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Peripheral context

- Rural communities in sparsely populated areas are facing a variety of changes
  - Out-migration
  - Decline of traditional rural livelihoods
  - The coming of new kinds of livelihoods, especially tourism and recreation

- Planning challenges
  - How to anticipate the changes?
  - How to keep the villages inhabited and the infrastructure in use?
  - How to involve local people into planning processes?
  - How to engage the locals in new livelihoods?
Problems of planning and development

- Development through top-down strategies
  - initiatives not from grassroot level

- Participatory planning as a routine practice?

- Expert knowledge vs. local knowledge

- Emphasis on centres (especially in tourism)
Involvement of local residents

- Why local people should be involved?
  - Involvement not possible or not necessary?
  - Local knowledge
  - Prevention of conflict
  - Democracy

- Who should be involved?
  - Increasing mobility – of whom does the local community consist?
  - Increase in interest groups
  - Differences in abilities to participate (time, education, expertise)

- What effects participation has?
  - Do the hearings have concrete effects?
# Forms of participatory planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>Information gathering and feedback</td>
<td>An outcome supported by all parties; agreement</td>
<td>Full respectful interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>Structured by the decision authority</td>
<td>Structured by the parties; controlled access</td>
<td>Accessible and inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power and control</strong></td>
<td>Sought and maintained decision authority</td>
<td>Shared, as dictated by the decision authority</td>
<td>Shared and negotiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Daniels & Walker 2001*
Village of Lokka:
100 inhabitants, beside the biggest artificial lake in Finland, fishing, reindeer herding, forestry, agriculture, tourism as a growing field
Village community of Lokka

**Actors in village:**
- villagers
- village collective
- associations
- livelihoods
- school
- village store
- Lokka’s co-operative society
- entrepreneurs
- second home owners
- tourists
- customers of other products

**Actors outside village:**
- municipality
- The Leader Regional Development Association
- Reindeer Herders’ Association
- Metsähallitus
- hydroelectric power company
- Lapland Regional Environment Centre
- Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute
- METLA
- State, EU, etc.
Participation in communal action

- Traditional cooperative practices:
  - village meetings and voluntary work
  - communal events, hobbies, recreation activities
  - cooperation in associations, communities of livelihoods

- According to village inquiry for village plan II
  - 71% of the villagers are interested in participating in arranging common activities
  - 9% of villagers are active in arranging these activities
Village plans

- Two village plans
  - the first plan: focuses on the development of the infrastructure and include the first plans to develop tourism
  - the second plan: focuses on the development of livelihoods: fishery and tourism

- Village plan is needed to get funding from the Leader Regional Development Association for village development
  - instructions and formula for the plan

- Plans include cooperation of villagers BUT they are reaction to outside demand
## Land-use issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
<th>Mining</th>
<th>Water reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The problem of overcuttings</td>
<td>New land-user</td>
<td>Development of fish populations, water regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagers’ participation</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Statements, hearings</td>
<td>Hearings, workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the actions</td>
<td>Some arrangements with cutting areas</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Development of fishery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Livelihoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fishery</th>
<th>Reindeer herding</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of the livelihood</strong></td>
<td>One of the main livelihoods</td>
<td>One of the main livelihoods</td>
<td>A new livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role in village development</strong></td>
<td>Main concern</td>
<td>Stabile</td>
<td>Future expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in tourism processes</strong></td>
<td>Fishing tourism included in fishery development activities</td>
<td>Activity in land-use issues supporting tourism</td>
<td>Plans in collaboration Action by entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participatory planning used in Lokka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village development</strong></td>
<td>Regional plan&lt;br&gt;Regional tourism strategy&lt;br&gt;Rural development strategy</td>
<td>Village plans I and II</td>
<td>Action research by Metla?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land-use issues</strong></td>
<td>Forestry&lt;br&gt;Mining</td>
<td>Village landscape&lt;br&gt;Water reservoir</td>
<td>Village landscape&lt;br&gt;Water reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihoods</strong></td>
<td>Fishery&lt;br&gt;Reindeer herding&lt;br&gt;Tourism</td>
<td>Fishery Reindeer herding</td>
<td>Fishery Reindeer herding&lt;br&gt;Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- In land-uses issues, statements and hearings have been the most common participatory activities
  - All development plans express good will to involve locals effectively
  - According to the action research process, the villagers wish to have more possibilities to collaborate in planning – not only to be heard
  - Participation in the village is regarded important
- The village plans represent the most collaborative way of planning
- All action in the village is intertwined:
  - The number of different groups in the village is big but the same persons participate in many groups
  - Hearings and statements regarding one livelihood affect also other livelihoods
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