



ENDBERICHT EU-PROJEKT IMPALA

Verbesserung von Infrastrukturen für körperliche Aktivitäten in der Freizeit auf kommunaler Ebene

IMproving Infrastructures for Leisure-Time Physical Activity in the Local Arena



IMPALA Projektkoordination

Prof. Dr. Alfred Rütten
Institut für Sportwissenschaft und Sport
Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg

IMPALA-Team in Österreich

Abteilung Bewegungs- und Sportpädagogik
Zentrum für Sportwissenschaft und
Universitätsport, Universität Wien

Projektleitung:

o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Michael Kolb

Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeit:

Ass. Prof. Dr. Rosa Diketmüller

DI Irene Bittner



Nationaler Kooperationspartner

ÖISS - Österreichisches Institut
für Schul- und Sportstättenbau



EU-Fördergeber



Österreichischer Fördergeber



Das IMPALA-Projekt wurde von der Europäischen Kommission, Exekutivagentur für Gesundheit und Verbraucher (EAHC), und auf nationaler Ebene vom Fonds Gesundes Österreich (FGÖ) gefördert.

Wien am 7. Februar, 2011

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

A)	DEUTSCHE KURZFASSUNG	6
I)	IMPALA - Ergebnisse Österreich	6
1.	Ziele von IMPALA	6
2.	Entwicklungsverfahren und Optimierungspotenziale von Bewegungs- und Sporträumen in Österreich - Teilergebnisse aus dem EU-Projekt IMPALA	6
2.1.	Zusammenfassung	6
2.2.	Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastrukturen im Wandel	7
2.3.	Das IMPALA-Projekt	8
2.4.	Untersuchungsmethoden	10
2.5.	Die Rahmenbedingungen zur Entwicklung von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen in Österreich	11
2.6.	Optimierungspotenziale und Good-Practice-Modelle in Österreich	15
2.7.	Kurzfassung der europäischen Leitlinie	16
2.8.	Literatur	17
B)	ENGLISCHE VOLLVERSION (ENGLISH FULLVERSION)	18
I)	Abstract	18
II)	IMPALA - The Project	18
1.	Content and project partners	18
2.	Strategic objectives of the IMPALA-project	19
III)	Work package 1: Assessment of National Policies	20
1.	Planning process and facility types of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity	20
2.	Methods - Individual interviews and focus group discussion	20
3.	Report on Austrian Individual Interviews	22
3.1.	Country specific background information	22
3.2.	Main findings	23
3.3.	Selection of experts	23
3.4.	National policy	26
3.4.1.	National policy documents	27
3.4.2.	National policies for population subgroups	30
3.5.	Regional/local policy	31
3.5.1.	Tuning national to regional/local policies	33
3.6.	Stakeholder analysis (relevant Austrian actors in the field of development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity)	34
3.6.1.	Policymakers	34
3.6.2.	Collaborating partners	34
3.6.3.	Benefits and downfalls of existing policies	35

3.7.	Overall conclusion.....	37
4.	Report on the Austrian Focus Group.....	38
4.1.	Summary: Main findings	38
4.2.	Selection of experts	38
4.3.	Experiences with policies regarding development of leisure-time physical activity.....	40
4.3.1.	Potential problem areas and limiting factors	40
4.3.2.	Issues regarding the maintenance of facilities	41
4.3.3.	Issues regarding access to facilities.....	42
4.3.4.	Quality of communication between local policy officials and end-users	43
4.4.	Key advices stated by the participants	43
5.	Overall conclusion	45
IV)	Work package 2: Assessment of National Mechanisms	46
1.	Work package objective	46
2.	Work package methods and content	46
3.	Research questions	46
4.	Report on Austrian Mechanisms and Procedures.....	48
4.1.	Summary: Main findings	48
4.2.	Procedure of data collection and analysis	48
4.3.	Documents – mechanisms and instruments	49
4.3.1	National documents	49
4.3.2	Documents on federal state level	50
4.3.2.1	Binding instruments and mechanisms on a federal state level	51
4.3.2.2	Non-compulsory instruments, guidelines and strategy papers.....	53
4.4.	Planning.....	53
4.5.	Funding.....	54
4.6.	Construction & designing.....	55
4.7.	Management.....	56
4.8.	Overall conclusion	57
V)	Work package 3: Austrian workshop on Good Practice Criteria.....	59
1.	Work package objective	59
2.	Work package methods	59
3.	Date and timeframe	59
4.	Organizational frame and responsible institutions.....	60
5.	Participants and level of involved decision-makers (national workshop)	60
5.1.	Method of invitation.....	60

5.2.	List of participants.....	61
6.	Methods and procedures.....	62
6.1.	Initial workshop for Austrian experts.....	62
6.2.	Debriefing phase (2nd expert meeting, additional comments and feedback via email) ..	62
6.3.	Results of assessment.....	62
7.	Specific discussions on 5 dimensions for developing infrastructures	64
7.1.	Policy-making and other superordinate issues.....	64
7.2.	(Strategic) Planning	66
7.3.	Building (Object Planning)	68
a)	Systematic optimisation of the chapter 'object planning / building':	69
b)	Additional contents relevant to 'object planning':.....	69
7.4.	Financing	70
7.5.	Management.....	71
8.	Examples of good practice to be added to the IMPALA guidelines:	71
8.1.	Policies.....	71
8.2.	Building	72
8.3.	Management.....	72
C)	ANNEXES.....	73
VI)	WP1 – ANNEX 1 – IMPALA-Guideline for individual expert interviews	73
VII)	WP1 – ANNEX 2 – IMPALA-Guideline for focus group discussion	75
VIII)	WP2 – ANNEX 0 – OVERVIEW ON AUSTRIAN LAWS AND DECREES.....	77
IX)	WP2 – ANNEX A – AUSTRIAN DATA SOURCES	81
X)	WP2 – ANNEX B – AUSTRIAN MECHANISMS	83
XI)	WP2 – ANNEX C – AUSTRIAN INSTRUMENTS.....	91

A) DEUTSCHE KURZFASSUNG

I) IMPALA - Ergebnisse Österreich

1. Ziele von IMPALA

Ziel war es, Erkenntnisse über „gute Praxis“ in Planung, Finanzierung, Bau und Management lokaler Infrastrukturen für Bewegungsaktivitäten in der Freizeit zu gewinnen und zu verbreiten. Dafür untersuchte IMPALA nationale politische Strategien sowie Verfahrensweisen und Instrumente zur Entwicklung von Infrastrukturen für Sport und Bewegung in der Freizeit. IMPALA unterscheidet drei Typen von Infrastrukturen für Sport und Bewegung in der Freizeit:

- Sportanlagen, z.B. Sporthallen, Bäder und Schwimmhallen, Sportplätze.
- Freizeitinfrastrukturen, die spezielle Sport- und Bewegungsgelegenheiten bieten, z.B. Parks, Spielplätze, Radwege.
- Urbane und naturnahe Räume, die nicht speziell für Sport und Bewegungsaktivitäten gestaltet wurden, allerdings dazu genutzt werden können, z.B. Plätze, Straßen, Wälder, Strände.

IMPALA sollte die koordinierte Entwicklung lokaler Infrastrukturen für Bewegungsaktivitäten in der Freizeit in den EU-Mitgliedsstaaten unterstützen sowie dazu beigetragen, soziale Ungleichheit im Zugang zu Infrastrukturen innerhalb der Länder und zwischen den Ländern zu reduzieren.

2. Entwicklungsverfahren und Optimierungspotenziale von Bewegungs- und Sporträumen in Österreich - Teilergebnisse aus dem EU-Projekt IMPALA

(Dieser Text ist als Artikel im Spectrum der Sportwissenschaften - Zeitschrift der Österreichischen Sportwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft (ÖSG), Jahrgang 22, Heft 2010/2 erschienen, Autorin: Irene Bittner)

2.1. Zusammenfassung

Die Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sporträumen befindet sich derzeit im Wandel. Die Gründe hierfür liegen einerseits in einem veränderten Bewegungs- und Sportverhalten der körperlich aktiven Bevölkerung. Andererseits wird den Kommunen immer deutlicher bewusst, dass die bedürfnisgerechte Entwicklung der Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastruktur einen wichtigen Beitrag für eine bewegungsorientierte Gesundheitsförderung bei inaktiven Bevölkerungsgruppen darstellt. In diesem Zusammenhang kommen neben den klassischen Sportanlagen insbesondere auch Bewegungsgelegenheiten vermehrt in den Blick. Wie sehen die Rahmenbedingungen zur Entwicklung bevölkerungsadäquater Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen aus? Wo gibt es vorbildliche Praxismodelle? Wo bestehen Potenziale einer intersektoralen, koordinierten Planung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen? Im Rahmen des EU-Projekts IMPALA wurden der Ist-Zustand und Good-Practice-Modelle in Österreich und elf weiteren Ländern untersucht. Die Erkenntnisse sind in eine EU-Leitlinie mit einem ausführlichen Kriterienkatalog eingeflossen. Der Beitrag stellt die im Projekt erhobenen Rahmenbedingungen, Good-Practice-Beispiele und Entwicklungspotenziale in Österreich vor.

Schlagerworte: Infrastruktur – Sportanlage/Sportstätte – Gesundheitsförderung

2.2. Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastrukturen im Wandel

Sporthallen, Hallenbäder, Freibäder, Spielplätze sowie Wander- und Radfahrwege sind unter den vielfältigen Bewegungs- und Sporträumen in den Städten und Gemeinden in Österreich wohl die bekanntesten. Es sind jene Infrastrukturen, die Menschen dazu anregen, sich gerne, häufig und vielfältig zu bewegen. Lange Zeit wurde Infrastrukturen für Bewegungs- und Sportaktivitäten weder im sportwissenschaftlichen noch im planerischen Kontext besondere Bedeutung beigemessen. Vor allem neuere Publikationen der WHO¹ haben verdeutlicht, dass geeignete Infrastrukturen für Freizeit und Alltag eine wichtige Basis für eine aktivitätsfördernde, gesundheitsorientierte Kommune darstellen. In einer Vielzahl internationaler Studien (vgl. Rütten, Frahsa & Abu-Omar, 2010)² über Infrastrukturen und Bewegungsaktivitäten aus den Bereichen Gesundheitssport und Public Health zeigt sich ein signifikanter Zusammenhang zwischen Bewegungsinfrastrukturen in Form freizeitrelevanter sowie transportrelevanter Infrastrukturen³ und erhöhten Bewegungsaktivitäten. Standortfaktoren von Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastrukturen sind demnach mitentscheidend für einen körperlich aktiven Lebensstil sowohl in der Freizeit wie im Alltag. So haben attraktive Wegenetze ebenso einen Einfluss auf das Zu-Fuß-Gehen und das Radfahren wie eine funktionierende Nahversorgung und Nutzung von Erdgeschosszonen in Stadtteilen und Gemeinden. Freizeitsportanlagen wie Sport- und Schwimmhallen, vor allem aber auch Bewegungsgelegenheiten wie Parks und Spielplätze, werden besonders durch eine gute Erreichbarkeit zu Wohnstandorten von der lokalen Bevölkerung als attraktive Bewegungsinfrastrukturen bewertet.

Die Erweiterung der Bewegungsinfrastrukturen über die klassischen Sportstätten hinaus hin zu informellen Bewegungsräumen wie Parks, urbanen Räumen oder Naturräumen erscheint auch in Österreich dringend notwendig. Angesichts der Tatsache, dass 2009 nur 38 % der österreichischen Bevölkerung regelmäßig sportlich aktiv waren, insgesamt 69 % allenfalls moderat und 31 % nur selten oder nie körperlich aktiv waren (vgl. Europäische Kommission, 2010, S. 10ff), erscheint die vermehrte Errichtung von bewegungsanregenden Infrastrukturen äußerst bedeutsam. Ähnliche Daten auf lokaler Ebene liefern die Studie „Zukunft – Freizeit – Sport. Situation und Perspektiven des Freizeit- und Breitensports in Salzburg“⁴ (vgl. Popp & Steinbach, 2008, S. 51ff) oder die Bedarfserhebung aus Eisenstadt als wissenschaftliche Erhebung für den dortigen kommunalen Sportentwicklungsplan⁵ (vgl. Mairinger, Kolb & Diketmüller, 2009, S. 43ff; Mairinger, 2009, S. 41ff).

¹ „Bewegungsförderung und aktives Leben im städtischen Umfeld – Die Rolle der Lokalverwaltung“ (2010) sowie „Bewegung und Gesundheit in Europa: Erkenntnisse für das Handeln“ (2010) - englischsprachige Publikation der WHO Europe 2006, dt. Fassung erhältlich unter: <http://www.fgoe.org/der-fonds/infos/who-booklets-zur-bewegung-und-gesundheit-sforderung>. Ein weiteres relevantes Strategiepapier der WHO ist von Edwards, P. & Tsouros, A. D. (2008). *A healthy city is an active city: a physical activity planning guide*. Kopenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

² Siehe Rütten, Frahsa & Abu Omar (2010). „Zur Entwicklung von politischen und infrastrukturellen Ansätzen in der Gesundheitsförderung durch Bewegung. Eine internationale Analyse“, 18-31 in dieser Ausgabe.

³ Freizeitrelevante Infrastrukturen sind z. B. Spiel- und Sportplätze, Sport- und Schwimmhallen und Parks; transportrelevante Infrastrukturen sind z. B. Gehsteige, Fahrradwege sowie die Erreichbarkeit von Geschäften (vgl. Rütten, Frahsa & Abu-Omar, 2010).

⁴ Die Studie wurde im Auftrag der Sozialpartner der Stadt Salzburg (Arbeiterkammer und Wirtschaftskammer) erstellt.

⁵ Der Sportentwicklungsplan Eisenstadt wurde von der Abteilung für Wirtschaftsbetriebe der Stadt Eisenstadt, zu der auch alle kommunalen Sportanlagen zählen, beauftragt.

Die Fokussierung auf bislang weitgehend inaktive Bevölkerungsgruppen hat den Blick für die Aufgabenfelder der Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturentwicklung in den letzten Jahren zusätzlich geschärft. Politische Entscheidungsträger(innen) stehen vor der Aufgabe, sozial ausgewogene Bedingungen für eine wirksame Gesundheitsförderung herzustellen. Ein räumliches Angebot für Bewegungsaktivitäten ist daher auch im Hinblick auf die unterschiedlichen Nutzungsansprüche verschiedener sozialer Gruppen wie Kinder, Jugendliche, Frauen, Männer, ältere Menschen, Migrant(inn)en etc. zu planen.

Die zunehmende Vielfalt an Bewegungs- und Sportformen, denen körperlich aktive Bevölkerungsgruppen nachgehen, stellt die Gemeinden, Städte und Regionalverbände vor zusätzliche Anforderungen, da dafür differenziertere, spezifische Anlagentypen errichtet oder bestehende Anlagen modernisiert werden müssen (vgl. Wetterich, Eckl & Schabert, 2009, S. 35ff). Daneben sind gerade nicht speziell für Sport und Bewegung vordefinierte Orte – urbane Räume gleichermaßen wie Naturräume – eine wichtige Ressource für alltägliche wie freizeitorientierte Bewegungsaktivitäten. Für die Eurobarometerstatistik 2010 der Europäischen Kommission zum Thema „Sport und körperliche Betätigung“ ist auch die Frage nach den Orten, an denen Bewegung und Sport betrieben werden, gestellt worden. Im EU27-Durchschnitt sind 48 % im Park oder in der freien Natur und weitere 31 % auf dem Weg zwischen Wohnort und Schule/Arbeit/Einkaufen körperlich aktiv. Im EU-Durchschnitt sind jeweils 11 % in einem Fitnessclub oder in einem Verein organisiert, weitere 8 % sind in einem Sportzentrum und weitere 4 % in einer Schule oder Universität körperlich aktiv. In Österreich bewegen sich sogar 64 % der Befragten in einem Park oder in der freien Natur, 24 % auf dem Weg zwischen Wohnort und Schule/Arbeit/Einkaufen, 13 % in einem Fitnesscenter, 15 % in einem Verein, 6 % in einem Sportzentrum, 8 % bei der Arbeit und 5 % in der Schule oder Universität (vgl. Eurobarometer 72.3, 2010, S. 23ff). Das bedeutet, dass ein Großteil der Bewegungsaktivitäten im EU-Durchschnitt und sogar überdurchschnittlich häufig in Österreich in öffentlichen Freiräumen wie in Parks, in der offenen Landschaft, auf Plätzen oder Straßen außerhalb der klassischen Sportstätten stattfindet. Diese räumlichen Rahmenbedingungen werden von sehr unterschiedlichen öffentlichen Bereichen verwaltet, entwickelt und größtenteils auch finanziert: Neben Sport und Gesundheit sind auch Sektoren wie Planung, Verkehr, Tourismus, Umwelt, Bildung und Wirtschaft an der Entwicklung von Bewegungsinfrastrukturen beteiligt. Hier zeigen sich die Komplexität des Themas und die aktuellen Herausforderungen, denen sich kommunale Verwaltungen genauso wie staatliche Institutionen stellen müssen, um geeignete Politikstrategien für die bedürfnisgerechte Erstellung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen entwickeln zu können.

2.3. Das IMPALA-Projekt

Das von der Europäischen Union geförderte IMPALA-Projekt lieferte Erkenntnisse im Hinblick auf die im Wandel begriffenen Entwicklungsverfahren lokaler Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen. Übergreifendes Ziel war es dabei, Optimierungspotenziale sowie bestehende Good-Practice-Beispiele innerhalb von zwölf europäischen Ländern zu identifizieren.

Tab. 1: Projektdaten und Netzwerkpartner von IMPALA

Wissenschaftliche Projektpartner		Kooperationspartner
<i>Dänemark:</i> Universität Süd Dänemark, Odense <i>Deutschland:</i> Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg <i>Finnland:</i> Universität Jyväskylä <i>Frankreich:</i> Universität Nancy <i>Italien:</i> Universität Rom "Foro Italico" <i>Litauen:</i> Akademie für Leibeseziehung <i>Niederlande:</i> TNO Quality of Life, Leiden <i>Norwegen:</i> Oslo University College Österreich: Universität Wien <i>Portugal:</i> Universität Porto <i>Spanien:</i> Universität der Extremadura <i>Tschechische Republik:</i> Palacky-Universität, Olomouc		<i>Dänemark:</i> Verkehrsamt Stadt Odense <i>Deutschland:</i> Deutscher Olympischer Sportbund <i>Finnland:</i> Finnischer Städte- und Gemeindebund <i>Frankreich:</i> Ministerium für Gesundheit und Sport <i>Italien:</i> Censis Serviui S.p.A., Acciari Consulting <i>Litauen:</i> Stadtamt Kaunas <i>Niederlande:</i> VU University Medical Center, Netherlands Institut for Sport and Physical Activity <i>Norwegen:</i> Gesundheitsdirektorat Österreich: Österreichisches Institut für Schul- und Sportstättenbau <i>Spanien:</i> Regionalregierung der Extremadura <i>Tschechische Republik:</i> Stadt Olomouc <i>WHO:</i> European Centre for Environment and Health
Projektkoordination	Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Deutschland	
Öffentlichkeitsarbeit	Universität Wien, Österreich	
Projektelevaluation	TNO Leiden, Niederlande	
Projektdauer	Jänner 2009 – Dezember 2010 (24 Monate)	
Fördergeber	EAHC - Executive Agency for Health and Consumers, EU- Commission FGÖ – Fonds Gesundes Österreich, nationaler Fördergeber	

Das Hauptaugenmerk wurde auf die Untersuchung von Freizeitsportanlagen (z. B. Sporthallen und -plätze, Bäder und Schwimmhallen) gelegt. Zudem wurden auch freizeitrelevante Bewegungsgelegenheiten wie z. B. Parks, Spielplätze oder Wanderwege einbezogen. Im Projekt wurden drei Typen von Infrastrukturen für Sport und Bewegung in der Freizeit unterschieden:

1. Sportstätten (öffentliche und kommerzielle Anlagen wie z. B. Sport- und Schwimmhallen oder Freianlagen),
2. Freizeitinfrastrukturen, die als Bewegungs- und Sportgelegenheiten gestaltet wurden (z. B. Parks, Spielplätze, Radwege),
3. Urbane Räume und Naturräume, die für Bewegung und Sport in der Freizeit genutzt werden können, jedoch nicht spezifisch dafür definiert wurden (z. B. Straßen, öffentliche Räume, Wälder, Strände und Uferzonen).

Ziel des Projektes ist es, Leitlinien für koordinierte intersektorale Entwicklungen lokaler Infrastrukturen für körperliche Aktivitäten in der Freizeit in den EU-Mitgliedsstaaten zu entwickeln und dadurch auch soziale Ungleichheiten im Zugang zu Sport- und Freizeitanlagen innerhalb der Länder und zwischen den beteiligten Ländern zu vermindern. Das Projekt stellte folgende Fragen hinsichtlich der Optimierung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen:

- Wie können bestehende Politstrategien im Hinblick auf aktuelle Freizeit- und Bewegungsbedürfnisse optimiert werden?

- Welche Synergien zwischen den verschiedenen verantwortlichen Politikbereichen Sport, Stadt-, Verkehrs- und Freiraumplanung, Gesundheitswesen, Tourismus, Bildung u. a. sind notwendig?
- Welche integrativen Planungsverfahren, die Akteurinnen und Akteure aus unterschiedlichen Fachdisziplinen sowie aus der lokalen Bevölkerung zusammenbringen, existieren bereits?
- Wie sieht die Entwicklung von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen im europäischen Vergleich aus?
- Welche europäischen Praxisbeispiele unter Berücksichtigung lokaler Bedingungen können als zukunftsfähige Modelle zur Herstellung und Optimierung von Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastruktur herangezogen werden?

Im Projekt wurden nationale, regionale wie lokale politische Strategien und Verfahrensweisen im Hinblick auf Planung, Bau, Finanzierung und Management zur Entwicklung von Infrastrukturen untersucht. Als Ergebnis wurden Good-Practice-Modelle zur Optimierung lokaler Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastrukturen identifiziert und ein Kriterienkatalog mit europaweiter Geltung wurde erarbeitet.

2.4. Untersuchungsmethoden

Das IMPALA-Projekt wurde in drei Projektphasen umgesetzt. Die erste Phase beinhaltete eine Bestandsaufnahme zu Politikstrategien und Dokumenten mittels qualitativer Expert(inn)eninterviews. Auf Basis eines standardisierten Samplings wurden geeignete Interviewpartner(innen) aus verschiedenen Politikbereichen (Sport, Stadtplanung, Tourismus und Erholung) und auf verschiedenen Ebenen (national, regional, lokal) in allen zwölf Partnerländern identifiziert. In Österreich wurden elf Experten aus zehn Institutionen mittels Leitfadenterviews befragt. Als zweiter Schritt wurde eine Fokusgruppe mit weiteren Expert(inn)en einberufen, um deren Kenntnisse auf der Umsetzungsebene zu erheben. Die Transkriptionen der Interviews wurden frei codiert und im ersten österreichischen Zwischenbericht zusammengefasst. Die TNO Quality for Life (Leiden, Niederlande - Leitung des ersten Arbeitspakets) war mit der Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse aus den europäischen Partnerländern betraut.

In der zweiten Projektphase wurden Mechanismen und Verfahrensweisen zur Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen mittels Dokumentanalyse und vereinzelter weiteren Experteninterviews analysiert. In Österreich wurde einerseits auf die in der ersten Erhebungsphase genannten Strategiepapiere zurückgegriffen, andererseits wurden vor allem die rechtlichen Grundlagen in Eigenrecherche mittels öffentlich zugänglicher Online-Datenbank, dem Österreichischen Rechtsinformationssystem (vgl. BKA, 2010), zusammengetragen. Mittels systematischer Schlagwortsuche konnten die relevanten Dokumente österreichweit gefunden werden. Die verwendeten Schlagworte auf Bundesgesetzesebene sowie 9 x auf Bundesländerebene waren: „Sport“, „Sportstätte“, „Entwicklung“, „Planung“, „Freizeit“ und „Erholungsraum“. Die Ergebnisse wurden anhand eines Kategoriensystems ausgewertet und in den zweiten österreichischen Zwischenbericht eingebunden. Die Zusammenfassung der europäischen Ergebnisse übernahm die Universität Jyväskylä, Finnland - Leitung des zweiten Arbeitspakets.

