

## QUESTIONS OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN SLOVENIA

Andrej Černe\*

### *Abstract*

*Questions of regional development in Slovenia are discussed within its regional structure which is characterised by: historically, geographically, economically, culturally and linguistically extremely heterogeneous regions, the deepening of internal contrasts between the centre and the periphery and to the predomination of regional centres of neighbouring states over a great part of Slovene border regions, and by social segregation, unbalanced regional development and deterioration of many urban and rural areas. Within such spatial context the elements of regional policy in Slovenia are presented.*

**Key words:** *Spatial structure, regional development, regional disparities, regional policy, Slovenia.*

### VPRAŠANJA REGIONALNEGA RAZVOJA SLOVENIJE

### *Izveček*

*Vprašanja regionalnega razvoja so opredeljena znotraj regionalne strukture Slovenije za katero so značilne nekatere temeljne poteze: izredna zgodovinska, geografska, kulturna, jezikovna pestrost regij, povečevanje notranjih regionalnih razlik med osrednjimi in perifernimi območji ter prevlado nekaterih regionalnih središč sosednjih držav nad obmejnimi območji, družbena segregacija, neuravnotežen regionalni razvoj in slabšanje razmer v številnih urbanih in podeželskih območjih. S tega vidika so prikazani nekateri elementi regionalne politike Slovenije.*

**Ključne besede:** *Prostorska struktura, regionalni razvoj, regionalne razlike, regionalna politika Slovenija.*

---

\* Dr. izred. prof., Oddelek za geografijo, Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani, Aškerčeva 2, SI 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

The regionalism and regionalisation are the most current and controversial issues of the past decade within European institutions, especially within the Council of Europe. The latter has directed its attention in many ways mostly on regionalism and efforts to pass in this field similar comprehensive, long term and resounding directive as well. The basic aim of European regional policy is to supplement and to balance the development of democratic and decentralised Europe in such a way that it will not be just the Europe of national states, but also of regions and individuals. The European Charter of Regional self-government is the collection of recommendations and the synthesis of positive experiences of various systems and practices of European countries.

The Slovenian territory is from natural and socio-geographic aspect very variegated and non-uniform area. Its area is consisted of historically, geographically, economically, culturally and linguistically extremely heterogeneous regions. There are many expert discussions about dilemma resulting from the tendencies toward the regionalisation of Slovenia, ensuring more uniform regional development. The conception of the Act on Regions results from estimation, that it is necessary, for numerous internal reasons and because of the integration of Slovenia into European integration, to establish the regions as the second, broader degree of local government. The survey of the analysis of regional development points out that it is impossible to direct the development changes in Slovenia with fragmented administrative units and small communities without regional organisation. Practically every ministry has its own regional organisation, which does not coincide with the organisation of other ministries (1, 2).

Slovenia is facing the continuous breaking of communities into smaller areas (already 192 communes), and there are still tendencies to establish more new communities. The reform of local government is increasing the gap between the more developed central regions and other regions, which become or remain peripheral. The periphery, composed of a number of small and weak municipal centres and towns, passively observes the events happening in the capital and at the some time dose not direct most of its power into the encouragement of its own development but into securing more help from the central treasury.

The development of Slovenia is leading to the deepening of internal contrasts between the centre and the periphery and to the predomination of regional centres of neighbouring states over a great part of Slovene border regions. It is believed that among 576 urban centres in Slovenia, with different hierarchical levels, only 17 centres from the fourth to seventh degrees could be taken in consideration as future seats of regions in Slovenia. Ljubljana may lose its influence as a centre, which has difficulties to compete with Milan, Trieste, Vienna, Budapest and Zagreb, and Maribor may lose its development energy because of the development of Graz (13). The influence of development centres in the neighbouring states and the subordination

of Slovenian bordering regions will be that much bigger as much they will be subordinated to the state centre and the less will they be qualified for independent development. In 14 town regions on 15% of the territory live 75% of inhabitants who manage more than 80% of the economic potential of the State and have 88% of all the employed (12). Inadequate treatment of a greater part of Slovenian territory may hinder cross-border co-operation and even led to the subordination of bordering areas to economic, cultural and financial centres of the neighbouring countries. The fact is that almost all Slovenian regions are bordering regions, as 25-kilometre border zone would embrace two thirds of the whole territory. In addition, there are mostly mountain regions with all consequences as to the density of population, demographically endangered areas, and urbanisation and traffic connection.

