

# De-compartmentalisation and coherence in the watershed of the Narbonne Territory lagoons - FR

## 1. Policy Objective & Theme

- SUSTAINABLE USE OF RESOURCES: Preserving coastal environment (its functioning and integrity) to share space

## 2. Key Approaches

- Integration

## 3. Experiences that can be exchanged

The analysis and assessment of the problems which were encountered by the “Parc Naturel de la Narbonnaise” (PNR) to advocate de-compartmentalisation of the present territorial structures.

## 4. Overview of the case

As it was created in 2003, the “Parc Naturel de la Narbonnaise en Méditerranée” is a new local stakeholder. Its main mission is to support the several contracting authorities and help them to reach the collectively accepted objectives. The park wished to develop and accelerate the started work and make all its partners think about the increasing number of dialog structures and management tools. However although most stakeholders use to complain about such an institutional “mille-feuille”, they were reluctant to approve the proposed approach. Finally despite the work of think and follow on, which was carried on by the university of Montpellier, and education and awareness actions, which were done as regards to sustainable development and integration, the project could not be achieved within 18 months (the allotted time of the DIACT proposal).

## 5. Context and Objectives

### a) Context

For a long time, the economy of the coastal front of Aude Department was based on fishing and viticulture. The processes of tourism management, which have been run and planned by the French State from the early sixties, have transformed this region into an area, specialised in mass seaside tourism. Despite such drastic change, the Narbonne region still has outstanding natural and rural areas, which are well representative of the Mediterranean biodiversity. From the nineties, local stakeholders wanted obviously to better develop the whole territory: find a better link between coast and inland, control demographic and urban pressure and protect existing cultural and natural inheritance. The creation of the Narbonnaise PNR in 2003 reflected such an ambition.

Otherwise a true common territorial project and sharing management process could not emerge, despite recent merging of communes (community of communes and greater city community) and multiplication of planning tools (PLU, SCOT, SAGE...), which are often juxtaposed and have their own decisional organisation.

Both missions and belt given to the park might allow it to change the situation and peculiarly the way of working. The “DIACT” ICSM call for proposal was received by the park technical team (already invested in this way) as a good opportunity to possibly improve the territorial work more quickly and completely.

### b) Objectives

To change the way of working together in such a context, the park proposed three objectives within the scope of the project:

- Clarify missions of the different management structures within and even outside the park belt. The goal was to propose merging, grouping and limitation of consultation structures or develop specific coordination tools.
- Reinforce urban engineering capacity and propose follow-up and advice to the elected representatives
- More widely associate the local people.

## **6. Implementation of the ICZM Approach (i.e. management, tools, resources)**

### **a) Management**

An ad-hoc steering committee was scheduled to follow up the approach. It had to be formed with deliberative and consultative members of the park, plus representatives of the State services, public institutions, research institutions and universities... It was expected to meet at key stages around 4 times a year, during 18 months.

A scientific and technical committee was equally scheduled every other month to regularly follow up the project.

### **b) ICSM Tools**

The project had to rely on three types of tools:

- Meetings and exchange sessions with the partners. Debates had to rely on structured indicators of the project progress
- Communication and education tools: "GISC info" newsletter, web site, new chat forum.
- Thinking process to follow up the approach

## **7. Cost and resources**

Most partners were reluctant as regards to this approach and were not really involved in the scheduled structures, which could not work consequently.

Some communication actions partly took place: publication of a newsletter but no site web nor forum. On the other side, there was broadcast on various themes concerning sustainable development and also a "café/bistrot" operation for the elected representatives. Meanwhile the program of follow-up could be put in place.

The study of follow-up and analysis, which was led by the University of Montpellier, had to be modified and rely on interviews due to the absence of steering and technical committee meetings

## **8. Effectiveness (i.e. were the foreseen goals/objectives of the work reached?)**

The grant of 60 000 euros has allowed funding the thought study, communication actions and investment of the park team in the project (especially the Director)

## **9. Success and Fail factors**

The difficulties, which were encountered, are largely due to the reluctance of the main partners to join the approach. This lack of involvement is linked with two main factors resulting first from the project itself, secondly from the way it was set up.

- If most partners do admit they suffer from too many dialog structures on close themes and territories and wish a better coordination of the institutional "mille-feuille", it cannot be hushed up that some concurrence exists between recent and badly stabilised structures. So it is not surprising that some stakeholders were quite reluctant to join the approach. Indeed the question of the real nature, rightfulness and even lasting quality of the new organisation was underlying the question of clarification and simplification. The whole proposed approach, with a part of education and

awareness, suffered from these doubts.

- It would have been necessary to have strong sharing will, important political support and sufficient maturation time before launching the project. It was not the case insofar as the project started on the occasion of the call for proposal without any preliminary consultation.

Moreover the PNR was a recent structure. Compared to other partners it had not the sufficient legitimacy to approach the problem and the study belt was left vague (the park belt or a wider belt?). The success of the park in the DIACT call for proposal was not sufficient to give it some legitimacy. Finally the project was strongly weakened by the practically disappearance of the French State "Mission Littorale", which had helped elaborating the project.

## 10. Unforeseen outcomes

Contrary to other older PNR, the Narbonnaise PNR has received just a short five-year agreement. Thus as soon as 2008 it had to elaborate a new charter and take into account previous thoughts and difficulties to improve the ICSM approach.

## 11. Prepared by

Luce Goudedranche – CETMEF- France

## 12. Verified by

Yvonne Battiau-Queney – EUCC-France

## 13. Sources

- Application file for the project call for proposal - «PNR de la Narbonnaise en Méditerranée»
- Questionnaires and interviews to follow through the call for proposal «Pour un développement équilibré des territoires littoraux par une GISC» of the DIACT/SGmer - CETMEF/IFREMER- Luce Goudedranche/ Jean-Louis Gaignon
- Report of the project DIACT/SG mer - «PNR de la Narbonnaise en Méditerranée»



Appel a projet\_DATNAR\_Narbonnaise V2 (1.11 MB) 