In der dritten Projektphase wurde ein europaweiter Good-Practice-Kriterienkatalog zur Optimierung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen erarbeitet. Die gemeinsame europaweite Basis wurde in einem ersten Treffen der Projektpartner diskutiert. Daraufhin wurde eine erste Version des Katalogs von der Leitung des Arbeitspakets – Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Deutschland – bereitgestellt und in einer Feedbackschleife von den Projektpartnern kommentiert. Die daraufhin überarbeitete Version wurde als Entwurf einer EU-Leitlinie versendet und in allen zwölf Partnerländern mit nationalen Expert(inn)en diskutiert. Am Workshop in Österreich am 11. Juni 2010 nahmen 17 Expert(inn)en aus den Politikfeldern Sport, Stadtplanung, Tourismus/Erholung und Gesundheit teil, die auf unterschiedlichen Ebenen (bundesweit, landesweit, kommunal) mit Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturentwicklung befasst sind. Die Workshopergebnisse wurden im dritten österreichischen Zwischenbericht zusammengefasst und von der Leitung des Arbeitspakets – der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg – mit den Länderergebnissen verglichen und als EU-Leitlinie im Rahmen der internationalen Konferenz „POIN2010 – Politik und Infrastrukturen für Bewegung und Sport – Gute Praxis in Europa“ am 8. und 9. November 2010 in Frankfurt am Main, Deutschland, vorgestellt.

2.5. Die Rahmenbedingungen zur Entwicklung von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen in Österreich

In Österreich werden aufgrund stark föderaler politischer Strukturen und der daraus resultierenden Kompetenzteilung von Bund und Bundesländern Sport- und Bewegungsinfrastrukturen ausschließlich auf Bundesländerebene konzipiert. In den neun Bundesländern werden individuelle Gesetzgebungen und Strategiepapiere erarbeitet und später auf Gemeindeebene projektorientiert umgesetzt. Im Sportbereich wird das Thema Infrastrukturen für den Breitensport auf der Bundesebene nur marginal behandelt. Für den Bildungs- und Planungsbereich gilt dasselbe. Die entsprechende Gesetzgebung wie auch unverbindliche Strategiepapiere werden auf Länderebene ausgearbeitet. Es gibt daher insgesamt nur wenige bundesweit gültige Dokumente und Initiativen zum Thema.

Unbedingt zu erwähnen ist an dieser Stelle die „Enqueteresolution für Sport- und Bewegungsräume“, die im März 2009 in Hartberg präsentiert wurde (vgl. ÖISS, 2009). Dieses Dokument hält die Bedeutung von Bewegungsräumen und Sportanlagen für Breitensport und organisierte wie selbstorganisierte Bewegungsaktivitäten fest. Die Enqueteresolution wurde vom ÖISS (Österreichisches Institut für Schul- und Sportstättenbau) erarbeitet. Diese Resolution ist eine erste Initiative nach dem sogenannten österreichischen Sportstättenplan (ÖSSP) aus dem Jahr 1968, mit dem der Bedarf aller fehlenden Sportanlagen für jede österreichische Gemeinde, für jedes Bundesland sowie auf nationaler Ebene festgestellt und ein quantitativer, auf die Bevölkerung bezogener Quadratmeter-Schlüssel errechnet wurde. Diese statistische Methode erwies sich mit der Zeit als zu grob, um lokale Bedingungen differenziert zu erfassen. Der ÖSSP ist nach wie vor rechtliche Grundlage auf Bundesländerebene, wurde allerdings in den letzten 20 Jahren kaum noch umgesetzt. Die Enqueteresolution ist ein erster Schritt für einen strukturellen Wandel auf dem Gebiet der Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturentwicklung in Österreich.

Ein besonders auch in der Umsetzung erfolgreiches – allerdings nur für eine Bewegungsart konzipiertes – bundesweit gültiges Strategiepapier ist der „Masterplan Radfahren“, der sich mit dem Radfahren im Sinne umweltfreundlicher Mobilität beschäftigt (vgl. BMFLFUW, 2006). Dieses Programm wurde vom Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt- und Wasserwirtschaft 2006 entwickelt und sogar in das aktuelle österreichische Regierungsprogramm von 2008 - 2013 mit dem Ziel der Verdoppelung des Fahrradanteils österreichweit auf 10 % aufgenommen.

Ein weiteres österreichweites Dokument ist der ÖNORM-Katalog, der hauptsächlich technische Kriterien von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastruktur festlegt, jedoch keine grundlegend strukturellen Bedingungen zur Entwicklung beinhaltet.

Die einzelnen Bundesländer gestalten die Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sport-Infrastrukturen maßgeblich in eigener Regie. Die gemeinsame verbindliche Basis bilden dabei folgende Gesetze, die jedoch in sehr unterschiedlicher Ausformung in allen neun Ländern aufliegen:

- Landessportgesetze,
- Landesschul(bau)gesetze⁶,
- Landesraumordnungsgesetze und
- Landesbauordnungen⁷.

Nur in kleinen Teilen beschäftigen sich die neun unterschiedlichen Landessportgesetze mit Sportanlagen. Alle erwähnen, dass Sportanlagen öffentlich finanziert und der Allgemeinheit zur Verfügung gestellt werden sollten. In den meisten Bundesländern wurde der Schutz existierender Sportanlagen ausdrücklich gesetzlich verankert (Wien, Steiermark, Salzburg, Niederösterreich, Oberösterreich) bzw. wurde zumindest vorgesehen, dass das jeweilige Bundesland für die Instandhaltung der bestehenden Sportanlagen zuständig ist (Burgenland, Kärnten, Tirol, Vorarlberg).

Die Landesschul(bau)gesetze sind aufgrund der Schulsportanlagen, die zu vergünstigten Tarifen für Sportvereine zugänglich sind, relevant. Schulsportanlagen sind eine wichtige Ressource für den Freizeitsport in Österreich.

Die Landesraumordnungsgesetze und die Landesbauordnungen sind nicht nur für klassische Sportstätten, sondern auch für Bewegungs- und Sportgelegenheiten sowie allgemein nutzbare urbane Räume und Naturräume relevant. Verbindliche Planungsinstrumente, die von den Raumordnungsabteilungen in den Bundesländern erarbeitet werden, sind Raum- bzw. Sachprogramme sowie Entwicklungspläne – je nach Bundesland unter unterschiedlichen Namensgebungen. Diese Planungsinstrumente besitzen den rechtlichen Status einer Verordnung und werden in verschiedenen Maßstäben – bundeslandweit, regional, auf Gemeindeebene – ausgearbeitet und dienen der Umsetzung der Raumordnungsgesetze.

⁶ Teilweise bestehen eigene Schulbaugesetze, die die Errichtung von Schulsportanlagen regulieren, andernfalls sind die baulichen Richtlinien für Schulen in das Landesschulgesetz integriert.

⁷ Eine Ausnahme ist das Bundesland Wien, das seine Raumordnung in die Bauordnung integriert hat und daher nur ein Dokument verwendet.

Des Weiteren bestimmen vor allem unverbindliche Strategiepapiere die Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen. Die Ausformung ist in allen Dokumenten sehr anlagespezifisch gestaltet, das heißt, ein Papier bezieht sich nur auf Spielplätze, das nächste nur auf Parkanlagen etc. Tabelle 2 zeigt zur Veranschaulichung eine unvollständige exemplarische Auswahl konkreter verbindlicher und unverbindlicher Dokumente, die für die Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen in einzelnen Bundesländern in Österreich bedeutsam sind. Eine vollständige Liste befindet sich im Anhang/Annex ab S. 76 in diesem Bericht.

Für Österreich zeigt sich ein ausgeprägt heterogenes Bild im Hinblick auf Strategiepapiere und Gesetzgebungen zur Entwicklung und Planung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastruktur. Gemeinsam ist den Bundesländern, dass die verschiedenen Arten von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen in unterschiedlichen Sektoren entwickelt werden. Die Planung klassischer Sportstätten wie Fußballplätze, Laufanlagen oder Sporthallen wird in der Regel von kommunalen Verantwortlichen aus dem Sportbereich häufig in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Land durch individuelle Förderungsmittel ermöglicht. Öffentliche Hallen- und Freibäder sind zum Teil eigene Ressorts (z. B. in Wien) und teilweise auch dem Gesundheitsbereich (z. B. in Niederösterreich) in den Ländern und Gemeinden zugeordnet. Sogenannte Sport- und Bewegungsgelegenheiten wie Radwege, Spielplätze oder Parkanlagen werden vor allem von kommunalen Planungsabteilungen sowie Verantwortlichen aus dem Umweltbereich (z. B. Stadtgartenämtern) entwickelt und verwaltet. Die Freizeitnutzung von Naturräumen wie z. B. das Wandern oder das Radfahren wird primär von Akteur(inn)en aus dem Umwelt- sowie aus dem Tourismusbereich organisiert. All diese Planungen geschehen in der Regel unabhängig voneinander und sind kaum miteinander koordiniert.

Die Finanzierung der Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen in Österreich wird zum größten Teil über öffentliche Mittel vor allem aus den Budgets der verantwortlichen Politikbereiche (z. B. Sport, Stadtplanung, Tourismus) der Bundesländer und der Gemeinden geleistet und dementsprechend als öffentliche Planungswettbewerbe ausgeschrieben. Teilweise werden Anlagen auch mit privaten Investoren als Public-Private-Partnerships (PPP-Modelle) realisiert, nur ein kleiner Anteil, vor allem Fitnesscenter, werden ausschließlich privat finanziert. Größtenteils werden der Betrieb und die Instandhaltung der Sportstätten oder Bewegungsgelegenheiten zumindest ansatzweise im Voraus in der Planungsphase mitbedacht.

Tab. 2: Beispiele relevanter österreichischer Strategiepapiere zur Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen

Regionale, verbindliche thematische Sach- bzw. Entwicklungsprogramme	
Kärnten	Entwicklungsprogramm Sportstättenplan (Verordnung) in Kärnten (StF: LGBl Nr. 1/1978)
NÖ	Freizeit- und Erholungsraumordnungsprogramm (Verordnung) in Niederösterreich (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1978)
NÖ	Spielplatzgesetz in Niederösterreich (StF: LGBl. Nr. 124/2002)
Salzburg	Sachprogramm für die Errichtung von Golfanlagen (Verordnung) in Salzburg (StF: LGBl Nr. 90/1998)
Salzburg	Sachprogramm über die Errichtung oder Änderung von Schianlagen (Verordnung) im Land Salzburg (StF: LGBl Nr. 49/2008)
Steiermark	Entwicklungsprogramm für das Sportwesen (Verordnung) in der Steiermark (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1991): Hier werden auch der Bau und die Prüfung qualitativer Aspekte geregelt wie z. B. die Aufforderung umweltfreundliche Materialien zu verwenden oder die architektonische Gestaltungsqualität der Bauten und Stätten.
Steiermark	Entwicklungsprogramm für Freizeit, Erholung und Fremdenverkehr (Verordnung) in der Steiermark (StF: LGBl. Nr. 53/1990)
Tirol	Raumordnungsprogramm für Golfplätze (Verordnung) in Tirol (LGBl. Nr.1/2009)
Tirol	Raumordnungsprogramm betreffend Seilbahnen und schitechnische Erschließungen (Verordnung) in Tirol (LGBl. Nr. 10/2005)
Wien	Wiener Spielplatzverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 46/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2009)
Regionale, unverbindliche Strategiepapiere	
NÖ	Landesentwicklungskonzept für Niederösterreich 2004 Die Entwicklung von Freizeiteinrichtungen und Naturschutzgebieten zum Zwecke der Erholung wird erwähnt.
NÖ	Kriterien für touristische Hauptradrouten in Niederösterreich – von der Koordinationsstelle für touristische Radwanderwege der Niederösterreich-Werbung GmbH, im Auftrag des Landes NÖ, Wirtschaftszentrum Niederösterreich (2008)
OÖ	Spielraumförderung NEU – vom Oberösterreichischen Landesamt – Abteilung Wohnungswesen (2009)
Wien	Stadtentwicklungsplan Wien 2005 In Wien ist eine m ² -Anzahl an Grünraum und Sportanlagen pro Einwohner festgelegt: mind. 3,5 m ² /Person an Grünfläche in Wohnquartieren; 3,0 – 5,0 m ² /Person an Grünraum in dicht bebauten Stadtteilen, Parks, Spielplätze, Freiräume im Allgemeinen; 8,0 m ² /Person berechnet für das gesamte Stadtgebiet/mind. 3,5 m ² /Person an Sportanlagen.
Wien	Das Wiener Parkleitbild – von der Wiener Magistratsabteilung 42 – Parks und Gärten (2008)

2.6. Optimierungspotenziale und Good-Practice-Modelle in Österreich

Der Ablauf von strategischer Planung hin zu Objektplanung, Bau, Finanzierung sowie Betrieb und Instandhaltung von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen ist in Österreich innerhalb klar abgegrenzter Sektoren in den einzelnen Bundesländern auf regionale wie lokale Gegebenheiten abgestimmt und wird daher eher projektorientiert abgewickelt. Wie bereits erwähnt, gibt es in den einzelnen Bundesländern sehr unterschiedlich elaborierte Gesetze, Verordnungen und Strategiepapiere. Unverbindliche Leitlinien und Förderinstrumentarien sind weitgehend anlagespezifisch ausgerichtet. Im Bereich Radfahren gibt es ein besonders erfolgreiches Modell, den „Masterplan Radfahren“, der österreichweit erarbeitet wurde und in allen Bundesländern angewandt wird – jedoch nur spezifisch für eine Bewegungsaktivität (vgl. BMFLFUW, 2006). Vorbildlich sind vor allem unverbindliche Leitlinien, die Qualitätskriterien, Bürgerbeteiligungsverfahren sowie den Zugriff auf Fördertöpfe miteinander koppeln. Sowohl strategische wie auch rechtliche Rahmenbedingungen können in dieser Form wesentlich zielorientierter umgesetzt werden als ausschließlich auf der Basis von gesetzlichen Verordnungen. Es sind sogenannte Governancestrategien⁸, die Anreize für kommunale Infrastrukturverbesserungen schaffen. Sie ergänzen herkömmliche Strategien, die eine Mindestausstattung nach einem Quadratmeter-Schlüssel aus soziodemografischen Daten vorschreiben wie etwa der ÖSSP (Österreichischer Sportstättenplan) oder das Konzept der zentralen Orte in der Raumplanung.

Im Planungssektor werden längst individuelle Regionalpläne zu bestimmten Themen wie Verkehr und Grünraum in bestehende Strategiepapiere integriert. Ähnliche Planungsinstrumente, die konkret auf die Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sporträumen abzielen, fehlen in Österreich noch weitgehend. Derzeit besteht keine ausgeprägte intersektorale Koordination der kommunalen und regionalen Planungsvorhaben. Bislang existiert noch kein systematischer Erfahrungsaustausch zwischen den unterschiedlichen Sektoren und damit bestehen noch deutliche Defizite bei der Bildung von Netzwerken zur Stärkung inter- wie intrasektoraler Kapazitäten. Eine kooperative, gemeinsame Vorgehensweise könnte dazu beitragen, Entscheidungen rationaler wie transparenter zu gestalten und anderen Akteur(inn)en wie z. B. NGOs und interessierten Bürger(inne)n Informationen überhaupt erst zugänglich zu machen. Erste Tendenzen in diese Richtung zeichnen sich in Österreich bereits durch die Enqueteresolution zu Sport- und Bewegungsstätten des ÖISS ab, der bewusst von Sport- und Bewegungsräumen spricht. Zudem wurden in Österreich gerade zwei Pilotprojekte einer sport- und bewegungsübergreifenden, intersektoralen Sportentwicklungsplanung in der Stadt Eisenstadt und in der Region Hartberg umgesetzt (vgl. Gstöttner, Kolb, Mairinger & Schwarz-Viechtbauer, 2010, S. 43ff). Die beiden Sportentwicklungspläne sowie das IMPALA-Projekt zeigen, dass in Österreich ein deutlicher Bedarf an innovativen, integrativen, partizipativen und damit ressourcenschonenden Planungsverfahren besteht, um die bisher dominierende und – auf längere Sicht betrachtet – kostenintensivere, isolierte Anpassung und Neuerrichtung einzelner Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen zu optimieren.

⁸ Governance (engl.) - Steuerung, Regieren. „Der Begriff Governance verweist auf eine Ausweitung des Akteursspektrums [Anmerkung: auch zwischen staatlichen und nicht-staatlichen Akteur/innen], auf die Modernisierung von Verwaltungsabläufen sowie auf die Institutionalisierung neuer Formen von Kooperationen.“ (vgl. Hamedinger, 2006, S. 12)

2.7. Kurzfassung der europäischen Leitlinie

Dieser Textteil ist eine Ergänzung zum Artikel aus dem Spektrum der Sportwissenschaften vom Februar 2011.

Wichtigstes Resultat des IMPALA-Projekts ist eine europäische Leitlinie, die aus dem Vergleich verschiedener Entwicklungsmethoden aus den Partnerländern sowie dem Feedback aus den nationalen Workshops von Mai - Juni 2010 entstanden ist. (Feedback österreichischer Workshop siehe Kapitel V, S. 59ff). Die Leitlinie beinhaltet insbesondere eine Checkliste zur Verbesserung der Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen und ist in die Kapitel Politikstrategien (policies), strategische Planung (planning) und Objektplanung (building) zur Entwicklung der Infrastrukturen sowie deren Finanzierung (financing) und Betrieb (management) gegliedert.

Übergeordnete Grundsätze der Leitlinie, die in alle Kapitel eingearbeitet wurden, sind:

- Soziale Ausgewogenheit im Zugang zu den Infrastrukturen
- Intersektorale Strategieentwicklung der unterschiedlichen Infrastrukturentypen
- Partizipation relevanter AkteurInnen in Planungsprozessen

Die 5 Kernthemen Politikstrategien (policies), strategische Planung (planning), Objektplanung (building), Finanzierung (financing) und Betrieb (management) sind jeweils in 3 Teile gegliedert:

1. Schritt: Bestandserhebung
2. Schritt: Verbesserungsmaßnahmen
3. Best Practice Beispiele aus verschiedenen europäischen Ländern

In einem ersten Schritt soll immer der Bestand erhoben werden, erst in einem zweiten Schritt soll basierend auf dem Ist-Zustand die Weiterentwicklung der Politikstrategien, Planungsansätze, Betriebs- und Finanzierungsmodellen für Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen entstehen. Die Kriterien zur Erhebung und zur Verbesserung stellen eine inhaltliche Hilfestellung für EntscheidungsträgerInnen auf nationaler wie regionaler und lokaler Ebene. Ergänzend sollen „Best-Practice-Beispiele“ Ideen, Impulse und Anregung für die Umsetzung von Verbesserungsmaßnahmen liefern.

Die Leitlinie ist damit eine wichtige Initiative der EU. Nun liegt es an den einzelnen europäischen Ländern, die Optimierung der strategischen Entwicklung von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen weiter voranzutreiben. Die beiden Sportentwicklungspläne in Österreich, die Enqueteresolution des ÖISS sowie das IMPALA-Projekt zeigen, dass in Österreich zwar erste wichtige Schritte in Richtung verbesserter Entwicklungsstrategien von Bewegungs- und Sportinfrastrukturen gesetzt wurden, jedoch auch weiterhin Bedarf besteht innovative, integrative, partizipative und damit ressourcenschonende Planungsansätze zu optimieren. Die Leitlinie kann dazu Ansätze liefern. Die englischsprachige Leitlinie kann auf folgendem Link heruntergeladen werden:

www.impala-eu.org/fileadmin/user_upload/IMPALA_guideline_draft.pdf

(Zugriff am 7. 2. 2011)

2.8. Literatur

- BMFLFUW – Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft. (2006). *Masterplan Radfahren – Strategie zur Förderung des Radverkehrs in Österreich*. Wien: BMFLFUW. Zugriff am 13.09.2010 unter URL: <http://umwelt.lebensministerium.at/article/articleview/56062/1/7207>
- BKA – Bundeskanzleramt Österreich. (Hrsg.). (o.J.). *Österreichisches Rechtinformationssystem des Bundeskanzleramtes*. Zugriff am 01.10.2010 unter URL: <http://www.ris.bka.gv.at/>
- Cavill, N., Kahlmeier, S. & Racioppi, F. (2010). *Bewegung und Gesundheit in Europa: Erkenntnisse für das Handeln*. Englischsprachige Erstausgabe der WHO Europe 2006, deutsche Übersetzung durch Fonds Gesundes Österreich. Wien: FGÖ. Zugriff am 13.09.2010 unter URL: <http://www.fgoe.org/der-fonds/infos/who-booklets-zur-bewegung-und-gesundheit-sforderung>
- Europäische Kommission. (Hrsg.). (2010). *Sport und körperliche Betätigung. Eurobarometer 72.3*. Brüssel: Europäische Kommission. Zugriff am 04.10.2010 unter URL: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_334_de.pdf
- Edwards, P., & Tsouros, A. (2008). *A healthy city is an active city: a physical activity planning guide*. Kopenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Edwards, P. & Tsouros, A. (2010). *Bewegungsförderung und aktives Leben im städtischen Umfeld – Die Rolle der Lokalverwaltung*. WHO Europe Publikation, englischsprachige Erstausgabe 2006, deutsche Übersetzung des Fonds Gesundes Österreich, 2010. Wien: FGÖ. Zugriff am 13.09.2010 unter URL: <http://www.fgoe.org/der-fonds/infos/who-booklets-zur-bewegung-und-gesundheit-sforderung>
- Gstöttner, S., Kolb, M., Mairinger, F. & Schwarz-Viechtbauer, K. (2010). Sportentwicklungspläne – Eine neue Aufgabe für die Landschaftsplanung? *zoll+ Österreichische Schriftenreihe für Landschaft und Freiraum*, 20 (16), 43-48. Wien: ForumL – AbsolventInnenverband für Landschaftsplanung und -architektur.
- Hamedinger, A. (2006). Governance: „Neue“ Technik des Regierens und die Herstellung von Sicherheit in Städten. *Dérive – Zeitschrift für Stadtforschung*, (24), 11-14. Wien: IWI.
- Mairinger, F., Kolb, M. & Diketmüller, R. (2009). *Sportentwicklungsplan Eisenstadt*. Unveröffentlichter Endbericht, Institut für Sportwissenschaft, Universität Wien.
- Mairinger, F. (2009). *Sportentwicklungsplan Eisenstadt*. Magisterarbeit, Institut für Sportwissenschaft, Universität Wien.
- ÖISS – Österreichisches Institut für Schul- und Sportstättenbau. (2009). *Enqueteresolution für Sport- und Bewegungsräume*. Hartberg: ÖISS. Zugriff am 13.09.2010 unter URL: <http://www.oeiss.org/publikationen/?nav=sport>
- Popp, R. & Steinbach, D. (2008). *Zukunft – Freizeit – Sport. Situation und Perspektiven des Freizeit- und Breitensports in Salzburg, Werkstattbericht*. Salzburg: Zentrum für Zukunftsideen – FH Salzburg.
- Rütten, A., Frahsa, A. & Abu-Omar, K. (2010). Zur Entwicklung von politischen und infrastrukturellen Ansätzen in der Gesundheitsförderung durch Bewegung. Eine internationale Analyse. *Spectrum der Sportwissenschaft*, 22 (2), 18-31.
- Wetterich, J., Eckl, S. & Schabert W. (2009). *Grundlagen zur Weiterentwicklung von Sportanlagen*. Köln: Sportverlag Strauß.

B) ENGLISCHE VOLLVERSION (ENGLISH FULLVERSION)

I) Abstract

The development of infrastructures for physical activity and sport is currently undergoing alterations due to changes in physical activity and sports behaviour within the active parts of the population. In addition, municipalities are becoming increasingly aware of the crucial role of adequate development of sport infrastructures to support activity-orientated health promotion in inactive populations. Therefore, not only typical sport facilities but also informal opportunities for activity in public spaces are becoming the focus of attention in this field. What are the general frameworks that shape the process of developing physical activity and sport infrastructures? Where can models of good practice be found? Are there potentials for intersectoral, coordinated planning strategies for these infrastructures? As part of the EU-project IMPALA the as-it state as well as good practice models have been examined in Austria and 11 additional European countries. Main findings have been incorporated into an EU guideline with an extensive criteria catalogue. This report documents the full results found in the IMPALA project in Austria, which focused on the frameworks investigated in Austria as well as examples of good practice and development potentials.

