

## ENSURING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF NATURA 2000: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

**Abstract.** *All European Union countries are challenged by Natura 2000, i.e. the Birds and Habitats Directives, poses due to deficient understanding of the concept of sustainable development. The main objective of this article is to theoretically present the governance of Natura 2000 in line with the sustainable development concept. The research background encompasses the legislation and institutions as the basis for the good governance of Natura 2000. The literature review outlines the views of several scholars and recommendations to improve the governance of Natura 2000 according to the concept of sustainable development. The conclusion points to changes in behaviour in response to environmental legislation and institutions.*

**Keywords:** *European Union, Sustainable Development, Governance of Natura 2000*

### Introduction and methodology

The governance of Natura 2000 (N2000) is a process that builds on the concept of sustainable development, making it vital to better understand the concept of sustainable development itself. This concept relies on legislation and institutions as the basis for a multi-level governance (MLG) system of natural resources such as N2000 (Šobot and Lukšič, 2016; 2017; 2019; 2020).

The MLG system of N2000 divides responsibilities among different policies on multiple levels of government (local, national, supranational) (Niedziałkowski et al., 2015). Newig and Fritsch (2009) state the MLG system improves the connectivity of actors and reduces the impact of government institutions. Christophersen and Weber (2002) describe how within the MLG system of N2000 non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are given an equal chance to participate as governmental organisations. Carter (2006) notes that mutual cooperation between governmental and non-governmental actors becomes stronger in the MLG system, while Stubbs (2005) states that democratic conditions are fulfilled in such a way. Lockwood et al. (2009) explain that MLG represents communication, co-operation and

---

\* Aleksandar Šobot, PhD, Centre for Political Theory, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia; Andrej Lukšič, PhD, Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

coordination among various actors at the organisational level and hence could underpin a new model of management within the national system of nature protection.

The primary challenges of the sustainable development concept within N2000 according to the theory of Šobot and Lukšič (2016; 2017; 2019; 2020) are legislative and institutional changes to the nature protection system and changes in the population's understanding and behaviour concerning the legislation and institutions of the protected areas (N2000 areas). The main research objective was to describe the biggest challenges and solutions in the governance of Natura 2000 in line with the concept of sustainable development. The research was carried out within the framework of the *Multi-Level Governance of Natural Resources in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina* research project from 2013 to 2016. A literature review was conducted with the main research objective in mind.

## Literature review

### *Challenges and solutions in governing N2000 according to the concept of sustainable development: Lessons from research many scholars*

Gambert (2010) explains that the governance and management of natural resources, such as N2000, is a political process that has an interest in the commons. The N2000 may be seen as commons in this century. Hardin (1968) highlights the importance of the commons while Ostrom (1990) says that all of society must be involved in it. Baker (2003) thinks a functional logic is at play; including the public, experts and politics in the commons is the key to natural resource management. Torkar and McGregor (2012) use the term "people included" and point out the need to ensure that the public, professions and politics are involved in the management of natural resources and environmental protection. Niedziałkowski et al. (2015) promote the public's participation in decision-making so as to add to the legitimacy and effectiveness of nature protection policies. Borgström et al. (2015) suggest that the level of success of a nature protection policy and the governance and management of natural resources depend on the degree of participation, knowledge and confidence entailed. Nastran (2015) believes the effectiveness of the governance and management of natural resources is subject to attitudes and perceptions while Holling (1993) finds it is important to learn about the protection of nature, implementation of nature protection policy and management of natural resources. Niedziałkowski et al. (2012) contend it is vital to include institutions in these processes. Torkar and McGregor (2012) think it is essential to share knowledge and understanding acquired in nature protection processes, with Kakabadze (2011)

going further and saying that if natural resources are to be successfully governed and managed it is essential to involve all of them, regardless of private interests. Reed (2008) even states that participation in the management of natural resources is a democratic right.

Legislation and institutions play a huge role in the governance and management of natural resources. N2000 is a supranational policy obligation (Rosa and Da Silva, 2005) and the management process must be coordinated. The governance and management of nature is located at the supranational level (Baker, 2003) because nature has no borders. Giljum et al. (2005) suggest that the governance and management of nature protection at the supranational level may be seen as the first major step towards sustainable development. Kati et al. (2014) report that, in addition to the supranational level, such as the EU, the support of governmental and non-governmental representatives is also required to ensure successful implementation of the project management of natural resources, like N2000. Neumann (2005) considers that national parks have a great impact on successful implementation of N2000 because they have long been involved in nature protection, and the experiences and perceptions of people from these areas will be included. Geitzenauer et al. (2016) suggest that N2000 is a model of European national parks. National parks represent the management of natural resources (Lockwood et al., 2010) whereas Gruby and Basurto (2013) suggest that this also means the management of ecosystem services, i.e. ecosystem management.

Ecosystem management refers to the politics of natural resource management (Lakićević and Tatović, 2012), such as N2000. The ecosystem approach entails the involvement of all in the associated decision-making (Niedziałkowski et al., 2012). Gruby and Basurto (2013) suggest that ecosystem management, i.e. N2000, is biological/political management. The ecosystem management includes a planning process within institutions, cooperation with participants, and flexible and adaptive management (Layzer, 2012). The ecosystem management, i.e. N2000, requires an institutional (Gruby and Basurto, 2013) and legislative transformation (Kakabadze, 2011) along with stronger governmental–non-governmental stakeholder connections (Imperial, 1999) to adapt the values of nature protection and ecosystem services as defined in a nature protection policy. In order to ensure that this management is effective, both deliberation (Slocombe, 1998) and adaptive management are required (Lakićević and Tatović, 2012; Blenckner et al., 2015). Adaptive management proceeds best through ecosystem-based management (Bennett, 2016). Slocombe (1998) says that ecosystem management is “the process of an ecosystem-based management (EBM) of human activities”.

EBM denotes an understanding between scientific and human values

while making decisions (Imperial, 1999). Blenckner et al. (2015) suggest that with EBM humans manage those parts of the ecosystem to which they belong. Slocombe (1998) states that EBM is very valuable for the planning process and management because it involves several stakeholders and relationships in a smaller territory. Borgström et al. (2015) contend that EBM is the key to implementing a nature protection policy which contributes to environmental governance on the local, national and supranational levels. EBM is crucial for effective natural resource management (Nilsson and Bohman, 2015; Blenckner et al., 2015) since it includes all levels of management from supranational, such as the EU where nature protection policy is created, to local (community) ones where these objectives are put into practice, and may be regarded as a partnership in environmental management (Niedziałkowski et al., 2012). Accordingly, this partnership includes elements of joint decision-making, for example through advisory boards and representative committees. Partnership can take the form of co-production, co-regulation, co-management or community-based management.

