2 only in the sense that the international commitments served as a source of legitimisation for the Government’s selection of areas.

National level: During phase 2, the policy processes at the national level were the most important. The Danish government, and in particular the new MoE, were key actors in being the drivers of the process. Their interest in coordinating the process with the regional and local levels will be discussed below in section 5.4.1. The Outdoor Council, which is a “new” actor in the sense that it does not belong to government, became a key actor when it entered the arena in January 2003. This was due to the financial capability of the council rather than due to the involvement of multiple levels in the process. The two political parties in support of government were directly involved in that their votes in Parliament were decisive to the 20 million DKK grant.

Regional/local levels: The counties and the municipalities became directly involved in the process, but their role was limited to react on the Minister’s letter with regard to whether or not they wanted to join the process.

6.3.2 Formal statements and rules related to co-ordination

During phase 2 policy statements can be studied mainly through the following documents: (1) The letter of agreement between the Ministry of Environment and the Outdoor Council and (2) The Ministers’ letter of September 2002 to the counties and municipalities (3) the answers from the counties and municipalities to the Minister, and debates in the parliament.

None of the investigated policy statements mention coordination between different territorial levels as an issue, but the issue does play an important implicit role. In their letter of agreement, for instance, the MoE and the Outdoor council state that the main purpose of the pilot projects is to create “the best possible coordinated basis for a decision whether there should be national parks in Denmark, and if so how they should be organised, etc.” Furthermore, the letter underlines the importance to ensure a close dialogue between the local population, local associations, the local authorities and the relevant central government authorities. The Minister emphasises that he wants the process to be voluntary and participatory.
6.3.3 Interdependence of levels and interaction patterns and effects of coordination

During phase 2, the role played by local actors depended on actions taken at the national level. In this sense, the mode of interaction between the national and the local levels can be characterised as hierarchical. At the same time, there was some mutual adaptation between the territorial levels, in that the local levels had the option to abstain from joining the process. This was what Southern Funen actually did. The Minister played an outstanding role in driving the interaction among the involved levels in this phase. There were no problems regarding coordination.

6.3.4 Summary

During the second phase, the national level was still the most important. It was the MoE and the Outdoor council who were the key actors. Part of the process did take place at the regional and local levels, but only to the extent this was required for the counties and municipalities to produce the requested reaction for or against the national park process. Coordination between different territorial levels was not mentioned in any of the examined policy statements. There was, however, much concern about how to ensure interplay and dialogue with, involvement and representation of local interests and local authorities in the process. The expressed need for involving local authorities instead of coordinating with them indicates that the key actors themselves viewed the process as being hierarchical.

6.4 Third phase: implementation of the national pilot park projects (April 2003- May 2006)

6.4.1 Actors involved at the various territorial levels

6.4.1.1 The supranational/international/EU/regional levels:

No actors belonging to the supranational level were directly involved in governance in the third phase. In the three letters of initiative which were sent out last, it was mentioned that the projects should be carried out under consideration to and coordinated with the up-coming process of elaborating management objectives for Natura 2000 and EU’s Water Frame Directive (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006). All the pilot projects referred to international commitments in their final reports. Lille Vildmose SC underlined that their national park visions only concerned areas covered by Natura 2000 and areas that were protected otherwise. Mols Bjerge SC took departure in the national habitat areas, and Møn stated that the present Natura 2000 areas and other protected areas constituted the core areas in their proposal, etc. In its final report, the NAG referred to Natura 2000 and to the guidelines on legal frameworks for protected areas/national parks from IUCN’s Environmental Law Centre. Thus, the phase was influenced by international commitments and experiences.
With regard to other types of influence from international and regional levels, NAG initiated an investigation of experience with national parks in 13 different European countries. Later on, more detailed investigations were carried out on the management structures of national parks in five selected countries including England, Netherlands, Scotland, Sweden and Germany. Moreover, the committee granted a group of farmers a tour to England to study how farms and national parks co-exist in practice, and organised a conference to learn from international experience. In this sense, the international/regional levels were only involved indirectly and to a limited extent.

6.4.1.2 The national level
During the third phase there were three key actors at the national level: the MoE, NAG, and NFNA.

What was the role of the Minister of Environment (MoE)
The Ministry of Environment played an important formal role in the beginning of the third phase, signing the formal letter, in which it was stated how the process at the regional and local levels should be organised. The guidelines are commended by some and criticised by others for providing only few details about the process. For instance, the Thy SC Chairman states that:

“The process was bottom-up. Only the framework had been decided beforehand and there was actually a space where people could decide for themselves. This resulted in a sense of ownership. Without the pilot process there would still have been a lot of prejudice against national parks” (Interview 16 SC Chairman Thy).

An MP from an opponent political party, on the other hand states that “A weakness was that in the beginning, it took a long time for people to figure out what it was they were supposed to do.” No matter whether the lack of details is considered a strength or weakness, these and other similar quotations indicate that the MoE did not closely control the local processes.

Who were the actors participating in NAG?
In February 2004, the MoE set up the ad hoc NAG. The NFNA acted as secretariat. The MoE appointed Bent Agerskov (chairman of the Outdoor Council) as chairman, and Nils Wilhjelm as his deputy. Moreover, the committee comprised 32 members appointed by the MoE. A complete list of the members is attached below as annex 3. From this list it will appear that the 32 members include the seven SC chairmen, representatives from trade and industry including farmers associations, various interest groups/NGOs, and representatives from different Ministeries. Most of the organisations represented in NAG had also been represented in the Wilhjelm Committee. An important exception was that, as the SC chairmen were recruited mainly from the local authorities (six municipalities and one county): they had a much stronger representation in NAG than they had in the Wilhjelm committee.

What was the role of NAG and NFNA?
The NAG was assigned to come up with recommendations with regard to procedures, and criteria for selecting and establishing Danish National Parks, management models, and legal frameworks. Moreover, the committee was supposed to follow, discuss and support the work of the pilot projects, collect and communicate international experience with national parks, discuss how to organise government support- and subsidies (the committee set up a special working group to address this issue), and evaluate the pilot projects. During the process, the pilot projects and others could apply for extra funding to relevant projects through the committee.
In the end, NAG had visited each of the seven national park pilot project areas, held 12 meetings, two workshops, three conferences, and initiated five major surveys. The committee had received four applications for extra funding, of which only one was approved with a grant of 100,000 DKK for a group of farmers to conduct the study tour to England.

The NAG respondents in our study agree that NAG played the main part of its role during the last part of the third phase, i.e.

“During the first meetings we circled around it. There were no clear rules, objectives or financial guidelines, but we quickly found out how much nature we aimed at. When Connie Hedegaard became minister, we finally got these guidelines. This was really important to the process! In the beginning we held excursions, seminars, hearings... I was asleep... Finally, when we received the reports from the steering committees that is at the 9th or 10th meeting it became very interesting. Then we had to compile all the findings. We had to discuss: Where should the funding come from? Who are going to decide: the municipalities, the State, or...? This debate caused repercussions. For instance, in Vadehavet the local people themselves wanted to decide, should we have a national park or not? But we could not let them decide! After all, it is a national, not a local park. Isn’t it?” (Interview 22).

A staff from NFNA assigned as a coordinator for the process describes the role of the NFNA during the third phase as follows:

“Before the establishment of the National Advisory Group, NFNA referred directly to the minister. Now NFNA played two roles. The role as secretariat to the advisory group was a comprehensive task. We had to prepare many papers, organise meetings and excursions. We produced guidelines for the analysis of the consequences for national economics, and idea catalogues. We also had to support the local chairmen and secretariats, and to manage the total process. Everything was new, especially the process involving the citizens. Many steering committees faced problems specifically related to their areas, but there were also many common traits. Therefore we set up a group meeting 3-4 times a year. We also had to produce technical support papers on request. Oh yes, and then we still had to serve the Minister, so actually we played three different roles ....

There were so many different interests represented in the National Advisory Group: agriculture, forestry, users of the nature, conservationist. The main conflicts were between the latter. NFNAs daily work is to find a way to deal with these interests. The carrot is: that if these two parties find each other and agree no minister will touch the decision afterwards.

We [the secretariat] elaborated guidelines for writing the report, but the guidelines were not followed equally well by all steering committees. When the committees submitted their reports, we [the secretariat] and the chairmanship discussed which themes should be on the top of the agenda ... It was a skilled and experienced chairmanship. They recommended to start out with the least controversial issues, and that worked well ... We also discussed how to approach the evaluation of the pilot projects. We, the secretariat, proposed that the evaluation should be put out to competitive tendering. The chairman supported the proposal and presented it to the committee. The committee maintained that the evaluation was their task but agreed that compiling the information should be put out in tendering.

In the end, NIRAS [a consultancy firm] was assigned to carry out the task. Their report was finalised in October, and the National Advisory Group held a seminar in
November 2005 for all the members of the steering committees. The purpose was to acknowledge their voluntary work. Around half of the members actually came, which was nice.

When we reached Christmas 2005, there was a huge time pressure. Proposals for how to formulate the purpose of the national parks and the criteria for selecting the area were being elaborated. There had been so much focus on popular participation that people in general thought that local support had to be considered one of the criteria. In NFNA, we did not think so. Popular participation is not valid as criteria in a Bill. For us, popular participation is part of the process. Furthermore, we were of the firm opinion that the Bill had to be operational. Our lawyers agreed. Popular participation and nature protection belonged to the process, not to the Bill.

Anyway, at that point of time we were so pressured by time that we had to buy assistance from NIRAS for the final evaluation. We bought the same consultant to do the task for us. Still, there was a lot of work to do. Discussions and meetings in the National Advisory Group, it was a tough job.

Then we reached the exciting last meeting. There were still some disagreements: Some members wanted to add something about guidelines for grazing. Another disagreement, which had to be solved, related to the fact that some of the areas proposed by the pilot projects constituted only parts of Natura 2000 areas. Some members wanted it all to be included. The farmers had great difficulties in supporting this point. Then it was pointed out that the areas were defined as a result of a difficult compromise between local interests, and that it had been necessary to have such compromises in order to make the proposal acceptable for all the different local interest groups, especially the farmers.

We did not reach total consensus. In the end, we had to include statement from Project Vadehavet. They wanted a steering committee to become the link between the national and the local levels. Here, the main issue is: how to allocate authority between the national and the local levels. And it is evident that NFNA prefers the national level. After all it is about NATIONAL parks. Isn’t it?” (Interview NFNA)

The picture painted here of the chairmanship and NFNA as being very influential is reinforced by the point of view of other respondents: “In Møn the debate was, in reality, used to show what it was, NFNA really wanted” (Interview researcher FLD) …. “The secretariat had a lot of influence” (Interview Outdoor Council), “NFNA was much involved in all the projects, so it was in many ways their agenda and their way of approaching nature that came to dominate the process…” etc. (Interview MP for Danish Social Democrats)

Nevertheless, the respondents agree that, in general, the process in the NAG was a success both in terms of process and outcome:

“During the process, we sought influence through different channels: through the work in the committee, contacting the relevant officials, and by providing inputs to the National Advisory Group’s as well as to the steering committees’ final reports. In addition we entered into dialogue with different groups outside the meetings. We talked a lot with Bent Agerskov and Nils Wilhjem, and appreciate that a lot of efforts were put into the process of reaching consensus in the National Advisory Group. The Association of Danish farmers like the way NFNA handled the process” (Interview 6 Danish Association of Farmers)

“There was a good process in the national advisory group. It is really great that so many interests can meet. In the beginning, we seriously considered leaving the process,
but it turned out that this was not necessary. As an organisation, we have not learned anything new. We are used to this type of processes. But it was important that we had time to get to know each others. And then we had a good leadership and an extremely well-functioning secretariat” (Interview 22 Birdlife Denmark)

The above quotations, also illustrates how at least some of the single actors played informal roles: by trying to affect the processes through many channels at a time. Moreover, the members, who represented particular organisations, regularly consulted their support base, which means that the latter may or may not be considered “informal” actors (Interviews NFNA, Birdlife Denmark, SC Chairman Thy).