Key words: infrastructure – sports facility – health promotion

II) IMPALA - The Project

1. Content and project partners

The EU-sponsored IMPALA project aims to identify, implement, and disseminate good practice in the planning, financing, building, and managing of local infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity.

The project's main concerns are sports and recreational facilities for leisure-time physical activity (e.g. gyms, swimming-pools, sports fields). Additionally, it will deal with opportunities for leisure-time physical activity, such as recreational areas (e.g. parks, beaches) and playgrounds.

IMPALA will assist in concerting efforts for the development of local infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity in EU member states, thus helping to reduce inequalities in access to infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity within and across nations.

The IMPALA project group currently consists of 25 institutions from 12 European nations.

a) Associated Partners

Austria: University of Vienna
Czech Republic: Palacky University, Olomouc
Denmark: University of Southern Denmark
Finland: University of Jyväskylä
France: University of Nancy
Germany: University of Erlangen-Nuremberg
Italy: University of Rome Foro Italico
Lithuania: Academy of Physical Education, Kaunas
Netherlands: TNO Quality of Life, Leiden
Norway: Oslo Universtiy College
Portugal: University of Porto
Spain: University of Extremadura

b) Collaborating Partners

Austria: Austrian Institute for School and Sport Facility Development
Czech Republic: City of Olomouc
Denmark: City of Odense – Traffic Department
Germany: German Olympic Sports Federation
Finland: Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities
France: Ministry of Health and Sports
Italy: Censis Serviui S.p.A., Acciari Consulting
Lithuania: Kaunas Municipality
Netherlands: VU University Medical Center, Netherlands, Institute for Sport and Physical Activity
Spain: Regional Government of Extremadura
WHO European Centre for Environment and Health

Project duration: January 2009 - December 2010 (24 months)

2. Strategic objectives of the IMPALA-project

- To assess national policies for the development of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity
- To assess national mechanisms in the development of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity
- To agree on good practice criteria for policies and mechanisms for the development of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity
- To disseminate and implement good practice recommendations

More details on the project and information about the following work packages can be found on the project's website:

www.impala-eu.org

III) Work package 1: Assessment of National Policies

The aim of this work package was to assess national policies for developing local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity by identifying existing regulatory laws and guidelines for the development of those infrastructures. The work package goal was fulfilled by taking qualitative interviews with experts and policy-makers. The work package was lead by TNO Leiden, Netherlands. An overall European report will be published in September 2009 (estimated).

1. Planning process and facility types of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity

The process of developing infrastructures includes the following four elements:

- a) planning/designing,
- b) financing,
- c) building, and
- d) managing of local infrastructures.

The local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity contains the following three facility types:

1. Sports facilities (i.e. public and commercial facilities)
2. Facilities designed for sports and physical activity (e.g. playgrounds, cycle paths)
3. Facilities not designed for sports and physical activity but usable for LTPA nonetheless (e.g. forests and beaches).

2. Methods - Individual interviews and focus group discussion

The research on existing laws and guidelines is based on qualitative socio-scientific methods. At least 6 individual expert interviews are taken in every member state. To identify relevant interview partners in the different sectors the following this sampling matrix guided the selection:

Sector	Sports			Urban planning			Tourism & Recreation		
	1. Sports facilities	2. Facilities designed for sports and physical activity - PA	3. Facilities not designed for sports and PA but usable nonetheless	1.)	2.)	3.)	1.)	2.)	3.)
<i>Type of facilities</i>									
National level									
Regional level									
Local Level									

Table 1: Sampling matrix of IMPALA – Individual Interviews

The interview guideline can be found in the Appendix I). A detailed overview and information on the Austrian experts is given in part III) Report on individual interviews, chapter 3.1.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed. The results were summarized through an open coding method of the interview texts and paraphrasing the statements. The report on the individuals is part III) of this paper.

Additionally to the individual expert interviews a focus group discussion with experts on the executive level was initialised. A maximum of 10 experts for the focus group in each country were selected by the following criteria:

1. Two local municipalities
2. Two NGO's involved in coordinating land use for recreation or sports
3. Two larger commercial contractors/property developers with regional coverage
4. Two larger local sports facilities/complexes housing more than one type of sport (e.g. swimming pool, fitness facility, athletics, soccer field).
5. Two larger sport clubs (e.g. local field hockey/soccer club)

The Austrian results and overview of the Austrian experts of the focus group can be found in this paper's part IV) Report on the Austrian focus group. The focus group discussion was recorded and transcribed. The results were summarized through an open coding method of the interview texts and paraphrasing the statements.

3. Report on Austrian Individual Interviews

3.1. Country specific background information

The Republic of Austria is a federal, parliamentary representative democracy through the Federal Constitution of 1920, reintroduced in 1945. Austria consists of nine federal states with all in all 8.3 million inhabitants. The head of state is the Federal President (Bundespräsident), who is directly elected. The chairman of the Federal Government is the Federal Chancellor, who is appointed by the president after federal elections every five years (Nationalratswahlen). The Parliament of Austria consists of two chambers, the National Council (Nationalrat) and the Federal Council (Bundesrat). With the separation of state powers into legislative and executive, the courts (judiciary) are the third column of Austrian state powers. Notably the Constitutional Court (Verfassungsgerichtshof) may exert considerable influence on the political system by ruling out laws and ordinances not in compliance with the constitution. Just like the federation, the nine states of Austria all have written state constitutions defining them to be republican entities governed according to the principles of representative democracy. The state constitutions congruently define the states to be unicameral parliamentary democracies; each state has a legislature elected by popular votes and a cabinet appointed by its legislature.

Therefore issues of mass sports and physical activity as well as issues on planning, tourism and recreation are issues on a federal state level in Austria. Every one of the nine federal states has its own policies, laws and guidelines on sports, on planning and on tourism or recreation. The responsibility for developing infrastructure for leisure time physical activity is not a cooperative, intersectoral process at the moment, in none of the nine federal states. The three different types of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity are developed by different sectors (sports, planning, tourism, recreation and environment) which are marginal connected. The duty of the nine federal state governments and their administration is to develop the infrastructure in partnership with smaller regions and municipalities. Therefore even within the single federal states differences exist between smaller regions or single municipalities depending on their specific political networks.

In Austria the ÖISS – Österreichisches Institut für Schul- und Sportstätten (Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities) is a foundation that works on policies of sports facility planning on a national as well as on a regional level. The development of infrastructure for leisure time physical activity as a cooperative intersectoral method for all three types of facilities became a stronger issue recently and is summarized by the first published concept on a national level called “Enqueteresolution für Sport- und Bewegungsräume” (enquete’s resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity). At the moment there are two pilot projects on municipal and regional sport facility planning in Austria. One project took place in the region around the town of Hartberg, Federal State Styria, was commissioned by the federal state to the ÖISS who worked with a of sport planers (Margarete und Martin Havel, Havel&Havel GesmbH) and landscape planers (Sabine Gstöttner, office inspirin). The second project took place in the capitol of the Federal State of Burgenland, in the city of

Eisenstadt, led by the Institute of Sport Science, University of Vienna (Team: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Michael Kolb, Ass.-Univ.-Prof. Dr. Rosa Diketmüller, Cand. Mag. Franz Mairinger). Both projects involved local authorities, sports associations and population groups to investigate specific needs for a future development of local infrastructure for sports and physical activity. A plan of measurements is the result of both projects. While the project of Hartberg had the benefit of working in a region (network of municipalities) the project in Eisenstadt took more intensive efforts to investigate the population's needs, discussing the results with local representatives of the population, politicians and sports associations and finally working out measures and further steps within this local platform in a participative process. As a further step both project groups intend to exchange their experiences from Eisenstadt and Hartberg together with the ÖISS and could be influential on further infrastructural developments for physical activity in Austria.

3.2. Main findings

The development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity in Austria takes place on a federal state or municipal level. The development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity in Austria is based on sectoral programmes and concepts, which in many cases are non-compulsory measures of the communes. There are only few policy papers on a national level due to the federal system of the Austrian Republic and therefore most of the papers are made on a regional level. If policies exist they are mostly developed for specific facility types (sport facilities, cycling facilities, playgrounds, etc.) or not exclusively deal with infrastructure for leisure-time physical activities. Most projects on local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity are built and developed individually in each municipality or smaller region. Different sectors (sports, planning, tourism, recreation, environment) are responsible for the three facility types. Those sectors are not necessarily connected in the development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. There are tendencies to work out policies for connecting strategies for all types of facilities by the ÖISS (Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities). The major benefit in developing infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity in the current situation is the good possibility to adapt them due to local conditions. The major problem area is the dependence on singular political actors that are or are not aware of the importance of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity.

3.3. Selection of experts

In Austria 24 organisations from the sectors sports, urban planning, recreation/tourism and environment were contacted. From the sports sector 2 organisations were on a national level and 4 on a federal state level. From the planning sector 3 organisations were consulted on a national level and 6 on a federal state level. From the environmental and tourism sector 2 organisations were asked on a national level and 7 organisations on a regional level. On the regional level we had contact with organisations from 5 out of 9 Austrian federal states. The experts were selected after consulting our personal network from the sports and from the planning and environmental sector and additionally by asking institutions, where we had no personal contact before, but which could be responsible for developing local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. Either through personal or new found contacts we found the final interview partners by the snowball method.

Finally we conducted 10 individual interviews. We decided to conduct more than 6 interviews because of the strong role of policy making on a federal state level in Austria. 4 interviews, one of each sector (sports, planning, tourism), took place with organisations on a national level. 6 interviews took place with organisations on a regional level. 3 interviews on the regional level, one of each sector, were taken in Vienna. This row of interviews represents infrastructural development for leisure-time physical activity in urban areas. Another row of 3 expert interviews took place 2 federal states of Austria, who represent rural areas. The sports and the tourism sector were covered by 2 interviews in Lower Austria. The interview from the planning sector was held with an institute of Upper Austria. One reason was that one major expert of the planning department went on pension. Other arguments were that the planning sector did not feel that the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity was a major topic in their department and infrastructure like cycling paths are more an everyday not a leisure-time infrastructure. The following 11 experts from 10 organisations were consulted for the individual interviews:

<i>Sector</i>	Sports	Urban planning	Tourism & Recreation	
<i>Type of facilities</i>	Sports facilities	Facilities designed for sports and physical activity (PA)	Facilities designed for sports and PA	Facilities not designed for sports and PA but usable nonetheless
National level	ÖISS – Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities 1 (Head of the institute) Austrian Federal Ministry of Defense and Sports - Department V/2: General Federal Sports Funding, Investment Funding, Major Events, Sports and Society 2 (Head of the institute)	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management - Department for Traffic/ Mobility/ Urban Area/ Noise 5 (Coordination for Cycling)		Austrian Federal Forests 9 (Real Estates and Tourism)
Regional level <i>Federal States of Lower and Upper Austria (Rural Areas)</i>	Federal State Administration of Lower Austria – Group Economy, Sports and Tourism – Department for Sports 3 (Head of the department)	IFAU – Institute for Applied Environmental Education (Upper Austria) 6 (Head of the institute, Organisation of annual Austrian symposium on play grounds and open space)	Federal State's Publicity - Agency of Lower Austria 10 (Coordination of touristic cycling in Lower Austria)	
Local/Regional Level <i>Municipality and Federal State of Vienna (Urban Areas)</i>	Municipal Department 51 – Sports Office of Vienna – Department of Sport Facilities 4 (Head of department)	Municipal Department 18 – Urban Development and Planning – Department Open Space and Landscape Planning 7 (Head of the department) 8 (Project Consultant of the department, Sport Facility Planning)		Municipal Department 49 – Forestry Office and Urban Agriculture – Group 1 Urban Forest, National Park and Biosphere Parks 11 (Head of department)

Table 2: Sampling matrix of the Austrian IMPALA Interview partners IMPALA

a) National level:

- ÖISS – Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities: Head of the institute

The ÖISS is installed by the state and the federal states, with the head office in Vienna and regional offices in the five federal states of Austria: Upper Austria, Salzburg, Styria, Tyrol, Vorarlberg. The ÖISS provides information on sports facility planning, guides planning competitions, examines projects of national and regional interest especially on technical and economical aspects.

- Austrian Federal Ministry of Defense and Sports - Department V/2: General Federal Sports Funding, Investment Funding, Major Events, Sports and Society: Head of the department

The duties of this department of the Austrian Ministry of Sports are in general funding and organising major sports events e. g. the European Football Championship in 2009. Until the early 1990ies a department for leisure-time physical activity still existed within the ministry, also providing a small budget for this field. At the moment the departments of the Ministry of Sports are neither working on leisure-time physical activity nor on the development of local infrastructure in this field. Recently, the interviewee worked on the chapter of sports infrastructure in the paper "Zukunft:Sport" ("future:sports") and is member of the steering committee of the ÖISS. The meeting with the interviewee took place after the report was written. Due to the short time quota of the interview only some open matters were discussed instead of using the whole interview guideline.

- Austrian Federal Forests – Real Estates and Tourism: Head of department

The Austrian Federal Forests is a state-owned enterprise that manages forests and lakes that are state-property. The organisations duty is to manage those estates in terms of sustainable forestry and water management. Along with those main responsibilities they also work on concepts for tourism and recreation management for mountainbiking, hiking, horse riding, swimming, diving, etc. The Austrian Federal Forests consist of one head office, 25 regional forestry companies, 2 technical forestry companies, 1 sawmill, 2 forestry administrations for national parks and 1 tourism office.

- Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management - Department for Traffic / Mobility / Urban Area / Noise: Coordination for Cycling

This department of the ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management works on different matters improving the environment of built-up areas. Ecological tourism and mobility are their major issues. Especially the "Master Plan Cycling", a policy paper to increase the percentage of cycling within the total volume of traffic in Austria from 5 to 10 %, was developed and is now executed in every federal state of Austria. This master plan was worked out for everyday usage of bicycles mainly as an environmental measurement.

b) Local/Regional Level: Municipality and Federal State of Vienna (Urban Area)

- Municipal Department 51 – Sports Office of Vienna – Department for Sports Facility Development (Head of department)

This municipal department works on concepts concerning sports issues in Vienna starting from events in the competitive sports sector to sportive activities of the population and

administering and maintaining larger sport facilities. The municipal department consists of 10 subdivisions; one of them is the department of sports facility development.

- Municipal Department 18 – Urban Development and Planning – Department Open Space and Landscape Planning: Head of department and Department's Consultant i. a. Sport Facility Planning

This municipal department works on concepts concerning urban development and planning in Vienna e. g. new development areas for housing, urban greenery networks ("green belts"), urban traffic plans including cycling lanes. The department consists of 11 subdivisions; one of them is the department of open space and landscape planning, which recently also starts to work on the topic of physical activity.

- Municipal Department 49 - Forestry Office and Urban Agriculture – Group 1 Urban Forest, National Park and Biosphere Parks: Head of department

This municipal department works on concepts concerning urban forestry and agriculture in Vienna and consists of 9 subdivisions; one of them is the group for urban forest, national park and biosphere parks. It is responsible for existing hiking and mountain biking tracks. Their work includes the cooperation with the neighbour federal state of Lower Austria, which surrounds the area of Vienna, connecting the facilities. Within the city area the department guides and consults the 23 of Vienna districts in building and maintaining infrastructure for hiking, jogging or mountain biking.

c) Regional level: Federal States of Lower and Upper Austria (Rural Areas)

- Federal State Administration of Lower Austria – Group Economy, Sports and Tourism – Department for Sports: Head of department

This federal state department works on concepts all sports issues in Lower Austria. As a subgroup of the economical department it i. a. provides budgets for building and maintaining Lower Austrian sport facilities (mainly professional and competitive sports facilities).

- IFAU – Institute for Applied Environmental Education (Upper Austria): (Head of the institute)

This non-governmental institute is a major organisation in Austria for the development of playgrounds especially through organising an annual symposium on playgrounds and open space since 1995. Other activities of the 7 employees are environmental education, municipal and regional development and designing open space and playgrounds.

- Federal State's Publicity Agency of Lower Austria: (Coordination of cycling tourism in Lower Austria)

One major activity of the federal state publicity agency of Lower Austria is the management of tourism issues. Besides hiking tourism the cycling tourism plays a strong role within the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity in Lower Austria.

3.4. National policy

According to the information provided by the interviewed experts working on a national (=state) level or on a regional (=federal state) level, two recent policy documents explicitly deal with the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity on a national level: "Zukunft:Sport" (future:sports) by the Austrian ministry of sports, 2008, and "Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume" (enquete's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity) by the ÖISS, 2009. Those national papers are recommendations and

action plans that are not compulsory. Additionally we found out about regional documents either for specific types of facilities or that indirectly or not exclusively deal with infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. In general Austrian policies for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity are developed on a regional level (=federal state) or even only on a local level (= small regions or municipalities).

Within the spatial planning law of the federal states of Austria, there are development programmes some specifically for sport facilities some in general for the inventory of central municipalities, which are de jure a regulations or decrees. The impact of this papers is very different, varying from only general statements (the federal state only guarantees a suitable amount of sport facilities for the population and for school - e. g. Carinthia, Lower Austria) to quite sophisticated regulation (including environmental aspects, architectural quality, etc. - e. g. Styria). Those regulations base on versions from the 1970ies and only some were updated (e. g. Styria updated the regulation in the 1990ies). Within those development programmes of the spatial law or within the sport law depending on the federal state, there are laws to protect sport facilities. This means it is the duty of the federal states to modernize the facilities and to keep this land reserved for sportive usage.

3.4.1. National policy documents

a) Overview

Name document	Topic	Organisation (author)	Level (national regional)	Target group
1 <i>Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume (enquête's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity)</i>	Concept paper to work on the paradigmatic change of needs for infrastructure for sports and physical activity	ÖISS (2009)	national	Scientific and municipal, administrative experts of the fields sports, health, planning, etc.
2 <i>Sammelmappe Sportstätten-Richtlinien (Collection of technical Guidelines for specific sports facilities)</i>	Technical Guidelines for specific sports facilities	ÖISS (2009)	national	Planners and Municipalities who intend to built facilities
3 <i>Österr. Sportstättenplan (Austrian Sports Facility Plan)</i>	Inventory and m ² -key on lack of sport facilities for Austrian municipalities (historic document)	ÖISS (1968-1980)	national and regional	Municipal administrations
4 <i>Zukunft:Sport (Future:Sports)</i>	expert paper on the future of Austrian sports	Ministry of Sports (2008)	national	Experts on the field of sports
5 <i>Ö-Normen (Austrian Standards)</i>	Technical standards for building and constructing infrastructures	Austrian Standards Institute	national	Planners and Municipalities who intend to built

		(continuous)		facilities
6 <i>Masterplan Radfahren. (Masterplan Cycling)</i>	Strategy paper on the increase of cycling within the total traffic volume in Austria	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (2008)	national	Experts of regional and local level, planners working in this field.
7 <i>Österreichisches Seenkonzzept (Austrian Concept for Lakes).</i>	Paper on useage and maintainance of Austrian lakes	<i>Austrian Federal Forests (2002)</i>	national	General public information
8 <i>Fairplay-Regeln Mountainbiken (Fairplay rules for Mountainbikers).</i>	Paper on behaviour in the forests for mountainbiking	<i>Austrian Federal Forests</i>	national	Mountain bikers
9 <i>Fairplay-Regeln Reiten (Fairplay rules for Horse Riding)</i>	Paper on behaviour in the forests for horse riding	<i>Austrian Federal Forests</i>	national	Horse riders
10 <i>STEP 05 - Stadtentwicklungsplan Wien 2005 (Urban development plan of Vienna, 2005).</i>	Master plan of urban development in Vienna from 2005-2015	City of Vienna (2005)	regional	Viennese Municipal Departments, Experts and developers working in this field (e. g. Planners)
11 <i>Das Wiener Parkleitbild (The Viennese Guideline for the Development of Parks)</i>	Guideline for the Development of Viennese Parks	Vienna's Municipal Department 42 – Parks and Gardens (2008)	regional	Viennese Municipal Departments, Experts and developers working in this field (e. g. Planners)
12 <i>Spielraumförderung NEU. (Play Ground Subsidies NEW)</i>	Brochure for applications to subsidies for neighbourhood improvements or for renovating a play-ground in Upper Austria	Regional Government of Upper Austria – Department Housing (2009)	regional	Municipalities, Developers of housing projects and Planners in Upper Austria
13 <i>Landesentwicklungskonzept für Niederösterreich - (Concept for Regional Development of Lower Austria)</i>	Principles and aims of integrated spatial development in Lower Austria	Regional Government of Lower Austria: (2004)	regional	Experts on federal state and municipal level, experts and developers working in this field (e. g. Planners)
14 <i>Kriterien für touristische Hauptradrouten in Niederösterreich. (Criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria), St. Pölten, Austria.</i>	Criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria	Cycling Coordination of the Federal State Publicity Agency of Lower Austria (2008)	regional	Experts on federal state and municipal level, experts and developers working in this field (e. g. Planners)

Table 3: Overview on Austria's National and Regional Policy Documents

b) Description

One very general kept document is an expert paper that deals with the future of sports in Austria: "Zukunft:Sport" (Austrian ministry of sports, 2008). The former state secretary of sports (since 2008 the ministry of sports) therefore invited agents and experts on a national level (e. g. ÖISS) and on a regional level from every federal state in Austria to discuss the development of sports in Austria. One chapter of this paper deals with issues on the development of sports facilities for leisure time physical activities. One critique in the individual interviews was that this paper is kept very superficial noting that infrastructure for leisure time is a general need and has to be established by the federal states.

The second explicit document, "Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume" (enquete's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity), was presented in March 2009 at the Austrian conference "Sportstättenenquete" (sports facility conference), organised by the ÖISS. The two days conference provided a broad range of lectures on strategies and on recent sports facility planning: e. g. sports facility development in certain federal states and in municipalities, pilot projects of cooperative sports planning, technical aspects of sports facility planning (e. g. standard sizes and markings of sport facilities in Austrian schools combining basketball, football, volleyball and handball, the use of materials to guarantee security for accidents), school yards, physical activity in the open landscape, gender aspects, planning for handicapped people, etc.

The conference was summarized by the enquete's resolution which among other subjects resulted into issues like cooperative planning methods for municipalities and regions in Austria. The resolution is a first step towards a follow-up model to the dated document from 1968, the Austrian Sports Facility Plan (Österreichischer Sportstättenplan), which was an inventory of all sports facilities that nominated a quantitative m²-key for the lack of facilities in each Austrian municipality, each Austrian federal state and on a national level. In the federal states the Austrian Sports Facility plan was worked out into laws and degrees on federal state level and was compulsory. The problem of this paper was that it did not involve regional aspects, everywhere in Austria the same m²-key was in use. Additionally at the conference on sport facilities in 1968 the basis for the general use of sport facilities of schools in evenings or weekends for sport associations in whole Austria was made. Also this aspect is regulated by the federal states themselves.

The new paper, the "Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume" (enquete's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity), offers a broader view to the meaning of infrastructure towards physical activity including now facilities for the organised sports sector and as well as for big population group doing self-organized physical activity. Though some interviewed experts prefer to have a standardized tool for planning infrastructures like the Austrian Sports Facility Plan from 1968, the aim of the resolution is to communicate the benefits of a modified paradigm in planning and developing infrastructure for physical activity not summarized in a simple instrument as a quantitative m²-key. The enquete's resolution was discussed and passed by the ÖISS supervisory board, which consists of all national and

federal state sports commissioners. The work group regularly meets to discuss this topic, still goes on with negotiations and will implement the resolutions guidelines.

Within the other sectors (Environment, Health, Urban Planning) there are neither national nor regional strategy papers that only deal with developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activities. Some of them are specified documents for playgrounds, for cycling or for hiking infrastructure. (e. g. "Play Ground Subsidies NEW" from Upper Austria or "Criteria for tourism top cycling paths" from Lower Austria). Other regional documents only indirectly deal with the development of leisure-time physical activity by recording the importance of recreational infrastructure in general or by rating m²-keys for open space within the urban area (e. g. the urban development plan of Vienna or the Concept for Regional Development of Lower Austria).

The Austrian Federal Forests worked out three documents on a national level dealing with users rules for the infrastructure for leisure time physical activity (for lakes, mountainbiking and horse riding) that are in state property. There is an Austrian law on forestry that generally allows the usage of the forest by the population as a recreation area but there are no further national strategies on developing that the infrastructures.