The community-based conservation approach seeks a direct cooperative relationship between the integrity of ecosystems and the sustainable livelihoods of communities (Torkar and McGregor, 2012). The community must participate in the resource management plans (Booth and Halseth, 2011). Armitage (2005) believes a better understanding of the socio-ecological conditions of the area, as well as any risks/opportunities is needed for making adaptations in management. Torkar and McGregor (2012) suggest that community-based management is important for local participation and credibility of the process. Bennett (2016) considers that this approach yields better insights into nature protection able to contribute to more developed decisions for nature protection in planning, implementation and management based on real information. Such decision-making in the management of natural resources is called co-management. N2000 is the only feasible choice given the co-management of the various government, NGO and EU stakeholders.

Carlsson and Berkes (2005) describe co-management as two or more social parties that negotiate and share management rights and responsibilities. Torkar and McGregor (2012) consider nature protection as the co-evolution of conservational objectives that must be shared in the local environment. Giljum et al. (2005) suggest that co-evolution goes towards sustainable development. Carlsson and Berkes (2005) state that co-management entails a joint arrangement of the state and local communities regarding shared authority in decision-making and responsibilities. The state plays a major role in nature protection, yet in co-management this role is shared with those who use the local environment (Carlsson and Berkes, 2005). Ferranti et al. (2010) believe that co-management is being revolutionised by N2000

and the involvement of the public, professions and politics in its planning, implementation and performance. That only the government makes decisions is an old notion (Buttel, 2003) because the state alone is unable to cope with ecological problems (Kapaciauskaite, 2011). In addition, EU organisations may possess superior capacities for solving environmental problems, making their participation essential (Brown, 2013). Beunen and de Vries (2011) reveal that the practice of co-management has increased in all EU countries with N2000. Lockwood et al. (2009) state that collaborative governance requires stronger governmental coordination with the aim of the greater involvement of stakeholders in decision-making. Gambert (2010) believes that it is only through collaborative governance that the traditional system of governance, which has concealed many private interests, can be counteracted and thereby bring greater transparency. Lukšič and Bahor (2011) indicate that decisions may be based on individuals' concealed interests, making it necessary to increase the participation of the public, professions and politics in decision-making. Torkar and McGregor (2012) say that collaborative decisions contribute to democracy, legitimacy, governance and the sharing of knowledge and understanding and, without such a decision, problems might arise.

**372**

Niedziałkowski et al. (2015) point out that the biggest problems with co-management are delays in the participation or non-inclusion of various stakeholders in N2000. Grodzinska-Jurczak and Cent (2011) suggest that problems with participation in N2000 are considerable in South-east Europe. Rosa and Da Silva (2005) specify that the most common problems are associated with the use of land in the N2000 area, such as intensive agriculture. Cent et al. (2014) believe these problems arise within the administration. The problems emerging during the course of natural resource management are actually due to the different positions held by the participants and the varying access to information (Booth and Halseth, 2011). Armitage (2005) states that such problems stem from poor institutional organisation and the non-equal involvement of all stakeholders. Lakićević and Tatović (2012) indicate that they happen due to a poor cross-sectoral integration that does not allow the inclusion of all stakeholders. Carlsson and Berkes (2005) believe the problems arise from inadequate knowledge and understanding. Gambert (2010) thinks that challenges with N2000 are due to excessive interest in government institutions in relation to participants in terms of natural resource management. Schusler et al. (2003) note that this is not an issue of great interest for the government but for the different interests of the participants. On the other hand, Reed (2008) states that problems may stem from skewed local knowledge. Nastran (2015) says that local knowledge concerning nature protection is historically based on the national parks and the experiences of participating in their management.

The perceptions of such management can be challenging in new natural resource management projects, such as N2000. Liu et al. (2010) explain that challenges may reflect cultural differences or the fact that participation in nature protection was developed earlier. Dimitrakopoulos et al. (2010) think that all of these problems concern the issue of sustainable land use, public or private property and the right to manage.

Niedziałkowski et al. (2012) indicate that individual users of land in N2000 are passive when it comes to implementing international directives. Kay (2014) explains that this passivity hinders monitoring, evaluation and control in these areas, possibly leading to conflict. Rosa and Da Silva (2005) believe that the greatest problem is ensuring that landowners properly understand N2000. They add that this is an ethical issue where the values of nature protection are the opposite to those of private property. The Habitats Directives were created without private owners from Europe and are better protect species regulations of than land use. Niedziałkowski et al. (2015) describe how experts from the natural sciences created N2000 without taking the historical and social conditions into account, which Louette et al. (2011) find are important in nature protection planning. Torkar and McGregor (2012) suggest that people have traditionally used the land for non-environmental purposes, or for economic gain. As a result, Dimitrakopoulos et al. (2010) believe that problems arise which can cause conflicts. Nastran (2015) thinks that people view N2000 as the nationalisation of private land similarly to the way it was in communism and that therefore N2000 is poorly accepted. Arnberger et al. (2012) assert that its poor acceptance means the modest implementation of the directives. Fagan (2008) concludes that financiers are responsible for the weak implementation of the directives, with Rosa and Da Silva (2005) adding that the problem is that the EU often funds projects with opposite ecological values in the same area. Nastran (2015) points out that the EU is more nature-oriented and that the EU generally funds nature protection projects. Newig and Fritsch (2009) feel that those who are located far from natural resources support nature protection while those who live close to them support its economic viability. Torkar and McGregor (2012) suggest that this is because people have a more immediate need to earn, or survive, than to protect the environment. Louette et al. (2011) say these problems must be planned in the management of N2000, making it necessary to account for people's perceptions of nature protection and N2000 in the planned area of implementation in order to manage any problems. Acuna (2015) explains that it is vital for the entire process of planning, implementation and management of N2000 to bring about an institutional and political transformation in order to adopt a nature protection policy and to be operational in the area. Ostrom (1990) states that this institutional transformation should involve everyone in the



decision-making process. Institutions must recognise that the area is multi-functional and that it is therefore important to define individual rights.