To decrease the development disparities among Slovenian regions is an imperative for more successful integration of Slovenia into European Union. Slovenia is losing the comparative advantages, which it held due to decentralisation and polycentric urban system after 1974 and due to her open borders with Austria and Italy, because of the underestimation of the importance of more uniform regional development. Without regionalisation, Slovenia will not be adequately qualified for successful integration into the keen competition among the states, regions and towns, and the differences in the level of development could deepen the unbearable extent. This means integration of Slovenia into successful European development area so it would not remain at the periphery, and the development of internal regionalism, without which a more uniform development of Slovenia is impossible. The decreasing of external dependability of regions and the increasing of the use and importance of its own regional resources, accompanied by selective state stimulation of uniform regional development and especially of the rural bordering regions is a key importance. The regionalisation must be one of the main instruments for the accomplishment of the aims of regional development of regions and local communities and the basis, for a quicker and more balanced development of Slovenia.

### **THE SPATIAL CONTEXT**

Economic policy has given priority to the tasks concerning the formation of a political and administrative structure of the new state and macroeconomic problems of transition. So emphasis of economic policy was on macroeconomic stability and on measures to arrest the fall in production and employment. It is also recognised that the basic regulations of spatial planning adopted in 80's should be modified according to the main characteristic of market economy (3).

The economic development had a different impact on individual sectors of economy and individual region. Manufacturing and construction industry suffered most, while the service sector managed to pull itself out of the crisis already at the end of 1992. Growth rates for all sectors began to improve again in 1994. Economic restructuring

changed the sectoral distribution of output, with the share of industry in GDP decreasing in favour of services. The engineering sector, especially in machine and transport equipment building, remains an important branch of industrial activity, and a major contributor to exports (31% of total export value in 1995) followed by textile industry, wood-processing and paper industry. Other important industrial sectors are leather and footwear, sportswear, pharmaceuticals and chemicals. In the structure of GDP by activity and with respect to added value, the most important activities are manufacturing industry (about 30%), trade (about 10%), real estate, letting, business services (about 10%) transport warehousing, communications (about 6%) and farming (about 5%) (2, 7).

The problems of economic restructuring have become very acute and complex. The growth social polarisation and income differentiation are the major driving forces behind the process of unregulated spatial restructuring. This could result in social segregation, unbalanced regional development and deterioration of many urban and rural areas. During the transition, many problems stem from land speculation, unauthorised construction, an underdeveloped real estate market and taxation system, and lack of the investment. The redistribution mechanisms of former system, which regulated regional development, have ceased to exist, while new one are not yet in place. Excessive disparities in the economic, social and environmental situation of individual regions will hinder sustainable development and require an active regional policy. This concerns, in particular certain rural areas, old industrial areas, demographically threatened areas, and areas dominated by large industrial plants. The Slovenian government is treating these problems as individual or as sectoral and not as regional problems and is helping firms in troubles on a case-by-case basis. The main characteristics of these government interventions are the lack of any system and no predetermined criteria for the distribution of resources between firms or regions. The land policy continues to depend on intervention by the State in the form of spatial planning acts and administrative procedures.

Detailed socio-economic analysis conducted at the level of statistical regions and at the level of new municipalities for the period 1991-1997, indicates that regional disparities are large and growing. This holds true both the demographic and the economic indicators.

The spatial structure shows at least the three main characteristic areas:

- The areas (municipalities and settlements) where the concentration of population is increasing amount to about 33% of the territory and they comprise about 75% of population. The population density in these areas is about 216 persons per km<sup>2</sup>.
- The areas with stagnant population comprise about 26% of the territory and 12% of the population with the average density of 45 persons per km<sup>2</sup>.
- Depopulating areas comprise 41% of the territory and 13% of population with the average density of 31 persons per km<sup>2</sup>.