There is one national policy document for everyday cycling as an environmental measure. This programme is financed by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management ("Masterplan Radfahren – Master Plan Cycling"). One step forward was an entry on the cycling traffic in the Austrian government programme. The cycling traffic should be doubled from 5% to 10% until 2015.

Other Austrian documents are technical guidelines and laws for planning and building, which marginally include the development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. Those documents record technical and safety standards: e. g. (1) the "ÖNORM" (catalogue of Austrian technical standards) - among others for example ÖNORM B 2605 outdoor sport facilities, ÖNORM B 2606 surfaces of outdoor sport facilities, or (2) the nine "Bauordnungen" (Building regulations) of the nine federal states e. g. in Vienna playgrounds for small children under 6 years are compulsory in housing estates bigger than 14 apartments, additionally playgrounds for bigger children and teenagers are compulsory in housing estates with 50 apartments or bigger.

3.4.2. National policies for population subgroups

There are no specific policies or notations in national policy documents dealing with the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. There are Austrian laws dealing with antidiscrimination in general e. g. against discrimination of gender. Another example, the "Behindertengleichstellungsgesetz" (equality law for handicapped people), prescribes among other aspects that public buildings must be accessible to handicapped people. Within our interviews we could not find out how many sport facilities are accessible for handicapped people. Especially older facilities are not renewed according to this law. The Ministry of Sport has made a new strategy, sport facilities of national relevance (esp. facilities for professional competitive sport) have to be evaluated by the ÖISS, which plans to work

together with the Austrian Handicapped Sports Organisation, An inventory on handicapped friendly sports facilities was never made. A pilot project to make open nature accessible for wheel chair user is a walking path around a Carinthian lake initiated by the Austrian Federal Forests.

In general policies concerning population subgroups are made on a federal state level and the range of policies differ. In Vienna e. g. there is a planning directory for specific gender needs, there are departments for integration and for adolescent people. In Lower Austria the tourism cycling paths include not too steep routes that are friendly for families and children equipped with playground and other attractions on the route. In Upper Austria subsidies for playgrounds include planning criteria with gender aspects.

3.5. Regional/local policy

In general Austrian policies for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity are developed on a regional level (=federal state) or even only specifically on a local level (= small regions or municipalities). The main reasons are that federal states in Austria have a high autonomy in governing the countries (due to the federal political structure in Austria) and that the term “infrastructures for leisure-time physical activities” summarizes a heterogeneous field of different actors and policies that vary from federal state to federal state.

There are no policies for the planning process that connect the three types of facilities. Even within one facility type the range of methods how planning projects are initiated can be very different. Most infrastructures are developed on a local, municipal level and are adapted due to local conditions. In practice the municipality initiates and decides to develop playgrounds, cycling paths, sport facilities, hiking tracks, etc.

To plan and design the facilities it is common that external planning offices and civil engineers are awarded with a contract by a municipality or a region. In large municipalities with bigger administrations some infrastructures are made by employed planners. E. g. in Vienna cycling paths, hiking tracks, many playgrounds, etc. are done by the different municipal departments. For bigger infrastructures, depending on the costs of the project, architects and planners are found by competitions to enhance a certain project quality. Smaller projects can be awarded directly.

The building process is strongly connected to the planning and designing part of the project. After designing the infrastructures on the paper and finding the right financing form for a project a construction firm is found to build the infrastructure. For bigger infrastructures a call for bids is done. Smaller projects can be awarded directly. In case of bigger housing projects it is compulsory to build playgrounds (e. g. building laws in Vienna). In Vienna the city tries to offer a great range of playground and public facilities for leisure-time physical activity.

Usually master planning (= creating a map or a catalogue expressing conceptual requirements in a greater contexts for a specific area to guide the realization of architectural

designs. A master plan could e. g. define where housing estates, where greenery, where commercial or industrial areas will be situated and what general qualities the areas should have e. g. defining that the houses will be a blocks or single family homes, defining maximum heights and densities, etc.), especially in bigger municipalities is done before single building projects are developed. E. g. in Vienna the master plan for urban development prescribes a 3,5 m² of green area for each inhabitant, prescribes a green network through the city and affects the land use and zoning plans of Vienna. The principle of master planning is done in most municipalities to guarantee certain amounts of land to certain usages. In case of cycling infrastructure master planning is done within the different federal states. In general infrastructure for leisure-time physical activities are planned in reach of public transport.

The form of financing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity varies a lot, depending on the size of the project and the measures of the different federal states. An important financing form are subsidies connected to quality criteria to guarantee certain infrastructural standards. This method is practiced for playgrounds in e. g. in the federal states of Lower Austria and Upper Austria (federal state's housing departments). In Lower Austria sport facilities of a certain size are financed by federal state (federal state's economy department) or by regional subsidies (regional management departments), but the project quality is individually awarded, depending on the type of the project. Another form of financing is the model of co-financing. In case of top routes for cycling tourism in Lower Austria, which are nominated by the federal state and have to fulfil certain quality criteria, they are financed 2/3 by the federal state (federal state's economy department) and 1/3 by the municipalities that are connected by the infrastructure. Some recreational facilities in the open landscape need connection between two or more federal states. In those cases the federal states cooperate in planning and co-finance the facilities (cycling or hiking paths). In Vienna most of the projects are co-financed partly by the central budget of the city and partly by the decentralized budget of the Viennese districts. Bigger urban developments are financed by the central budget or are even co-financed by the European Union. E. g. a new park within a new housing area in Vienna was built by funds of the EU. Inside the park there are many zones for different physical activities. Two programmes by the European Union to improve infrastructure in general are the URBAN programme (e. g. there are projects in Vienna and Graz financed by the URBAN funds) and the LEADER programme, which funds regional projects in rural areas. Recently, bigger infrastructures are also developed in form of public-private-partnerships, where the question how to finance the management and maintenance of an infrastructure in the future is included in the planning process.

The management of the facilities varies. Sport facilities are often managed by the municipalities themselves. Many sport facilities, which are used for leisure-time physical activity are school properties owned by the municipality or the federation (elementary and secondary schools are property of the municipalities, grammar schools/high schools are property of the federation). Some other sport facilities, are managed by one of the three Austrian sport associations ASKÖ, Sportunion or ASVÖ, sport clubs or private users, who rent the estates. Facilities like parks, cycling paths or forests that are public space are usually managed by the municipalities. E. g. parks in Vienna are administrated and maintained by the municipal department 42 – parks and gardens. Forests and open

landscape of Vienna are administrated by the municipal department 49 –forestry and urban agriculture, etc. Facilities in rural areas like hiking paths or mountainbike tracks are either maintained by the municipalities or alpine associations.

Most of the facilities are already established and exist for long time. This means the question of renovation is another aspect of planning facilities. For sport facilities we found out that in two federal states (Styria and Vienna – probably there are more) there is a law to protect existing sport facilities (Sportstättenschutzgesetz). This means sport facilities have to be maintained and modernized after some time.

3.5.1. Tuning national to regional/local policies

Most of the policies are made in the federal states in Austria. There are mainly two kind of activities that discuss and bring ideas together on a national or at least supraregional level: First of all there are annual meetings of the different sectors (sports, cycling, playgrounds and open space). Secondly there are workgroups, one from the ÖISS and some more to discuss technical standards.

The annual meetings of the different sectors are not coordinated intersectoral. Those meetings are not compulsory but still most of the relevant actors of each sector are involved: There is an annual conference of the federal state's sport consultants. There is another annual meeting for cycling experts and another one for experts and planners for playgrounds and open space. The ÖROK (Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning) is a conference on a national level for spatial planning, but the issue of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity is only marginal discussed there. All of the interviewed experts mentioned that there are no publications or documents based on those meetings (except the ÖROK has reports and development programmes based on their conferences). The meetings have more the character of networking events to exchange experience in those field.

For playgrounds and for sport facilities there are additional workgroups installed to discuss technical standards called Ö-Norm (Austrian Standards). Another workgroup that consists of national and federal state coordinators implements the "master plan cycling" by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management. Additionally a consulting programme and a financing programme is installed for municipal administrations, developers, tourism offices and planning offices who built the cycling infrastructure.

Maybe the most relevant work group for the IMPALA study was installed by the ÖISS to work out new guidelines for developing infrastructure for physical activity. A first public release of this work group (mainly the ÖISS supervisory board) is the "Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume" (enquete's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity), presented in March 2009 at the Austrian conference "Sportstättenenquete" (sports facility conference).

3.6. Stakeholder analysis (relevant Austrian actors in the field of development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity)

3.6.1. Policymakers

The three types of facilities (sports facilities, facilities designed for sports and physical activity and facilities not designed for sports and physical activity but usable nonetheless) are administrated by different fields and coordinated on federal state or municipal level. There is no over-all intersectoral concept for developing infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity. If policies are made, the strategies and papers are made for specific facilities like cycling or playgrounds and are first discussed between the political level and the administrative level of a federal state or within the municipality, in case of bigger cities. In rare cases they are discussed on a national level (Master Plan Cycling). Most of the facilities are not developed by the guidance of regional or national policies or strategies. Therefore the municipalities have strongest role in decision making. This means that the situation of decision making in Austria is very heterogeneous.

3.6.2. Collaborating partners

The actors and parties participating in the development of leisure-time physical activities vary within the three different types of facilities. In general the field of sports facility planning is independent from the stakeholder of the other two types of facilities. The relevant actors for facilities designed for sports and physical activity and facilities not designed for physical activity but useable nonetheless are sometimes the same stakeholders and there is more cooperation and exchange within their federal state or municipality.

Sport facilities are in general matters of political agents for sports and the administrative departments for sports on a federal level and are guided by the ÖISS (Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities). The dated policy, the Austrian Sports Facility Plan, is not in use anymore. The ÖISS tries to define a new strategy for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity at the moment and therefore published a first concept, the resolution on sports facilities. Traditionally there is a strong influence of the Austrian sports associations. The sports sector is therefore also interested in developing facilities for professional sports additional to facilities for leisure-time physical activity.

A special situation affects swimming facilities that are not developed for swimming championships: They are either administrated by a own department for public pools like in Vienna or are administrated by the health department like in Lower Austria.

Facilities designed for sports and physical activity are the duty of the federal state sectors urban and spatial planning, cycling coordinators, tourism and environment. The administrative level define the criteria for subsidises and funds e. g. for cycling paths or playgrounds on a federal state or municipal level usually after discussing the issues with the councillors of the local government. In urban areas departments for forestry, urban planning and for urban parks can be awarded to work out guidelines for the amount of green areas and guidelines for the qualities of the parks. It is not a single sector or stakeholder leading the decision making but the personal commitment of politicians and persons working in the

administration are highly necessary. Non-governmental organisations (e. g. interest groups for cycling) are sometimes involved in the process either because they try to initiate projects or programme with a communal partner themselves or they play an advisory role for the communal actors.

The development of surroundings not designed for sports and physical activity but usable nonetheless are duties of the owner of the territory, who might be the state, a federal state, a municipality or private owners. In case of communal property the environmental sector and the land use and forestry departments of the federal states or municipalities are responsible for the policy making. In case of state property the Austrian Federal Forests, who additionally administrates state-owned lakes are responsible. At a local level they work together with non-governmental actors like alpine associations, horse riding associations or diving associations.

In the planning process of all three types of infrastructure of leisure-time physical activity the end-users are hardly involved. In case of sports facilities the sports associations are asked and represent the interests of their members. More difficult is the participation of the population doing self-organized physical activity because they are a very heterogeneous group. In some cases like new housing areas it is difficult to find out specific needs because the future inhabitants are unknown. Most of the parks (in Vienna) are planned with participation of the neighbourhood. Though most of the interviewed experts are conscious about the importance of involving the population in the planning process it is still an exception that end-users participate in planning in Austria, but the amount of project increases.

3.6.3. Benefits and downfalls of existing policies

All of the experts mentioned as a major benefit of the existing Austrian situation that the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity is very flexible and therefore can be easily adapted to local conditions. The constructive exchange between different competences in diverse sectors and departments in municipalities and in federal states and the cooperative process of decision making are an expression of democracy. The good network is another major benefit of the existing situation. Also the involvement of the municipalities and districts guarantee a high accuracy to plan due to local, individual requirements. The existing system in Austria is motivating actors for own initiatives.

In case of the national master plan for cycling it has a high political acceptance and is quite successful on an executive level. Many regions in Austria are motivated to improve their cycling facilities recently. It created a positive competition between the different federal states and on the local level the population and politicians are convinced about the improvement of the cycling infrastructure.

One expert pointed out the elaborate concept of planning green areas in Vienna. The city builds up reserves of green areas, so that the green areas can be defined before the building process of housing areas starts. Therefore the greenery can grow in the meantime to be used right from the beginning of the new housing areas.

Obverse to the benefit of the high freedom for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity is the dependence of single actors who are or are not committed to sports and physical activity. The ÖISS therefore started to develop strategies to improve the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity and launched the first concept, the “Enqueteresolution Sport- und Bewegungsräume” (enquete’s resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity). It is a first step to create a higher sensibility for the topic in Austria although it gets more difficult to develop infrastructures because of the higher range of types of physical activity nowadays. Many of the experts emphasise that a new instrument like cooperative sports facility planning like the two Austrian pilot projects done in Eisenstadt and Hartberg (also see chapter 1. of the Austrian Report) could help to improve the development of infrastructure for physical activities. This instrument brings together all three types of facilities, investigates the needs of a municipality or region and discusses the measures with local authorities, sports and other associations and population (This planning method was i. a. worked out by Dr. Alfred Rütten). The interviewees expect that this new instrument would show the effort of the municipal level more clearly and would guarantee a transparency of the development process. Therefore some of the experts wish to get more assistance by the federal states and federation to establish instruments for all over Austria.

Another problem area named was that the sometimes insufficient organisation for the usage of the existing facilities. Many sports facilities of schools and sports organisations are only frequently used at certain daytimes. At times they are not used they could be accessible for groups like adolescent persons or students. In Vienna the department for “Mehrfachnutzung” (multiple usage) tries to open school facilities but only few examples could be realized. It is mainly a question of legal liability to open schools e. g. on weekends or in the summer holidays.

At some places urban nature and forests are used to intensively by mountainbikers, joggers, hikers, etc. This means ecological problems and conflicts between user groups especially between mountainbikers and hikers. There are plans and strategies to offer those groups separate path systems. In urban areas this can be difficult due to the general lack of green areas in cities.

Public outdoor facilities cannot be used in the evening. Some of the facilities were equipped with light systems. Evening usage means extra costs for the commune and additional noise in the neighbourhood therefore this strategy cannot be applied to every public outdoor facility.

Another problem area most of the experts mentioned was how self-organised groups can be involved in the process of the development for leisure-time infrastructure.

3.7. Overall conclusion

The development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity in Austria takes place on a federal state or municipal level. The development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity in Austria is based on sectoral programmes and concepts, which in many cases are non compulsory measures of the commune. The benefit of this practice is that planning measures can be developed according to local conditions. There are only few policy papers on a national level due to the federal system of the Austrian Republic and therefore most of the papers are made on a regional level. Only few general policy papers exist dealing explicitly with infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. The existing policies mostly deal with specific facility types (sport facilities, cycling facilities, playgrounds, etc.) and different sectors are responsible for them. The situation of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity seems to be satisfying but could be improved. The ÖISS (Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities) already began to work out a concept, called the enquete's resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity, a concept that shows tendencies for better integration of all types of facilities. This could be an occasion to build up a better intersectoral network on developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. Although the different actors may have different interests an intersectoral network could mean new synergies for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity.

4. Report on the Austrian Focus Group

4.1. Summary: Main findings

An overall perspective for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity is not a common topic in Austria.

There is no instrument at the moment to coordinate the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity.

There is no network of people working in the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity.

The problem areas in developing, maintaining and giving access to the facilities are different for sports and fitness associations and for organisation working in public space.

Access to the different infrastructures is provided for broad public and diversified offers in sports clubs as well as in public space can be found.

The management of using the different facilities could be improved through better timetables and multi-shift and temporary usage.

Master plans of coordinated development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should an important quality criterion for the allocation of subsidies.

The participation of the population and non-governmental organisations in the planning process is a strong recommendation of the focus group.

Conferences or other forms of networks for people working in the field of developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should be established.

Compared to the Austrian summary of the individual interviews the Austrian focus group meeting reveals a similar picture of future improvement of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity.

4.2. Selection of experts

In Austria we approached to contact 15 organisations in 3 federal states. 4 organisations from local municipalities were contacted (3 in Vienna, 1 in Burgenland). 3 organisations were NGO's coordinating land use for recreation or sports (2 in Vienna, 1 in Lower Austria). 2 organisations were commercial contractors with regional coverage (1 in Vienna, 1 Lower Austria). 2 organisations which administrate larger local sports facilities/complexes housing more than one type of sport in Vienna were contacted. 4 larger sport clubs were contacted (2 in Vienna and 2 in Lower Austria). Most of them were contacted from our personal network. Only some contact persons were from organisations we never contacted before. The responsible persons for discussing issues on the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity were found through the snowball method.

Finally 7 interview partners were discussing at the focus group meeting on 28th of May 2008. The most frequent reason for non-participation was that the persons had other appointments

or meetings on this day. 3 of the potential interview partners cancelled only one day before the meeting. Another reasons for non-participation was that the person who is responsible for the development of infrastructure within the organisation could not be found or did not answer after several attempts getting in contact. The Austrian focus group members were:

a) Experts from local municipalities

Municipal Department of Leisure-Time Enterprises, Eisenstadt, Burgenland (Head of the department): The aim of this municipal department is to administrate all issues concerning leisure-time facilities owned by Eisenstadt municipality. It administrates a swimming hall, a multisport complex, a cinema and a historic pavilion from the Esterhazy castle, which is restaurant and seminar and exhibition hall.

Park Care Service („Parkbetreuung“), Municipal Department 13 – Education, Out-of-School Activities for Children and Young People, Vienna (Projectleader): The aim of this municipal department is to administrate and the sector education, out-of-school activities for children and young people. One division organises the park care service (“Parkbetreuung”) to guide and manage activities by young people in Viennese parks.

Municipal Department 42 - Parks and Gardens, Vienna (Head of the planning department (attended the focus group only short) The aim of this municipal department is to administrate all issues of parks and gardens in Vienna. The municipal department consist of 9 subdivisions; one of them is the planning department. Many of the parks in Vienna are designed by this department.

b) NGO’s involved in coordinating land use for recreation or sports

Austrian Alpine Association, Vienna (Trainer and member of the department for alpine activities): The Austrian Alpine Associaton is the biggest club for alpine sports, has 360.000 members and 197 sections in whole Austria. Among others one of their duties is the maintenance of hiking paths.

c) Commercial contractors

Beer’s Vienna Health and Dance Club. (Management Assistant): Beer’s is a fitness club in Vienna offering a high quality programme and special programmes for managers. It has 1300 members with 3 studios.

d) Local sports complexes housing more than one type of sport

Sportunion Vienna (Architect for sports facilities and member of the steering committee of the sports association: “Sportunion” is one out of three major sports associations in Austria. The “Sportunion Vienna has approximately 200 member clubs and 100.000 single members. They provide access to 8 sport facilities and complexes housing more than one type of sport.

e) Larger sport clubs (e.g. local field hockey/soccer club)

ASKÖ Vienna (Head of the sports association): The ASKÖ (Arbeitsgemeinschafts für Sport and Körperkultur / Consortium for Sports and Body Culture) is one out of three major sports associations in Austria. The “ASKÖ Vienna” has 650 member clubs offering a high range of sports types. They provide access to 10 facilities and complexes housing more than one type of sport.

4.3. Experiences with policies regarding development of leisure-time physical activity

4.3.1. Potential problem areas and limiting factors

The answers of the interview partners brought up different problem areas, depending on their work field. In the federal state of Burgenland, the municipality Eisenstadt is the capitol city and has various problems with the development and maintenance of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. The municipality owns a swimming hall and a multisport centre which were not renovated the last 30 years. A newer infrastructure is an ice skating facility. The responsible politicians did not enhance the sports or physical activity issue in the municipality the last decades. All those infrastructures cause high costs to the commune and run a deficit. There are no clear subsidies by the state or the federal state. Especially swimming halls in whole of Austria need help in financing by the communes or federal states. One lack in Eisenstadt might be the absence of marketing strategies for the existing facilities. In comparison, the city of Vienna could increase their public bath users by 15% after starting advertising campaigns and combining their swimming halls with other facilities like fitness centres or wellness and spa activities. In general Eisenstadt found out that the importance of organised sports is declining while self organised physical activity is increasing. Therefore Eisenstadt started in 2008 to work out a cooperative sports development plan which will succeed into an action plan to improve the development of infrastructure for sport and physical activity for the next 10 to 15 years.

The two communal experts from Vienna are in charge of public space and parks. The density of activities in parks changed a lot within the last decades. Nowadays many people use parks for physical activities. Officially to use the lawn in Viennese parks is allowed since July 2007, but it was used as play ground and recreation area much earlier. The head of the municipal department for urban parks explained that parks in Vienna are made as user-friendly as possible. This means a potential for conflict especially in living areas because physical activity and the high usage of several parks, playgrounds and street ball facilities, etc. cause regular complaints about the noise. Therefore some parks stay closed in the evenings and only street ball facilities which do not disturb the neighbourhood have a light system to be used in the evening hours. The spatial situation differs within the city and therefore problem areas are hard to generalize. A big park in a living area with inhabitants of higher income has different problems than most of the small parks in dense city quarters where people with lower incomes live.

The expert involved in coordinating land use for recreation or sports sees problems especially in the financial area. Most of the duties of alpine associations are done unsalaried. This voluntary work is important for the tourism sector, but there are few subsidies or regulations for renovating hiking paths. At the moment this voluntary system still works but is depending on the local commitment. A recent trend in the field of alpine sports is bouldering. This sport which was traditionally done outdoors is nowadays additionally practiced indoors. Some bouldering halls were built but there is a lack of facilities in the east of Austria. In Vienna only one big bouldering hall exists but there could be even three more halls. At the moment the different Austrian alpine associations try to work together in developing new facilities.

The expert representing commercial facilities explained that fitness centres are more flexible in finding suitable estates and their gyms are multifunctional in general. If new trends occur the fitness equipment is changed. Infrastructure is not a very important issue more important to them is the qualification of their trainers. Therefore further education is compulsory once a year. For some programmes they use public space (jogging or other outdoor fitness) because this is the most inexpensive space. Although the costumers wish to have a swimming hall or spa area, this fitness club does not run this additional infrastructure because they know from other clubs' experiences that it is not profitable.

The two experts from sports clubs which both run complexes housing more than one type of sport noted that in Vienna, like in other municipalities, sports facilities are run by the commune and are rent to sport clubs. The rules to rent the faculties are rather restrictive. Vienna has a special situation for financing sports because it is federal state and municipality at one time. Therefore it is harder to receive subsidies. In other federal states sport clubs are funded by the federal state and by the municipalities where they are located. In many sports clubs people work voluntary. A master plan for running sport facilities is missing. Due to the experts of the sports club a lot of money is invested in professional sports, leisure-time physical activity is neglected. There is no needs assessment done at the moment. The sports clubs are not involved in the cities development of sport infrastructure. The sports clubs stressed that they are important "social profit organisations" which means not only the need for physical activity and being healthy is fulfilled in their clubs but also social networks are created. Especially at core hours between 5 p.m. to 9 p.m. there is a lack of sport facilities. At other times the facilities still have capacities. One expert stated that two thirds of the sports activities in their clubs don't need standardized sport fields or halls (e. g. gymnastics, yoga,...). On the other hand there is a lack of facilities for competitive sports like swimming (only one 50m swimming pool in Vienna) or athletic sports. One expert gives the example that an older multisport centre should be closed but the options of rebuilding it at a new location are insufficient (not in reach of public transport).

All of the experts agreed that a lot of knowledge is kept by each sector represented on the table, but there is no network or exchange of knowledge established yet.

4.3.2. Issues regarding the maintenance of facilities

The communal expert of Eisenstadt stated that the maintenance of the sport facilities has been neglected in the last decades. No renovation of the swimming hall has been done in the last 30 years. Also the multisport center could be run more economically. The future concept of maintaining the facilities will probably be public private partnerships. Another idea to maintain the facilities more economic would be to invest in alternative energy, so the energy coast would decline. At the moment the city fights to preserve their big facilities and to alternatively offer attractive public outdoor areas for cycling and hiking.