Individual rights are not the only relevant rights; collective rights also exist (Acuna, 2015). Nature cannot be privately owned (Holling, 1993). Rolston (1996) states that the private right is the right of the community. N2000 is a new framework that encompasses a considerable proportion of private property (Kay 2014). N2000 is probably the most ambitious supra-national policy measure in the world with the aim to preserve biodiversity through land use regulation. A system of private ownership is different from a nature protection system and international agreements (Hlaing et al., 2013), where one problem is that international agreements are not included in the system of rights and the use of private property. However, N2000 imposes obligations on all landowners with respect to sustainable use and management, with or without their agreement (Hunka and de Groot, 2011). Citizens desire greater rights and hence declare themselves content to join the EU, which is the source of N2000. Greater community rights require smaller property rights over natural resources. Lukšič (2010) explains that people often do not have an autonomous and free will in responding to rules that come from the EU and thus become victims of the system. In this way, people can come into conflict with their own values (Nilsson et al., 2016).

Hardin (1968) states that individual benefits may be inconsistent with human values even when all of society suffers. Individual benefits are frequently not sustainable or good for the community in the long term. Blenckner et al. (2015) indicate that human activities mostly refer to economic benefits that do not consider the destruction of ecosystem dynamics and benefits for the good of all. The users of protected areas typically seek financial compensation for what they could otherwise earn without the nature protection (Nastran, 2015), while at the same time they overlook the benefits of the nature protection and the values held by the ecosystem services. For the N2000 area, the EU assessed the values of ecosystem services that contribute to human well-being at some USD 30 billion. The question of how these services are evaluated occupies thinking on the collective and individual levels. Lukšič (2010) contends that people must transform their thoughts or leave behind old skills that are not long-term sustainable and adopt a new identity that is sustainable. N2000 represents the acceptance of a new identity with sustainable values (Šobot and Lukšič, 2020). People must acknowledge that they are not isolated on planet Earth, but are members of a community in which everyone has equal responsibility (Torkar and McGregor, 2012). Conflicts typically arise when one does not want to accept his/her individual and social responsibility in an area. Private users are very important for the protection, monitoring and management

of natural resources (Mertens, 2013). The underperformance of N2000 and its monitoring is often associated with problems/conflicts with private land-owners or farmers. Rosa and Da Silva (2005) explain that the EU is often the cause of conflicts because it provides funding for large agricultural projects that are harmful to N2000 areas. In one example in France, N2000 was politically suspended for funding agricultural projects. Acuna (2015) determines these are institutional conflicts. The overriding problem is the lack of institutional organisation and insufficient transformation with respect to the needs of nature protection, natural resource management and sustainable development. Imperial (1999) underscores the lack of government programmes able to fund sustainability and the fact that farmers are, following the old practices, used to funding from other sources. In the future, EU funding should go through government institutions in order to avoid conflicts with projects within the same area.

The success of N2000 depends on conflicts in a certain area (Ferranti et al., 2010). Gifford and Nilsson (2014) believe that conflicts arise when protected areas are not given funding. Liu et al. (2010) views this as ignoring local interests in the planning, implementation and management. Acuna (2015) points to the need to establish conflict management on all state levels. Winter et al. (2014) think that conflict management should contribute to the transition from a commercial use of land to a sustainable resource use. Holling (1993) suggests conflicting plans should be based on understanding, including the perceptions and decentralisation of actions. Nastran (2015) states that including perceptions is fundamental to preventing conflicts. Slocombe (1998) believes this plan must include the public, professionals and politics, while Holling (1993) notes that adaptive management is required during a conflict. Adaptive management would support the functioning of N2000 even during situations of conflict. Acuna (2015) concludes that adaptive management is a way to resolve conflicts. N2000 causes conflicts in all countries and the need for adaptive management is real (Ferranti et al., 2010). Vikolainen et al. (2013) suggests that adaptive management should include all stakeholders, understand the historical and socio-environmental conditions and consider sustainable resource objectives. Nastran (2015) states that for conflict resolution it is important to promote the non-economic objectives and benefits of nature protection. Hiedanpaa (2002) suggests a wider discussion of the N2000 areas. Šobot and Lukšič (2016, 2017, 2019) propose discussing the role of legislation and institutions in nature protection with the people from the protected areas. This entails sustainable development education, which helps transform opinions and attitudes so as to keep conflicts to a minimum (Torkar, 2014).



### *Perceptions and Natura 2000*

Perceptions, attitudes, values and behaviour are vital components of any analysis of the implementation of environmental EU legislation (Bennett, 2016) as N2000 involves a multi-level system of governance. The influence of public opinion has grown over time (Park, 2000) due to the need to effectively implement EU legislation (Lima et al., 2011) and properly manage natural resources (Nastran, 2015). The transfer of EU policy into a piece of national legislation, such as N2000, requires the consideration of all relevant knowledge (Hiedanpaa, 2002), including the local people's perception of the roles of legislation and institutions as important factors in nature protection and its effective management (Aretano et al., 2013). Research on perceptions is essential for the successful adoption and implementation of EU environmental policy (Nilsson et al., 2016) such as N2000 because it permits an understanding of the local and cultural circumstances which contribute to nature protection, good environmental management (Grodzinska-Jurczak and Cent, 2011) and the preservation of ecosystem values (Romano and Zullo, 2015). Perceptions refer to the manner in which an individual observes, understands, interprets and evaluates a referent object, action, experience, individual, policy or outcome (Bennett, 2016). Perceptions are influenced by the social and cultural contexts of individuals and society (Aretano et al., 2013). Perceptions can convey important details about the social acceptability and appropriateness of management inputs (Bennett, 2016) for protected areas.

Nastran (2015) states that while perceptions are key to the successful management of protected areas, Southeast Europe countries have done very little to gather perceptions. The public administration is responsible collecting perceptions within protected areas (Cent et al., 2014). Perceptions are best collected as part of a process of planning the implementation of EU environmental policy at the national level. Studies of local people's perceptions can give important insights into: observations, understandings and interpretations of the social impacts and ecological outcomes of protection; the legitimacy of protection management; and the social acceptability of an environmental policy (Bennett, 2016), such as N2000. Indicative factors impacting citizens' perceptions and behaviours concerning a protected area include the level of trust in the institutions responsible for environmental management and their effectiveness in the protected area, the level of awareness among citizens and the personal attribution of individuals (Dimitrakopoulos et al., 2010).

Considerable public involvement in managing protected areas is typical of areas with greater experience with this kind of system protection, where the actual involvement depends on the level of knowledge (Nastran, 2015).

Nicolescu (2007) introduces different knowledge and different perceptions, which lead to different levels of reality that must be understood in order to establish new values and attitudes.