Did the range and variety of actors increase and did “new” actors enter the national arena due the involvement of multiple levels in the process?

The range of actors increased slightly in phase 3: the SC chairmen, who mainly belonged to the local authorities, were represented in the NAG. This was due to the involvement of multiple levels in the process. The NAG was comprised by a combination of government actors and “new” actors. However, this was due to lines of conflicting interests rather than to the involvement of multiple territorial levels.

Why was the national level of policy making involved in the specific process?

The idea of and initiative to introduce national parks in Denmark came “from above” and was a result of environmental concerns at supranational and national levels. In accordance with this, some of the national respondents view national parks as basically national, not as local (cf. the quotations above). In this regard it makes sense, that national level actors were much involved in the process of writing up the proposals for national parks. In “the Government’s Written Account on National Parks May 2006”, the reason for setting up the NAG simply was that this was part of the agreement between the Minister and the Outdoor Council.

The reason for having the NFNA attending as secretariat at least at the local level is explicitly mentioned in the MoE’s initiation letter: “The link to the State will happen through … NFNA’s attendance as secretariat to the SCs in collaboration with counties and municipalities”. It may safely be assumed that a similar motive was decisive for having NFNA acting as secretariat to NAG.

With regard to the reason for involving particular actors in the work of NAG, the NFNA staff quoted above, explains that the representatives from the Ministries had to ensure that NAG’s recommendations would be in agreement with existing legal frameworks (Interview NFNA). It may be assumed (but cannot be documented here) that the SC chairmen were represented because it was necessary to coordinate the processes at the national and local levels and that representation by interest organisations and research institutions may be assumed to have come about because the decision makers wanted to ensure support from powerful actors and smooth implementation of the process.

In conclusion, The MoE played an important direct role at the national level in the very beginning of phase 3, and an indirect role during the rest of the phase. The NAG played a decisive role mainly towards the end of the phase assisted by (or in reality maybe rather assisting) NFNA, who on their side played an important role throughout phase 3. The national level was involved because the process was initiated “from above”, and because international and national decision makers consider national parks as an issue which is of national concern.
6.4.1.3 The regional and local levels

Which actors are formally and informally involved at the regional and local levels?

Formally, the key actors at the regional and local level were the ad hoc SC, the secretariat, the thematic working groups, and the “citizens’ summit.”

Who were formally involved in the steering committee and the secretariat?

In his letter of initiation printed in (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006) the MoE wrote:

“...A steering committee will be established representing the relevant authorities, associations and organisations (including trade and industries, nature, culture, outdoor life, tourism), and representatives for private land owners and inhabitants. The members will be appointed by the steering committee chairman in consultation with the relevant local politicians from counties and municipalities... the Minister of Environment has appointed Per Tærsbøl, Mayor of Helsinore municipality, as chairman for the steering committee in Kgs. Nordsjælland”

In Kgs. Nordsjælland, the SC was comprised of one chairman and 19 members. One of the six municipalities in the area was represented by the chairman; the other five were represented by each one member. The county was represented by one member, trade and industries (farmers) were represented by two members, there were three members from the “green” NGOs, outdoor life organisations by four members, and communication by one member (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b). A complete list of members is seen in figure 1-3 p. 12.

One of the two local state forest districts in the area was assigned as “core” secretariat to the SC. Together with civil servants from the involved county and municipalities, this district constituted, moreover, the “extended secretariat”. The organisation of the committee and secretariat is illustrated in figure 1-3.

What was the role of the steering committee and the secretariat?

Formally, the role of the SC in Kgs. Nordsjælland was to

“... Elaborate a vision and a plan for a national park having Gribskov/Esrum Lake as its core area. The committee will contribute to further considerations and decisions at the national level about the establishment of national parks in Denmark. The steering committee must, in close dialogue with the local population, elaborate a final report describing different alternatives and possibilities for development” (Schmidt 2004).

The SC carried out this task, and submitted its final report to the NAG June 2005. In addition to this formal role, the SC played the role as an important “arena” for the local interest conflicts as the following quotations illustrates: “It was not so easy for the members of the SCs to collaborate. One of the farmers’ representatives was pretty ill-tempered” (Interview Outdoor Council); “If you really want to make a difference, you have to include cultivated land. NFNA made sure that land owners were represented in the SCs” (Interview NFNA). Some of the respondents attach much importance to the role played by the chairman in relation to these interest conflicts: “When Per Tærsbøl finally accepted to be the chairman, he went all out. He was very skilled. For instance, when the farmers sometimes threatened the process by opting out, he was amazingly good to focus on the task...” (Interview County). Finally, many respondents point to the role played by the SC and in particular the chairman in relation to coordinating the national and local levels cf. below.

One of the members of the extended secretariat, a civil servant from the county, describes the role of the secretariat as follows:
“In the secretariat we were three persons from the county and some technical staff from the municipalities. Together, we had a lot of relevant professional knowledge. We carried out some investigations by ourselves, and we hired a consultant to do some complementary work on green corridors. We ended up having an almost complete picture of the nature and cultural history of the region. We held some meetings and prepared inputs for the political actors. We also prepared inputs for the Citizens’ Summit. We wanted to present different models to keep the options open for the citizens to select by themselves” (Interview County)

In addition to this formal role, it was mentioned in section 5.4.1b that MoE in his letter of initiation explicitly viewed NFNA as being an important link to the State, and that at least some of the respondents view NFNA as being the most influential actor at the national as well as at the local level.

Who were formally involved in the thematic working groups and the citizens’ summit?

See also chapter 3, section 3.1.1. In this context, it will suffice to mention that each of the thematic working groups, which were set up in Kgs. Nordjælland was associated with a resource person from the extended secretariat. Apart from this, the thematic working groups and the Citizens’ Summit were open to all.

In reality, there was a disproportionately high representation of highly educated people with a clear professional or local interest in the process, and by people who were already active in associations, organisations etc. (Interview Outdoor Council). According to one of the organisers of the process, disappointingly few “common people” could be convinced to participate:

“We really did a lot to involve people. Still, we managed to organise “only” 10 thematic working groups. For the citizens summit we had hoped for 800 people, but ended up with only 600. It was really difficult to mobilise these people” (Interview County).

What was the role of the thematic working groups and the Citizens’ Summit?

The role formally assigned to the thematic working groups was, as mentioned, to formulate ideas and specific proposals in preparation of the large “citizens summit.” At the summit, the participants discussed and finally participated in a referendum on 10 different proposals regarding a possible national park in the area. The resource persons were not supposed to contribute with their own attitudes, just to contribute with their knowledge and facilitate the process (Interview County).

Informally, the thematic groups were arenas for local interest conflicts along the same lines as the SC, but some of the respondents also noticed that the meetings in the groups were useful to minimise the importance of the conflicts:

“It was a positive experience to take part in the work of the thematic groups. In the beginning in one of my groups, there was a farmer who opted out of the process because he disliked the approach. There were real conflicts of interest, but gradually there was a change of attitudes. The different groups, e.g. the farmers, Birdlife Denmark and the Danish Nature Conservation Society, gained a much better understanding of each others’ viewpoints. I must say, it is hard to maintain a line of confrontation when you regularly meet and drink coffee together” (Interview County).

It may be concluded that the key actors at the local level were to a very large extent involved in phase 3.
“Informal” actors

Taking a step aside, looking at the national and local actors in a more informal and cross cutting way, the following actors may be said to have been very much involved with the processes both at the national and local levels: The Ministries, the counties, the municipalities, the outdoor life organisations (including the outdoor council, associations of sportsmen, anglers, hunters etc.), the “green” organisations (including in particular Birdlife Denmark, WWF-Denmark, Nepenthes and Danish Society of Nature Conservation), the farmers’ associations, the tourist associations (Visit-Denmark) and the association of rural districts. In addition to these actors, there were the research institutions and consultancy firms. The media was yet another actor, playing an important role in the process. Many of the respondents agree that no significant actor was excluded from the process during phase 3.

Did the range and variety of actors increase due to involvement of different levels?

Non-governmental actors were invited to take part in the process. With regard to the representatives for the local authorities and organisations, this was probably not so much due to the involvement of multiple levels in the process. At least, these types of actors were similar at the national and local levels. In spite of not being as many as the organisers hoped, a number of “common citizens” did participate in some of the activities. This was due to the involvement of the local level.

Why are different territorial levels of policy making involved in the process?

As mentioned the idea of having national park pilot projects was introduced by national level politicians and came about partly as a result of international pressure on the Danish government to protect Danish nature. Many actors at the national level considered national parks as “national”, cf. the quotations above, and the plan was to use national funds to finance them. At the same time, the local population and the local authorities were involved to a much larger extent than seen in any previous process of policy making in the field of environment and nature. It has been noticed by many respondents that, in the beginning, the Minister not only wanted to involve local people in the projects, he even did not want to implement the projects if there was “any” local resistance at all. Hence, the question why the local level was involved to such a large extent is highly relevant. Based on interviews and documents, there are at least eight possible answers to this question.

1. MoE just followed the recommendations of the Wilhjelm Committee (2001) “National parks should be implemented in close dialogue with the local authorities” and “there should be a better interplay between national and local interests”
2. National parks are likely to affect local people and in particular private land owners. Hence, it makes sense to involve these groups in the process.
3. The government wanted to ensure that if the national parks were to be implemented, there would be local support and ownership
4. Having “new” actors involved in the policy process is not a new phenomenon in the Danish context, at least not when it is about NGOs. This time it was just more institutionalised
5. The Outdoor Council had a lot of influence on how the process was organised. This was due to its 20 million DKK contribution. Being an umbrella organisation for many NGOs and associations, the organisation had a strong interest in having a process involving the local organisations.
6. The national park process was “alibi politics”, i.e. when it came to taking unpleasant decisions the government could hide behind all these committees and local democracy.
7. The participatory process was a PR stunt for the national government to “look good”. In reality the process took place at the level of civil servants.

8. In reality, the liberal Hans Christian Schmidt was against having national parks. He had inherited the idea from his social democratic predecessor, whom the new government very much disliked. Moreover, the two political parties in government traditionally have been concerned with protecting private ownership rights, and the larger of the two (the liberals) traditionally is considered as “the farmers’ party”. Hence, the reason for involving the local level to such a large extent was to stop the process through local resistance. Even if the national parks would gain local support, the process would still make government “look good”. In this sense, Hans Christian Schmidt had nothing to loose by involving the local levels.

6.4.2 Formal aspects of multi-level co-ordination

The following documents, which were all important to the third phase, were consulted to study policy statements on the need for multi-level coordination: (1) Hans Christian Schmidt’s letters of initiation Schmidt 2003b, (2) The terms of reference for NAG (Printed in the final report of the NAG 2006), (3) NAG’s final report 2006 and (4) The final report of the SC in Kgs. Nordsjælland 2005b.

NAG’s final report includes a legal specialist’s brief evaluation of different possible management models for national parks. In his evaluation, which is an annex to NAG’s main report, the legal specialist mentions the need for coordination between the national, regional and local levels as one of the important issues when planning for national parks. The main report does not refer to this statement and none of the consulted documents (1-4) explicitly mention the need of coordination between different territorial levels. The word “coordination” is mentioned in some of the documents, but not in relation to the different territorial levels. In this sense, multi-level coordination does not appear to be a rhetorically important element.