The communal experts in Vienna suggest investing in qualitative better and maybe more high-priced new public infrastructure, which is long-lasting. Parks in Vienna provide special equipped areas like playgrounds, streetball facilities or skate facilities as well as multifunctional areas as lawns or unpaved areas that can be used for jogging, ball games, badminton, etc. The combination of both is important to cover many aspects of physical activities. Within the planning process later costs of maintenance are already considered.

Other good examples of public facilities in Vienna are outdoor swimming pools for children, which are free of charge (adults pay). Those pools were established in the 1920ies. After a period of closing some of those pools, the city and districts of Vienna started to invest in the renovation of those facilities. This means public pools for children in many central districts of Vienna. In general the maintenance of public space in Vienna works very well.

In case of recreational area in the open landscape mostly alpine associations are in charge of the maintenance of hiking tracks. This maintenance for the path network is done voluntarily. and differs from region to region if only private person or the commune helps to keep the infrastructure in shape.

As mentioned before, the maintenance of the facilities is not a strong issue for the owner of the private fitness centre. More important is the investment in new equipment or in further education of the trainers.

The two participants from sports clubs which both run complexes housing more than one type of sport noted that their facilities are generally in good shape. Smaller renovations are usually done by the sports clubs running the estates themselves. Overall renovations are done by the municipality. Many courses take place in schools which are rented in the evening hours. In case of damage most of the renovation work is done by the school administration and paid by insurances.

4.3.3. Issues regarding access to facilities

All of the focus group members answered that their aim is providing access to a broad public, except the representative for commercial contractors. Their private fitness centre has rather high membership fees so people (from different nationalities) with higher incomes find their offer attractive.

In the swimming hall of Eisenstadt core hours are often used by sport associations or baby swimming courses which receive subsidised entrance fees by the city. This limits other costumers, who would pay full entrance fees, to use the swimming hall. In general the admission charges for private persons in relation to members of associations are irreproducible. Therefore the access to the swimming hall and its prize system has to be better organised there.

The focus group participants named two projects how migrants were attracted for sports clubs. One project of a sports club offered a summer programme for migrants where German courses and sport courses were connected. Another project is swimming courses for Islamic women. Unfortunately there are only two courses at the moment although the demand is bigger, but in Vienna there are too less female pool attendants employed.

The amount of female members in the two sports association is less than the amount of male members. There are no special offers at the moment to attract more women.

Other difficulties occur in public open space. In theory this space is accessible for everyone, but especially in urban areas some groups are more dominant in parks than others and it differs from district to district. E. g. streetball facilities are more frequented by boy groups. The office where the focus group expert for adolescent people works prepares street work for public parks called "Parkbetreuung" (Park Care Service). Within this "Parkbetreuung" programmes are worked out e. g. where for some hours streetball facilities stay reserved for

girls. In general the parks are equipped with different spatial offers so everyone can find attractive space. Urban public space has a bad image for middle class inhabitants, the expert for adolescent park users told us. Mostly people with low incomes (often with immigrant background) use this space, others who can afford memberships in a sports clubs for themselves or their children don't find public space attractive. Still there is a good social mixture of park users in Vienna: Joggers, old and young users, male and female. Within a new guideline for planning parks in Vienna, participation of neighbourhood inhabitants and non-governmental organisations is compulsory for future planning processes. This guarantees that different user groups can propose their needs.

4.3.4. Quality of communication between local policy officials and end-users

The quality of communication by some of the focus group members was described as rather insufficient. One representative from the commune emphasised that he got most assistance by the ÖISS (Austrian Institute for School and Sports Facilities). All of the representatives from the sports sector explained that there is no intense contact or assistance by the federal states in developing infrastructure for sports and physical activity. They furthermore explained that responsibilities – if the development of infrastructures is a matter of the federal state or the federation – are sometimes not clear. None of the participants of the focus group discussion knows of any meetings to exchange experience in the field of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity which involves different policy levels.

Within the commercial sector our representing participant told that networks of certain interest groups exist in Austria, but the content is e. g. about trainers' further education and does not concern any infrastructural issues.

The two participants from the Viennese municipal departments have different experiences than the participants from the sports sector. They reported that exchange in their sectors take place in committees. They meet on a regional level to discuss recent issues. E. g. within the committee for adolescent and youth aspects physical activity is a topic sometimes, but the municipal department for sports is only rarely at the meetings. Sport clubs don't take part in those committees because they are only for municipal departments.

4.4. Key advices stated by the participants

The focus group participants agreed on the following key advices given in the end of the discussion:

a) Building Networks

All organisations and actors in Austria involved in developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should start an exchange of experiences e. g. at conferences. There is a lot of knowledge that is not brought together yet. Planners, pedagogues, sports scientists, people working in the municipal or other governmental administrations, and non-governmental organisations should work together closer in this field. An example was given by the representative from the Alpine Club: The different alpine Associations in Austria started to work together to built new boulder halls; before every association built their own estate. A better regulation and coordination of the development of infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity means to exchange experiences from different sectors. Among others an

important aspect of this network would be that organised sports and self organised physical activity are not seen as concurrence any longer but try to develop synergies.

b) Initiating a coordinated infrastructural development for leisure-time physical activity

Master plans like cooperative sports development plans, that are orientated on the needs of every party (inhabitants, politicians, investors, non-governmental organisations etc.) and that are valid in the long run, should be a condition for public funds and subsidies. A criteria system based on this type of master plan should be worked out on all levels – national, federal state and municipal level. To bound funds to a master plan for infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity would guarantee an improvement of transparency in allocation of subsidies. Through this measure the value of leisure-time physical activity and popular sports should be better acknowledged. Therefore the existing situation in developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should be analysed more detailed.

c) Participation of the population and interest groups in the planning process

To participate inhabitants and interest groups (e. g. cycling associations, park care service, NGOs, etc.) who are relevant for the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should be enforced. This would prevent politics from critique after building facilities. The development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity should involve interested persons of all population subgroups (e. g. gender, age, ethnicity, etc.). The municipality, federal state and federation should understand themselves as partners of the population and non-governmental interest groups in the planning process.

d) The development of leisure-time infrastructure should be sustainable

New facilities should be multifunctional and developed with ecological standards (energy-efficient, use of ecological materials, durability of equipment etc.) This probably means higher costs to invest in building the infrastructure (indoors and outdoors) but lower prices on the long term: the maintenance will be easier and the equipment will last longer. The design of the facilities should create a good, warm atmosphere and should be user-friendly.

e) More efficient organisation and management of existing facilities / concerted multi-shift usage

Existing halls and outdoor sports facilities administrated by sports clubs or schools should be easier to use also for groups who are not part of the maintaining institution. The criteria and price system for using a facility should be clearer. Regular controls if the usage and timetable of the facility is still up to date should be done. If permanent sports groups temporarily don't use the facility, there should be the chance for temporary use to other groups. The permanent group should have the right to come back. This rule would encourage to temporarily share facilities. The experts noted that multi-shift and temporary use would mean a higher administrative effort. The usage of halls without additional employees should be possible e. g. in schools without the attendance of a concierge. Another advice was that sport facilities in parks which are closed for the public should be opened if they are not used by the schools or sports clubs. The multi-shift usage is most important outside the core hours (approx. 5 p.m. to 9 p.m.) when facilities are used intensively.

5. Overall conclusion

The experts of the focus group meeting stated that there are different situations and problem areas in the different work fields but also common aspects in developing infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. An important problem area is that an overall perspective for the infrastructural development for leisure-time physical activity is missing. There is no network of people working in the field and there is no instrument at the moment to coordinate the development of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. Therefore a platform like a regular conference or other forms of networks might be established.

Other improvements of the local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity could be better timetables and multi-shift and temporary usage of the facilities and master plans of coordinated development of the local infrastructure as a criterion for the allocation of subsidies. The participation of the population and non-governmental organisations in the planning process should not be neglected.

Compared to the Austrian summary of the individual interviews the Austrian focus group meeting reveals a similar picture of future improvement of infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity: Establishing a network of people working in the field, recommending a coordinated master planning for those infrastructures and participating the population.

IV) Work package 2: Assessment of National Mechanisms

1. Work package objective

The aim of this work package was to assess national mechanisms and procedures for developing local infrastructures for leisure-time physical activity (LTPA). Developing infrastructures includes four dimensions:

- e) planning/designing,
- f) financing,
- g) building, and
- h) managing of local infrastructures.

and three facility groups :

4. Sports facilities (i.e. public and commercial facilities)
5. Facilities designed for sports and physical activity (e.g. playgrounds, cycle paths)
6. Facilities not designed for sports and physical activity but usable for LTPA nonetheless (e.g. forests and beaches).

The work package was lead by University of Jyväskylä, Finland. An overall European report will be published in September 2009 (estimated).

2. Work package methods and content

Document analysis

Policy documents and decisions were analysed if they contained information on mechanisms and instruments for developing infrastructures for LTPA.

Interviews

To assure that you identify and analyse all relevant policy documents, it was sometimes necessary to conduct either interviews with additional experts (other than in WP1) or to return to the interviewees from WP1 to discuss the policy documents that had been identified by them in more detail.

3. Research questions

The following research questions guided the document analysis and the discussion about the policy documents:

- What policy documents and decisions include mechanisms and instruments for developing local infrastructures? –Describe the documents/decisions and provide a copy of it

PLANNING

- To what extent are inventories on LTPA-infrastructures done in a systematic approach? Are inventories done for all three different facility groups? - Describe the inventories and their approaches
- What methods are used for developing the inventories?
- Does the planning procedure include a needs assessment (e.g. surveys on the behaviour and the needs of the general population, or of sport clubs etc. or systematic procedures of calculating needs by balancing supply and demand regarding LTPA-infrastructures)?
- How does needs assessment look like for the different facility groups?
- Do different interest/population groups systematically participate in planning? How are different perspectives considered?
- What methods are used in participatory planning?
- Does something like a development plan exist regarding the three different facility groups?
- Is the planning procedure evaluated? What evaluations methods are in use?
- What priorities are considered in developing infrastructures of LTPA? - Please elaborate the decision making mechanism (practice) concerning the realization of a LTPA-infrastructure.
- What are the major influencing factors in the realization or abortion of a plan of infrastructure of LTPA?

FUNDING

- In what extent are private, public and EU financial sources involved in developing infrastructures of LTPA?
- What importance do the different financial sources bear considering the three different facility groups?
- What main mechanisms are in use arranging initial capital investment in developing infrastructures of LTPA? (e.g.: public fund, PPP, sponsorship, subsidy)

CONSTRUCTION

- What is the selection procedure of constructors in developing infrastructures of LTPA? Please also investigate the role of lobbying in selecting the constructor of infrastructures of LTPA's.
- What are most important criteria while LTPA constructors are selected? (e.g.: price, quality, construction time, local/domestic/international contractor, innovation, design, functionality, environmental concerns, etc)

- What construction mechanisms are in use in developing infrastructures of LTPA? (e.g.: Construction zone – one constructor build whole residential area, including LTPA infrastructure at once,; Over-all construction - one facility with key-in-hand approach; French contracting – quality tender contest for fixed price.

MANAGEMENT

- What managerial mechanisms are in use in public administration (e.g. sports department is responsible for managing infrastructure, or municipal utilities, outsourcing)?
- To what extent do other institutions (e.g. sports clubs) bear responsibility of safety/risk, maintenance and further development during the operation of the LTPA-infrastructures in the three different facility groups?
- What professional requirements and what personnel educational scheme is in force for developing infrastructures of LTPA?

4. Report on Austrian Mechanisms and Procedures

4.1. Summary: Main findings

Some regional and local planning mechanisms and instruments for leisure-time physical activities (LTPA)-infrastructures exist. They refer to local conditions and start to connect new challenges like gender aspects, extended view on facility types, design quality, participative planning methods etc.

Austrian schools are encouraged to rent their facilities to sport clubs. The rates are fixed by the Federal State. According to our knowledge this system is unique in Europe

Due to the high autonomy of the Federal States and the high number of different mechanisms and instruments, planning mechanism and instruments for LTPA-infrastructures are very different and complex.

A lack of overview and coordination on planning all facility types for LTPA exists. There is no connecting strategy or intersectoral network The ÖISS has recently started to work on it.

There are some interesting pilot projects with model character in Austria, e.g., Sport facility development plans in 2 municipalities or experimental housing estates like the “Bike City” in Vienna, park care services, “Sport and Fun”-halls etc.

4.2. Procedure of data collection and analysis

Many documents, mechanisms and instruments were already discussed in the individual interviews in WP1 - National Policies. On own initiative we additionally researched the juridical situation in each of the nine Federal States of Austria. In the online search engine called “Rechtsinformationssystem” (Law Information System) at <http://ris.bka.gv.at> we

systematically searched for the key words “sport”, “sport facility”, “development”, “planning” and “recreation” in each of the nine Federal States. This was performed, because apart from non-compulsory guidelines experts only gave us little overview on the binding instruments. Within the interviews not all Federal States could be reached. After the research and lecture of all types of documents, 4 additional interviews were done with:

- Andrea Kinsperger, (see WP1)
- Karin Schwarz, (see WP1)
- Horst Scheibl - New expert: ÖISS employee in Salzburg and employee of the spatial planning department of the Federal State Salzburg.
- Alexander Payer - New expert: Head of the ZSSW - Zentrale für Sportgeräteverleih und Sportplatzwartung (Centre for renting sport equipment and maintaining sport facilities). This is a department of the Austrian Ministry of Education and Culture.

4.3. Documents – mechanisms and instruments

4.3.1 National documents

On a national level there are only some papers dealing with the issue of LTPA. In general, those national papers are recommendations and action plans that are not compulsory. It is the responsibility of the nine Federal States to implement those papers (see chapter “Regional Documents”).

One of the national documents is the “**Österreichisches Raumentwicklungskonzept 2001**” (**Austrian Concept for Spatial Development 2001**) made by the ÖROK (Austrian Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning) every 10 years. It roughly describes the Austrian common view on spatial development, only few passages speak about leisure-time infrastructure in general (e.g., including cinemas, shopping malls and sports halls). This concept is a non compulsory guideline that does not interfere with the juridical competence of the Federal States.

The development of infrastructure for LTPA as a cooperative, intersectoral method for all three types of facilities recently became a stronger issue and is summarized by the first concept published on a national level called “**Enqueteresolution für Sport- und Bewegungsräume**” (**enquete’s resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity, 2009**). This new paper from March 2009 offers a broader view to the meaning of infrastructure towards physical activity including facilities for the organised sports sector and as well as for big population groups doing self-organized physical activity. The enquete’s resolution was discussed and passed by the ÖISS supervisory board, which consists of all national and Federal State sports commissioners. The work group regularly meets to discuss this topic, is still in the process of negotiating and will implement the resolution’s guidelines.

The resolution is a first step towards a follow-up model to the document dated from 1968, the **Österreichischer Sportstättenplan - ÖSSP (Austrian Sports Facility Plan, 1968)**, which was an inventory of all sports facilities that specified a quantitative population-based m²-key

for the lack of facilities in each Austrian municipality, each Austrian Federal State and on a national level.

Another but very general kept document is an expert paper that deals with the future of sports in Austria, "**Zukunft:Sport**" (**Future:Sport, 2008**). The former state secretary of sports (since 2008 the Ministry of Sports) therefore invited agents and experts on a national (e. g., ÖISS) and regional level from every Federal State in Austria to discuss the development of sports in Austria. One chapter of this paper deals with issues on the development of sports facilities for leisure time physical activities. On the one hand there seems to be a common understanding that having a more transparent list concerning the criteria of financing sport facilities is a necessity. On the other hand though, this paper is kept very superficial, only noting that infrastructure for leisure time is a general need that has to be established by the Federal States.

Concerning LTPA in nature, the Austrian Federal Forests worked out three documents on a national level dealing with **users rules** for the infrastructure for LTPA (for lakes, mountainbiking and horse riding) that are in state property. There is an Austrian **Forestry Act (Forstgesetz 1975, StF: BGBl. Nr. 440/1975, idF: BGBl. I Nr. 55/2007)** that generally allows people to use the forest as a recreation area but there are no further national strategies on developing infrastructures.

There is one national policy document that deals with everyday cycling as an environmental measure. This programme is financed by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management ("**Masterplan Radfahren – Master Plan Cycling**"). Another step in the right direction was an entry on cycling traffic in the Austrian government programme that until 2015 wants the cycling traffic to be doubled from 5% to 10%.

Other Austrian documents are the **list of Austrian technical standards (ÖNORM)** and **building regulations (Bauordnungen)**, which marginally include the development of local infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. Those documents record technical and safety standards: e. g. (1) the "ÖNORM" (list of Austrian technical standards) - among others for example ÖNORM B 2605 outdoor sport facilities, ÖNORM B 2606 surfaces of outdoor sport facilities, ÖNORM 2607 playground benchmarks for urban development, ÖNORM B 2608 school sport halls., or (2) the nine "Bauordnungen" (Building and Construction Acts) of the nine federal states, e. g. in Vienna playgrounds for small children under 6 years are compulsory in housing estates bigger than 14 apartments, while playgrounds for bigger children and teenagers are compulsory in housing estates with 50 apartments or bigger. Additionally the ÖISS provides **technical guidelines for specific sports facilities**.

4.3.2 Documents on federal state level

Due to the federal political system in Austria, the Federal State level is more important than the national level concerning the development of infrastructure for LTPA. An overview can be found in Appendix B and C of work package 2.

4.3.2.1 Binding instruments and mechanisms on a federal state level

There are binding mechanisms and instruments, especially the various Acts and Decrees that are separately passed in each Federal State. In general the following four basic types of Acts concerning the development infrastructure for LTPA can be found in every Federal State:

- a Sports Act,
- a Schools (Building) Act,
- a Spatial Planning Act and
- a Building and Construction Act.

Not all of their content explicitly deals with infrastructure for LTPA. In some Federal States additional Acts and Decrees have to be considered (see Appendix C). In many Federal States Nature Conservation Acts exist, which state that before permitting LTPA in nature areas ecological issues should be considered.

Only small parts of the nine different Sports Acts deal with sport facilities. All mention that sport facilities should be funded. In most of the Federal States specific articles were made to protect existing sport facilities (Vienna, Styria, Salzburg, Lower Austria, Upper Austria) or the different Acts (Burgenland, Carinthia, Tyrol, Vorarlberg) state at least, that the Federal State is responsible to maintain and preserve the existing sport facilities. Some of the Sports Acts prescribe that municipalities bigger than 2500 inhabitants are obliged to build certain sports facilities (Carinthia, in Lower Austria inside a Spatial Programme). The Sports Act in Vorarlberg (updated 2008) is special, because it is the only one of the Austrian Federal States' that includes other facilities than sports facilities, § 3a deals with the rights of hikers and mountainbikers, § 4 with the rights of persons doing winter sports.

The Spatial Planning Acts are implemented through planning instruments, so-called programmes, which have the legal status of decrees. The names and also the content of the instruments can be very different in every one of the nine states. Planning instruments are worked out in different scales, whereas the bigger scale - the Federal State spatial development plan - is implemented and elaborated more detailed within regional plans and further on into municipal development concepts. Still, the planning autonomy of the municipalities is quite high in Austria. The mayor (in bigger cities: the planning departments) is responsible for the final zoning plan/land use plan (Flächenwidmungsplan) and for the building plan (Bebauungsplan) which means mayors in Austria are responsible for locating and building local infrastructure for LTPA.

Overview from the bigger to smaller scale instruments:

- **Development Programmes of the Federal States** (Landesentwicklungsprogramme)
- Different **Thematic Programmes** within the Federal States (Sachprogramme, Entwicklungsprogramme)
- **Regional Programmes** (Regionalprogramme); meaning a subdivision of regions within one federal state
- **Spatial Development Concepts** (Räumliches Entwicklungskonzept) for smaller regions
- **Municipal Development Concepts** (Örtliche Entwicklungskonzept) of the municipalities to define zones for living, for industries, for greenery, for agriculture, etc..
- **Zoning Plans** (Flächenwidmungsplan) of the municipalities for every parcel of land, defines the land use
- **Constructing Plans** (Bebauungsplan) of the municipalities for every parcel of land, defines the heights, density and other criterias of the building land

In some Federal States there are instruments (called “programmes” or “plans”, de jure they are decrees) which deal with the development of infrastructures for LTPA. The most interesting ones for the IMPALA-project are listed here:

Examples on the scale of Development Programmes for the Federal State:

- **Urban Development Plan of Vienna 2005**
Green Belts and Parks, as well as the m²-based amount of green and sport area is defined per inhabitant: 3.5 m²/person of greenery at the living environment | 3.0 – 5.0 m²/person of greenery in close surroundings e.g., Parks, Playgrounds, Open Space in General | 8.0 m²/person in the city quarter | 3.5m²/person for sport facilities
- **Concept for Regional Development of Lower Austria of 2004**
Development of leisure-time facilities and nature reserve area for recreational use mentioned.

Examples on the scale of Thematic Programmes (Decrees)

- **Development Programme for the Sports Facilities Plan (Decree)** in Carinthia - Entwicklungsprogramm Sportstättenplan (StF: LGBl Nr 1/1978)
- **Spatial Programme on Leisure-Time and Recreation (Decree)** in Lower Austria- Freizeit- und Erholungsraumordnungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1978)
- **Playground Act** in Lower Austria - Spielplatzgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 124/2002)
- **Thematic Programme on Building Golf Facilities (Decree)** in Salzburg - Sachprogramm für die Errichtung von Golfanlagen (StF: LGBl Nr 90/1998)
- **Thematic Programme on Building Skiing Facilities (Decree)** in Salzburg - Sachprogramm über die Errichtung oder Änderung von Schianlagen im Land Salzburg (StF: LGBl Nr 49/2008)
- **Development Programme on Sports (Decree)** in Styria - Entwicklungsprogramm für das Sportwesen (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1991): Issues on Sports Facilities are also building and considering qualitative aspects such as calling for ecological use of materials, architectural design quality of the buildings and sites.
- **Development Programme on Leisure Time, Recreation and Tourism (Decree)** in Styria - Entwicklungsprogramm für Freizeit, Erholung und Fremdenverkehr (StF: LGBl. Nr. 53/1990)
- **Spatial Programme on Golf Facilities (Decree)** in Tyrol - Raumordnungsprogramm für Golfplätze (LGBl. Nr. 1/2009)
- **Spatial Programme on Funiculars and Skiing Facilities (Decree)** in Tyrol - Raumordnungsprogramm betreffend Seilbahnen und schitechnische Erschließungen (LGBl. Nr. 10/2005)
- **Viennese Decree on Playgrounds** - Wiener Spielplatzverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 46/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2009)

The impact of those papers depends on their topics (sports, recreational issues, playgrounds) and varies in each Federal State. Some of those programmes are Decrees based on the Austrian Sports Facility Plan from 1968 and were not updated ever since (e. g. Carinthia, Lower Austria). Some other Federal States updated those basic programmes to more sophisticated regulations on sports facilities including environmental aspects, gender aspects, architectural quality etc. (e.g. Styria) or developed site-specific instruments for skiing facilities, golf facilities and playgrounds (e.g., Tyrol, Salzburg, Vienna, Lower Austria). Some regional documents deal only indirectly with the development of LTPA by emphasizing the importance of recreational infrastructure in general or by rating m²-keys for open space within the urban area (e.g. the urban development plan of Vienna or the Concept for Regional Development of Lower Austria).

Austrian Schools are encouraged to rent their gyms and sport halls in the evening hours to sport associations. The rates are fixed by the Federal States themselves Sports clubs can usually get regulated discount rates, while private persons or associations have to pay the full fee. In all nine Federal States this was a political decision that was initiated by the ÖISS and implemented through the ÖSSP - Austrian Sports Facility Plan back in 1968. Therefore

the School (Building) Acts in the nine Federal States are relevant for leisure-time infrastructure, although most of them only regulate the size of the gyms and sport halls for different types of schools – e.g., primary schools exist also in smaller towns and have smaller gyms, secondary school have bigger gyms, grammar school have bigger gyms as well, but as an exception the Austrian Federation is responsible for those buildings. In general those school gyms are built according to Austrian Standards (ÖNORM B 2608).