### *Attitudes and Natura 2000*

Hiedanpaa (2002) states that people often believe that ecology limits their freedom. Kati et al. (2014) say that most people hold a negative attitude and little knowledge about nature protection (the role of legislation and institutions for nature protection). Park (2000) asserts that ecology is a path to the future and such people must develop positive attitudes about the logic of life. Rolston (1996) believes that ecology is the logic of life and that we should ask ourselves what is the human attitude towards it. An attitude is defined as a tendency to think, feel or act positively or negatively about objects or issues in our environment (Torkar et al., 2010). Environmental socio-psychological studies have found that people who are close to nature (e.g., those who live near areas of natural wealth) have an environmental attitude. Lima et al. (2011) say environmental attitudes are based on beliefs, a notion supported by Kollmuss and Agyeman (2002), which Kotchen and Reiling (2000) define as ethical beliefs. Rosa and Da Silva (2005) further explain that attitudes to N2000 may be seen as falling within three ethical theories: anthropocentric, biocentric and ecocentric. The different positions held by participants from various sectors and areas contributing to N2000 lead to this kind of division. Kotchen and Reiling (2000) suggest that moral responsibilities affect divisions. Environmental psychology informs us that individuals with positive environmental attitudes are more moral (Papagiannakis and Lioukas, 2012).

Rosa and Da Silva (2005) find two conflicting moral values in N2000, namely: private law and the collective right to a healthy environment. N2000, i.e. the Habitats Directive, creates a potential conflict when it encompasses private property. Nastran (2015) says that people find protected areas to be a 'grab of private property' and often compare it to nationalisation during the period of communism. Ferranti et al. (2010) states that N2000 is the sole concept of sustainable development which is acceptable. Tzaberis et al. (2012) define the sustainable development concept as comprising three pillars: economy, environment and society. Lukšič (2010) says sustainable development is only possible when moral consciousness has been raised. Tzaberis et al. (2012) establish that moral values contribute to maintaining the commons, with Hardin (1968) highlighting that it is necessary to understand the need for the commons and that stakeholders are prone to self-destruction. Radović (2010) wrote: "If someone were watching us from another planet, they would find that we are halfway to destroying

ourselves". Ostrom (1990) suggests institutions must be in place which are prepared to meet the needs of the commons (Anderies and Janssen, 2013). Nastran (2015) states that people complain they accrue no benefits from the institutions because N2000 requires nature protection while adding that people's expectations of protected areas are sometimes too high. In addition, Tzaberis et al. (2012) think that individual and collective goods should be in harmony with an eco lifestyle and sustainable environmental management. An eco lifestyle denotes a change in lifestyle towards sustainability in a transdisciplinary world (Goetz et al., 2008). Nastran (2015) believes that the environmental management of protected areas such as N2000 should be approached in a transdisciplinary way.

A transdisciplinary approach means accepting a more logical system of life (Nikolescu, 2014). Transdisciplinarity will build understanding and new values (McGregor, 2014). Torkar and McGregor (2012) reported a better governance model based on the 'stakesharer' (collective good) compared to the stakeholder (individual good). According to Hardin, stakeholder refers to individual self-interests and can lead to self-destruction or destruction of the commons. Stakesharer refers to more collective interests that contribute to the commons for human well-being. Bullard (2010) contends that it is essential to ensure environmental justice for nature protection in relation to the commons, which is a prerequisite for sustainable development. Kluvánková-Oravská et al. (2009) find that the primary mission of the Birds and Habitats Directives is sustainable development. Rosa and Da Silva (2005) say that the directives are more favourable to species than humans because collecting data on attitudes is very important for the successful implementation of N2000. This is crucial in the planning processes of N2000 (Casado-Arzuaga et al., 2013). Nastran (2015) finds it is essential to build knowledge and understanding regarding attitudes and protected areas. Arnberger et al. (2012) indicate that attitudes are the main factor in the acceptance and success of the environmental management of protected areas such as N2000. N2000 may be seen as an ecosystem management (Borgström et al., 2015) and Grodzinska-Jurczak and Cent (2011) believe that the most important aspect of ecosystem management is developing proper civic attitudes.

### *Values and Natura 2000*

Values are important life goals or standards that serve as guiding principles in a person's life (Papagiannakis and Lioukas, 2012). Human values are said to be structured in two motivational dimensions: openness to change versus protection and self-enhancement versus self-transcendence (Gifford and Nilsson, 2014). Lima et al. (2011) state that "a value is a desirable trans-situational goal varying in importance, which serves as a guiding principle

in the life of a person or other social entity". Values are a filter of information, which are under the influence of beliefs (Park, 2000). Dietz et al. (2005) think that values hold three meanings: the worth of something, opinions about that worth, and moral principles. Romano and Zullo (2015) believe that the establishment of N2000 has led to strong conservation values, yet conservation values are not the only values, as cultural values also exist (Rolston, 1996).

Hajer and Versteeg (2005) suggest that nature is basically human culture. Culture reflects the values adopted while learning the complexities and diversities essential for nature protection and sustainable development (Lockwood et al., 2009). Nature provides the life support system for culture and what is good for nature is therefore often good for culture (Rolston, 2010). Gifford and Nilsson (2014) assert that the values of nature protection are better developed in more developed countries which have a policy of 'higher goals' of protection, such as global problems. In Norway, nature protection is related to human dignity and inner values. The public in Finland takes part in environmental policy and environmental protection through a large number of NGOs. Environmental non-governmental organisations (ENGOS) have contributed to nature protection by raising awareness of morality with regard to nature protection (Breitmeier and Rittberger, 1998). Moral values are a prerequisite for nature protection (Hiedanpää, 2002). Rolston (1996) points out that, among all other living beings, only humans are capable of developing moral values and are thus solely responsible for nature protection.

Lima et al. (2011) find such people with morality are part of nature. Gifford and Nilsson (2014) suggest that moral people are more concerned about environmental and nature protection problems. Lukšič (2010) states that sustainable development can only be achieved by raising the level of moral standards in society. Fornara et al. (2016) indicates that values are associated with culture while Rolston (1996) finds there is a need for cultural reconstruction in order to maintain society and that we must introduce moral values in the management of natural resources. Gifford and Nilsson (2014) state that people hold multiple values and they can change and conflict with each other.

Nature has become a basic concept of negotiation among different professions, interests and values. Slocombe (1998) finds that considerable differences in values cannot support the objectives of nature protection. Gifford and Nilsson (2014) hold the opinion that people have multiple values, which can change and conflict with one another. Changes in values are seen as leading to changes in decisions and thereby changes in behaviour (Dietz et al., 2005).