Large depopulating areas exist in the north-eastern, eastern, south-eastern, and north-western part of Slovenija which are the consequences of large migrations in past decades and the present dying out of the aged population. Majorities of depopulating areas are agricultural and peripheral areas with weak economic structure especially on the border with Croatia, Hungary and Italy (Pomurska, Posavska, Goriška in Notranjsko-kraška region).

The criteria utilised to define the problem of rural depopulation were:

- population density,
- rate growth of population,
- ageing index and
- percentage of active population in agriculture.

A region was designated as a region with severe rural depopulation problems if it fulfilled one of the following three sets of criteria:

- Population density less than 60% of Slovenian average and ageing index higher than 115% of Slovenian average;
- Decrease in population in the period 1991-1997 and ageing index higher than 110 % of Slovenian average;
- Decrease in population in the period 1991-1997 and percentage of active population in agriculture higher than 150% of the Slovenian average.

Unemployment level remained high and become the most important long-term problem with a very strong regional dimension. The rate of registered unemployment started to grow in all regions but in some at much higher speed than in others depending on the economic structure of the region. The criterion utilised to define the problem of unemployment was the rate of unemployment in working age population. These regions with the unemployment level higher than 120% of Slovenian average were designated as severe problem regions: Podravska, Pomurska and Zasavska region, comprising 18,6% of the area and 25,3% of the population of Slovenija.

Studies made in the early 90's have distributed Slovenian regions according to the level of economic development, economic structure and evaluation of natural, human, financial and infrastructural potentials into four different groups:

- economically developed regions with perspective economic structure and positively evaluated development potentials: Osrednja, Obalna in Gorenjska region;
- economically medium developed regions with fairly prospective economic structure and mostly positively evaluated development potentials: Savinjska, Dolenjska and Goriška region;
- less developed regions with a prospective structure of the economy: Pomurska in Notranjsko-kraška region;

- medium developed regions with a problematic economic structure but with some positively evaluated development potentials: Podravska, Koroška, Posavska region;
- and Zasavska region as a region in industrial decline (16).

In the period 1991-1997 the polarisation of the Slovenian regions have become quite obvious: on the one hand there is a group of economically more developed and medium developed regions whose relative position has improved, on the other hand there is a group of less developed and medium developed regions whose relative position has worsened.

The disparities between the municipalities are even much bigger than disparities between the statistical regions. This holds true for the demographic data (growth rate, ageing index, and density of population) and even more for the socio-economic indicators. The span in the ageing index between the ten municipalities with the lowest ageing index and the ten municipalities with the highest one is 1 : 2,5. The span of unemployment rate between the ten municipalities with the lowest and the highest unemployment rate is more than 1 : 4. There are some very small rural municipalities which have no or just a few employers (enterprises), so it must not be surprising that the disparities in gross value added per inhabitant are very large reaching the span of 1 : 30. On the other hand the disparities in the gross basis for the income tax per inhabitant are much smaller, about 1 : 2,7, since the income position of the population in such small municipalities is better due to their employment in some other municipality (daily commuting).

The new municipalities in Slovenija (since 1995) are small. If we exclude Ljubljana and Maribor they average less than 9.000 inhabitants. The Parliament passed a series of laws on the basis of which the reform of local self-government and the national administration was carried out in 1995. The administrative division was changed essentially many times, from 1945 to the abolishment of districts in 1965, and underwent as many as 32 changes altogether. There were no changes from 1965 to 1994. Before, there were 62 communes. Slovenija has now 192 municipalities, of which 11 are city municipalities. Deciding on small municipality level on radical planning measures (such as location of industrial zones, of tourist objects, waste disposal areas) cannot always lead to the best solution for the municipality nor for the whole region and country.