4.3.2.2 Non-compulsory instruments, guidelines and strategy papers

Additionally there are non-compulsory national (see upon) and regional guidelines and strategy papers that have been worked out in all sectors (sports, planning, environment, tourism etc.) on a governmental level. Some papers are lists of criteria for funding certain types of facilities within the Federal States, e.g. funding guidelines for playgrounds in Lower and Upper Austria, funding and planning guidelines for tourism cycling paths in Lower Austria. Here is a list of papers we found by now, though the list is most likely much longer and extendable. We covered different sectors from three Federal States:

Examples for Regional Documents:

- **Criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria** - Kriterien für touristische Hauptradrouten in Niederösterreich - by Cycling Coordination of the Publicity Agency of Lower Austria (2008)
- **Playground Subsidies NEW** - Spielraumförderung NEU- by Regional Government of Upper Austria – Department Housing (2009)
- **Viennese Manifest of Living in Green Surroundings** - Manifest Wiener Wohnen im Grünen - by the Workgroup for Living in Green Surroundings (Gisa Ruland), (2008)
- **The Viennese Guideline for Park Design** - Das Wiener Parkleitbild - by Vienna's Municipal Department 42 – Parks and Gardens (2008)

The most successful instruments are probably subsidies bound to quality criteria e.g., playground subsidies for playgrounds in Upper Austria for private housing developers or the list of criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria bound to a co-financing programme between the Federal State and the Municipalities. Another method is to provide criteria to lead the jury's decision in case of (landscape) architectural competitions e. g. the guideline for the development of parks in Vienna.

4.4. Planning

On a national level the Austrian Sports Facility Plan (ÖSSP) from 1968 initiated by the ÖISS was the first instrument to encourage the Federal States to systematically raise an Austrian inventory and needs assessment. The nine Federal States' inventories of sports facilities were the base for nominating a quantitative population-based m²-key. Parallel systematic needs assessments for each Austrian municipality and each Austrian Federal State were established and summarized on a national level. The inventory contained statistics on "General sport facilities" (Gyms, Sport and Swimming Halls, Sport Grounds, Playgrounds) and on "Special Facilities" (e. g., Asphalt/Ice Curling Facilities, Skiing Facilities etc.). Additionally socio-demographic data - number of inhabitants, population groups (age, gender), amount of sports classes and of pupils in a municipality - supported the needs

assessment of the ÖSSP. The ÖSSP concluded with benchmarks (m²/inhabitant) and a lacking number of facilities depending on the size of the municipality (the ÖSSP made distinguished between small towns and cities). Regional divergences from the benchmarks were tolerated. Project lists with priority ranking were made. Parallel on Federal State Level, the Austrian Sports Facility Plan (ÖSSP) was given the status of Acts and Decrees and was therefore compulsory. Meetings took place every 10 years, later every 20 years (1977, 1987, 2009), to evaluate the ÖSSP. One major problem of the ÖSSP was that it is not easy to determine uniform benchmarks for special facilities and to incorporate changing and highly differential physical activity behaviour. The future challenge is to coordinate the planning process of new facilities and to extend the plan to other facility types (e.g., cycling paths, hiking tracks, parks). At the moment this project is being realized by the recent resolution on space for sports and physical activity and the two pilot projects like the intersectoral plans for infrastructures of LTPA in Eisenstadt and Hartberg (see WP1). Those projects cooperated with municipalities, political parties, sport clubs and local inhabitants, made individual surveys on the behaviour and the needs of the general population. In Eisenstadt the needs were calculated by balancing supply and demand regarding LTPA-infrastructures.

There are other national and regional instruments that especially apply to facilities designed for sports and physical activity (e.g. parks, playgrounds, cycling paths). There are also population-based m²-keys. Examples are the development plan of green belts and areas in the Urban Development Plan of Vienna 2005 or on a national level the ÖNORM 2607 - playground benchmarks for urban development. For nature areas (facilities not designed for LTPA but useable) needs assessment is often done by analysing the number of visitors (visitors monitoring) in certain areas and the data is balanced with ecological issues.

Other instruments like list of criteria for playgrounds, park design or tourism cycling paths nominate qualitative criteria, which are for the development of LTPA-infrastructures as important as quantitative benchmarks. Qualitative criteria are e. g., the consideration of gender, age, class or the direct participation of local inhabitants and actors. For many building projects in Austria this is not compulsory and could be more encouraged. E. g., the Viennese Guideline for Park Design or the Guideline for Playground Subsidies in Upper Austria suggest to consider gender aspects and to make different local actors participate.

Many planning projects in the field of LTPA-infrastructures are not evaluated. Prior to the building process singular planning projects are usually examined by the ÖISS and its team in the Federal States. The ÖSSP was evaluated in terms of how the quantitative lack of sport facilities had decreased and is subject to discussions in meetings of the ÖISS that take place every 10 years. The Urban Development Plan of Vienna 2005 will be evaluated as the first of its kind. The evaluation starts 2010, the criteria and methods are being discussed at the moment.

4.5. Funding

In Austria all three facility types are mainly co-financed by the municipalities and (if necessary) by subsidies of the Federal States. The subsidies usually come from the sports departments, sometimes also in cooperation with the spatial planning department or the economy department of the Federal States. The strategy paper "Zukunft:Sport" (Future:Sport, 2008), chapter "sports facilities and sport infrastructure", p. 78, emphasizes

the importance of the “development of a funding concept for LTPA-infrastructures in cooperation with the Federation, the Federal States, the municipalities and the sports associations and clubs” and the “development of a list of criteria for sport facilities financed by the budget obtained from the federal sports lottery” as one of the main aims in the future of Austrian sport facilities.

Within the sector of facilities designed for LTPA (that are mainly co-financed by municipalities and the Federal State) a wide range of quality criteria for the funding of projects have already been developed. Examples are: a separate office for the funding of playgrounds in Lower Austria, list of criteria for the funding of playgrounds in new housing estates in Upper Austria, a guideline for designing parks in Vienna, list of criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria etc. Those instruments have been developed in the Federal States and therefore big differences between the Federal States exist, e. g. in Styria or in Salzburg there are no such guidelines for playgrounds. Some bigger projects of this type of facilities are also partly EU-funded e.g. from budgets of the programmes “objective-1”, “objective-2”, “Interreg III” or “Urban II” which are bound to infrastructural improvements of less developed regions or city quarters. E. g. the Bednar Park in Vienna in a top urban development area was co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) as an objective-2-area.

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/funds/prord/prord_en.htm (2009-10-28)

Facilities in nature areas (facilities not designed for LTPA but useable) are also funded by the municipalities, sometimes co-financed by the Federal States or the Austrian Federal Forest. Tourism projects (hiking tracks, skiing infrastructure) are mainly co-financed by Tourism Departments and sometimes local tourism associations (NGOs). Rarely tourism facilities for LTPA are financed just by private developers, e. g. adventure tracks in the treetops of Viennese forests.

4.6. Construction & designing

The law applying to the procedure of finding a designer and constructor is the so-called “Bundesvergabegesetz” (Public Tenders Act - Federal level). It prescribes threshold values for public tenders:

- **Single Tender Actions:** permitted until the contract value of Euro 40,000.00
- **Invited (=non-open) Procedure:** One option to find a suitable architect or planner are invited competitions. There the municipalities select specialists for certain projects according to their projects lists and references. At the moment a popular model to identify the most qualified project is a two-stage procedure. While in the first stage a bigger number of planners are invited, it is in the second stage only a small number of participants that are selected to work on a more detailed plan.
- **Open Procedure:** Open competitions are announced by public calls addressed to all qualified planners in the field.
- **EU-wide Procedures:** If the contract value is higher than Euro 5,150.000.00 the competition has to be announced within the whole European Union. Since infrastructures for LTPA usually do not reach contract values in that height, this regulation is of no particular relevance.

In the case of building projects the Public Tenders Act also applies to private developers who receive subsidies. According to the Public Tenders Act (§ 19 and § 187) the basic rules of competition are: free and fair competition, equality of all participants, transparency, awarding of contracts to qualified companies and at reasonable prices, intention of the awarding authority to realize the project, confidentiality, considerations of environmental and social aspects.

Usually the procedure starts with a call or competition announced by a municipality or other public or subsidised developers. In general the call or competition aims to find a “general planner” (Generalplaner) who designs the infrastructure and furthermore searches for the best building company (constructor). For bigger infrastructures (e. g. football stadiums) a “general contractor” (Generalunternehmer) is at work and appoints planners, constructors and other specialists for the building project. Usually this procedure is not relevant to LTPA-infrastructures (only in case of subsidised housing for infrastructures in close surroundings).

The selection method to find a suitable contractor does usually not only consider the lowest prizes. Instead additional attributes are normally to be considered: e. g. technical value, aesthetics, functionality, environmental aspects, operating costs, profitability, client service and technical support, delivery or completion time.

In some Federal States a quality committee decides on public or subsidised housing projects (e. g. Upper Austria). In Vienna open space and playgrounds in housing projects seem to have in the last few years gained in quality, as landscape architects have to participate in the competition teams (Bauträgerwettbewerbe). Due to the experimental housing development in Vienna, several thematic housing estates have been developed, one of them is the so-called “Bike City”, with less car parking space and more parking facilities for bicycles, a bike shop and a community who share the same interests (high usage of bikes) is living there. Another example where projects are selected by quality is the “Playground Office” (Spielplatzbüro) in Lower Austria.

4.7. Management

Most of the sport facilities are managed by the municipal sports department, in smaller municipalities from the mayor's office. Additionally sport facilities at public schools can be rented in the late afternoon/evening hours and on weekends. There are fixed rates to rent the facilities. This is usually governed by the school department in cooperation with the sport department.

The sport clubs rent the sports facilities from the sports or school department. The sport clubs are responsible for the programme and courses and in case of damage it is their insurance company that pays, whereas the facility owner organizes the replacement. In schools the cleaning service is paid by the schools. In bigger municipal sport facilities, sport associations rent the buildings and give it to their associated sport clubs and trainers. They organize additional staff like caretakers or cleaning personnel.

There are recent examples of public-private-partnerships, but there are no guidelines regulating those operation models. E. g. the municipality of Eisenstadt is thinking about this option to fund its swimming hall. Some swimming halls in Vienna (e. g. in Floridsdorf) work together with a fitness centre to run the facility. The professional swimming halls which can

be used by the public as well are managed by the outsourced company “Wiener Stadthallen”, which acts like an enterprise but is still owned by the municipality.

Other facilities types like parks, playgrounds, cycling paths etc. are managed by public departments, usually the Federal State in cooperation with the municipalities. The managing public sectors vary, according to the type of facility, from environmental or planning to tourism/economy departments. Some facilities like skiing or golf facilities are not subsidised by the Federal State, because they are commercially orientated. Those infrastructures can be financed by their own profit and are additionally supported by the local tourism associations.

4.8. Overall conclusion

Austria, generally stated, is on its way to update the planning mechanisms and instruments on LTPA-infrastructure. The initiative of the ÖISS, the resolution on space for sports and physical activity, is promising. Furthermore the structure of planning mechanisms and instruments in Austria is good and complex but needs to be reviewed according to the following aspects:

Good practice in Austria

- + In some Federal States regional and local planning mechanisms and instruments exist, which refer to local conditions and start to connect new challenges like gender aspects, extended view on facility types, design quality etc. (Styria, Salzburg, Tyrol, Vorarlberg)
- + Austrian schools are encouraged to rent their sport facilities mainly to sport clubs, other associations or private groups. The rates are fixed and coordinated by the Federation of Austria, the Federal States and Municipalities. This system is unique. On long term this could be extended to rent facilities also during school holidays.
- + Every Federal State regulates the protection of existing sport facilities by Sport Facility Protection Acts.
- + There are some regional and local guidelines with good quality of especially in the field of facilities designed for physical activities (Parks, playgrounds, cycling paths). Those guidelines respond to contemporary needs including gender aspects and participative planning methods (e. g. Guideline for Designing Viennese Parks, Playground Subsidies NEW in Upper Austria)
- + There are some interesting pilot projects with model character in Austria: e. g.,
 - Sport facility development plans in 2 municipalities (Eisenstadt, Hartberg)
 - Low-threshold sports facilities like the sports halls like the “Sport & Fun” halls in Vienna, rentable for everyone temporarily for low prices, funded by the municipality.
 - Participative projects e.g. open spaces for teenagers in 17 municipalities “Teens’ Open Space” in Austria (Upper Austria, Styria, Vienna) and Slovakia, which was partly EU-funded by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture.

- Experimental housing estates like the “Bike City” or the “autofreie Mustersiedlung” (the car-free housing estate) in Vienna.
- The park care service (“Parkbetreuung”), an adolescent-orientated streetwork in Vienna, guides and manages activities by and for young people in parks and open space. Furthermore they try to empower socially deprived, girls and migrants (diversity management).
- The Act-In-Park in Vienna is one of the first initiatives to design open school sports facilities (without fences!) for leisure-time physical activity. Another initiative of that kind is to open doors of sport facilities in a large park in Vienna (Augarten), which are usually closed for self-organized LTPA.

Needs for improvement

- Lack of updated, modern instruments; especially within the sports sector there is no binding list of criteria regarding the funding of facilities, particularly in the field of LTPA-infrastructures. (See the paper “Zukunft:Sport”)

- Many different local and regional planning mechanisms and instruments exist. Some of them have never been updated since the ÖSSP (Austrian Sport Facilities Plans) was created in 1968. Only few Federal States renew their Development Programmes or Thematic Programmes based on the Spatial Planning Acts (sometimes also Sports Acts) with issues on sports and physical activities. Those programmes have a high potential to manifest issues on improving infrastructures for LTPA.

- Lack of overview and coordination of the planning process for all facility types: There is no overview or connecting strategy based on the high number of different mechanisms and instruments. A strategy is needed to establish an intersectoral coordination that can balance the interests of the different parties. The ÖISS has recently started to work on it: The pilot projects on “sport development planning” in Eisenstadt and Hartberg were discussed according to harmonize the methods and elaborate standards. Additionally the ÖISS published a resolution on spaces for physical activity and sports, that considers all types of infrastructures.

- No intersectoral network has been established yet. Only site-specific specialists work within the Federal States not knowing each other. An exchange of information and expertise, e.g. in form of an annual/biannual meeting could be established.

V) Work package 3: Austrian workshop on Good Practice Criteria

1. Work package objective

The aim of this work package was to work out a draft for an EU-guideline which basically contains a checklist of good practice criteria to improve and develop infrastructure for leisure-time physical activity. This concluding paper of the IMPALA project was built along the initially defined

dimensions for developing infrastructures

- i) policy-making
- j) planning
- k) financing
- l) building an
- m) managing of local infrastructures.

and includes three facility groups :

- 7. Sports facilities (i.e. public and commercial facilities)
- 8. Facilities designed for sports and physical activity (e.g. playgrounds, cycle paths)
- 9. Facilities not designed for sports and physical activity but usable for LTPA nonetheless (e.g. forests and beaches).

The work package was lead by the University of Nuremberg-Erlangen, Germany. An overall European report will be published after the final event of IMPALA - International POIN2010 conference "Policies and Infrastructure for Physical Activity and Sport - Good Practice in Europe", Frankfurt/Main, 8.-9. November 2010.

2. Work package methods

Initial Discussion on Good Practice in Developing Infrastructure

At the 2nd project meeting at Erlangen, December 1st - 2nd, 2010, results of the first 2 work packages were presented and discussed. Finally a brainstorming in defining good practice was worked out.

Internal Feedback

The work package leader, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, made an initial draft of the check list of good practice. The 12 project partners gave feedback and additional information in the beginning of May 2010.

National Workshop

A second draft was worked out until June 10th, 2010 as an EU-guideline. Within national workshops in the 12 partner countries expert of all fields (Sport, Planning, Recreation and Tourism, Health) and on all levels (national, regional, local) discussed the draft of the EU-guideline.

3. Date and timeframe:

June 11th 2010, 10 am – 3 pm

4. Organizational frame and responsible institutions

The Austrian IMPALA workshop was organized by the scientific team of the University of Vienna with the support of the collaboration partner ÖISS. The workshop took place at the 'Haus des Sports' (House of Sports) where several key stakeholder are located (ÖISS, Ministry of Sports, Federal Sports Association, 'Fit für Österreich'-initiative). Additionally the conference rooms are located more centrally in the city and were therefore easier to reach for the participants. (Location: Haus des Sports, Großer Sitzungssaal, Prinz-Eugenstraße 12, 1040 Wien)

The official workshop with input and discussions was held from 10 am to approx. 1.30 pm. After the official part a lunch was prepared, which offered the opportunity for regeneration and social networking for the participants. With the informal part the workshop ended at approx. 3 pm. As the official draft was sent late on June 10th, only one night before the before the Austrian workshop was held, an interim version of the checklist was used, that being the draft from May 30th.

5. Participants and level of involved decision-makers (national or local workshop):

5.1. Method of invitation

The Austrian researchers of IMPALA contacted 36 decision makers and experts for the national workshop at WP3 according to the sampling matrix by the German IMPALA Team (leader of WP3). Initially, individual emails were sent to the experts, then the potential participants were also contacted by telephone. 11 participants – national, regional, local from the fields of sport, urban planning, tourism/recreation, and health – were already interview partners who had participated at WP1 and WP2. Other decision makers and experts were found by asking existing IMPALA-contacts for potential participants and using our personal networks (snowball method). Only a few partners from the health sector could be reached successfully. It was difficult in this sector, because generally the health sector in Austria focuses on medical infrastructures and only a very small part can be connected with swimming facilities. Unfortunately none of the stakeholders of those leisure facilities from the health sector attended the Austrian workshop – one participant from the Viennese Sports Department is also responsible for public swimming baths which are also used as pools for professional competition. Further partners in this sector were:

- the head of the Viennese municipal department MA44 (Public baths);
- the project manager for spa facilities at VAMED, a major private building company for hospitals and spa facilities;
- the head of leisure-time facilities of Eisenstadt, capitol of the Federal State Burgenland.

Sending their apologies, all 3 experts regretfully cancelled the IMPALA-workshop. 17 decision makers attended the Austrian IMPALA workshop. Some of those experts represent more than one institution which ist connected to leisure-time infrastructures for physical activity and sport. 8 experts were representatives on a national and 11 experts on a regional or municipal level from the Federal States of Vienna, Lower Austria and Salzburg.

5.2. List of participants

Austrian Climate Initiative 'klima.aktiv': on behalf of the Austrian Energy Agency and the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management – consultant at the Austrian Energy Agency, national expert.

Austrian Federal Forests 'ÖBf - Österreichische Bundesforste': Dept. of Real Estate and Tourism – consultant, national expert.

Austrian Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports: Dept. V/1: General Federal Sports Affairs, Public Relations, International Affairs and Outsourced Facilities – consultant, national expert.

Austrian Health Promotion Foundation 'FGÖ - Fonds Gesundes Österreich': on behalf of the Federal Austrian Ministry of Health and Gesundes Österreich GmbH (Austrian Health Co.) – health promotion officer, national expert.

Austrian Initiative for Physical Activities 'Fit für Österreich': on behalf of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports in cooperation with the Federal Sports Organisation and the 3 Austrian Sports' Associations ASKÖ, ASVÖ, SPORTUNION – deputy managing director, national expert.

Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities 'ÖISS - Österr. Institut für Schul- und Sportstätten': Head Office, Vienna – head of the institute, national expert.

Central Sports Equipment Rental and Maintenance of Sport Facilities 'ZSSW': Dept. of the Austrian Ministry of Education and Culture | **Vienna, USZ, University Sports Centre** – head of both institutions, national and regional expert.

Havel & Havel Beratung GmbH: Office for Sport Facility Planning and Consultation – office head, member of the committee for Standards on Sport by the Austrian Standards Institute, national and regional expert.

Lower Austria, Publicity Agency for the Federal State Office: Dept. of Tourism – coordinator of cycling tourism in Lower Austria, regional expert.

Salzburg, ÖISS Regional Office | Federal State Office: Dept. 7 for Spatial Planning – consultant, regional expert.

Salzburg, Office for Landscape Architecture: Planning of Open Spaces, Playground and Sports Facilities – office head, regional and local expert.

Vienna, ASKÖ, Regional Office of the Sports' Association – managing director, regional expert.

Vienna, Boulder Halls: on behalf of the Association for Alpine and Nature Sports 'Naturfreunde' – managing director, regional expert.

Vienna Campus Schools, pilot project for all-day-schools at all school levels | Lecturer 'Municipal Sport Development' at the Institute for Sport Science, University of Vienna – project manager and lecturer, regional expert.

Vienna, Municipal Dept. 18, Urban Development and Planning, Vienna, Dept. for Open Spaces and Landscape Planning – consultant, regional expert.

Vienna, Municipal Dept. 42, Parks and Gardens, planning department – consultant, regional expert.

Vienna, Municipal Dept. 51, Sports Office, department of sport facilities – head of department, regional expert.

6. Methods and procedures

6.1. Initial workshop for Austrian experts

10 am to 10.25 am – Welcome: Brief introduction from the experts.

10.25 am to 10.45 am – IMPALA: Brief project information and results of WP1 and WP2.

10.45 am to 11.45 am – Part 1: EU-guidelines – Introduction and General Issues, afterwards brief discussion of successful policies in Austria and Europe, guided by the chapter ‘Policies’ from the checklist, moderation by IMPALA researchers | short coffee break

11.45 am to 1.15 pm – Part 2: EU-guidelines – Discussion at four round tables divided into the topics of planning, building, financing and management of infrastructures for physical activity and sports. At half time this experts changed to a second round table to enable a discussion of at least two topics for each participant. The workshop on planning and building were most frequented with approx. 20 experts joining the two sessions, the topics financing and management were visited by approx. 14 experts at both tables.

1.15 pm to 3 pm – Lunch break and informal get-together of participants.

6.2. Debriefing phase (2nd expert meeting, additional comments and feedback via email)

A summary in German of the workshop’s discussion issues was sent out to the experts on June 25th in preparation for an additional meeting with the ÖISS - Head Office, Vienna, as collaborating partner on June 30th. There were no other experts who could attend this second meeting but some comments were emailed up until the July 16th.

6.3. Results of assessment

- **Current status of their intersectoral, equity- and participation-promoting policies for LTPA infrastructures:** In Austria, there are no intense cross-sectoral networks, but networks within the sectors exist. Some participants stated that even across the borders of the Austrian Federal States it is considerable work to organise national meetings within one branch. The IMPALA meeting therefore, was one first step for the participants to meet cross-sectorally and to make contact. The consideration of all user groups also in form of participation at the planning procedure is established in an appropriate way.

- **Current status of planning:** The different types of infrastructure for physical activity and sports are planned and developed by different sectors, differing even within the Austrian Federal States. There are only a few pilot projects in Austria offering a broader, intersectoral view on physical activity and sports facility development within municipalities or regions. The ÖISS begins to advance their planning tools by enforcing physical activity and sports facility development plans in Austria which provide a view on all types of infrastructure and a method to balance all local interests.
- **Current status of building:** Some Austrian Federal States have well-established compulsory or non-compulsory policies. In some Federal States policies were not yet modernized. However, the regional autonomy of the Federal States on decision-making is regarded as highly important by the Austrian experts. Due to the high municipal autonomy in planning in Austria, regional policies to build and to modernize infrastructures for PA and sports are rather the exception. Within the tender contracts and assessments (e. g. done by the ÖISS) there is a rather well-established culture of case-by-case decision-making in Austria. This approach also contains the potential of reacting adequately on local conditions. On the other side, the disadvantage of a case-by-case approach is that a general overview of regional developments even between neighbour municipalities does not exist. Therefore, a national guideline could help to gain an overview on the development and to balance specific interests, the participants summarized. The ÖISS already published a guideline for sustainable development of sport facilities, called 'The future-orientated sport facility', in cooperation with German institutions working in this field. (For further details see also the chapter on 'additional good practice', below)
- **Current status of financing:** In Austria the development of physical-activity and sport infrastructure is financed mainly by public officials and sometimes supported by private investors. Some infrastructure facilities are financed only privately. The regional governments (Federal State level) provide subsidies for only specific facilities types and the measures are not comparable with governance strategies of the other Federal States, which makes a heterogeneous picture of Austria's status in financing infrastructures.
- **Current status of management:** The ÖISS took part in the EU-project SMS on improving the training of facility managements. 'The project deals with the development and transfer of learning modules on the topic of 'Modern management of sports facilities' for the vocational training and further education in member states of the European Union.' (From the project's website: http://www.leonardo-sms.eu/project_en.htm 2010-07-29) The operators of sports facilities in Austria remain well-informed about the results and today actively consider optimise their management system if necessary. Some high-quality tenders in Austria tend to request planning for the maintenance and operation of the facility.