### *Behaviour and Natura 2000*

Values and attitudes clearly play an important role in determining pro-environmental behaviour (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002). It is necessary to understand the complex relationships between people's attitudes and values regarding nature protection (the role of legislation and institutions for nature protection) and pro-environmental behaviour (Park, 2000). Behaviour means "the activity of an organism interacting with its environment" (Popescu, 2014). Pro-environmental behaviour is typically defined as "intentionally reducing the negative impact that an action can have on the environment" (Dono et al., 2009). Pro-environmental behaviour can be reduced to three factors: social status, values and attitudes, and social structure (Park, 2000). Pro-environmental behaviour visualises the problem on a macro scale and therefore includes non-psychological factors such as geophysical conditions and political influence (Gifford and Nilsson, 2014). Rules are imposed from the outside, and norms of behaviour from the inside (Hiedanpaa, 2002). Many personal factors play a role in pro-environmental behaviour such as felt responsibility, cognitive biases, place attachment, age, gender, chosen activities and social factors like religion, urban versus rural residence, norms, social class, proximity to problem sites and cultural and ethnic variations (Gifford and Nilsson, 2014). Dietz et al. (2005) indicate that environmentally conservational behaviour is promoted by environmental legislation, such as N2000. Conservation can alter behaviours and conservation biologists can play a central role in promoting changes in human behaviour (Schultz, 2011).

Park (2000) indicates the biggest barriers to pro-environmental behaviour are limited knowledge, experience and education, which often underpin conflicts. Podmetnik et al. (2000) believe that conflicts are often caused by previously created internal motives. In addition, the stealing of ideas has happened often in post-communist countries, triggering conflicts. Hiedanpaa (2002) states that the problems with pro-environmental behaviour may occur through deficient traditional practices and current practices. Conflicts are very common in the protected areas of post-communist countries (Nastran, 2015) and often arise due to varying perceptions included in landowners' expectations of protected areas. Tzaberis et al. (2012) point out that conflicts can emerge due to unsuitable models of development and landowners' selfish demands. Kollmuss and Agyeman (2002) suggest that problems and conflicts may occur due to individuals' low awareness and poor institutions.

Torkar (2014) emphasises the value of environmental information for helping in conflict resolution and creating pro-environmental behaviour. Rolston (1996; 2010) states that people need to know that they are an

element of nature and that without nature there is no human life, making it thus imperative to improve understanding of the current bad behaviours and which new behaviours can be introduced to enable a sustainable future. Schultz (2011) recommends a stronger connection with nature so as to achieve the objectives of pro-environmental behaviour for nature protection and the sustainable management of resources. Šobot and Lukšič (2016, 2017, 2019) propose discussing and educating people from protected areas about the role of legislation and institutions in nature protection and sustainable development. Education concerning respect for legislation and institutions is essential for a growing capacity to understand (Casado-Arzuaga et al., 2013) and can positively contribute to pro-environmental behaviour (Torkar, 2014; Gifford and Nilsson, 2014).

## Conclusion

The governance of Natura 2000 poses a challenge for all EU countries. This article explains many paths to N2000 governance on international, national and local levels. Along the way, a description is given of the main problems seen in the governance of N2000, such as misunderstandings, misperceptions, distorted values and attitudes that are maintained by non-environmental behaviour.

The bases for the governance of N2000 areas are legislation and institutions for nature protection. A proper understanding of the role played by legislation and institutions in nature protection, especially among the people who live in protected areas, provides the foundation of good governance. This understanding is often based on previous nature conservation experiences, which can lead to major problems with examples of land use. Therefore, it is proposed that a wide discussion and education be provided for the people living in these protected areas concerning the importance and role of the legislation and institutions in nature protection and of understanding the environmental system at the local, national and international levels. This will instigate a change in behaviour among the people in the protected areas and bring about the good governance of the N2000 areas. In this way, the local effect can contribute to the global sustainable development movement.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuna, Roger Merino (2015): The Politics of Extractive Governance: Indigenous Peoples and Socio-Environmental Conflicts. *Extractive Industries and Society* 2: 85–92.
- Anderies, John and Marco Janssen (2013): Sustaining the Commons. In John Anderies and Marco Janssen (eds.), *Sustaining the Commons*, 3–39. Arizona: Center for the Study of Institutional Diversity, Arizona State University.