There is no regional public administration. The national and the local level are the two formally established levels of administration. The State has transferred part of its responsibilities to 58 administrative units, the centres of former communes, linking national ministries and local administrative bodies. Individual ministers reorganised their services into 8-12 regional offices, covering the territory of the whole country. For example Water Management Departments within the Nature protection Authority as part of Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning has eight subdivision. Its

Nature Protection Department has seven regional offices, which function as technical supervisory bodies for the local level. The Inspectorate for Environment and Physical Planning is organised in several regional subdivisions of similar legal status: nine offices for environmental inspection and twelve for the inspection of physical planning (3).

## **REGIONAL POLICY**

The elements of regional policy can be determined within the different ministries and different legislative procedures. The aim of the regional policy is to “enhance the development of those areas with weak and unstable development and preserve the Slovene rural areas”. Which are those areas is very hard to define, because there are a lot of different criteria on which such definitions are based. The policy instrument established to implement is the Fund for Regional Development and Preservation of Rural areas.

### **THE FUND FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION OF RURAL AREAS**

The first regional development agency in Slovenija was established in 1995 by the Ministry of Economic Affairs, as a private institution to develop:

- regional economic activity,
- create and support jobs,
- support the regional restructuring of heavy industry and
- to provide training and advisory services.

The Fund established in 1995, is a limited liability company fully owned by the republic of Slovenija. The Fund empowered to award soft loans and issue guarantees for bank loans. The criteria of award of assistance are the level of demographic endangerment of the location of the proposed investment and the quality of the proposed investment programme. The financial support is intended for farmers, individual entrepreneurs, companies and municipalities. The Fund has no set targets to achieve in respect of reducing the number of demographically endangered settlements, and therefore has no means of judging whether it is being effective or not.

### **EXPENDITURE ON LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

The second element of regional policy is Government expenditure on the construction of local infrastructure, which is currently targeted as a matter of Government policy towards the “enhancement of the development of demographically endangered

regions". The Ministry of Economic relations and Development is responsible for these elements of regional policy.

The areas eligible for co-financing infrastructure are the same as the areas supported by the Fund for Regional Development. The criteria for award of assistance are the level of demographically endangerment of the location of the proposed investment and the quality of the proposed investment programme. Demographically endangered areas and settlements being currently defined as settlements with:

- Population growth  $\leq 1,012$ , ageing index  $\geq 92,47$
- Population growth  $\leq 0,953$
- Border area/10 km corridor, population growth  $\leq 1,031$

Over 60% of Slovenija are within this category, and it embraces 20% of the population (3).

A scattered approach is utilised with almost every eligible municipality recording co-financing. 120 municipalities, for example, of 147 received co-financing for their infrastructure investments in the 1998. The Ministry tried to encourage regional infrastructure investments where more municipalities are involved in the last tender, but only four projects were submitted and only one project was of an appropriate quality.

The under-resourced and partial regional policy limited to small peripheral demographically endangered areas scattered all over Slovenija cannot change the trends in regional disparities and create conditions for an endogenous self-sustainable development in these areas. Investment into these small areas cannot be effective in building up a new economic structure if at the same time the economic strength of the whole region is decreasing owing to the restructuring problems in nearby industrial centres.

#### **MINISTRY OF LABOUR ACTIVE EMPLOYMENT MEASURES POLICY**

Unemployment is a very significant economic and social problem throughout Slovenija. The National Employment Office and the Ministry of labour, family and Social Affairs utilised passive employment measures in the early 90's, but have now introduced an active employment policy, with a shift from social to economic function.

Both organisations primarily implement national programmes with obvious regional and local impact, but also some specifically regional programmes. The national Employment Office has established 10 regional offices which have gained a substantial degree of autonomy. The regional offices are permitted to commit finance



in furtherance of the active employment policy for their region which is designated at national level.

New “regional” programs were introduced in the last three years. The Ministry of labour, family and Social Affairs began, together with SBDC (Small Business development Centre) to support local employment initiatives. There are institutions at the local level (local development coalitions) which try to promote development at the local level (neighbouring municipalities and other local development actors).