7. Specific discussions on 5 dimensions for developing infrastructures

7.1. Policy-making and other superordinate issues

The workshop participants in Austria agreed upon the headlines and topics of the chapter 'policies' at the drafted checklist. The experts also focussed on more general, superordinate aspects, which were either discussed in the preliminary session of the workshop (Part 1) or discussed at two or more of the four round tables (Part 2). Those issues should be therefore taken into consideration for the potential new EU-guideline:

- **To enforce intersectoral cooperation:** All experts agreed that infrastructure for leisure-time sports and physical activity should be regarded as a cross-sectoral issue concerning different types of facilities developed in different professional disciplines. This issue was seriously discussed in the general preliminary session of the workshop (Policies) as well as in the round table sessions (Planning, Building, Financing and Management). This shows the relevance of intersectoral cooperation as a superordinate topic. In particular at the 'Policies' Chapter, Step 1: Assessment - a) 4. one important sector from the Austrian perspective is missing: Education. In Austria school sport facilities by law should be accessible for the general public and can be therefore rented for rather low rates by sport clubs. This sector has a prominent role in providing facilities for leisure-time sports and physical activity.

At the Austrian workshop the use of different scientific terminology within interdisciplinary work was discussed intensively. In particular, the planning experts (traffic planner, urban and regional planners, project planners) claimed that the use of the terms 'planning' and 'building' in the draft of the IMPALA-guidelines would be better differentiated into 'strategic planning' (Strategische Planung) instead of only using the term 'planning' and into 'object planning' (Objektplanung) instead of the term 'building'. This could benefit by giving both chapters from the guideline a more understandable title and clearer structure. At the moment 'planning' is a very open term, while 'building' is a phase understood by most of the participants as the activity at and to prepare a construction site. Therefore an itemisation on the main steps of planning procedures for the general development of all kinds of infrastructure was defined in the beginning of the workshop by one planning sector participant:

Stage 1: Assessment of Existing Infrastructures and Needs

Stage 2: Policy-Making and Strategic Planning (in Austria due to the Federal political system this step is only developed on a regional, Federal State level and not on a national level)

Stage 3: Phase of Decision Making

Stage 4: Object Planning and Financing

Stage 5: Realization and Building

Stage 6: Installation of an Operating Management

All 6 steps are linked to each other. To give an example, usually the aspect of financing is already discussed in the phase of strategic planning, e. g. to decide on a later state upon governmental subsidies (governance strategies). A better linkage of all steps, especially the development of sustainable infrastructures and the considerations of operation managements and facility maintenance should have been taken stronger into account already at the level of 'strategic planning' or at least at the very least at level of 'object planning'. The Austrian experts subsequently stated that the IMPALA guideline (version May 30th) does not differentiate adequately enough between 'strategic or large-scale planning' and 'object or project planning' expressed through the terms 'planning' and 'building'.

- **To coordinate the Development of Infrastructure for Sports and Physical Activity on a national as well as on a regional level** (Federal State and smaller regions) is necessary and has to be intensified, having in the first place established. In particular, facilities for leisure-time cycling additionally demand more exchange and cooperation with neighbour countries to establish Europe-wide facilities like the EUROVELO routes and to benefit from mutually shared information.
- **To clearly define Areas of Responsibility and Relevant Contacts** within intersectoral workgroups which have to be made in the beginning of a development process at all levels (national, regional, local) and dimensions (policy-making, planning, building, financing, management)
- **To improve the Assessment of Need and Forecasting** when developing infrastructures according to local and regional level means to include participation more seriously as additional planning tools to the existing methods (inventories, per capita approaches, geographical distribution) which are frequently too approximate to apply on local conditions and characteristics. (see also chapter on 'planning')
- **To improve Resource Management for Existing Infrastructures:** Empty sport facilities such as school or university sport facilities which remain closed for months during summer holidays should be opened; and the multifunctional potential of sport facilities should be more seriously considered.
- **To further develop and maintain a Basic Supply of All Types of Infrastructures** according to shifting needs in order to balance interests between the traditional sports facilities maintained by usually sport clubs, the rising of sports also self-organised in public space and the privately established facilities.
- **To guarantee Access for All Social Groups** to different types of infrastructures. Public space has a high potential to offer a 'free of charge' sports facility. Nevertheless public space cannot be made use of throughout the whole year in Austria. Entrance fees to other facility types should therefore be as low as possible. Some experts were discussing if the rates should be graduated for different social groups or at least to create easier access for socially deprived groups (e.g. such as some museums in Austria can be entered for free for people who are unemployed or on welfare benefit). Some experts stated even that a low cost entrance rate for certain groups is better than free access for

all, in order to cover some operating costs to counter the often 'free of charge' facilities that are seen as 'valueless', the consequence of which that less care is taken by the individual user.

- **Awareness-Raising Measures:** Of superordinate importance in the opinion of the Austrian participants seems to be the information, dissemination and lobbying of the guidelines topic 'Improvement of Local infrastructures for Leisure-Time Sports and Physical Activity'. This issue was discussed at the preliminary session (Part 1) and at all four round tables (Part 2).
- **Benefits and Challenges of this EU-Guideline for the Austrian Participants:** In general, the Austrian participants appreciate the advantages of such a checklist as a catalogue of quality criteria and ideas which have not yet been established in detail and cross-sectoral in Austria. For example, the checklist could help for finding clear quality criteria for subsidies or the realization of policies in that field could be proofed according to their feasibility. However, there is also a certain scepticism on this potential EU-guideline. The chapters from the checklist's topic themselves seem to be too detailed to build a general European guideline. Some participant's critique was that not all the issues could be implemented in Austria, e. g. a common national database due to the big gap between the nine Federal States and the general highly Federal political system in Austria is not regarded as realistic.
- **The issue of sustainability and future-orientation in the development of infrastructure** is not yet mentioned specifically as quality criteria for policy-making at the IMPALA-checklist. This aspect seems important to all participants at the workshop and should be an additional issue remaining above the dimensions of planning, building, financing and management.

7.2. (Strategic) Planning

Discussed in the sense of 'strategic planning' (as mentioned above) at the Austrian workshop, meaning the policy-making of large scale national and regional action plans such as the planning tools like the Urban Development Plan of Vienna.

- **First of all, the term 'Planning Requisites'** does not exist within the field of urban or spatial planning (not in German nor in the English language) and was not clearly understood by the participants and this was a subject of discussion. The correct terms according to the knowledge of the participating urban planners are '**Planning Tools**' or '**Planning Instruments**' and should be used instead to have a common terminology based on existing terms. After consulting a professional English language coach from the UK, working in Vienna, he suggested to use '**Planning Prerequisites**' as mentioned on the next page of the checklist, chapter 'planning - Step 2 - improvement' to point out that those are the basic planning tools.
- **The Planning Prerequisites - in particular inventories - are incoherent in Austria:** Data collection and analysis for a common national database on existing infrastructures

seems to be one of the greatest challenges in Austria because of the big differences which exist between the 9 Austrian Federal States. In general, all of the participants would appreciate a common comparable database for Austria, but it also seems to include many obstacles. For example at the moment Salzburg works out a GIS-database with all types of infrastructures. In particular, the facilities for physical activity in public spaces including natural greenbelts and urban spaces such as pavements or cycling paths present a great challenge to be solved. Only the city of Graz has also started to develop GIS-database for sport infrastructures in a broader sense. Other Federal States and municipalities did not update their inventories like manifested by the Austrian Sports Facility Plan (ÖSSP) in 1968 since the late 1970's or 1980's. Therefore, this gap between the Austrian Federal States does not seem to be solveable by only ordering a new common national inventory by the Austrian Federation because of too little resources in most of the Federal States and at the national level as well. Another reason for not refreshing the idea of a mandatory national inventory is that the elaborate inventory ÖSSP from 1968 failed at that point when being adapted as a general per capita approach with a certain geographical distribution which was valid for all municipalities. This method was too approximate on a local level as it neglected specific conditions at the lower level. Therefore, the ÖISS intends at the moment to focus upon the local and regional development plans for sports and physical activity infrastructures as a general planning tool. The basis for this more or less standardised future planning tool could be the recent pilot projects in the city of Eisenstadt and the Hartberg region. Both were intersectoral sports facility development plans, but different methods were in use. Surveys (on the public behaviour in sports and physical activity) and the assessment of all existing infrastructures of the region (including cost estimate for modernization and/or new facilities) could be made more accurately and 'in situ' at the two pilot projects.

Summing up, the development of a new standardized method that includes participation and local characteristics seems to be the more promising strategy in Austria at the moment than improving the system of inventories.

- **The different Planning Tools are not equally represented in the checklist:**
Subsequently to what was discussed above, in the opinion of the Austrian experts the part of the checklist focusing on inventories is much too detailed for a general EU-guideline and could be more balanced according to the different strategic planning tools mentioned in the checklist: inventories, surveys, participation. Here are some more ideas on what was discussed about participation: Levels of public participation in planning procedures in Austria, ranging from the highest stage of top-down procedures to the highest stage of bottom-up procedures:

- General possibility for public inspecting of future building projects: It is a general duty of the Austrian executive to give insight on future buildings projects. Depending on the size, if it will be established privately or publicly and also differing in the Federal States of Austria, the period of insight to the public (or at least the neighbours) is between 2 to 8 weeks in general at the municipal government's office.
- Hearing of the public opinion on planning projects

- Advisory Board of the General Public (or Public Panels as mentioned in checklist),
 - Cooperative Planning (mentioned in the checklist)
 - Open Space Methods (e. g. Future Workshops - mentioned in the checklist),
 - Mediation (if interest conflicts already occurred)
 - Petitions (bottom-up method e.g. by citizens' initiatives)
- **Existing Spatial Development Plans and Programmes of Federal States as potential planning tools for Sport Development Plans** (There are different names - plans, programmes - in use in the different Federal States Austria): Those planning instruments are Development Plans made in the mid-term between 10 to 15years. Those are large-scale spatial programmes or master plans, which usually combine quantitative global approaches (per capita approach, geographical distribution, etc.) with qualitative global approaches such as development prognosis related to certain topics (traffic, green areas, living areas, spatial economical development, et. al.) and are implemented by first defining certain target areas for urban development. A good example is for this kind of planning instrument is the Urban Development Plan of Vienna, which is re-evaluated every 5 years and updated every 10 years. Other examples are the Development Plan of Lower Austria, or the Spatial Programme of Styria, already containing a chapter on Sports Development. Within those plans the development of leisure-time sport and physical activity infrastructures was neglected in Austria, but urban planners have begun to get more and more aware of this important issue. Those of the large-scale spatial plans and programmes (which are sometimes compulsory and are always developed interdisciplinary with planners, sociologists, economists, et. al.) provide a mature structure within the culture of planning which could be extended by progressive development planning on sports and physical activity infrastructure.
 - **The Evaluation of Planning Procedures:** The guideline and checklist does not mention any tools to evaluate planning procedures.
 - **Differentiation between 3 types of sport:** Professional Sports (Leistungssport), Leisure-Time Sports (Freizeitsport) and Health-Improving Sports (Gesundheitssport) should be seriously considered also in regards to the planning of infrastructures. Those different kind of sportive levels require different levels of standardised sports facilities or sport opportunities.
 - **A good connection to the public transport system** to all facility types should be a must for the development of those infrastructures.

7.3. Building (Object Planning)

The Austrian group agreed on talking about aspects related to 'object planning' also, synonymously used in English language could be 'project planning'. This term was more appropriate for participants from the planning sector. All experts taking part at this round table agreed that

a) **Systematic optimisation of the chapter ‘object planning / building’:**

(Checklist version May 30th, 2010)

- **In general, the quality assessment of existing infrastructures at ‘Step 1: Assessment’ point b)** should be part of the chapter ‘strategic planning’ (Which fits to the comment of participants attending the round table ‘strategic planning’ and missed the aspect of sustainability there.) **Point a)** assessment of existing infrastructures is only necessary for renovations or extensions of existing buildings. One question missing at that point is if the building is only renovated or if new functions are added. For new buildings no assessment of existing infrastructures is important at the level of object planning (this is a task on step before at the ‘strategic planning’ at the stage of ‘prerequisites - assessment of needs)
- **The part a) Improving existing infrastructures; at ‘Step 2: Improvement’** and there in particular the points 3. Promote re-orientation of streets towards LTPA; 4. Reorientate public urban space towards LTPA and 5. Reorient natural space towards LTPA - all of them still exist in the newer draft from June 10th - are not subject to ‘object planning’.
- **In general for the title ‘Step 2: Improvement’, the Austrian participants prefer the term ‘optimisation’** (Optimierung) than the term ‘improvement’ (Verbesserung), this might only be of relevance in using the German language because ‘optimisation’ has a slightly more positive connotation.

b) **Additional contents relevant to ‘object planning’:**

- **A better connection between the planning levels** of strategic planning (on a large scale – national, regional) and the level of object planning (small scale – local) should be established.
- **The Austrian participants at this round table recommend to have more balance in the guideline between quantitative and qualitative methods to assess needs:** The Austrian experts are of the opinion that a quantitative analysis of needs is a tool that requires many resources and then remains even too approximate. Instead, they suggested to additionally point out the possibility to make greater use of qualitative methods in the checklist such as interviews with all relevant stakeholders of small regions, municipalities or urban districts. Interview partners at that stage could be local politicians, sports clubs, schools, local urban planners, NGOs, the general public, specific subgroups, etc.
- **Tender Acts have great influence in the facilities’ quality on the level of object planning and building** and are entirely missing in the guideline. The participants of the round table for ‘object planning’ summarized the following criteria of quality:
 - Economical Usage of Urban Areal;
 - Adequate Carring Capacity;

- Diversity of Form and Function
- High Energy Efficiency
- Participation at the Object Planning Procedure
- Accessibility in particular for deprived social groups (depending on income, education, gender, ethnicity, age, disabled and incapacitated people, etc.)
- Easy to repair
- Ecological design
- Facilities for multiple sports and nevertheless specialised for popular competitive sports
- Aesthetic factors such as coherence, incidence of light, colour, choice of materials, etc.
- Hygienic factors
- Safety and security factors

7.4. Financing

The Austrian experts were discussing the following aspects at the round table that were only related to financing:

- **Discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the following Investor Models and Facilities:** public investor, PPP-models, commercial (private) investor, and the potential of facilities for cooperate sports (Betriebssportanlagen). The experts' opinion was that all models could be appropriate investor models to finance facilities, it is on one side a matter of how far the quality object planning as well as the future operation management are taken into account at the stage of tender acts and prerequisites. On the other side the experts state that they prefer that the building of those infrastructures is financed mainly by public investors so that access for all social groups can be guaranteed.
- **To optimise existing public funding systems** for sports and physical activity infrastructure in cross-sectoral cooperation. However, an intersectoral approach combined with big differences between the Austrian Federal States could be a great challenge because public funding connecting to all three facility types does not exist at all in Austria. There are funding systems only for specific facility types (e. g. classical sport facilities, children's playground, cycling paths, parks) and responsibilities are divided mainly into the sectors of the Federal State Sport Authority, the Federal State Authority for Spatial Planning, the Federal State School Authority. Beyond that, responsible stakeholders are differing; depending on the Federal State Authorities for Environment, Traffic, Health, Tourism, et al. can be additional decision-makers for leisure-time sport and physical activity infrastructures. Combined with the already mentioned difficulty of a common database for those leisure infrastructures there are big gaps between the Federal States also concerning public funding systems. Summing up, some Federal States have well-established public funding connected to quality criteria for only specific facility types, other are on half way and at least demand a

professional survey or consultation for the individual facility development, some Federal States have not yet sufficiently established funding systems for infrastructures of leisure-time sport and physical activity throughout all sectors. In particular, for trend sport facilities and public spaces the responsibilities are not clearly defined. This fact causes a certain lack of transparency in some Austrian Federal States and modernisation has to be done urgently, but the relevant participants from the workshop were already well informed about this problem and intend to take imminent action.

7.5. Management

The Austrian experts were discussing the following aspects only concerning the management of facilities - this was the only round table at the Austrian workshop which could filter the major interests:

- **Major work in Austria should be done on in**
 - Using open management systems more frequently to stay flexible to changing conditions or trends
 - Installing however sustainable management systems
 - Offering opportunities for different target groups
- **Further important management issues in Austria:**
 - Awareness-raising measures including promotion and public relations
 - Support for cooperations between different stakeholders (time slots at facilities, open school or university sport facilities, etc.)
 - Target-group specific, multifunctional usage of facilities
 - Continuous evaluation of the management strategy
 - the guarantee of facility maintenance
 - the guarantee of access for all groups
 - management input as part of planning procedure considerations

Additionally, the Austrian collaborating partner, the ÖISS, recommended to consider the results of the **EU-Project SMS “sustainable management of sport facilities”**: ‘The project deals with the development and transfer of learning modules on the topic of ‘Modern management of sports facilities’ for the vocational training and further education in member states of the European Union.’ (from the project’s website: http://www.leonardo-sms.eu/project_en.htm 2010-07-29)

8. Examples of good practice to be added to the IMPALA guidelines:

8.1. Policies

Austrian Action Plan on Cycling

Austrian Ministry of Ecology, Department Traffic and Urban Development, R. Thaler, H. Koch (2006): <http://www.klimaaktiv.at/article/articleview/64794/1/24460>, last view: 2010-08-04, an

Englisch abstract can be found at '8 Abstract'.

This policy document is the only national strategy in that field, aims of this document are even quoted in the Federations Governmental Programme, namely to increase cycling in Austria from the average of 5% to 10% (big regional differences exist). All dimensions (planning, building, financing and managing) are considered. Implementation through regional managers bound to CO2-reduction / Information campaigns via the initiative "klima.aktiv"

Key words: Social equality, ecology, sports for all, public health, participation, planning, building, financing, managing,

8.2. Building

The Future-Orientated Sport Facility - Guideline for Sustainable Development of Sport Facilities

The ÖISS published this guideline in cooperation with German institutions working in that field (DOSB, Federal State sport associations of Nord-Rhein-Westfahlen, Niedersachsen, The sports University of Cologne, et al.

(http://www.oeiss.org/docs/sp_produkt15002282008144617.pdf last viewed at 2010-07-29, German version only).

8.3. Management

EU-Project SMS - Sustainable Management of Sport Facilities'

The ÖISS took part in the EU-project SMS on improving the training of facility managements. 'The project deals with the development and transfer of learning modules on the topic of 'Modern management of sports facilities' for the vocational training and further education in member states of the European Union.' (from the project's website: http://www.leonardo-sms.eu/project_en.htm last view: 2010-07-29)

Sport and Fun Halls Co., Vienna

Managing Director Wilhelm Göppert, in cooperation with Municipal Department MA 51 (Sport), Low cost, multifunctional (polysportive) hall, and located in particular at deprived neighbourhoods, Low-Energy building technique. Financing at two stages:

Stage 1: The subsidies by Municipal Department of Sports and Municipal Department of Education, Vienna, finance the facility management - energy, maintainance, therefore low coast entry fees.

Stage 2: The stuff of those 4 halls - same concept - is financed by the entry fees.

<http://www.sportundfun.at> last view: 2010-06-10

C) ANNEXES

VI) WP 1 – ANNEX 1 – IMPALA-GUIDELINE FOR INDIVIDUAL EXPERT INTERVIEWS (BY TNO LEIDEN, NETHERLANDS)

0. Are you responsible for the development of local infrastructure for LTPA? Please describe the part that you are responsible for.

At what level are you responsible?

- National level
- Regional/local level

NATIONAL POLICY

1. What are the national policy documents that explicitly deal with the development of LTPA infrastructures in the local arena? _ please provide (links to) these documents.

2. Do national policies exist that specifically deal with or affect access to and/or use of infrastructures for LTPA of population subgroups (e.g. age, gender, social class, ethnicity)?

REGIONAL/LOCAL POLICY

3. How are national policies distributed/communicated to local (and if applicable: regional) governments?

4. Are policies for the development of local infrastructures for LTPA primarily developed at the national level or also at the regional or local level?

a. Is this different for the four steps in the planning process (i.e. planning/ designing, financing, building and managing)?

b. Is this different for the three facility types?

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

5. Who are the relevant actors (governmental/non-governmental) in the development of national/local1 policy for the development of local infrastructures for LTPA?

a. Which party/parties (e.g. policy sectors) lead(s) the decision-making on

policies in this area and who has the final say?

b. Which other party/parties (interest groups/target groups) are involved?

c. What is the role of each party and what is the level of collaboration?

d. Which parties are currently not involved but should be involved to improve the policy-making for the planning of local infrastructures for LTPA?

6. What are potential benefits of the existing national/local policies for the development of infrastructures for LTPA?

7. What are potential problem areas or limiting factors of the existing national/local policies for the development of infrastructures for LTPA?

8. If problem areas or limiting factors do exist, are there plans to change existing policies to address these shortcomings?

MECHANISMS

9. Are there formal planning mechanisms (e.g. procedures and instruments) recommended or mandated by national policies? What are these mechanisms?

10. Are there informal planning mechanisms or other initiatives to stimulate cooperative planning between actors not written down in laws, guidelines or other documents?

Additional question:

A1. Would you be interested in good practice guidelines / a checklist for good practice in developing local infrastructures for LTPA?

**VII) WP 1 – ANNEX 2 –
IMPALA-GUIDELINE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION
(BY TNO LEIDEN, NETHERLANDS)**

Key considerations in conducting a focus group discussion

There are several key considerations in conducting a focus group discussion. First, the focus discussion should have a narrowly focused topic. A narrowly focused topic encourages the group members to give specific and detailed information which is easily analyzed. Secondly, the topic should be of interest to both the investigators and respondents. Thirdly, during the discussion the emphasis should be placed on the interaction between the group members. The aim should be to elicit the most detailed, vivid and valid responses from the group members. The focus group leader should be the listener who facilitates the interaction among the group members.

Preparation:

- Duration: approximately 3 hrs
- Number of participants: max. 10 end users, who are unknown to each other (see: sampling guideline for focus group discussion)
- Materials: digital voice recorder, pen and paper, IMPALA folders, preferably to be sent out prior to the group discussion.

Method

During the focus group discussion the question route should be followed so that all the participating countries gather comparable data. It is important to realize that the discussion guideline should guide, not limit, the questions that can be asked. The focus group leader should follow up leads offered by the group members with additional questions. When starting the focus group discussion the group leader introduces him/herself and his/her recorder. Next, the discussion guideline should be followed.

Explain goal of the focus group (by chair)

Short explanation of the IMPALA project and the main goal of the focus group discussion: to evaluate the experiences and opinions of the end-users regarding the development process of infrastructures for LTPA and to evaluate the collaboration between different parties in this area.

Discussion guideline (and indicative time schedule):

Introduction question

Please introduce yourself (name and organization) and explain in three sentences your role in the development process of infrastructures for LTPA.

Transition question

Can you tell us briefly about your experiences (e.g. problem areas and limiting factors) with existing (local) policies for the development process of infrastructures for LTPA.

Key questions

What are the existing problem areas in the development process of infrastructures for LTPA and how can they be resolved?

What are the main maintenance issues of infrastructures for LTPA and how can they be resolved?

What are the main issues regarding the access to the infrastructure for LTPA and how can they be resolved? (e.g. ethnic groups, costs, opening hours, rules/regulations)

What is the quality of the collaboration/communication between the national/local policies and the end-users, and how can it be optimized?

Ending question

What would be your key advice for developing local infrastructures for LTPA?