On the other hand, the letter of initiation and the terms of reference for NAG are much concerned with assigning such tasks to the committees that makes sense in the perspective of multi-level coordination. The letter of initiation mentions that “the link to the state will happen through the MoE nominating the convenors for the local SCs and the National Forest and Nature Agency acting as secretariat in collaboration with counties and municipalities," that “the SC will become a member of the NAG” and that “the SC regularly must inform the NAG about the project work”. Moreover, some of the letters of initiation refer to the importance of coordinating with future decisions related to Natura 2000 and EU’s Waterframe Directive.

In its terms of reference, NAG was assigned a range of tasks including, for instance, to elaborate a common framework for the pilot project reports, to initiate exchange of experiences between the participants in the pilot projects, to evaluate the projects etc. In NAG’s final report multi-level coordination is approached at different levels. It is stated that: “another main problem was to identify a model for managing national parks, which at the same time would meet the conservation objective, ensure local level influence, and take into consideration the new local government structures and tasks resulting from the reforms”.

In the end, NAG and the Kgs. Nordsjælland’s SC recommend management models where coordination between different territorial levels obviously has played an important role. Thus, according to NAG, a small board of directors will elaborate management plans, these plans should be elaborated within the frameworks of municipal plans, local participation will be ensured through a local advisory committee, the local state forest district will continue as secretariat, and, at the national level, a committee for questions common to all the national parks
with representatives from ministries, municipalities, the relevant organisations, representatives from the boards and relevant professionals.

In sum, the need for coordination between different territorial levels was not important at the level of rhetoric. In reality, however, most of the initiatives proposed in the documents circled around the issue of multilevel coordination referring to all the territorial levels (apart from the counties, which were just about to be abolished). The question about the formal distribution of competencies among levels involved at different stages of policy-making in the process under study is more or less addressed above in section 5.4.1.c.

6.4.3 Interdependence of levels and interaction patterns

The Government/MoE had many interests in ensuring support from local people in general and farmers and private land owners in particular, no matter whether these groups would accept or reject the national park idea. Following this, the formal coordination between the work of NAG and the local SCs was “triggered” by NAG’s terms of reference and the letter of initiation, which explicitly assigned coordinating tasks to the committees and secretariat at the two levels. It is likely that politicians and local authorities, moreover, had a genuine wish for mutual policy learning. At least, the responding representatives from the local authorities of this study, who were involved in the process, expressed much enthusiasm about the participatory process, and disappointment that it had not been possible to mobilise even more “common people”.

The national park pilot project was a new type of process, aiming at generating ideas and proposals. No legal framework existed to guide the particular process, but the project was about land use planning, and hence could not take place independently of the present and planned local government structure, and the Plan Act which, as mentioned, aims at coordinating land use planning at different territorial levels in Denmark.

Processes of multi-level coordination also took place outside the formal political arenas (the national and local committees and thematic working groups). Different organisations entered into alliances both at the national and at the local levels conducting preparatory meetings (“we are happy that we could agree with the Outdoor council, Danish Society of Nature Conservation and WWF and could elaborate common statements”) (Interview Birdlife Denmark). Moreover, many of the involved organisations have national as well as local branches, and for some of them it was important to coordinate across territorial levels. The farmers’ associations were quite successful in coordinating activities at national and local levels:

“The association of Danish farmers made a huge effort to speak with one voice. We did not want different people to express very different opinions. The board of directors held a lot of meetings for the farmers to get in step. Then we set up a national park working party with representatives from agriculture and forestry. Our secretariat worked as sparring partner and advisers to the local representatives”.

The national association of municipalities was less successful in coordinating its members:

“In the beginning, the national association of municipalities became very active. They wanted the municipalities to speak with one voice. They invited us for some preparatory meetings, but municipalities in Thy and Northern Zealand do not necessarily have the same interests” (Interview SC Chairman Thy).

“The national association of municipalities was quite passive. They have not played any important role in the process” (Interview NFNA).

In sum, the formal coordination processes were triggered mainly by national decision makers’ interests in ensuring support from local people, and for local actors’ need to follow guidelines
and gain influence. Outside the formal political arenas, coordination was triggered by a wish to gain as much influence on the process as possible.

*What is the mode and logic of interaction between the various territorial levels (vertical coordination)?*

Returning to the formal arena for policy making, there was a strong hierarchical element in the mode of coordination. The process was structured from above, it was the actors at the national level (NAG) who had the final word in phase 3, and the MoE specifically underlined the importance of NFNA and the SCs as being “the link to the state” (letter of initiation). However, there was also an element of negotiation and mutual adaptation in that NAG according to their TORs had to take into account the results of the seven national park pilot projects in their final report and in that the local SC chairmen were members of NAG and hence had the option to inform and negotiate.

Outside the formal processes, coordination took place in many different arenas, and it is not possible to decide to what extent the mode of coordination could be characterised as hierarchy etc. But there was an important line of information and communication between the formal representatives and their organisations. It was common for representatives of different organisations to inform their support base about how the process developed with greater or lesser success:

> “We informed the county all the way through the project. For the municipalities, there were huge differences. Some municipalities were very supportive towards the process, others resisted it. This also affected the line of communication. In one of the municipalities, the technical staff assigned to the national park process hardly got a chance to inform the politicians about anything” (Interview County)

> and “of course, the NAG representatives for Danish Society for Nature Conservation and the other organisations had to report back to their support base” (Interview NFNA).

It already appears from above, that NAG, the SCs and NFNA staff played the main part in driving the interaction and cooperation between the different levels involved. Different respondents emphasise that especially the SC chairmen and the secretariats (national and local level NFNA staff) played outstanding roles in facilitating coordination.

There was sufficient staff and resources devoted to vertical coordination but there were other problems. A minor problem was that

> “In the beginning, there was some disagreement in NAG because the chairmen of the SC did not want the national committee to come up with any recommendations before the local pilot projects had finalised the projects. Some of the green organisations presented a paper in NAG. This led to conflict because the SC chairmen felt it was their task” (Interview NFNA).

Most other problems were related to the process in general. The most important problem was farmers being sceptical towards the idea of having national parks. It was clear that:

> “Danish farmers do not see any advantages of national parks but participate in the process to minimise problems, to ensure proper compensation for those who will lose their farmland, and to urge that things happens voluntarily, not by force” (Interview Danish Association of Farmers).

In most pilot projects, there were conflicts between farmers (and other people depending on natural resources for their living) on the one hand and conservationists on the other hand.
Another problem was the “national-local dilemma,” illustrated by Vadehavets minority statement in NAG’s final report, cf. above concerning who should decide for national parks: the national or the local actors.

During the third phase, multi-level coordination was supported by temporary organisations (NAG and the SCs) and permanent organisations (national and local levels of NFNA and, to a limited extent, the counties and municipalities).

*The effects of multilevel co-ordination*

At the tangible level, the effect of multilevel co-ordination together with all the other elements in the process was NAG’s final report submitted to MoE. Together with the other elements in the process, multilevel coordination had the positive effect that many actors at national and local level felt that they actually had some influence, and that all the interest organisations in the end could (almost) reach agreement. In some cases, the process had a negative impact in the sense that interest conflicts were not solved and maybe grew larger than they were before.

6.5 Phase 4 (April 2006 – May 2006)

Until now, the key actor in this phase 4 has been the MoE/the government. “New” actors and actors at regional and local levels have been involved only to the extent that they have provided their comments to the act. For this reason it is not relevant to address the questions in TOR regarding multi-level coordination for the political process in phase 4. Instead, a few words will be attached to the act. The act has ten objectives. Four are directly concerned with creating nature and maintaining the values of nature. The six other objectives concern (5) culture, (6) support research and teaching in the values of nature (7) increased possibilities for the population to use and experience the nature, (8) improved communication about nature and culture values, (9) support to local development, (10) and public participation in the establishment and development of the national park. The act states that it is the MoE who decides whether an area can become a national park or not, but that a proposal for a national park must be circulated for consideration before the MoE takes the final decision.

In the available statements on the circulated bill, the points of criticism that are most relevant to multi-level governance are the following (Statements 2006):

- The management model is too centralised, and assigns too much power and authority to MoE (Statements 2006: Outdoor Council, Tourist Organisation, National Association of municipalities, Danish Farmers Association).
- MoE defines the national park areas instead of following the recommendations of the local SCs (Statement 2006: Danish Association of Farmers)
- There is not (as recommended by NAG) a national advisory council in the proposed set up (Statement 2006 Outdoor Council)
- The bill does not create sufficient options for public participation (Statements 2006 Outdoor Council, Danish Association of Farmers) and does not contain guidelines for how to ensure participation by citizens who are not represented by the organisations (Statement 2006 Danish Board of Technology)
- Municipalities should be given more power (Statement 2006 Outdoor Council)
- The planning process and the processes of popular participation for the national parks should be coordinated with the planning procedures for the municipalities instead of Natura 2000 (Statement 2006 National Association of Municipalities)
6.6 Conclusion

Decision making took place at different levels from phase to phase. During the first phase, actors at the international level were catalysts for the process, which started at the national level. At this point of time, MoE was the key actor. During second phase, it was the MoE and the Outdoor Council who were the main actors. Part of the process here did take place at the local level but only in a proactive manner. During the third phase, MoE was an important direct actor only in the very beginning. At the national level, NAG’s chairmanship and secretariat (NFNA) were the important players, while at the local level it was in particular the SC chairmen and the Local State Forest Districts who were the key actors. Finally, in phase four, the MoE came to play an important part again, elaborating the Bill on National parks.

Many respondents were happy about phase 3 and the kind of experiment with public participation that happened during that phase. They felt they could really influence the outcome of that phase: the SCs’ and NAG’s final reports. In phase 3, coordination between different territorial levels was an important element in the process finally leading to a situation where NAG’s report could be based, more or less, on consensus in spite of their very different interests represented in the Committee. Nevertheless, the process ended in Phase 4 with MoE sketching out a relatively centralised model for managing national parks. In this phase, it definitely was (or rather has been until now) MoE who determined the final decision and outcome.

The question remains whether decision-making took place within a multi-level system or not. National and local levels were important throughout the process (the counties did not play as significant role, probably due to the expected local government reforms). Territorial levels were important, and decision making thus did take place within a multi-level system. Moreover, many “new” actors took part in the process in all the phases, and with the set up of the ad hoc committees at national and local levels, the picture became even more complicated. In many regards, the process thus appeared to take place within a new mode multi-level system. The final result indicates that in reality the government maintained its right to take the final decision, and thus to exercise the “old” mode of governance.
7 Expertise involved in the national park pilot projects

As policy issues are becoming more and more complex, scientific (and other experts’) knowledge has come to play an increasingly influential role in its contribution to the formulation of policy and regulatory decisions. In many policy fields, there has been a noticeable increase in the use of expert (scientific) advice to inform decision-making (GoFOR 2006).

The chapter focuses on the general process and not the phases.

7.1 Context for the use of expertise

In 1997 the Danish Parliament decided to have an analysis made on democracy and the distribution of power in the Danish society. As a part of this investigation the changing role of experts came under scrutiny (Albæk et al 2002; Albæk 2005). In these publications experts are defined rather narrowly to be trained/educated professionals in an established field and independent of the political system, i.e. public administrators are not experts. Albæk et al (2002) found that there had been an explosive growth in the number of times journalist cited experts in the media in the 90s and increasingly for non-technical matters. Expert statements are increasingly used to legitimise the point of view of the journalist and it is rare to find contradictory expert statements in the same article.