- Apostolopoulou, Evangelia, Evangelia G. Drakou and Kalliope Pediaditi (2012): Participation in the Management of Greek Natura 2000 Sites: Evidence from a Cross-Level Analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management* 113: 308–318.
- Aretano, Roberta, Irene Petrosillo, Nicola Zaccarelli, Teodoro Semeraro and Giovanni Zurlini (2013): People Perception of Landscape Change Effects on Ecosystem Services in Small Mediterranean Islands: A Combination of Subjective and Objective Assessments. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 112 (1): 63–73.
- Armitage, Derek (2005): Adaptive Capacity and Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Environmental Management* 35 (6): 703–715.
- Arnberger, Arne, Renate Eder, Brigitte Alex, Petra Sterl and Robert C. Burns (2012): Relationships between National-Park Affinity and Attitudes Towards Protected Area Management of Visitors to the Gesaeuse National Park, Austria. *Forest Policy and Economics* 19: 48–55.
- Baker, Susan (2003): The Dynamics of European Union Biodiversity Policy: Interactive, Functional and Institutional Logics. *Environmental Politics* 12 (3): 23–41.
- Bennett, Nathan (2016): Using Perceptions as Evidence to Improve Conservation and Environmental Management. *Conservation Biology* 00 (0): 1–11.
- Beunen, Raoul and Jasper R. de Vries (2011): The Governance of Natura 2000 Sites: The Importance of Initial Choices in the Organisation of Planning Processes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 54 (8): 1041–1059.
- Blenckner, Thorsten, Henrik Österblom, Per Larsson, Agneta Andersson and Ragnar Elmgren (2015): Baltic Sea Ecosystem-Based Management under Climate Change: Synthesis and Future Challenges. *Ambio* 44 (3): 507–515.
- Booth, Annie and Greg Halseth (2011): Why the Public Thinks Natural Resources Public Participation Processes Fail: A Case Study of British Columbia Communities. *Land Use Policy* 28: 898–906.
- Borgström, Sara, Örjan Bodin, Annica Sandström and Beatrice Crona (2015): Developing an Analytical Framework for Assessing Progress Toward Ecosystem-Based Management. *Ambio* 44 (3): 357–369.
- Breitmeier, Helmut and Volker Rittberger (1998): NGOs in an Emerging Global Civil Society. *Tübinger Arbeitspapiere zur Int. Polit. und Friedensforsch* 32: 1–29.
- Brown, M. Leann (2013): European Union Environmental Governance in Transition – Effective? Legitimate? Ecologically Rational? *Journal of International Organization Studies* 4 (1): 109–126.
- Brulle, Robert (2010): Politics and the Environment. In Kevin Leicht and Craig Jenkins (eds.), *The Handbook of Politics: State and Civil Society in Global Perspective*, 385–406. New York: Springer Publishers.
- Bulkeley, Harriet and P. J. Arthur Mol. (2003): Participation and Environmental Governance: Consensus, Ambivalence and Debate Participation and Environmental Governance. *Environmental Values* 12 (September): 143–154.
- Bullard, Robert (2010): Environmental Justice for All. In David Keller (ed.), *Environmental Ethics the Big Questions*, 6th ed., 491–501. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Carlsson, Lars and Fikret Berkes (2005): Co-Management: Concepts and Methodological Implications. *Journal of Environmental Management* 75 (1): 65–76.
- Carmin, JoAnn (2010): NGO Capacity and Environmental Governance in Central and Eastern Europe. *Acta Politica* 45 (1–2): 183–202.
- Casado-Arzuaga, Izaskun, Iosu Madariaga and Miren Onaindia (2013): Perception, Demand and User Contribution to Ecosystem Services in the Bilbao Metropolitan Greenbelt. *Journal of Environmental Management* 129: 33–43.
- Cent, Joanna, Małgorzata Grodzińska-Jurczak and Agata Pietrzyk-Kaszyńska (2014): Emerging Multilevel Environmental Governance – A Case of Public Participation in Poland. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 22 (2): 93–102.
- Cent, Joanna, Cordula Mertens and Krzysztof Niedziałkowski (2013): Roles and Impacts of Non-Governmental Organizations in Natura 2000 Implementation in Hungary and Poland. *Environmental Conservation* 40 (02): 119–128.
- Dietz, Thomas, Amy Fitzgerald and Rachael Shwom (2005): Environmental Values. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 30 (1): 335–372.
- Dietz, Thomas, Elinor Ostrom and Paul Stern (2003): Struggle to Govern the Commons. *Science* 302: 1907–1912.
- Dimitrakopoulos, Panayiotis G., Nikoleta Jones, Theodoros Iosifides, Ioanna Florokapi, Ourania Lasda, Foivos Paliouras and Konstantinos I. Evangelinos (2010): Local Attitudes on Protected Areas: Evidence from Three Natura 2000 Wetland Sites in Greece. *Journal of Environmental Management* 91 (9): 1847–1854.
- Dono, Joanne, Janine Webb and Ben Richardson (2009): The Relationship between Environmental Activism, Pro-Environmental Behaviour and Social Identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 30: 1–9.
- Fagan, Adam (2008): Global-Local Linkage in the Western Balkans: The Politics of Environmental Capacity Building in Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Political Studies* 56: 629–652.
- Fernández, Ana Mar, Nuria Font and Charalampos Koutalakis (2010): Environmental Governance in Southern Europe: The Domestic Filters of Europeanisation. *Environmental Politics* 19 (4): 557–577.
- Ferranti, Francesca, Raoul Beunen and Maria Speranza (2010): Natura 2000 Network: A Comparison of the Italian and Dutch Implementation Experiences. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 12 (3): 293–314.
- Fornara, Ferdinando, Piermario Pattitoni, Marina Mura and Elisabetta Strazzera (2016): Predicting Intention to Improve Household Energy Efficiency: The Role of Value-Belief-Norm Theory, Normative and Informational Influence, and Specific Attitude. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 45: 1–10.
- Gambert, Sylvain (2010): Territorial Politics and the Success of Collaborative Environmental Governance: Local and Regional Partnerships Compared. *Local Environment* 15 (5): 467–480.
- Geitzenauer, Maria, Karl Hogl and Gerhard Weiss (2016): Land Use Policy The Implementation of Natura 2000 in Austria – A European Policy in a Federal System. *Land Use Policy* 52: 120–135.

- Gifford, Robert and Andreas Nilsson (2014): Personal and Social Factors That Influence Pro-Environmental Concern and Behaviour: A Review. *International Journal of Psychology*, 1–17.
- Giljum, Stefan, Thomas Hak, Friedrich Hinterberger and Jan Kovanda (2005): Environmental Governance in the European Union: Strategies and Instruments for Absolute Decoupling. *International Journal of Sustainable Development* 8 (1/2): 31–46.
- Goetz, Konrad, Jutta Deffner and Immanuel Stiess (2008): Does the Social-Ecological Lifestyle Concept Show Paths Towards More Sustainable Consumption Patterns? In Claus-Heinrich Daub, Paul Burger and Yvonne Scherrer (eds.), *Creating Values for Sustainable Development*, 1–3. Basel: International Sustainability Conference.
- Grodzinska-Jurczak, Malgorzata and Joanna Cent (2011): Expansion of Nature Conservation Areas: Problems with Natura 2000 Implementation in Poland? *Environmental Management* 47 (1): 11–27.
- Gruby, Rebecca L. and Xavier Basurto (2013): Multi-Level Governance for Large Marine Commons: Politics and Polycentricity in Palau's Protected Area Network. *Environmental Science and Policy* 33: 260–272.
- Hajer, Maarten and Wytske Versteeg (2005): A Decade of Discourse Analysis of Environmental Politics: Achievements, Challenges, Perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 7 (3): 175–184.
- Hardin, Garrett (1968): The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162: 1243–1248.
- Hiedanpaa, Juha (2002): European-Wide Conservation versus Local Well-Being: The Reception of the Natura 2000 Reserve Network in Karvia, SW-Finland. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 61: 113–123.
- Hlaing, Ei Ei Swe, Makoto Inoue and Juan M. Pulhin (2013): A Property-Rights Approach to Understanding Regulations and Practices in Community-Based Forest Management: Comparison of Three Systems in the Philippines. *Small-Scale Forestry* 12: 579–596.
- Holling, C. S. (1993): Gyroscope: Negotiation and Conflict. In Kai N. Lee (ed.), *Compass and Gyroscope: Integrating Science and Politics for the Environment*, 87–114. Washington: Island Press.
- Hunka, A. and W. T. de Groot (2011): Participative Environmental Management and Social Capital in Poland. *Social Geography* 6 (1): 39–45.
- Imperial, Mark (1999): Institutional Analysis and Ecosystem-Based Management: The Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. *Environmental Management* 24 (4): 449–465.
- Jones, Nikoleta, Theodoros Iosifides, Konstantinos I. Evangelinos, Ioanna Florokapi and Panayiotis G. Dimitrakopoulos (2012): Investigating Knowledge and Perceptions of Citizens of the National Park of Eastern Macedonia and Thrace, Greece. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* 19 (1): 25–33.
- Kakabadze, Ekaterine (2011): Governance and Public Participation in PAs. Case Studies Austria, Italy and Slovenia. Scholarship Report. Klagenfurt.
- Kamal, Sristi, Malgorzata Grodzinska-Jurczak and Agata Pietrzyk Kaszynska (2015):