### **OTHER GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES WHICH IMPACT ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The Government has introduced also a number of other policies whose objectives are not defined as “enhancement of the development of those regions with weak and unstable development” but which have the unintended effect upon these problems. Among these I would like to mention: the development of the economic base of ethnic minorities, financial support to certain economic sectors and to local authority budgets, Comprehensive Rural Development and Village Revitalisation Programme, Economic Development Strategy of Slovenija, the Government’s Strategy for Eu Accession and the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (16).

### **THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ECONOMIC BASE OF ETHNIC MINORITIES**

The Government has an existing policy to develop the economic base of ethnic minorities (the Italian minority in the south-west and the Hungarian minority in the north-east). The policy is not, per se, a regional policy as rather it serves to integrate ethnic minorities into the economic structure of the nation. The regional distribution of the two minority groups appear to give it a regional development dimension, but the policy is not itself aimed at balancing regional disparities.

### **FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO CERTAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS**

The Government provides financial support to certain economic sectors (iron, mining, hop growing, tourism, fishing) which are located in certain specific areas. Such policies may indirectly and very selectively lead the “enhancement of the development of those regions with weak and unstable development”, but this is clearly an offshoot of their intended purpose. It is the case intervention without inclusion into comprehensive programme of economic development of the area or region (there is no real regional impact assessment).

### **SUPPORT TO LOCAL AUTHORITY BUDGETS**

As many local authorities do not have sufficient financial resources to implement the programmes that they are obliged to by law, the central government provides financial support for this purpose. According to the Office for Local Self-Government only 7 municipalities were self-financing in 1998. The policy is not selective in providing additional support to “those regions with weak and unstable development” or “Slovene rural areas”, but it is likely that such regions are areas with rural depopulation or high levels of unemployment.

### **COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND VILLAGE REVITALISATION PROGRAMME**

The development strategy of Slovenian Agriculture (May 1993) places equal emphasis on:

- agricultural production goals and the protection of rural areas and villages,
- their further harmonious development,
- the preservation of regions of cultural significance,
- the protection of farmlands, and
- sustained presence of the population in rural areas.

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme is carried in rural areas by the Centre for Countryside Development and Village Revitalisation in co-operation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Food since 1991. The programme is based on the concept that the countryside and village are uniform areas where population, through different activities maintains and cultivates the characteristics of individual landscape traditions.

The Programme has no clear definition of rural areas, but utilises an ad hoc judgement as to whether an area is eligible or not, and has no defined targets for achievement, and therefore no basis for determining whether it has been successful or not.

### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF SLOVENIJA**

The Economic Development Strategy of Slovenia recognizes that Slovenia does need a more developed regional policy to stimulate the development of its problem areas. It highlights three problem areas:

- Structurally lagging and economically less developed areas with demographic problems and low income per capita (mostly agricultural regions);
- Economically and socially unstable areas with an old industrial structure, high levels of unemployment and low income per capita and
- Border areas.

The strategy does not itself constitute a specific regional policy, but rather calls for one to be formulated to deal with these problem areas.

### **THE GOVERNMENT'S STRATEGY FOR EU ACCESSION**

Slovenian Strategy for Accession into the EU defines Slovenian aims in connection with its membership of the EU in the economy, the social sphere, politics and security, harmonisation of legislation, the areas of justice and internal affairs and reform of public administration.

The Strategy for Eu Accession defines the goal of balanced regional development as the goal of its regional policy. With respect to its goals for territory development and land policy the most significant is a slower pace of rural depopulation. The strategy does not itself constitute a specific regional policy, but rather calls for one to be formulated.

### **THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND PHYSICAL PLANNING**

The core responsibility for spatial planning is within the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning. The preparation and implementation of policy, regulations and measures and supervision at large are under the jurisdiction of Ministry and its associated organisation. However, no formal prescriptions are made for interministerial co-ordination. As a result, such coordinating efforts are generally carried out on ad hoc basis, depending on personal initiatives (8, 11).