According to Albæk (2005) experts rarely have direct influence when decisions are made, but they might influence the process before and most obviously at the implementation stage. Despite the fact that experts play a more important role in the press and undoubtedly have political influence, the Danish society can not be characterised as technocratic since experts rarely have other resources than their knowledge; and arguments alone are not always what influence power holders most. If expert recommendations are in opposition to other strong interests or break with established thought, recommendations are unlikely to be converted to policy at least in the short run (Albæk 2005).

According to a study made by Kaae and Madsen (2003) regarding nature approximately 90% of the Danish population trusts scientific experts; 48% even has a high degree of trust; however, if the expert is employed in the Ministry of Environment the level of trust decreases to approximately 70% of the population, who has a high degree (18 %) or some trust in the experts. Apart from experts people have most faith in their own experiences.

Only a fourth of the Danish citizens get their knowledge of nature from scientific experts. The most frequent sources of knowledge are the media and personal experience. Only few get their knowledge from politicians; besides only two percent of the population has a high degree of trust and approximately 45 % has no trust in the information politicians provide. (Kaae and Madsen 2003). In other words, politicians have much to gain if they can successfully “borrow” the credibility of experts regardless if they are employed in research institutions or interest organisations.

Politicians seeking knowledge want it fast and to the point. Often they enter in to cooperation with interest organisations and get information from the experts employed there. Then it is up to the politician to sort out the biases of the organisation (Interview 11; Interview 20; Interview 5).

In nature and forest policy experts are involved in policy by means of sector research institutions and in formal councils such as the forest council and the Wilhjelm Committee, which also include interest organisations, and the former nature council (DMU 2005; Koch 2006; Naturrådet 2005; Skov & Landskab 2006).
Regarding the national park pilot projects there is nothing new or surprising in establishing SCs or an advisory group with broad representation of interest organisations. What is new is the scope of the exercise.

7.2 Overall patterns and “expectations” towards use of expertise

Concerning nature and forest policy in general there seems to be a trend that expertise increasingly is demanded from the politicians. Furthermore interest organisations cooperate with the NFNA exchanging expertise both in formal and informal ways, meaning that experts are more than the narrow definition from above, and that interest organisations that are recognised to possess expertise have opportunities to influence policy through the administration (Buhl et al 2004; Interview 11; Interview 6; Interview 5).

With respect to the national park case the rhetoric is filled with concepts such as knowledge based decision making, and in the initiation letters to the pilot projects the Minister demanded that a number of technical investigations were carried out. In the act proposal for the establishment of national parks there is a clear demand for expertise and knowledge based argumentation before a national park is an option for a given area. Furthermore there is a clear focus on the inclusion of several interest groups and sectors in the processes making it necessary to include a larger number of experts to cover all aspects (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a; 2006b). In other words the governance process reinforces the trend of increased expert involvement.

The demand for public participation and local anchorage makes it necessary that the relevant knowledge is accessible to the public. The citizens participating want to know the expert opinions leading to greater pluralism on the demand side. However, the main addressees are still the politicians who make the decisions regarding the establishment of national parks.

7.3 Policy statements related to the use of expert advice

This section addresses the question of how policy statements call for the involvement expertise, by what arguments and whether policy statements call particularly for accountable, democratic, legitimate forms of expertise.

The purpose of the national park pilot-project is a large scale intelligence gathering to get the best possible knowledge base before deciding if national parks should be established at all, and if so: where to put them, what their purpose should be, what they should consist of, how to manage them and how to govern them. The words knowledge and investigations are recurrent in the political statements. One might say that the whole process is a large scale call for expertise or at least knowledge of different kinds. The argument is that there is insufficient knowledge to answer either of the questions above, and knowledge is needed prior to establishing national parks (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Schmidt 2003b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b).

When the pilot projects were initiated the Minister specifically demanded that investigations were undertaken at least regarding the present and potential natural values including the possibilities to establish coherence between nature areas; the values concerning the cultural heritage; the present and potential possibilities of outdoor recreation of the prospective national parks; and a socio-economic and business-economic analysis of the consequences of establishing the park. Furthermore the whole process, especially participation was to be evaluated. It was recommended that investigations were undertaken in cooperation with the county and relevant
research institutions. Private consultant companies were also suggested as contributors. The quality of the investigations should be internationally convincing (Schmidt 2003b). Hence specialist knowledge was called for regarding the more technical matters such as the presence of endangered species in the area etc. but it was emphasised that the public should also be included. Science and the knowledge to be found in the public administration should form the knowledge base for the decision-makers and the public involved in the pilot projects, and the public should contribute to the vision and the priorities of the prospective national park as well as with the laymen knowledge they might possess. The SC should then report to the national level where the political decisions are made.

The NAG as well as each of the SCs had the option to buy expert analyses to fulfil the demand concerning investigations and to support their decision process. Consultants and research institutions among others could apply the NAG or the outdoor council for funds to perform the investigations they felt were relevant for future national parks. It was then up to Advisory group or the outdoor council respectively to decide if the proposals should be funded. The investigations demanded by the MoE were the responsibility of the local SCs (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b).

This has resulted in a number of reports about tourism, economic analyses nature quality, participation, recreation values etc. (Appel 2005; Frederiksborg Amts Landskabsafdeling 2005; Grønning and Lind 2004; Hansen-Møller and Gentin 2005; Jacobsen et al 2005; Jensen 2005a; Jensen 2005b; Johnsen and Wernberg 2005; Kvistgaard Consult 2005a).

In pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland the argument for having investigations undertaken was the need for knowledge but the types of investigations were determined by the demands of the initiation letter. Therefore investigations were performed regarding the above mentioned themes. Furthermore the SC chose to use consultants for the participation process and for making a communication strategy (Interview 12; Interview 14; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e).

There were no explicit demands for accountability or legitimacy; however, regarding the evaluation of the participation, it was emphasised that it should be undertaken by an independent institution. Some of the investigations were put out to tender giving all who have expertise a possibility to make an offer and argue why they should be involved. In the material for the tender for performing the final exposition of the projects as a whole the criteria for the selection of companies were the price, the experience with similar tasks and the professional qualifications of the employees of the companies. The criteria were weighted and the offers given points accordingly (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2004; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2005b).

7.4 Procedures and practices of integrating expert advice

Expertise was mobilised in the early stages of the political process to ensure that decisions were made with the best possible level of knowledge given the resource constraints (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b). In Kgs. Nordsjælland expert reports were generally not done sufficiently early to benefit the thematic groups through which the public was involved. However; at least one of the thematic groups benefited from the landscape report as on of the researchers performing the analysis was part of the group (Interview 24; Interview 17).

Expertise was generally mobilised for technical issues, but since many of the analyses were to include potential qualities of the area in question within a time frame of 20 – 30 years there was also scope for more visionary and potentially value laden input for the public and the politicians to consider concerning how to achieve specific results.
With respect to pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland investigations should be ready for the workshops of the SC on the 14th of April and the 18th of May 2005 and hence offer input to the political process. The participation experts facilitated the participation process at the different events and hence were involved throughout that process (Interview 12; Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e).

The public administrators, i.e. the counties and the NFNA, were recognised as experts regarding nature values and the rules and regulations such as Natura 2000 and existing public plans which must be adhered to. The experts from these public institutions were institutionalised in the extended secretariats of the pilot projects. They were accessible to the SCs, the public and interest organisations throughout the process. External institutional expertise was linked to the governance process by means of contracts with the Forest and Nature Agency describing task and the timeframe. Local experts could participate in the process in the open working groups, i.e. in Kgs. Nordsjælland in one of the ten thematic groups, and many did. Here the nature group was characterised as an expert group, since it consisted of well educated people from different branches of natural science (Interview 12; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 24; Interview 14; 2006a; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b; Interview 17).

In Kgs. Nordsjælland the thematic groups had resource persons from the extended secretariat attached and could and did use external experts (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a). Unfortunately the investigation reports from the 11 investigations where not finished until the first quarter of 2005. By then the thematic groups had finished or were in the final stages of their work, which was due for the citizen summit held on the 26th of February (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e). Therefore the thematic groups did not benefit from the investigations and neither did the citizens at the summit.

First and foremost expertise was involved through the investigations undertaken during the process. Some of these investigations were performed by Frederiksborg County, which is represented politically in the SC; the public administrators from the county were considered experts along with the rest of the secretariat, i.e. firstly Frederiksborg state forest district. In the SC some of the members could be considered experts in the field they represented, and in the working groups some of the participants were regarded as experts due to their educational background. That form of expert inclusion was especially prevalent in the nature group, but was the case in some of the other thematic groups as well.

7.5 The defining and inclusion of ‘experts’ in the process

The following address the question of what experts were involved and how these were selected. In other words:what makes an expert an expert and how? And are scientists perceived as independent experts “speaking truth to power” or as social/political actors among others, and what expectations do policy-makers have of expert advice?

Several experts were involved in the process at different levels. Some were called in to illuminate technical issues such as natural values in the different pilot projects, some were there to coordinate participation, some were called in to evaluate the projects as a whole etc. Readily identifiable experts were those performing the investigations during the process. Furthermore those are the ones the interviewees referred to, when asked who they considered to be experts. However, some of the citizens taking part in the local projects were also regarded as experts. Experts can mainly be defined by institutional affiliation and educational background. See annex 4 for a list of experts included in the process.
7.5.1 Institutionalised expertise

The formal selection of experts for the investigations was undertaken by the SCs in collaboration with the local secretariats for the local investigations and by the NAG and the national secretariat for the national investigations. The NFNA therefore had an important role in deciding who the experts were.

In Kgs. Nordsjælland 17 investigations were made according to the topics defined by the MoE. Six of the investigations dealt with nature. Frederiksborg County produced some of the reports and was chosen because it already was in possession of much of the material due to its authority function being responsible for much of the implementation and planning regarding nature in the open land. The results were a biological investigation of the natural values of the open land, an investigation of potential nature areas in Northern Zealand and an investigation of the two large lakes in the area; Arresø and Esrum sø. Secondly a consultant company called Grønning and Lind I/S was chosen to analyse the biological diversity in the forests of Northern Zealand. Furthermore a brief report was made regarding the biological value of corridors in the landscape ( Frederiksborg Amts Landskabsafdeling 2005; Grønning and Lind 2004; Jensen 2005a; Jensen 2005b; Pedersen 2004; Schneekloth et al 2005).

The investigation of the cultural history of the area was conducted by Centre of Cultural History of Holbo Herred under the museum of Gilleleje. However; the investigation was performed in cooperation with a number of museums in northern Zealand as well as Frederiksborg County, the NFNA and to a limited extent the investigators of outdoor recreation and landscape characteristics (Appel 2005).

The investigation on outdoor recreation was undertaken by Forest & Landscapes which also participated in the investigation of landscape characteristics in collaboration with Roskilde University and Frederiksborg County. As an addition the Danish sports federation made a report on sports activities (Hansen-Møller and Gentin 2005; Jacobsen et al 2005).

The economic consequences were investigated by the consultant company Niras and a valuation study was made by Forest & Landscape and the participation process was evaluated by the consultant company Kvistgaard Consult. Furthermore, master students from Roskilde University performed a participation project aimed at parents and children (Jacobsen et al 2006; Kvistgaard Consult 2005a; Nielsen et al 2005; Niras 2005a).