- Challenges and Opportunities in Biodiversity Conservation on Private Land: An Institutional Perspective from Central Europe and North America. *Biodiversity Conservation* 24: 1271–1292.
- Kati, Vassiliki, Tasos Hovardas, Martin Dieterich, Pierre L. Ibisch, Barbara Mihok and Nuria Selva (2014): The Challenge of Implementing the European Network of Protected Areas Natura 2000. *Conservation Biology* 29 (1): 260–270.
- Kay, Kelly (2014): Europeanization through Biodiversity Conservation: Croatia's Bid for EU Accession and the Natura 2000 Designation Process. *Geoforum* 54: 80–90.
- Kollmuss, Anja and Julian Agyeman (2002): Mind the Gap: Why Do People Act Environmentally and What Are the Barriers to Pro-Environmental Behavior? *Environmental Education Research* 8 (3): 239–260.
- Kotchen, Matthew and Stephen Reiling (2000): Environmental Attitudes, Motivations, and Contingent Valuation of Nonuse Values: A Case Study Involving Endangered Species. *Ecological Economics* 32 (2000): 93–107.
- Lakićević, Milena and Nevena Tatović (2012): Primena Ekosistemskeg Pristupa u Integralnom Upravljanju Prirodnim Resursima. *Letopis Naučnih Radova* 36 (1): 36–43.
- Layzer, Judith A. (2012): Part I: Managing the Earth's Life Support Systems: The Emergence of Sustainability Science and Transdisciplinarity. In M.P. Weinstein and R.E. Turner (eds.), *Sustainability Science: The Emerging Paradigm and the Urban Environment*, 177–197. New York: Springer Publishers.
- Lima, Maria Luisa, Sibila Marques and Sérgio Moreira (2011): 'A House in the Woods': Values, Attitudes and Behaviours Towards Forests. *PsyEcology* 2 (1): 87–100.
- Liu, Jing, Zhiyun Ouyang and Hong Miao (2010): Environmental Attitudes of Stakeholders and Their Perceptions Regarding Protected Area-Community Conflicts: A Case Study in China. *Journal of Environmental Management* 91 (11): 2254–2262.
- Lockwood, Michael, Julie Davidson, Allan Curtis, Elaine Stratford and Rod Griffith (2009): Multi-Level Environmental Governance: Lessons from Australian Natural Resource Management. *Australian Geographer* 40 (2): 169–186.
- Lockwood, Michael, Julie Davidson, Allan Curtis, Elaine Stratford and Rod Griffith (2010): Governance Principles for Natural Resource Management. *Society & Natural Resources* 23: 986–1001.
- Louette, Gerald, Dries Adriaens, Peter Adriaens, Anny Anselin, Koen Devos, Kurt Sannen, Wouter Van Landuyt, Desire Paelinckx and Maurice Hoffmann (2011): Bridging the Gap between the Natura 2000 Regional Conservation Status and Local Conservation Objectives. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 19: 224–235.
- Lukšič, Andrej (2010): Trajnosti Razvoj, Znanstveni Diskurzi in Nova Politika. In Andrej A. Lukšič (ed.), *Politološke Refleksije*, 423–435. Ljubljana: Centar za kritično politologijo, Univerza v Ljubljani.
- Lukšič, Andrej and Maja Bahor (2011): Zelena Politična Teorija in Državljanstvo. *Teorija in Praksa* 48 (Special Issue): 166–183.
- McGregor, S. L. T. (2011): Demystifying Transdisciplinary Ontology: Multiple Levels

- of Reality and the Hidden Third. Integral Leadership Review 2011. Accessible at <http://integralleadershipreview.com/1746-demystifying>, 10. 10. 2015.
- McGregor, S. L. T. (2014): Transdisciplinarity and Conceptual Change. *World Futures* 70: 200–232.
- McGregor, S. L. T. and Gabrielle Donnelly (2014): Transleadership for Transdisciplinary Initiatives. *World Futures* 70: 164–185.
- Mertens, Cordula (2013): Playing at Multiple Levels in Biodiversity Governance: The Case of Hungarian ENGOs in Natura 2000. *Society and Economy* 35 (2): 187–208.
- Nastran, Mojca (2015): Why Does Nobody Ask Us? Impacts on Local Perception of a Protected Area in Designation, Slovenia. *Land Use Policy* 46: 38–49.
- Neumann, R. Roderick (2005): Making Political Ecology. In R. Roderick Neumann (ed.), *Making Political Ecology*, 118–153. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Newig, Jens and Oliver Fritsch (2009): Environmental Governance: Participatory, Multi-Level – And Effective? *Environmental Policy and Governance* 19 (3): 197–214.
- Newig, Jens and Tomas M. Koontz (2013): Multi-Level Governance, Policy Implementation and Participation: The EU's Mandated Participatory Planning Approach to Implementing Environmental Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy* 21 (2): 248–267.
- Nicolescu, Basarab (2007): Transdisciplinarity as Methodological Framework for Going Beyond the Science-Religion Debate, 2007. Accessible at <http://www.fernandosantiago.com.br/transdisx.pdf>, 10. 10. 2015.
- Nicolescu, Basarab (2014): Methodology of Transdisciplinarity. *The Journal of New Paradigm Research* 70: 186–199.
- Niedziałkowski, K., Jouni Paavola and Bogumila Jedrzejewska (2012): Participation and Protected Areas Governance: The Impact of Changing Influence of Local Authorities on the Conservation of the Białowieża Primeval Forest, Poland. *Ecology and Society* 17 (1).
- Niedziałkowski, Krzysztof, Agata Pietrzyk-kaszyńska, Monika Pietruczuk, Małgorzata Grodzińska-jurczak, Krzysztof Niedziałkowski, Agata Pietrzyk-kaszyńska and Monika Pietruczuk (2015): Assessing Participatory and Multi-Level Characteristics of Biodiversity and Landscape Protection Legislation: The Case of Poland. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 1–21.
- Nilsson, Andreas, Geertje Schuitema, Cecilia Jakobsson Bergstad, Johan Martinsson and Maria Thorson (2016): The Road to Acceptance: Attitude Change before and after the Implementation of a Congestion Tax. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 46: 1–9.
- Nilsson, Annika and Brita Bohman (2015): Legal Prerequisites for Ecosystem-Based Management in the Baltic Sea Area: The Example of Eutrophication. *Ambio* 44 (3): 370–380.
- Ostrom, Elinor (1990): *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Edited by James Alt and Douglass North. Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions, 103–139. Ebooks. Cambridge (Online). USA: Cambridge University Press.