Final question

Is there anything else that is left unsaid but is important to be mentioned

VIII) WP 2 – ANNEX 0 – OVERVIEW ON AUSTRIAN LAWS AND DECREES

OVERVIEW ON LAWS AND DECREES IN AUSTRIA CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR LEISURE-TIME PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

NATIONAL ACTS (BUNDESGESETZE)

- **Forestry Act** - Forstgesetz 1975 (StF: BGBl. Nr. 440/1975, idF: BGBl. I Nr. 55/2007)
- **Public Tenders Act** - Bundesvergabegesetz (StF: BGBl. I Nr. 17/2006, idF: BGBl. I Nr. 86/2007)

FEDERAL STATE ACTS (LANDESGESETZE)

BURGENLAND

- **Sports Funding Act** - Sportförderungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 26/2004)
- **Federal State Schools Act** - Pflichtschulgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 36/1995)
- **Spatial Organisation Act** - Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 18/1969, idF: LGBl. Nr. 23/2007)
- **Programme on Federal Spatial Development (Decree)** - Landesentwicklungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 48/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 37/2000)

CARINTHIA – KÄRNTEN

- **Sports Act** - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 99/1997, idF: LGBl Nr 10/2009)
- **Federal State Schools Act** - Schulgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 58/2000, idF: LGBl Nr 7/2009)
- **Building Funds for Federal State Schools Act** - Schulbaufondsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 7/2009)
- **Building Federal State Schools Act** - Schulbauvorschriften (StF: LGBl Nr 86/1994)
- **Spatial Organisation Act** - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG (StF: LGBl Nr 76/1969, idF: LGBl Nr 136/2001)
- **Municipal Planning Act** - Gemeindeplanungsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 23/1995 (WV), idF: LGBl Nr 88/2005)
- **Building and Construction Act** - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl Nr 62/1996, idF: LGBl Nr 16/2009)
- **Development Programme for the Sports Facilities Plan (Decree)** - Entwicklungsprogramm Sportstättenplan (StF: LGBl Nr 1/1978)
- **Further Development Programmes on Carinthian regions (Decrees)** - Weitere Entwicklungsprogramme nach Regionen

LOWER AUSTRIA - NIEDERÖSTERREICH

- **Sports Acts** - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr. 60/1997, idF: LGBl Nr. 37/2009)
- **Lower Austrian Spatial Organisation Act** - NÖ Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr. 13/1977, idF: LGBl Nr. 72/2007):
- **Spatial Programme on Leisure-Time and Recreation (Decree)** - Freizeit- und Erholungsraumordnungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1978)
- **Spatial Programme on Central Municipalities (Decree)** - Zentrale-Orte-Raumordnungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 142/1973, idF: LGBl. Nr. 62/1992)
- **Playground Act** - Spielplatzgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 124/2002)

UPPER AUSTRIA - OBERÖSTERREICH

- **Sports Act**- Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 93/1997, idF: LGBl. Nr. 11/2009)
- **Decree on Upper Austrian Building and Equipment of Federal State Schools** - Oö. Schulbau- und -einrichtungsverordnung 1994 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 80/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 52/1999)
- **Spatial Organisation Act**- Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 114/1993, idF: LGBl. Nr. 1/2007)
- **Programme on Upper Austrian Spatial Organisation 1998 (Decree)** - Oö. Landesraumordnungsprogramm 1998 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 72/1998)
- **Building and Construction Act** - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 36/2008)

SALZBURG

- **Sports Act** - Landessportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 98/1987, idF: LGBl Nr 70/2007)
- **Decree on Building Federal State Schools** - Schulbauverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 60/1984, idF: LGBl. Nr. 73/2002)
- **Spatial Organisation Act** - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG 2009 (StF: LGBl Nr 30/2009)
- **Thematic Programme on Building Golf Facilities (Decree)** - Sachprogramm für die Errichtung von Golfanlagen (StF: LGBl Nr 90/1998)
- **Thematic Programme on Building Skiing Facilities in Salzburg (Decree)** - Sachprogramm über die Errichtung oder Änderung von Schianlagen im Land Salzburg (StF: LGBl Nr 49/2008)

STYRIA - STEIERMARK

- **Styrian Sports Act** - Steiermärkisches Landessportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 67/1988, idF: LGBl. Nr. 47/2008)
- **Federal State Schools Sustainment Act** - Steiermärkisches Pflichtschulerhaltungsgesetz 2004 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 71/2004, idF: LGBl. Nr. 94/2008)
- **Spatial Organisation Act** - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG (StF: LGBl. Nr. 127/1974, idF: LGBl. Nr. 89/2008)
- **Building and Construction Act** - Baugesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 59/1995, idF: LGBl. Nr. 88/2008)

- **Development Programme on Sports (Decree)** - Entwicklungsprogramm für das Sportwesen (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1991)
- **Development Programme on Leisure Time, Recreation and Tourism (Decree)** - Entwicklungsprogramm für Freizeit, Erholung und Fremdenverkehr (StF: LGBl. Nr. 53/1990)
- **Further Development Programmes on Stryian regions (Decrees)** - Weitere Entwicklungsprogramme nach Regionen

TYROL - TIROL

- **Tyrolean Sport Funding Act** - Tiroler Sportförderungsgesetz 2006 (LGBl. Nr. 97/2006)
- **Organisation of Tyrolean Federal State Schools Act** - Tiroler Schulorganisationsgesetz 1991 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 84/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 57/2008)
- **Tyrolean Spatial Organisation Act** - Tiroler Raumordnungsgesetz 2006 – TROG 2006 (LGBl. Nr. 27/2006)
- **Decree on Municipal Concepts of Spatial Organisation** - Verordnung für örtliche Raumordnungskonzepte, Bestandsaufnahme und Inhalt, (StF: LGBl. Nr. 122/1994)
- **Spatial Programme on Golf Facilities (Decree)** - Raumordnungsprogramm für Golfplätze (LGBl. Nr. 1/2009)
- **Spatial Programme on Funiculars and Skiing Facilities (Decree)** - Raumordnungsprogramm betreffend Seilbahnen und schitechnische Erschließungen (LGBl. Nr. 10/2005)

VORARLBERG

- **Sports Funding and Sports Safety Act** - Gesetz über die Sportförderung und die Sicherheit bei der Sportausübung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 15/1972, idF: LGBl. Nr. 36/2008)
- **Decree on Location, Building, Design and Equipment of Federal State Schools** - Verordnung der Landesregierung über Lage, bauliche Gestaltung, Einrichtung und Ausstattung öffentlicher Pflichtschulen (StF: LGBl. Nr. 14/1990)
- **Spatial Planning Act** - Gesetz über die Raumplanung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1996, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2008)
- **Nature Conservation and Landscape Development Act** - Gesetz über Naturschutz und Landschaftsentwicklung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 22/1997, idF: LGBl. Nr. 1/2008)

VIENNA - WIEN

- **Sports Act** - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 17/1972, idF: LGBl. Nr. 12/1980)
- **Viennese Statistics Act** - Gesetz über die Landes- und Gemeindestatistik in Wien (Wiener Statistikgesetz) - (StF: LGBl. Nr. 37/1987, idF: LGBl. Nr. 50/2001)
- **Viennese Federal State Schools Act** - Wiener Schulgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 20/1976, idF: LGBl. Nr. 40/2009)
- **Building and Construction Act** - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 11/1930, idF: LGBl. Nr. 25/2009)
- **Viennese Decree on Playgrounds** - Wiener Spielplatzverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 46/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2009)

IX) **WP2 – ANNEX A – AUSTRIAN DATA SOURCES**

TABLE OF INTERVIEW PARTNERS AND DATA SOURCES FOR ASSESSING NATIONAL MECHANISMS AND INSTRUMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LTPA INFRASTRUCTURES

Interview partner or Document name	Affiliation or Publisher	Part of the development process data source mainly refers to	Type of infrastructures data source mainly refers to	Mechanisms or instruments identified by the data source
Non-Compulsory Documents were found through by individual interview partners of WP1	National and Regional	All parts	All types	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)
Binding Documents are from: Rechtsinformationssystem (Austrian Juridical Information System) at http://ris.bka.gv.at	National and Regional	All parts	All types	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)
Additional Telephone Interviews for WP 2:				
DI Andrea Kinsperger (from WP1)	Vienna Municipal Department MA18 - Urban Development and Planning - Department Open Space and Landscape Planning	Planning Financing	Facilities designed for sports and physical activity	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)

DI Karin Schwarz-Viechtbauer (from WP1)	Head of the ÖISS - Austrian Institute for Schools and Sports Facilities	Planning Financing (Consulting)	Sports facilities and School sports facilities	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)
Dr. Horst Scheibl (New expert for WP2)	ÖISS employee in Salzburg and employee of the spatial planning department of the Federal State Salzburg.	Planning Financing	Sports facilities and School sports facilities	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)
ADir. Alexander Payer - (New expert for WP2)	Head of the ZSSW - Zentrale für Sportgeräteverleih und Sportplatzwartung (Centre for renting sport equipment and maintaining sport facilities). This is a department of the Austrian Ministry of Education and Culture	Management	Sport facilities	Mechanisms and Instruments (see Appendix B and C)

X) **WP2 – ANNEX B – AUSTRIAN MECHANISMS**

TABLE OF MECHANISMS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURES FOR LTPA

Name and website link (if existing)	Content	Publisher	Part of the development process it refers to	Level it applies to (national, regional, local)	Type of infrastructures it aims at
NATIONAL MECHANISMS					
BINDING					
Forestry Act - Forstgesetz 1975 (StF: BGBl. Nr. 440/1975, idF: BGBl. I Nr. 55/2007) http://www.ris.bkv.gv.at	Defines general usage of the Austrian forests (the right to walk in the forests for recreational reasons)	Republic of Austria	Management	Federal level	Facilities not designed for sports, but useable
FEDERAL STATE MECHANISMS					
BURGENLAND					
BINDING					
Sport Funding Act - Sportförderungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 26/2004)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities	Federal State Burgenland	Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities

Federal State School Act - Pflichtschulgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 36/1995)	Prescribes that schools have to be build with sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Burgenland	Planning and Constructing / Design	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
Spatial Organisation Act - Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 18/1969, idF: LGBl. Nr. 23/2007)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Burgenland	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
CARINTHIA					
BINDING					
Sports Act - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 99/1997, idF: LGBl Nr 10/2009)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected	Federal State Carinthia	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities
Federal State Schools Act - Schulgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 58/2000, idF: LGBl Nr 7/2009)	Prescribes that schools have to be build with sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Carinthia	Planning	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
Building Funds for Federal State Schools Act Schulbaufondsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 7/2009)	Defines how the building of schools are funded	Federal State Carinthia	Financing	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities

Building Federal State Schools Act - Schulbauvorschriften (StF: LGBl Nr 86/1994)	Prescribes how to built school sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Carinthia	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
Spatial Organisation Act - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG (StF: LGBl Nr 76/1969, idF: LGBl Nr 136/2001)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Carinthia	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Municipal Planning Act - Gemeindeplanungsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr 23/1995 (WV), idF: LGBl Nr 88/2005)	Defines criteria for land-use-planning	Federal State Carinthia	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Building and Construction Act - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl Nr 62/1996, idF: LGBl Nr 16/2009)	Defines criteria for building and construction	Federal State Carinthia	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	All facility types
LOWER AUSTRIA					
BINDING					
Sports Act - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr. 60/1997, idF: LGBl Nr. 37/2009)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected	Federal State Lower Austria	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sport Facilities

Lower Austrian Spatial Organisation Act - NÖ Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl Nr. 13/1977, idF: LGBl Nr. 72/2007)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Lower Austria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Playground Act - Spielplatzgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 124/2002)	Defines criteria for playgrounds	Federal State Lower Austria	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Playgrounds
UPPER AUSTRIA					
BINDING					
Sports Act - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 93/1997, idF: LGBl. Nr. 11/2009)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected	Federal State Upper Austria	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Spatial Organisation Act - Raumordnungsgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 114/1993, idF: LGBl. Nr. 1/2007)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Upper Austria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Building and Construction Act - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 36/2008)	Defines criteria for building and construction	Federal State Upper Austria	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	All facility types

STYRIA					
BINDING					
Styrian Sports Act - Steiermärkisches Landessportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 67/1988, idF: LGBl. Nr. 47/2008)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected	Federal State Styria	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities
Federal State Schools Sustainment Act - Steiermärkisches Pflichtschülerhaltungsgesetz 2004 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 71/2004, idF: LGBl. Nr. 94/2008)	Prescribes how to maintain school sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Styria	Management	Regional (State level)	School Sports Facilities
Spatial Organisation Act - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG (StF: LGBl. Nr. 127/1974, idF: LGBl. Nr. 89/2008)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Styria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Building and Construction Act - Baugesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 59/1995, idF: LGBl. Nr. 88/2008)	Defines criteria for building and construction	Federal State Styria	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	All facility types

SALZBURG					
BINDING					
Sports Act - Landessportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 98/1987, idF: LGBl Nr 70/2007)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected	Federal State Salzburg	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Spatial Organisation Act - Raumordnungsgesetz ROG 2009 (StF: LGBl Nr 30/2009)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Salzburg	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
TYROL					
BINDING					
Tyrolean Sport Funding Act - Tiroler Sportförderungsgesetz 2006 (LGBl. Nr. 97/2006)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities.	Federal State Tyrol	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Organisation of Tyrolean Federal State Schools Act - Tiroler Schulorganisationsgesetz 1991 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 84/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 57/2008)	Prescribes that schools have to be build with sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Tyrol	Planning	Regional (State level)	School Sports Facilities

Spatial Organisation Act - Tiroler Raumordnungsgesetz 2006 – TROG 2006 (LGBl. Nr. 27/2006)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Tyrol	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
VORARLBERG					
BINDING					
Sports Funding and Sports Safety Act Gesetz über die Sportförderung und die Sicherheit bei der Sportausübung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 15/1972, idF: LGBl. Nr. 36/2008)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected. Additionally speaks about nature space and rights for hikers and mountain-bikers	Federal State Vorarlberg	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Spatial Planning Act - Gesetz über die Raumplanung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1996, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2008)	Defines that suitable space for sport and recreation should be provided by the municipalities	Federal State Vorarlberg	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types

Nature Conservation and Landscape Development Act - Gesetz über Naturschutz und Landschaftsentwicklung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 22/1997, idF: LGBl. Nr. 1/2008)	Defines zones for the usage of recreation and LTPA in the open landscape	Federal State Vorarlberg	Planning	Regional (State level)	Facilities not designed for sports but useable
VIENNA					
BINDING					
Sports Act - Sportgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 17/1972, idF: LGBl. Nr. 12/1980)	Defines that parts of the Federal sports budget should be used for the development for sports facilities, and that sport facilities have to be protected.	Federal State Vienna	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Viennese Statistics Act - Gesetz über die Landes- und Gemeindestatistik in Wien (Wiener Statistikgesetz) - (StF: LGBl. Nr. 37/1987, idF: LGBl. Nr. 50/2001)	Prescribes that an inventory on Viennese Sport Facilities should be developed.	Federal State Vienna	Planning Management	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Viennese Federal State Schools Act - Wiener Schulgesetz (StF: LGBl. Nr. 20/1976, idF: LGBl. Nr. 40/2009)	Prescribes that schools have to be build with sport halls and outdoor facilities	Federal State Vienna	Planning	Regional (State level)	Sports Facilities
Building and Construction Act - Bauordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 11/1930, idF: LGBl. Nr. 25/2009)	Defines criteria for building and construction	Federal State Vienna	Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	All facility types (especially playgrounds)

XI) WP2 – ANNEX C – AUSTRIAN INSTRUMENTS

TABLE OF INSTRUMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURES FOR LTPA

Name and website link (if existing)	Content	Publisher	Part of the development process it refers to	Level it applies to (national, regional, local)	Type of infrastructures it aims at
NATIONAL INSTRUMENTS					
BINDING					
Public Tenders Act Bundesvergabegesetz	Defines benchmarks and competition types for public building projects	Republic of Austria	Planning / Building	National (Federal level)	All facility types
NON-COMPULSORY					
Resolution on spaces for sports and physical activity Enqueteresolution für Sport- und Bewegungsräume	Concept paper to work on the paradigmatic change of needs for infrastructure for sports and physical activity	ÖISS (2009)	Planning	National (Federal level)	All facility types
Collection of technical Guidelines for specific sports facilities Sammelmappe Sportstätten-Richtlinien	Technical Guidelines for specific sports facilities	ÖISS (2009)	Construction / Design	National (Federal level)	Sports facilities

Austrian Sports Facility Plan Österr. Sportstättenplan (dated document)	Inventory and m ² -key on lack of sport facilities for Austrian municipalities	ÖISS (1968-1980)	Planning	National (Federal level) and Regional (State level)	Sports facilities
Future:Sports Zukunft:Sport	Expert paper on the future of Austrian sports	Ministry of Sports (2008)	Planning Financing	National (Federal level)	Sports facilities
Austrian Standards Ö-Normen	Technical standards for building and constructing infrastructures	Austrian Standards Institute (continuous)	Planning Construction / Design	National (Federal level)	All facility types
Austrian Concept for Spatial Development 2001 Österreichisches Raumentwicklungskonzept 2001	Non-compulsory concept paper mainly claiming the need for the multitude of spaces, i. a. spaces of recreation and leisure-time	Austrian Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning - ÖROK (2001)	Planning	National (Federal level)	All facility types
Masterplan Cycling Masterplan Radfahren	Strategy paper on the increase of cycling within the total traffic volume in Austria	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (2008)	Planning	National (Federal level)	Cycling facilities (mostly everyday cycling as transportation)
Austrian Concept for Lakes Österreichisches Seenkonzept	Paper on useage and maintainance of Austrian lakes	Austrian Federal Forests (2002)	Management	National (Federal level)	Facilities not designed for sports but usable

Fairplay rules for Mountainbikers Fairplay-Regeln Mountainbiken	Paper on behaviour in the forests for mountainbiking	Austrian Federal Forests	Management	National (Federal level)	Facilities not designed for sports but usable
Fairplay rules for Horse Riding Fairplay-Regeln Reiten	Paper on behaviour in the forests for horse riding	Austrian Federal Forests	Management	National (Federal level)	Facilities not designed for sports but usable
FEDERAL STATE INSTRUMENTS					
BURGENLAND					
BINDING					
Programme on Federal Spatial Development (Decree) Landesentwicklungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 48/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 37/2000)	Concept paper mainly claiming the need for the multitude of spaces, i. a. spaces of recreation and leisure-time	Federal State Burgenland	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
CARINTHIA					
BINDING					
Development Programme for the Sports Facilities Plan (Decree) Entwicklungsprogramm Sportstättenplan (StF: LGBl Nr 1/1978)	Paper claiming the need of sport facilities (very general, short and dated)	Federal State Carinthia	Planning	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities

Further Development Programmes on Carinthian regions (Decrees) Weitere Entwicklungsprogramme nach Regionen	Five concept papers mainly claiming the need for the multitude of spaces in the regions, i. a. spaces of recreation and leisure-time	Federal State Carinthia	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
LOWER AUSTRIA					
BINDING					
Spatial Programme on Leisure-Time and Recreation (Decree) Freizeit- und Erholungsraumordnungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 39/1978)	The paper defines quantity of sport per capita in municipalities and claims a supply of recreation and leisure-time spaces all over the Federal State	Federal State Lower Austria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Spatial Programme on Central Municipalities (Decree) Zentrale-Orte-Raumordnungsprogramm (StF: LGBl. Nr. 142/1973, idF: LGBl. Nr. 62/1992)	Defines the amount and type of facilities in municipalities per capita	Federal State Lower Austria	Planning	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities

NON-COMPULSORY					
Concept for Regional Development of Lower Austria Landesentwicklungskonzept für Niederösterreich	Principles and aims of integrated spatial development in Lower Austria	Regional Government of Lower Austria: (2004)	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria, St. Pölten, Austria Kriterien für touristische Hauptradrouten in Niederösterreich	Criteria for tourism top cycling paths in Lower Austria	Cycling Coordination of the Federal State Publicity Agency of Lower Austria (2008)	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Cycling facilities
UPPER AUSTRIA					
BINDING					
Decree on Upper Austrian Building and Equipment of Federal State Schools Oö. Schulbau- und -einrichtungsverordnung 1994 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 80/1994, idF: LGBl. Nr. 52/1999)	Defines i. a. the size, amount and equipment of school sport facilities	Federal State Upper Austria	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
Programme on Upper Austrian Spatial Organisation 1998 (Decree) Oö. Landesraumordnungsprogramm 1998 (StF: LGBl. Nr. 72/1998)	Concept paper mainly claiming the need for the multitude of spaces, i. a. spaces of recreation and leisure-time	Federal State Upper Austria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types

NON-COMPULSORY					
Play Ground Subsidies NEW Spielraumförderung NEU	Information brochure for applications to subsidies according to the guidelines for neighbourhood improvements or for renovating/expanding of a playground in Upper Austria	Regional Government of Upper Austria – Department Housing (2009)	Planning Financing	Regional (State level)	Playgrounds
STYRIA					
BINDING					
Development Programme on Sports (Decree) - Entwicklungsprogramm für das Sportwesen (StF: LGBl. Nr. 66/1991)	Regulations on sports facilities including environmental aspects, gender aspects, architectural quality etc.	Federal State Styria	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities
Development Programme on Leisure Time, Recreation and Tourism (Decree) - Entwicklungsprogramm für Freizeit, Erholung und Fremdenverkehr (StF: LGBl. Nr. 53/1990)	The paper claims a supply of recreation and leisure-time spaces all over the Federal State; especially ecological aspects are mentioned	Federal State Styria	Planning	Regional (State level)	Facilities not designed for sports but usable

Further Development Programmes on Styrian regions (Decrees) - Weitere Entwicklungsprogramme nach Regionen	16 concept papers mainly claiming the need for the multitude of spaces in the regions, i. a. spaces of recreation and leisure-time	Federal State Styria	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types especially facilities not designed for sports but usable
SALZBURG					
BINDING					
Decree on Building Federal State Schools Schulbauverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 60/1984, idF: LGBl. Nr. 73/2002)	Defines i. a. the size, amount and equipment of school sport facilities	Federal State Salzburg	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
Thematic Programme on Building Golf Facilities (Decree) - Sachprogramm für die Errichtung von Golfanlagen (StF: LGBl Nr 90/1998)	Regulations on golf facilities to contain land consumption and other negative ecological aspects	Federal State Salzburg	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities (Golf)
Thematic Programme on Building Skiing Facilities in Salzburg (Decree) Sachprogramm ü. d. Errichtung o. Änderung v. Schianlagen im Land Salzburg (StF: LGBl Nr 49/2008)	Regulations on skiing facilities to contain land consumption and other negative ecological aspects	Federal State Salzburg	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities (Skiing)

TYROL					
BINDING					
Decree on Municipal Concepts of Spatial Organisation Verordnung für örtliche Raumordnungskonzepte, Bestandsaufnahme und Inhalt, (StF: LGBl. Nr. 122/1994)	Regulations for Municipalities and their Land Use Planning	Federal State Tyrol	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Spatial Programme on Golf Facilities (Decree) Raumordnungsprogramm für Golfplätze (LGBl. Nr. 1/2009)	Regulations on golf facilities to contain land consumption and other negative ecological aspects	Federal State Tyrol	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities (Golf)
Spatial Programme on Aerial Lifts and Skiing Facilities (Decree) - Raumordnungsprogramm betreffend Seilbahnen und schitechnische Erschließungen (LGBl. Nr. 10/2005)	Regulations on aerial lifts and skiing facilities to contain land consumption and other negative ecological aspects	Federal State Tyrol	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Sports facilities (Skiing)

VORARLBERG					
BINDING					
Decree on Location, Building, Design and Equipment of Federal State Schools Verordnung der Landesregierung über Lage, bauliche Gestaltung, Einrichtung und Ausstattung öffentlicher Pflichtschulen (StF: LGBl. Nr. 14/1990)	Defines i. a. the size, amount and equipment of school sport facilities	Federal State Vorarlberg	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	School sports facilities
VIENNA					
BINDING					
Urban development plan of Vienna, 2005 STEP 05 - Stadtentwicklungsplan Wien 2005	Master plan of urban development in Vienna from 2005-2015	City of Vienna (2005)	Planning	Regional (State level)	All facility types
Viennese Decree on Playgrounds Wiener Spielplatzverordnung (StF: LGBl. Nr. 46/1991, idF: LGBl. Nr. 35/2009)	Defines criteria for playgrounds	Federal State Vienna	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Playgrounds
NON-COMPULSORY					
The Viennese Guideline for the Development of Parks Das Wiener Parkleitbild	Guideline for the Development of Viennese Parks	Vienna's Municipal Department 42 – Parks and Gardens (2008)	Planning Construction / Design	Regional (State level)	Parks