Three reports/memorandums were made on procurement: One on strategy by external communication experts, one on the status and vision for procurement and experiences supplemented by the third, which was a memorandum for the procurement project on culture and nature The last was made as a protest to the second which the author found insufficient and biased (Johnsen and Wernberg 2005; Pedersen 2005; Interview 14; Zentropa Interaction Aps 2005).


The NAG had investigations made dealing with experiences from national parks in other European countries done by Kvistgaard consult and later supplemented by an extra report on legal circumstances and management practises. Forest and Landscape made a handbook on the impact and function of large grazers and grass cutting in nature management. A report on subsidies and payments in national parks was made by a working group under the NAG, a national valuation study of national parks in Denmark was done by Forest & Landscape and a report summarizing the pilot projects for the final evaluation of the processes was made. This report was undertaken by the consultant company Niras after a tender were 14 companies made
an offer. The NAG furthermore acquired a legal opinion from professor of law Henrik Zahle regarding the different management models of the prospective national parks (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 21; Niras 2005b).

Even though many experts were involved, there were only a few institutions and companies which did the major part of the investigations. Denmark is a small country and the number of institutions and people that are qualified for the job is limited. In Kgs. Nordsjælland the county played a major role in terms of supplying expertise. This has to do with the authority functions of the county. Traditionally the county is responsible for regional planning and the enforcement of the laws concerning protected nature etc. I.e. the county has regional level knowledge which no other institution holds. It might be noted that this has changed as the counties were abolished the 1st of January 2007 and the functions with regard to nature are taken over by the new and larger municipalities and the new environmental centres.

Forest & Landscape has also delivered a large part of the expertise in the process. Forest & Landscape has traditionally serviced the public authorities of Denmark being a sector research institution and is therefore an obvious place to go for knowledge regarding forest and landscape issues. The institution is now a part of a university. Niras is one of the larger private consultant companies regarding nature management and therefore has the prerequisites to win a tender. Roskilde University has been part of a few of the investigations partly through student projects.

The main criterion when selecting the experts to perform the investigations was their ability to do the job i.e. to fulfil the demands of the MoE as stated in the initiation letters and the task description of the NAG. Some of the investigators were chosen after a tender, but in reality there were only a few who were able to perform the needed investigations making the choice rather simple. Regarding the evaluation of the participation process one of the criteria was comparability across the pilot projects and therefore the same consultant company performed the evaluation of five of the seven pilot projects. In the material for the tender for performing the final exposition of the projects as a whole, the criteria for the selection of companies were price, experience with similar tasks and the professional qualifications of the employees of the companies. The criteria were weighted and the offers given points accordingly (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 21; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2004; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2005b).

### 7.5.2 Conferences and workshops

During the process three conferences and two workshops were held by the NAG on the themes: outdoor recreation and tourism in the prospective national parks, nature in the prospective national parks, international experiences with national parks, the final reports from the SCs, and the last conference was held to have a general debate of national parks. At these events there were presentations from various experts and the addressees were mainly members from the local SCs and the NAG (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

The workshops were held to exchange experiences among the SC members from all the pilot projects and to learn about the respective themes. Experts were invited to inspire the participants. The participants were from the NAG and the local SCs. The conference on international experiences served the purpose of learning from and being inspired by international experiences. There were presentations from a representative of IUCN, an Austrian public administrator, a Swedish representative, a Danish professor, an agricultural interest organisation and a private consultant company (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b).

The two last conferences were more generally about the results of the process so far, where employees from the NFNA as well as some of the authors of the produced reports presented their results (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b).
In Kongernes Nordsjælland the members of the SC participated in two workshops where the visions of the possible national park were discussed. The workshops used different scenarios based on the technical investigations and the results from the citizen summit as starting points for the discussions. The scenarios were created by the secretariat and a process consultant was used (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e).

### 7.5.3 The “ordinary citizen” as an expert

In Kgs. Nordsjælland the public had a chance to offer their expertise in the thematic groups which was done by approximately 180 people who managed to produce 700 pages with suggestions and proposals for a prospective national park. Some of the members were “ordinary citizens”; however, some members were considered experts due to their educational background and involvement in interest groups. In particular thematic group 5 dealing with visions for the nature values of the area was considered to be an expert group by informants. Several employees at Forest & Landscape took part in the thematic groups. One of the participants in a thematic group furthermore considered local knowledge as important: some of the local farmers in the group had knowledge of the area, which no map could have given them (Interview 12; Interview 14; Interview 17).

In the thematic groups participation was voluntary. Everyone who wanted to be a part of a group could do so. The only selection criterion was interest (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006e).

Experts were first and foremost defined by experience and education. In the material for tenders the educational background of the employees to undertake the task is one of the important criteria to be awarded the task. The thematic group working on nature was considered an expert group partly because of the education of its members. Furthermore the proposed future national park advisory boards are to involve people with specialist knowledge who are exemplified by education. In the act proposal there is no national advisory board; however, the prospective local advisory boards are to have members with specialist knowledge depending on the national park in question. Secondly expertise is defined by institution. Employees at research institutions are considered experts and so are the public administrators in the county and the NFNA (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 21; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

It is important for researchers to be visible and be quoted in the press; if you are quoted often enough on a subject, you are considered the expert in the area by the general public. Scientists do not see themselves as totally independent since they address their research findings to a target group; often the ones having financed the project. That being said, the university employed researchers considered their work to be at a higher level than the work done by private consultant firms, as they also want to publish in scientific journals and hence must work according to scientific standards which the private firms must not (Interview 17).

The addressees of the expertise were the members of the SC and the extended secretariat in the local process. The timing of the process did not allow for the thematic groups to really benefit from the investigations. In the national process addressees are the members of the NAG as well as the national politicians negotiating which areas to appoint as national parks in the future. The addressees of the knowledge disseminated through the thematic groups were firstly the secretariat who transformed the ideas and suggestions of the thematic groups to a number of issues to be voted on at the citizen summit, at which point the general public was the addressee. In the end the addressee of all the knowledge produced during the pilot-projects is the national political system.
As regards expectations to knowledge, the convenor of the NAG expected experts to fulfil the demand from the mandate of the group (*Interview 9*). At the local level the expectations of the members of the SC differed according to their interest and knowledge of the theme that was addressed. For example was the member representing the Outdoor Council disappointed with the report on outdoor recreation. He felt that his organisation had offered a lot of information and knowledge which he could not recognise in the report. Furthermore he was so discontent with one of the reports on procurement that he wrote his own supplement based on his 20 years of experience (*Interview 14*).

Another member with a background in environmental economics was dissatisfied with the valuation report, because he thought the methods for ranking the projects were problematic; however, the report could be used to show that the value of all projects were positive (*Interview 12*).

This might signify that knowledge is considered unimportant when it does not fit into the perceptions and agendas of the political recipients. Important and helpful information on the other hand can be used to serve the interests of the political actor.

### 7.6 Impact of expert advice on the policy process

At the present stage no national park has yet been designated. The proposal for the act by which to do so is being debated in parliament. The pilot projects and the investigations served the purpose of giving the politicians the necessary knowledge to decide if, where, and how Danish national parks should be. From the debate in Parliament so far there is a general agreement that there will be national parks (Folketinget 2006); apart from that no decisions have been made and therefore the expertise involved in the process has not materialised in actual national parks at this point.

The investigation results of the technical reports from Kgs. Nordsjælland were incorporated into the report of the SC where the area was described according to what had been reported in the different investigations on the present values in terms of nature, culture, recreation etc. (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b). This is; however, of a descriptive nature and with an emphasis on the things that makes Kgs. Nordsjælland unique. The SC hence uses the information in order to advertise their project to the national politicians.

With regard to the NAG the chairman said, that to some extent the investigations were used to validate what was already known since the technical reports produced had not changed the course of decision making in any radical way, which new, surprising knowledge would have done. Three members of the SC said that the investigations filled a real need for knowledge (*Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 14*).

Experts in the process so far did not think that their work was used very much; however, when areas are selected to become national parks this is likely to change. They recognise that knowledge is power and if political actors can use their results to support their interests, they will do so (*Interview 24; Interview 17*).

Some project proposals were turned down by the NAG. They were a proposal to make a TV production of each of the pilot projects which the group felt was to expensive and not central to the task of the Advisory group. An application from the Danish Mammals Association to hold a meeting which was declined out of principle; if this group was supported numerous other groups should also have money to have theme meetings. Finally a proposal for the development of locally based surveillance of nature and nature use in the prospective national parks was declined.
because it might be upsetting to landowners and be detrimental to the process (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2004a; 2004b; 2005b; 2006).

The Danish Outdoor Council had funded a research project on the biodiversity values of the seven pilot projects along with 25 other areas in Denmark. By the end of the pilot project phase, the employed researcher from Copenhagen University came up with results showing that if the pilot projects should be ranked according to the biodiversity value, the pilot projects were not the best choice (Petersen et al 2005; Rahbek and Petersen 2005) This created some debate. The environmental spokesman of the liberals was the first to react, saying that the whole process should be reassessed. The green NGO Danish Society of Nature Conservation did not appreciate the input since it was bad timing politically, threatened the process and would potentially postpone getting national parks. Hence they criticised the report (Interview 11). The process was not reassessed but the report is there for the politicians to consider presently before any national parks are designated. However, it seems unlikely that any areas where there has not been a pilot process will be designated. Furthermore biodiversity is not the only criterion when selecting the location of future national parks (Interview 20).

In Kgs. Nordsjælland Nepenthes was very much in favour of large grazers in the forest where as others were more in favour of restoring the original hydrology. They represent different schools that offer different solutions to improve natural values. Both approaches have an effect and where based on scientific results, but when it comes to concrete action no one seems to know exactly how many animals are needed. It is not an exact science, there are different schools believing in different theories. Consequently the decision of the SC was a political weighing and because of opposition against fencing, the grazer solution in forests was disregarded (Interview 12).

The head of Nepenthes claims that the long time frame and call for investigations and participation to some extent has been a cloak for stalling the process of actually getting nature reserves; that it is an example of the present government disclaiming responsibility and avoiding to make the necessary regulations and actually do something for nature. At the same time the process has served to give the impression of a government that does much to strengthen nature when reality is very different (Ryding 2006; Interview 5). The initiators of the national park process – the (former and present) MoE and the NFNA emphasize that the process serves to give the best possible knowledge base for deciding on national parks (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Schmidt 2003b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

The above examples show that experts and knowledge have been instrumentalised in various ways for political reasons. The NGO that claim that the process as a whole is an instrument to give the impression of an environmentally concerned government where experts are used to delay action. This claim is supported if investigations were only used to validate what was already known. However, the fact that the report by Copenhagen University did not lead to new pilot projects points in a different direction. Maybe Society of Nature Conservation managed to discredit the report for strategic reasons; or maybe simply because the process was to far along and to popular to start over despite of the claim to have the best possible knowledge base for decisions.

The process will continue in the national parliament, where the politicians will decide on which of the pilot-projects are to become national parks. Here it will be interesting to follow the argumentation for the final selection and see if expertise becomes instrumentalised in the process.

One of the local SC members expressed concern that the selection would to be subject to a political trade; irrespective of the generated knowledge. A politician stated that the expert reports were one of the criteria when selecting the location of the future national park, but other criteria
were at least as important. Several of the informants pointed to the proportion of state owned land in the pilot projects as important, i.e. the cost for acquiring land and compensating landowners for lost income possibilities. There is a level of pragmatism in the selection/designation. It is not necessarily the best place from a scientific perspective, but also a matter of political will, and where there the opposition is insignificant (Interview 16; Gade 2006; Interview 20; Interview 21; Interview 19; Interview 17).