- Papagiannakis, Giorgos and Spyros Lioukas (2012): Values, Attitudes and Perceptions of Managers as Predictors of Corporate Environmental Responsiveness. *Journal of Environmental Management* 100: 41–51.
- Park, Soonae (2000): A Causal Analysis of Human Values and Behaviors in Waste Management and Environmental Policies. *International Review of Public Administration* 5 (1): 93–106.
- Pietrzyk-Kaszyńska, Agata, Joanna Cent, Małgorzata Grodzińska-Jurczak and Magdalena Szymańska (2012): Factors Influencing Perception of Protected Areas – The Case of Natura 2000 in Polish Carpathian Communities. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 20 (5): 284–292.
- Podmetnik, Darka, Angelca Ivancic, Darjan Novak and Vida Spolar Mohorcic (2000): Learning Active Citizenship and Governance in Slovenia. In John Holford and Palitha Edirisingha (eds.), *Citizenship and Governance Education in Europe: A Critical Review of the Literature*, 117–162. Surrey: School of Educational Studies, University of Surrey.
- Radović, Ivica (2010): Nature protection. Lecture as part of the elective “Nature protection” study programme Ecology and Environmental Protection, Faculty of Science, University of Banja Luka. Banja Luka, 2010.
- Reed, Mark S. (2008): Stakeholder Participation for Environmental Management: A Literature Review. *Biological Conservation* 4: 2417–2431.
- Rolston, Holmes (1996): Nature, Culture, and Environmental Ethics. In Dušan Ogrin (ed.), *Nature Conservation Outside Protected Areas/Varstvo Narave Zunaj Zavarovanih Območij*, 25–33. Ljubljana: Office for Physical Planning Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning; Institute for Landscape Architecture Biotechnical Faculty.
- Rolston, Holmes (2010): Value in Nature and the Nature of Value. In D. Keller (ed.), *Environmental Ethics The Big Questions* (6): 130–137. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Romano, Bernardino and Francesco Zullo (2015): Protected Areas, Natura 2000 Sites and Landscape: Divergent Policies on Converging Values. In Roberto Gambino and Attilia Peano (eds.), *Nature Policies and Landscape Policies: Towards an Alliance*, 18th ed., 127–135. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Rosa, Humberto D. and Jorge Marques da Silva (2005): From Environmental Ethics to Nature Conservation Policy: Natura 2000 and the Burden of Proof. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 18 (2): 107–130.
- Schultz, P. Wesley (2011): Conservation Means Behavior. *Conservation Biology*, Special Section Essay: 1080–1083.
- Schusler, Tania, Daniel Decker and Max Pfeffer (2003): Social Learning for Collaborative Natural Resource Management. *Society Natural Resources* 16 (4): 309–326.
- Slocombe, D. Scott (1998): Defining Goals and Criteria for Ecosystem-Based Management. *Environmental Management* 22 (4): 483–493.
- Šobot, Aleksandar, and Andrej Lukšič (2016): The Impact of Europeanisation on Nature Protection System of Croatia: Example of the Establishment of Multi-Level Governance System of Protected Areas Natura 2000. *Socijalna Ekologija* 25 (3): 235–270.



- Šobot, Aleksandar and Andrej Lukšič (2017): The Impact of Europeanisation on the Nature Protection System of Slovenia: Example of the Establishment of Multi-Level Governance System of Protected Areas Natura 2000. In Andrej Lukšič (ed.), *Exploration of Political Ecology in Slovenia*, 113–147. Ljubljana: Centre for Political Theory, University of Ljubljana.
- Šobot, Aleksandar and Andrej Lukšič (2019): The Impact of Europeanization on the Nature Protection System of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Example of the Establishment of Multi-Level Governance of Natura 2000 Protected Areas. *Socijalna Ekologija* 28 (1): 28–48.
- Šobot, Aleksandar and Andrej Lukšič (2020): Natura 2000 Experiences in Southeast Europe: Comparisons from Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Comparative Politics* 13 (1): 46–57.
- Stringer, Lindsay C. and Jouni Paavola (2013): Participation in Environmental Conservation and Protected Area Management in Romania: A Review of Three Case Studies. *Environmental Conservation* 40 (2): 138–146.
- Torkar, Gregor (2014): Learning Experiences That Produce Environmentally Active and Informed Minds. *NJAS – Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences* 69: 49–55.
- Torkar, Gregor and Sue L T McGregor (2012): Reframing the Conception of Nature Conservation Management by Transdisciplinary Methodology: From Stakeholders to Stakesharers. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 20 (2): 65–71.
- Tzaberis, Nezam, Potitsa Xanthakou, Vasileios Papavasileiou, Dimitrios Matzanos, Debbie Hatzidiakos and Ioannis Papadomarkakis (2012): A Comparative Investigation of the Knowledge and Attitudes of High School Graduates in the Topic of Protected Areas. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 69 (Iceepsy): 404–413.
- Vikolainen, Vera, H. Bressers and K. Lulofs (2013): The Role of Natura 2000 and Project Design in Implementing Flood Defence Projects in the Scheldt Estuary. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 56 (9): 1359–1379.
- Weber, Norbert and Tim Christophersen (2002): The Influence of Non-Governmental Organisations on the Creation of Natura 2000 during the European Policy Process. *Forest Policy and Economics* 4: 1–12.
- Winkel, Georg, Marieke Blondet, Lars Borrass, Theresa Frei, Maria Geitzenauer, Axel Gruppe, Alistair Jump, et al. (2015): The Implementation of Natura 2000 in Forests: A Trans- and Interdisciplinary Assessment of Challenges and Choices. *Environmental Science & Policy* 52: 23–32.
- Winter, Susanne, Lars Borrass, Maria Geitzenauer, Marieke Blondet, Ruth Breibeck, Gerhard Weiss and Georg Winkel (2014): The Impact of Natura 2000 on Forest Management: A Socio-Ecological Analysis in the Continental Region of the European Union. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 23 (14): 3451–3482.