Up to 1989 Slovenija practised comprehensive, so called social planning which included economic, social and physical aspects. The system was radically changed during the transitional period. Planning was reduced to sector planning, carried out by individual ministries (sectoral national development programmes) and physical planning on state and local level. Presently long-term sector planning is being implemented through national development programmes of individual sector, which must be approved by the Parliament. So far, national programmes were adopted in the following fields: economic development, energy, agriculture and forestry, scientific research and technology policy, health, tourism, motorways and railway infrastructure. The shift away from the centrally planned system, where spatial planning had traditionally played a key role, toward a market economy, has plunged spatial planning into a deep crisis. The crisis can be seen in general move away from long-term thinking and long-term policies, and by reliance on the supposedly automatic benefits of the new approaches.

According to the legislation, the bodies responsible for physical planning are the state and the municipalities. This new regulation generated a problem of co-ordination,

negotiation, and co-operation with both state bodies and municipalities. A problem exemplified particularly in areas with specific problems like the coastal area, maining areas, heavy industrialised areas etc. (10).

For these reasons, and due to the numerous spatial development problems in some regions, National Office for Physical Planning, introduces planning workshops, which scope of work would result in guidelines for physical planning in the ad hoc planning region as a whole, as well as in separate municipalities. The Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning is encouraging the preparation of development plans for specific areas (functional regions), whereby particular emphasis is being placed on physical planning and environmental protection. The objective of such projects is the identification of development goals and guidelines for the development of individual sector at regional level. The results represent the premise for the preparation of harmonised inter-municipal policy on the physical planning and environment and for the co-ordinated planning settlements. This policy is being implemented, primarily, through physical planning at the municipal level. Another important result of such projects is the better co-ordination of activities between sectors, and between the national and local administration levels (4).

From all these we can summarised that questions of regional development are questions of organized complexity and it means that:

- they have no definitive formulation;
- understanding them means finding answers (solutions) for them;
- there are many explanations of questions; depending on the explanation chosen, so the solution differs;
- the possible range of methods which can be used to solve questions is unlimited;
- there are no right or wrong answers, answers or should I say, solutions can be only good or bad, relative to one another and the value system with which they are applied;
- there is no way of knowing when a question has been solved. As a result they require constant monitoring, and there is always scope for improving the solution;
- it is never clear that questions are being dealt with at the proper level as they have no identifiable root cause, and can be considered as symptoms of other questions;
- once a solution of question has been attempted it cannot be reversed. What is done is done. Unlike the physical science, there is no trial and error procedure wich can be followed;
- every question of regional development is a unique question.

## REFERENCES

- Černe A. 1998: Evropa regij – nove meje, stara merila. Statistična podpora pogajanjem Republike Slovenije z Evropsko Unijo in strukturni skladi, Statistični dnevi '98, Zbornik, Radenci, od 23. do 25. novembra 1998, str. 278-287, 12 ref.
- Černe A. 1997: Regional Development in the Context of Spatial Planning in Slovenia. Zielorientierte Regionale Geographie, Institut für Kulturgeographie, Stadt-und Regionalforschung, der J.W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Materialien Nr. 21, Frankfurt am Main, 99-127.
- Černe A. 1998: Slovenia. School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, Draft material, London.
- Gajšek M. 1995: Initiation of a Planning Process for a Slovenian Peripheral Region. Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Office for Physical Planning, 9th Congress of AESOP, Glasgow, 16-19 August 1995, Ljubljana.
- Habitat II 1995: Slovenian National Report. National Committee Habitat II, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Ljubljana.
- Independent Slovenia 1997: Origins, Movements, Prospects. Ed. J. Benderly and E. Kraft, Macmillan, London.
- Kus Z. 1996: Pristop srednje in vzhodnoevropskih držav k EU. Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Ljubljana.
- Lokalne vlade v državah Srednje in Vzhodne Evrope in v Skupnosti neodvisnih držav. 1994: Institute for Local Government and Public Services, Budapest, Hungary.
- Mezek S. 1996: Slovenian Coast from the Point of View of Sustainable Development. Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Office for Physical Planning, Mediterranean policy Workshop on Sustainable Development of Mediterranean Coastal Regions, Santorini island, Greece, 26-27 April 1996, Ljubljana.
- Okoljska predpristopna strategija za pridružitve k EU 1997: Drugi osnutek, Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Ljubljana.
- Regionalizem v Sloveniji 1998: Zbornik, Zbirka pravo in politika, časopisni zavod Uradni list R Slovenije, Ljubljana.
- Resolucija o prostorski razvojni politiki Republike Slovenije 1998: Delovni osnutek, Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad RS za prostorsko planiranje, Ljubljana.
- Slovenia 1997: Environmental Performance Reviews, Economic Commission for Europe. Committee on Environmental Policy, United Nations, New York.
- Strategija ekonomskega razvoja Slovenije - Približevanje Evropi - Rast konkurenčnost in integracija 1995: Inštitut za makroekonomske analize in razvoj, Ljubljana.
- White Paper on Regional Development in Slovenia 1999: National Phare Programme 1996, SL-9604/0301, F.C.WMEB, England, Ministry of Economic relations and Development, Ljubljana.