7.7 Accountability of expertise

In our understanding accountability of expertise has at least three layers: it relates to expertise in the process as a whole; where research, science and other expertise can contribute to the accountability of the process towards the general public; i.e. if research makes a difference it contributes to accountability of the process but if investigations are just performed and make no difference; the expertise does not contribute to the accountability of the process. Moreover there are issues of accountability relating to each of the investigations: Were procedures transparent? Where experts selected in an impartial way? Etc. This relates to the accountability of decision-makers towards the public. Finally accountability of expertise relates to the experts performing the investigations and their accountability towards the addressees of their expertise.

As for the difference the expert involvement has made regarding the potential of the areas; it is difficult to say what impact there has been before the prospective national parks have been selected. There might not have been any radical alterations in the local processes due to new knowledge; however, it would not have been possible for the local SCs to report much at all without the expert input, they have received. In other words, expert involvement has made a difference and contributed to the accountability of the process as a whole.

Regarding the process in general the democratic qualities have apparently been considered. Documents and reports have been readily accessible to the public through out the process, as they could and can be downloaded from the internet. That is the reports from the investigations, the minutes from the meetings in the NAG and the local SCs, the memorandums from the NFNA regarding the investigations and the statements from the MoE regarding expert involvement. This openness has also contributed to the transparency of procedures, at least regarding the investigations that were discussed in the NAG and the local SCs. However, the minutes are not very detailed; for example the minutes from the SC in northern Zealand only states who made the investigations, not why this selection was made and if there were other contenders for the job. Hence, this selection is not transparent to the general public, but the selections were made or at least approved by the SC which consisted of representatives from a wide range of interest organisations and not least elected local politicians; i.e. the general public was represented in this process of expert involvement.

The public officials in the secretariat in pilot project Kongernes Nordsjælland had a great deal of influence as regards the selection of experts for the different tasks, as it was the secretariat which recommended the experts to the SC. The participants of the secretariat were recognised as very competent but due to strict time constraints they were perceived as being too controlling at times (Interview 21; Kvistgaard Consult 2005a; Interview 14).

When investigations were submitted to tenders it was done by the NFNA according to a standard contract. The procedure of tenders is transparent and open to anyone who can produce an offer, but not all investigations were submitted to a tender. This was however not questioned or criticised by any of our informants. There seems to be a general agreement that the investigations in question were done by the appropriate experts. When contesters are declined they are entitled
to a solid reason and hence were sent letters explaining why the task went to someone else (Interview 21).

External moderators and consultants were used during the process, most notably in the participation process locally and for the evaluation of the individual pilot projects. Regarding the evaluation of the participation process it was emphasised that it should be performed by external consultants (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2004). The evaluation of the seven pilot projects was compiled by the NAG based on the evaluation report of the participation processes performed by the private consultant company “Kvistgaard Consult” and a report from the private consultant company “Niras” summarising the seven pilot projects (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

The process as a whole was followed by the press and at the local level in Kongernes Nordsjælland some events were arranged to inform and involve the public. Most notably the citizen summit and also when the final report from the SC was finalized. The emphasis on participation and local anchorage has contributed to a proactive communication to the public.

Several of the informants found that the national park process was something new in the sense that no other policy process regarding nature protection had been that extensive in terms of investigations. The process was described as unusually open to the public; however the NFNA was perceived to have a lot of influence; some thought too much influence, due to their role as a secretariat and the so called “blank paper” leaving the other participants insecure of how to approach the process (Interview 20; Interview 21; Interview 18; Interview 19; Interview 14; Interview 17).

Accountability of experts is an important issue for interest organisations. When interest organisations address politicians as experts accountability is important, otherwise the organisation looses credibility and hence access to the political system and influence (Interview 2; Interview 11; Interview 5). When experts are from research organisations or consultant companies it is no less important. Accountability of researchers is essential for research institutions to attract funding; and for society to be able to rely on the knowledge produced. Furthermore the public focus on the process and the press coverage made the researchers be extra cautious not to make mistakes (Interview 17).

The use of experts in the process of establishing national parks in Denmark was discussed in the NAG and the local SCs. It is fair to assume that the institutions and experts employed were considered and recognised as accountable. As for the report by University of Copenhagen of biodiversity values in 32 sites in Denmark; the timing of the report was politically inconvenient; that was the explanation why the Society of Nature Conservation tried to slander it, not because they held the researchers behind it unaccountable or poor researchers (Interview 11). However; the incident proves that knowledge alone was not powerful enough to make political decision-makers change direction. As Albæk (2005) found: If expert recommendations are in opposition to other strong interests or break with established thought, recommendations are unlikely to be converted to policy at least in the short run.

7.8 Conclusion

The official role of expertise was to give the national politicians the best possible knowledge base before deciding if and where to establish national parks in Denmark. In the local process the role of the expertise presented in the different reports was to map and emphasise the values in the area to support the possibility for Kgs. Nordsjælland to become one of the future national parks. The involvement of expertise was a requirement to be in question for the further process. Without the experts there would be little substance in the reports from the local SC.
The accountability of the expert involvement in the national park process was dealt with in the previous section. As for the selection of the experts the responsibility lies with the SCs, the NAG and the secretariats and they can be held to account. Where tasks were put out to tenders there are laws ensuring that there is given account for the reasons why the winner was chosen. The experts performing the different investigation are accountable to their employers and according to the contracts they have with the SC/advisory group.

If the criteria for democratic expert involvement are public access to documents, transparency of procedures, proactive communication to the public and external moderation; the process has been democratic. Most of the informants considered the process to be unusually open and that there was much information to the public. The only issue in terms of democratic quality was the role and power of the NFNA in general; not so much regarding expert involvement specifically (Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 20; Interview 21; Interview 18; Interview 10; Interview 17).

The legitimacy of expert involvement was high as the selection of experts was sanctioned by the SC or the NAG for involvement at the local or national level respectively. These groups represented a broad range of interests; the composition was proposed by the NFNA but decided upon by the Minister as regards the convenors and the organisations to be represented. Locally in the thematic groups experts could participate on the same terms as everyone else, making expert participation legitimate. However; in the individual groups experts may have attained undue influence through their expertise.

In the process of establishing national parks there was no explicit call for new kinds of expertise or to new ways of linking expert communities and non-expert communities. Still there were extensive efforts to involve the local non-expert communities in the process through the different participation measures where experts were involved and hence linking expert communities and non-expert communities.
8 Adaptable and Iterative Processes (AIP)

- The term “iterative” refers to using repetitive or recurrent steps, rather than one large step, to achieve outcomes, goals or solutions to a problem. A repetitive or reiterative approach allows the people involved to incorporate lessons on how to conduct the process more effectively while it is underway. An iterative process involves steps that are constantly being refined incorporating lessons from the process itself.

- The term “adaptive” refers to a process that changes or that is able to be changed so as to become suitable to a new or special application or situation. “Adaptive” refers to the process itself but also to the issues dealt with and the approaches towards solving the problems. Adaptive processes incorporate lessons and experiences as well as new aspects for constructing the processes and addressing challenges.

- In a process that is iterative and adaptive the situation/progress is typically regularly evaluated (either officially or at least reflected by the actors themselves) and necessary steps are taken to ensure that the process is “on track” (e.g. by fragmentation of long-term strategies into medium-term action plans and short-term work programmes with recurring evaluations)(GoFOR 2006).

8.1 Overall assessment of the governance process in terms of AIP

The long term plan of establishing national parks was an adaptable and iterative process. The first discussions about establishing national parks emerged already in the 1930s and the ongoing pilot projects are the results of discussions in the national nature commission ‘the Wilhjelm Committee’, and then the new Government’s nature policy. So the same issue ‘national park’ comes up in different versions, with different emphasis on the nature content, recreation, livelihood and business development, and with changing focus on the participatory content. At least some of the members of the Wilhjelm Committee were also actively involved in the further national park process (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006a).

The pilot phase of establishing national parks was to some extent an adaptive and iterative process as well. The process as a whole so far officially served the purpose of illuminating whether or not there should be national parks in Denmark, and consequently it can be seen as a learning process. During the pilot project phase the NAG offered a venue for the SCs of the individual pilot projects to exchange experiences and learn from each other and a report was made on experiences from national parks abroad to inspire and to learn from (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Kvistgaard Consult 2005c; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006b).

The pilot projects have been running since 2003, and in the final phase, the participatory process of each project was evaluated. Furthermore the NAG evaluated the end reports of the individual pilot projects to come up with recommendations as how to establish the first national parks (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a; Niras 2005b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2004).

Moreover the act proposal, which was issued September 2006, states that in order for an area to become a national park, investigations must be performed that show that the area can fulfil the purpose of a national park. Participation procedures are mandatory in this process. This means that if one of the pilot projects is chosen at least a reassessment of the investigations and lessons learned in the pilot phase must be undertaken. When a national park is designated, the foundation in charge must develop a plan for the area, which is to be revised every 6 years. The planning procedures involve a phase for incoming plan proposals and a hearing phase. Possible changes to
the plan following from the hearing phase leads to another hearing phase (Schmidt 2003b; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

### 8.2 Policy statements and rules on AIP

From the beginning of the pilot project phase there was little prescribed other than there should be local support and voluntary commitment to the national park idea in the area. Local participation was emphasised. Even though there were no explicit calls for an iterative and adaptable approach; the initiation letters and the whole set up of the process makes a certain degree off iterativeness and adaptability inevitable.

The agreement between the NFNA and the Outdoor Council ensured the NAG, which should follow and evaluate the individual pilot projects as well as be a venue for exchanging experiences. The group consisted of several interest organisations as well as administrative interests, which were to agree on some common ideas of the constitutional elements of a national park (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

Their starting point was some rather vague instructions from the MoE at the time, that merely said that the pilot project were to investigate nature values, cultural heritage, recreational possibilities of the areas and economic consequences of a possible national park. I.e. these issues were part of a national park, but nothing was stated regarding the importance of the respective issues, which subsequently was a matter of negotiation among the many stakeholders. Since agreement among the participants was a high priority some common understanding was necessary; and that was only reached little by little after recurrent debates on various themes (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 11; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 19; Schmidt 2003b).

Since the whole purpose of the pilot projects were to find out whether or not it would be appropriate to have national parks at all, it means that the coming national parks will be adapted according to the knowledge gained from the previous processes.

As for formal rules regarding AIP the only explicit statement is the planning procedures of the prospective national parks mentioned in the act proposal, stating that future national park plans are to be revised every 6th year which involve a number of stakeholders with opposing interests. If the act proposal is passed in Parliament without revisions, which is likely, the 6-year plans are the responsibility of the future national park foundations and their boards, consisting of 7-13 members representing interest organisations, municipalities and public authorities. The boards will be appointed by the MoE after recommendations from named organisations. The planning phase is to include local involvement. Apart from the time limits of the planning phase, the structure or design of this one formal rule is not specified (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

### 8.3 Descriptive characteristics of an adaptive and iterative process

The process under study began in 2003 with the initiation of the national park pilot projects and is ongoing. However, the idea of national nature reserves was manifested in Danish nature policy with the recommendations of the Wilhjelm Committee in 2001.

If we consider this process, beginning with the Wilhjelm Committee, in terms of stages of problem formulation, information gathering, vision building, planning/concept forming, implementation and evaluation these stages have taken place at different levels; although not intentionally contemplated as an iterative process. Beginning with the Wilhjelm Committee; the
committee goes through the stages up to the implementation stage; then a new government comes into power. The new MoE adopts the idea of nature reserves, expands it to national parks also including recreational and cultural values, and then both the NAG and the individual pilot projects go through the stages, again up to the implementation stage. The NAG also enters an evaluation stage when it evaluates the process and suggestions of the pilot projects. The results of the process so far is left to the political system and the public administration continuing the work of the NAG in creating the plans and programmes and initiating the implementation stage by designating the prospective national parks. Then, if the act proposal is passed, the board of the prospective national park foundations will go through the stages again when performing the concrete planning of the national parks.

