

### 2.9.1 Zoning

As we said before, the current CAP is not adequate for the various environments present in the EU and will therefore be even less adequate with the annexation of the Central Eastern European countries. It is furthermore important that a subdivision of the European territory should be carried out, according to areas with characteristics in common like environment conditions, type of breeding carried out, political aims (e.g. avoiding rural depopulation, conserving landscape, etc), and in which CAP may be applied in a differentiated manner.

Our proposal implies the creation of a series of geographical regions of environmental interest and differing socio-economic needs, in which the livestock breeding policy can be adapted to the local needs (different types of economic support, different stocking rate limits,...).

At Community level, an initial series of zones should be established, leaving the Member States to subsequently subdivide them according to their priority and administrative needs. The annex n° 8 cites Chapter 6 of the CEAS-EFNCP (1997) report which proposes a possible zoning of Europe on the basis of areas of differing agri-environmental value.

When approaching the creation of these areas, the necessity to conserve the wild species "in danger", should be taken in consideration. Considering this it is necessary to remember that the creation of limited natural reserves for the wildlife conservation is not sufficient to large carnivores. For species with large home ranges is necessary a conservation plan comprehending the entire landscape management (Noss et al. 1996).

Land use zoning is a division into areas with a priority use for each of them. A zoning plan implies the design and management of the entire landscape in order to reach a specific goal. Designing the landscape for zoning implies a lot a difficulties because is quite impossible to satisfy all interests in a given area.

An example of zoning is the spatial separation between agricultural-priority areas and large carnivore conservation-priority areas in order to reduce overlap between these two different landuse areas. This kind of separation between predators and domestic livestock might be a solution to the old conflict that, as already stated, has often been the cause of the extinction of large carnivores, in areas where they could be found in conflict with livestock and then persecuted. The "wild" areas are those in which livestock do not exist and where, consequently, the conflicts are absent. These are also the best areas for the conservation of large carnivores, but not for the need of the species of a particularly wild habitat (in fact the carnivores are a rather generalist species) rather because the lack of livestock eliminates the problem of persecution that derives from it (Linnel 1996).

The availability of these areas however is limited, and the future of large carnivores does not lie in an exclusive zonation that provides a net space segregation, rather a multiple-use approach of the overlapping territory. In fact, according to a program of total segregation, the lack of real wild areas (that is not exploited by men and therefore lacking zootechniques), could mean either the extinction of the predators due for the lack of territory, or the elimination of the breeders in areas considered as priority for the conservation of the various species of large carnivores. Without a doubt this cannot be proposed. Therefore, the alternative is an efficient program for the co-existence of predators and breeders.