**VPRAŠANJA REGIONALNEGA RAZVOJA SLOVENIJE****Povzetek**

Z vidika gospodarskega razvoja, ekonomske strukture in vrednotenja naravnih, človeških, finančnih in infrastrukturnih potencialov je bilo v 90. letih 12 slovenskih regij razvrščenih v štiri skupine:

- gospodarsko razvite regije z ugodno gospodarsko strukturo in ugodnimi razvojnimi potenciali: Osrednja, Obalna in Gorenjska regija;
- gospodarsko srednje razvite regije z razmeroma ugodnimi in večinoma dobrimi razvojnimi potenciali: Savinjska, Dolenjska in Goriška regija;
- manj razvite regije z razmeroma ugodno gospodarsko strukturo: Pomurska in Notranjska regija;
- srednje razvite regije z neugodno gospodarsko strukturo, a z nekaterimi posameznimi ugodnimi potenciali: Podravska, Koroška in Posavska regija;
- regija neugodno industrijsko strukturo: Zasavska regija (13).

Podrobnejše raziskave regionalnih struktur na ravni statističnih regij in na ravni lokalnih skupnosti za obdobje 1991-1997 pa govore o tem, da so bile regionalne razlike v Sloveniji razmeroma zelo velike in, da so se še vedno povečevale. Te razlike so se kazale tako na področju demografskih kot na področju gospodarskih kazalcev. S tega vidika bi lahko govorili v Sloveniji o treh značilnih območjih:

- območja (lokalne skupnosti in naselja) koncentracije so obsegala približno 33% vsega ozemlja Slovenije in približno 75% njenega prebivalstva. Gostota prebivalstva v teh območjih je bila več kot dva-krat večja od slovenskega povprečja in je znašala 216 prebivalcev na km<sup>2</sup>;
- območja stagnacije so obsegala približno 26% ozemlja in 12% prebivalstva Slovenije. V teh območjih je bila gostota prebivalstva za polovico manjša od slovenskega povprečja in je znašala 45 prebivalcev na km<sup>2</sup>;
- območja depopulacije pa so obsegala kar 41% vsega ozemlja Slovenije, kjer pa je živelo le približno 13% vsega prebivalstva. Na teh območjih je znašala gostota prebivalstva samo 31 prebivalcev na km<sup>2</sup> (16).

Razlike na ravni lokalnih skupnosti so bile celo večje, kot pa razlike na ravni regij. To je veljalo tako za demografske razmere kakor tudi za družbeno-gospodarske razmere. Tako je znašalo razmerje med indeksom staranja v desetih občinah z najnižjo vrednostjo indeksa in desetimi občinami z najvišjo vrednostjo indeksa 1 : 2,5. Razmerje med stopnjo nezaposlenosti v desetih občinah z najnižjo in najvišjo stopnjo znezaposlenosti je znašalo 1 : 4. Razlike med bruto dodano vrednostjo na prebivalstva pa so se gibale v razmerju 1 : 30.