The process might also be seen as an outward spiral, figure 7-1, where the knowledge of the state of Danish nature leads to the recognition of nature reserves as a possible solution. The Wilhjelm report constitutes the first vision and strategy. No action is taken due to the change of Government. For various reasons the idea of coherent nature areas, this time termed national parks, is brought up again; and the pilot projects are initiated to get new knowledge. As a result of these processes new recognitions, visions and strategies are made. When the first national parks are appointed, action will be taken based on these strategies and visions. As for further progression outwards in the spiral, the future must show.
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Figure 8-1: Outward spiral

The case is characterised as having a high degree of complexity as the issues dealt with were difficult to delimit. The initiation instructions only stated that the possibility of a national park and the consequences should be investigated in the area considering nature, recreation, cultural heritage and economics; and the involvement and support of the public was mandatory. Moreover, there were many participants and interests which had to come to terms with each other (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Schmidt 2003b).

There was much uncertainty among participants due to the so-called ‘blank paper’ from the Minister, which left the participants to develop their own ideas of what a national park might be.
Furthermore, no one knew if all their efforts in the pilot projects would matter; if a national park would actually be designated in their area (Interview 9; Interview 11; Interview 16; Interview 20; Interview 22; Interview 18; Interview 19; Interview 14; Interview 10).

Once the visions and ideas were developed there was uncertainty of methods to use. E.g. in pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland there was discussion of the best way to improve biodiversity in forests. Some argued that large grazers in the forests were the answer; others that restoring the natural hydrology was the only way to go. But none were sure of the actual consequences of either idea, nor the number of animals needed or optimal water level respectively (Interview 12).

One might say that the first to initiate iterativeness of the process was the MoE taking up the idea of national parks after the Wilhjelm Committee and initiating the pilot process; whatever his motives. Had there not been the shift of government in 2001, the process would probably have been different. The idea in the Wilhjelm report was to designate nature reserves from a national level through the usual planning procedures (The Wilhjelm Committee 2001). Had the minister of the time remained in office, this recommendation would probably have been followed. However, that is merely speculations.

As for obstructing the process, some claim that the ministers motives for initiating the pilot projects and emphasising participation and the importance of full local support to the extent he did, was to obstruct the idea of national parks by letting it die in local disagreement, and at the same time give the impression of doing something active for nature protection as well as local democracy (Interview 20; Interview 22; Ryding 2006; Interview 5). This interpretation seems to be prevalent in the political opposition, but again it is only speculation.

The goals of the individual participants differed according to interests. Environmental interest organisations had the goal of making future national parks as strong a tool as possible to conserve nature; landowners had the goal of minimising restrictions in land use and to be compensated for the restrictions that were inevitable in the possible national parks; recreational interest organisations had the goal of ensuring the best possible conditions for outdoor activities etc. (Interview 11; Interview 22; Interview 18; Interview 6; Interview 14).

The official goal of the whole process was as stated in policy document from the beginning of the process, to find out whether or not there was scope for national parks in Denmark as a tool for nature conservation as well as for strengthening tourism, recreation, local development etc., i.e. a qualitative statement and not very predefined.

It was up to the participants in the process to define what a national park in Denmark and in the specific areas could look like. Many criticised the blank paper; however some of the informants were in retrospect very glad, that they were allowed to develop their own projects, which contributed to the strong commitment of the convenors of the local SCs (Interview 9; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 21; Interview 14; Interview 10).

The main goal of each of the pilot projects was to be designated as national parks. In the pilot project reports ‘goals’ were stated as long term visions for the area, which are very much qualitative (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b; Niras 2005b).

In the act proposal for national park the preamble is also of a qualitative nature e.g.: the purposes of national parks are to create and ensure coherent nature areas of international significance, strengthen nature quality, conserve and render visible marks of cultural heritage, strengthen local development, strengthen recreational possibilities etc. (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c). In other words; goals are mainly if not solely of a qualitative nature.
8.4 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

This section addresses the extent to which monitoring and evaluation has been included as part of the policy process, in relation to

- Input (financial, physical and human resources and related activities)
- Effects (outputs, impacts, outcomes) of the process
- Process quality and design (e.g. regarding participation)

Second, it is addressed how this evaluation is being used, whether for policy adjustment, legitimisation or more fundamental learning processes.

During the pilot phase the participation measures of each of the projects were evaluated in terms of process design and quality. The NFNA wrote a memorandum regarding the evaluation of the participation processes, which was performed by the external, private consultant company Kvistgaard Consult. The participation efforts of the individual pilot projects were to be evaluated according to 8 topics: The design of the participation process in terms of methods and target groups; the extent of and selection of external process consultants; the level of information and publicity; an assessment of participants in terms of number, gender, organisational affiliation, special efforts to include specific groups etc.; the process as such in terms of timing, conflicts, coordination, perceptions of the participants; the tasks and influence offered and taken by participants; the level of ownership of the project in the local population; and finally the economic input to the participation process(es). The evaluation took place ongoing in the process (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a; Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2004).

The NAG had the task of evaluating the pilot projects. This was done in two stages: First a private consultant company was hired to go through all the material of the individual projects and write it up in a report according to themes/topics determined by the Advisory Group. These topics were: The premises of the SCs; the geographical delimitation of the individual projects; the visions; the proposals for development, the proposed means to reach the visions; the process; and the participation. The report was only to be descriptive and not an evaluation (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Niras 2005b).

The evaluation was discussed in the Advisory Group, written up in the secretariat and approved by the Advisory Group. The evaluation was meant as a help to the political system when deciding which areas to choose as national parks. However the group among others consisted of the convenors of the local SCs; which limited the amount of negative evaluations. Therefore the evaluation appears descriptive rather than valuating. The evaluation was done according to some of the same topics the consultant company had used. Furthermore the group had a professor of law make a statement on legal issues of the different management models proposed by the pilot project. The evaluation was used to give the political decision makers an overview of the processes and all their aspects rather then to adjust the process. They seem to be disconnected add-ons; not core parts of the governance process, as they do not seem to have much consequence to the process. According to the interviews the evaluation will have little effect on the selection of actual national parks. Criteria such as the proportion of the area in public ownership, i.e. the costs of establishing the national park and the support locally are more important to decision makers (Interview 9; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Interview 16; Interview 20; Interview 22; Interview 21).

The evaluation procedures only seem to have facilitated learning in the sense that the participants got a better overview of the process. Regarding the participation procedures some of the methods used were considered exiting and inspirational for the future (Interview 9; Interview 12; Interview 16; Interview 22; Interview 18; Interview 10).
9 Effects of the national park process

The effects of the national park process are dealt with in three categories: output, impact and outcome. Output relates to programmes, plans, acts, changes in policy instruments etc. arising from the process. Impacts refer to behavioural changes among the actors involved resulting from the process. Finally, outcomes are the consequences in terms of biophysical changes which have materialised because of outputs and impacts of the process (GoFOR 2006).

![Figure 9-1: Heuristic frame to operationalise “effects” of governance processes](Image)

9.1 Output

The national park process has resulted in outputs at the local level as well as the national level. Locally each of the seven pilot projects submitted outputs in terms of a project report e.g. (Kgs. Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b), a number of technical reports e.g. (Appel 2005; Grønning and Lind 2004; Jensen 2005b), minutes from meetings e.g. (Kgs. Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2004c) and as regards Kgs. Nordsjælland reports from the thematic working groups and minutes from workshops of the SC (Kgs. Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005c). Furthermore the Outdoor Council funded three additional investigation projects which also reported on their results (Friluftsrådet 2005).

Each of the pilot projects were evaluated in general and specifically regarding participation. The projects used a wide array of participation modes; some of which had never been tried in a Danish context before e.g. the citizen summit in Kgs. Nordsjælland (Kvistgaard Consult 2005a).

Apart from pilot project Læsø, the conclusions from the SCs are that in each pilot project a national park is basically a good idea based on the performed investigations and the participation results. The reports serve as a decision tool for the MoE for choosing which area to designate as national parks; unless an area is designated the individual reports for an area are not likely to have much impact.

Nationally the NAG made a report summing up and evaluating the seven pilot projects and recommending how a national park should be managed and set up administratively. Moreover, the Advisory Group had reports made on international experiences regarding national parks, the general evaluation of the pilot projects, a welfare economic analysis of the seven pilot projects, and a working group under the Advisory Group investigated and reported on the possibilities for using existing subsidy schemes for the financing of national parks, and if and how existing
schemes could be adapted to strengthen the prospective national parks. National outputs are also the minutes from the meeting of the NAG (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2005a; Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006; Jacobsen et al 2006; Niras 2005b).

The NAG concluded that during the process comprehensive and valuable material was provided by each of the pilot projects. The group recommended that the future act on national parks was to be a framework act consisting of the procedural demands for establishing a national park, the legal frames, the competencies of the national park authority and a management model. Moreover the act should establish the objectives of national parks and the criteria to be met. The NAG made recommendations regarding the mentioned subjects (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

National outputs also came from the governmental level in the shape of governmental statement on national parks in October 2006 which generally supported the recommendations of the NAG. The statement was received positively in Parliament (Folketinget 2006). An Act proposal was issued late 2006 and is expected to be passed during spring 2007 and with few exceptions follow the recommendations of the Advisory Group (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c).

According to the act proposal the coming national parks are to be steered through a self-regulating foundation with a board consisting of interest organisation representatives and public authorities from the state and the municipalities. The board is to be supported by a local national park council with representation from the local community as well as two or three experts. The foundation is to be independent; however, the funding is decided by the state in the form of annual appropriations of the Finance Act, and the location of the secretariat is decided by the MoE (Skov- og Naturstyrelsen 2006c). I.e. there will be a financial regulation from the Government. The NAG recommended a national advisory council for the national parks. This is not part of the act proposal.

9.2 Impact

Since no national parks are yet designated the main effect of the process so far are the impacts on behaviour among actors and target groups. (See also chapter 3, section 3.7)

Knowledge gaps were identified when discussing how biodiversity could best be improved in forests. Some saw large grazers to be the answer, but none had specific knowledge regarding how many animals were necessary; others thought that restoring the natural hydrology was the best approach, but did not know what water levels should be (Interview 12). The produced reports were not considered to add surprising, new knowledge to the process, but rather documented and confirmed the need for action. At least they did not cause any significant changes in the process, which new, unsuspected results would have done (Interview 9).

The process contributed to a clarification of the national park concept in a Danish context, which was one of the stated goals with the project; however, there is still some clarification needed as to what extent there will be restrictions on land-use, and what a reasonable compensation is. Furthermore, the national park process stimulated the discussion of setting priorities in Danish nature management, to discuss whether some - and then which - areas/habitats/species/use-values are more valuable than others? Which potential national park areas are the most valuable – and according to what criteria? (Christensen 2006; Interview 12; Folketinget 2005; Folketinget 2006).

In a broader perspective, the national park process and ‘Wilhjelm committee’ can be claimed to be the first efforts to formulate an actual nature policy and strategy, as the nature policy
conducted so far can be considered as reactions to other policies, mainly agricultural policy (Gade 2006).

For the NFNA the process has been a step in a direction where the employees gradually must adapt to a role as process facilitators rather than their traditional role of executing the policies decided by the MoE (Christensen 2006). This is a result of an increased emphasis on participation and an increasing number of situations where the NFNA are to facilitate implementation of projects on land not owned by the state. An informant has seen the national park process as an important step in creating networks between municipalities, which he deemed important because the counties and their knowledge is being dispersed as a result of the municipal reform (Interview 14).

In the national park process some of the experts felt that they had a more direct contact with the end users which made them more worried than usually about the need to produce valid, unassailable research results; there was press coverage, and they presented methods and results either at citizen meetings or for the local SCs or both in person rather than just handing in their reports. A further incentive for doing the job as good as possible was to get access to future research contracts in the ‘real’ national parks once they are designated. Since the process had an unusual media coverage it was therefore also important to be quoted in the press in order to be perceived as the expert on the area by the public, which affected the communication strategy of the experts (Interview 17).

A member of WWF sees a general development in nature policy where the State is loosing influence to both the international and the local level. He sees the role of the government i.e. the national level to ensure the national interests, and that international, national and local interests and efforts are integrated. The national park process is an example of the government transferring national responsibility to the local level, where all Danes living outside of the project areas are the ones really loosing influence on which nature areas are of national importance to protect (Carstensen 2006).

One must assume that establishment of national parks will cause some budget re-allocations, but the extent of reallocations is still unknown. Some of the informants were concerned that the Budget would not allow for sufficient funds to finance national parks as envisioned by the pilot projects along with the obligatory implementation of the habitats directive and the water framework directive.

9.3 Outcome

During the pilot projects the SCs could apply for funding to initiate small projects in the area in order for the participants to see that something actually happened and that it was more than just talking (Interview 21). Hence, minor projects were carried out in each pilot project area such as: paths, benches and nature restoration initiatives.

In Kgs. Nordsjælland seven physical projects were carried out: a foot path, a path suitable for wheel chairs, a small restoration project of the hydrology at ‘Rødedam’, a communication project, an exhibition about ecological corridors, a project to increase visibility of cultural heritage, and a forest grazing project with the local horse breed, the Frederiksborg horse (Kgs.Nordsjælland Styregruppe 2005b).
9.4 Goal achievement

The goals in the policy statements initiating the national park pilot process were mainly concerned with output and impact effects. The overall goal was to establish a comprehensive and thorough basis for deciding whether or not national parks were suitable in a Danish context, which was to be done in a participatory way. A number of investigations were to be made (Schmidt 2004). The level of goal achievement relies on how ‘comprehensive’ and ‘thorough’ is to be understood. Several of the informants thought that the process had been very comprehensive; one could not remember that any previous law proposal was ever based on such extensive preparatory studies (Interview 19). Apart from the Læsø committee, which did not want a national park, each of the pilot projects came up with an idea and a vision to a national park in their area, which was the demand from the initiation of the process (Den Nationale Følgegruppe 2006).

However, if the process is seen to start with the report of the Wilhjelm Committee the goal of national nature reserves was to stop the decline in biodiversity and to strengthen nature conservation. I.e. goals belong to the outcome category. The outcomes of the process so far are yet so modest that the effects of the projects in terms of nature conservation are indiscernible at this stage.
10 Personal communications referred to on text

Interview 2, 19-5-2006, Danish Forest Association

Interview 5, 5-7-2006, Lobbyist from Nepenthes

Interview 6, 14-8-2006, Representative of Danish Agriculture nationally

Interview 9, 17-8-2006, Convenor of the NAG

Interview 10, 18-8-2006, Convenor, Kgs Nordsjælland Steering Committee, Mayor of Helsingør municipality

Interview 11, 29-8-2006, Lobbyist from Danish Society of Nature Conservation

Interview 12, 2-11-2006, NFNA, Frederiksborg State forest district, in charge of the secretariat for pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland

Interview 13, 25-11-2006, Member of the Steering Committee, Kgs. Nordsjælland, Frederiksborg County, Politician

Interview 14, 25-11-2006, Member of the Steering Committee Kgs. Nordsjælland. The Outdoor Council, Frederiksborg

Interview 15, 29-11-2006, Citizen, thematic working group, Kgs. Nordsjælland

Interview 16, 2-12-2006, Convenor of Steering Committee Thy, mayor of Hansholm municipality at the time, member of the NAG

Interview 17, 8-12-2006, 3 Researchers used in the national park process, Forest & Landscape

Interview 18, 8-12-2006, Member of the Steering Committee Kgs. Nordsjælland representing an agricultural interest organisation

Interview 19, 11-12-2006, Member of the NAG representing Visit Denmark (tourism)

Interview 20, 12-12-2006, Social Democrats, MP

Interview 21, 13-12-2006, NFNA, national secretariat, project coordinator

Interview 22, 22-12-2006, Representative of BirdLife Denmark in the National Advisory Group (NAG)

Interview 24, 15-1-2007, Frederiksborg County, public official participating in pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland as expert and resource person
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## Annex 1. List of organisations represented in Wilhjelm Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation (English)</th>
<th>Type organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Minister of Industry (Chairman)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Nature Council (Deputy chairman)</td>
<td>NGO*3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers’ association (3 members)</td>
<td>NGO*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Society for Nature Conservation (2 members)</td>
<td>NGO*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish organisation for organic farming</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Fishermen’s Association</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic council of the labour movement</td>
<td>Trade union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Forest Association</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Association of hunters</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Association of anglers</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Danish Outdoor council</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdlife Denmark</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World wildlife fund for nature, Denmark</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish association of county councils</td>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National association of municipalities in Denmark</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of food, agriculture and fisheries (2 members)</td>
<td>Ministry*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate for food, fisheries and agri business</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Ministry of Economics and business affairs</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transport and Energy</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Forest and Nature Agency (2 members)</td>
<td>Ministry*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Environmental protection agency, Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Institute for Fisheries research</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Aarhus</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape Denmark,</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National environmental research institute</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Copenhagen (3 members)</td>
<td>Research*3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish nature council</td>
<td>NGO (observer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex 2: Members of the thematic working group on quality and monitoring of nature, Wilhjelm Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danish Forest and Nature Agency</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Association of Anglers</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Danish Farmers</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Counties</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdlife Denmark</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Hunters</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Nature Council</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen University</td>
<td>Member of Wilhjelm Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Forest and Nature Agency</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Landscape, Denmark</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Council</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Society for Nature Conservation</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Association of Foresters</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3: List of organisations represented in the National Advisory Group

- Outdoor council, chairman
- Previous minister of industry
- National association of counties (and chairman of local steering committee)
- Municipality/chairman local steering committees six members
- Danish hunting society
- Danish farmers
- Danish nature conservation association
- Birdlife Denmark
- Danish forest association
- VisitDenmark (tourism)
- Outdoor council, substitute chairman
- Association of rural areas
- WWF
- Coast, land, fior association
- Living sea association
- “Association of Danish anglers”
- Danish sportsmens association
- Ministry of transport and energy
- Ministry of food, agriculture and fisheries (2 members)
- Ministry of culture
- Danish nature and Forest agency (3)
## Annex 4: Experts involved through pilot project Kgs. Nordsjælland and/or through the National Advisory Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to national park pilot project</th>
<th>Name and position</th>
<th>Institutional background</th>
<th>Educational background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity in the forests of Northern Zealand</td>
<td>Jane Grønning</td>
<td>Grønning &amp; Lind I/S</td>
<td>MSc. Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anders Dam Lind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation report on nature</td>
<td>Karin Jensen</td>
<td>Frederiksborg County</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential nature values in the investigation area</td>
<td>Martin Schneekloth</td>
<td>The NFNA Consultant company</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Pedersen</td>
<td>Botanical and ornithological consultant (where?)</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biological value of corridors in the landscape</td>
<td>Martin Schneekloth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biological value of corridors in the landscape</td>
<td>Søren Mark Jensen, Project coordinator</td>
<td>Frederiksborg State Forest District</td>
<td>Biologist and ethno-geographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of the end report from the SC</td>
<td>Liv Appel, assistant curator</td>
<td>Council of cultural environment</td>
<td>MA Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kjartan Langsted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Søren Frandsen, assistant curator</td>
<td>Centre of Cultural History of Holbo Herred</td>
<td>MA Ethnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erik A. Jarrum</td>
<td>Museum of Gilleleje</td>
<td>Historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of the cultural history of investigation area</td>
<td>Jette Hansen-Møller, Assistant professor</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>Phil. Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Gentin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and recommendations for outdoor life in national park</td>
<td>Martin Kvistgaard (Heidi Skov?)</td>
<td>Kvistgaard Consult (now part of Orbicon)</td>
<td>MSc Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnny Grandjean Gøgsig Jacobsen</td>
<td>Geographical institute, Roskilde University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tine Falkentorp</td>
<td>Frederiksborg County</td>
<td>Landscape architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vibeke Nelleman</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape analysis</td>
<td>Ole Hjort Caspersen</td>
<td>Geographical institute, Roskilde University</td>
<td>PhD geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Strategy</td>
<td>Ask Agger, CEO</td>
<td>Zentropa Interaction Aps</td>
<td>Background in political science, sociology and system theory. Now scriptwriter, innovation expert, communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement project on culture and nature</td>
<td>Poul Erik Pedersen</td>
<td>The Buster Group, Helsingør municipality; The Outdoor Council</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences and procurement, status and vision</td>
<td>Lone Johnsen</td>
<td>Esrum Convent and Mill Farm</td>
<td>MA History and Social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Wernberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports activities</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The Danish Sports Association</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and welfare economic analysis</td>
<td>Henrik Nowak</td>
<td>Niras Consultants</td>
<td>MSc. Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of seven possible national parks in Denmark</td>
<td>Bo Jellesmark Thorsen, Head of division, Professor in applied forest economics</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>PhD Economics of forests and natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jette Bredahl Jacobsen</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>PhD Forest economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signe Anthon</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape at the time</td>
<td>PhD Environmental economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Halfdan Boiesen</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>MSc. Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesper Tranberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSc. Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Søren Gram</td>
<td>Council of Technology</td>
<td>PhD cultural sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation project, parents and children</td>
<td>Helle Nielsen</td>
<td>Roskilde University</td>
<td>Master student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stine Rahbæk Thuesen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arendse Dahlstrøm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aspects of management models in Danish National parks</td>
<td>Henrik Zahle, Professor</td>
<td>Copenhagen University</td>
<td>Doctorate, law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook on grazing and grass cutting</td>
<td>Rita Buttenschön</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>PhD, Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on outdoor recreation and tourism, August 26th 2004</td>
<td>Frank Søndergaard Jensen</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>PhD Landscape management and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pernille Kemel</td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bo Fisker</td>
<td>DGI</td>
<td>“Nature guide”/ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ove Gasbjerg</td>
<td>The Outdoor Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lene Feldthus Andersen</td>
<td>Centre for region and tourism research</td>
<td>MEM (Environmental Management, DTU), M.Sc. (Technology and Policy, MIT), M.Sc. (Civil Engineering, MIT), B.Sc. (Biology, USC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Croft</td>
<td>Chairman, European commission of IUCN on protected areas</td>
<td>WCPA, IUCN</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Günter Liebl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Austrian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and water management</td>
<td>Dipl.Ing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björn Risinger</td>
<td>Head of the natural resource department</td>
<td>Swedish environmental protection agency</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jørgen Primdahl</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Forest &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>Lic.Agro, landscape planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uffe Gjøl Sørensen</td>
<td></td>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kvistgaard Consult</td>
<td>MSc Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mette Seier Helms</td>
<td>Process consultant</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>