



**EUROPARC**  
F E D E R A T I O N

# Workshops summary - Report 2013

---

## EUROPARC Annual Conference

9-13 October, Debrecen, Hungary

**This report fulfils the following objective of the NGO operating grant 2013 under the Financial Instrument for the Environment (Life+):**

**2.1)** To ensure that protected areas across Europe significantly contribute to the implementation of the EU biodiversity strategy



*Funded by the European Union.*

*The production of this publication has been supported financially in the framework of the European Commission's (Directorates General Environment and Climate Action) LIFE + funding programme of operating grants for European Environmental NGOs.*

*The content of this publication does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union.*

*Responsibility for the information and views expressed in the publication lies entirely with the authors*

## WORKSHOP 1 Integrated management - Working to improve biodiversity

### Presentation

How does management in protected areas and N2000 sites support the EU Biodiversity strategy? We examine the example of conservation of ecosystems restored by the Hortobágy National Park.

- *Field trip:* Máta and Pentezug areas, Hortobágy National Park
- *Workshop manager:* **Gábor Szilágyi (HU)**
- *Speaker:* **Stefan Leiner (EU)**, DG Environment

#### *Key words:*

- The role of protected areas in the EU Biodiversity strategy 2020, networking, implementation, management needs, support from the EU  
An example of PA management to enhance local biodiversity and therefore implement biodiversity strategy
- Field trip: Máta and Pentezug areas
  - biodiversity conservation of alkaline marshes and grasslands
  - ecological effects of removing old canals, dykes and replacing overhead power lines with underground cables.
  - invasive plants, grazing management, traditional breeds, local food

#### *Input:*

**Stefan Leiner (EU)**

DG Environment

- How can EUROPARC and its members contribute to the implementation of the biodiversity strategy?
- How can the EU support the work of EUROPARC and its members?
- Illustrated by examples of Natura 2000, Green Infrastructure, ecosystem mapping and valuation

### Summary

After a short introductions of the participants themselves, Stefan, the speaker of the workshop explains, that his favourite things of EUROPARC Conferences are the possibilities is working together with different countries, representing different point of views. Some questions came up: What is the “quality of nature” term means? (participant from Denmark) How to balance between the strict rules and the real nature conservation management? (participant from Romania). Answered by Stefan during presentation “Study on permitting procedures soon be finalised.”

The main question of the workshop: How does the management of protected areas and Natura 2000 sites support the EU Biodiversity Strategy?

In the EU Biodiversity Strategy, there are six priority targets:

1. Enhance implementation of nature legislation,
2. Restore ecosystem establish Green Infrastructure
3. Sustainable agriculture and forestry
4. Sustainable fisheries
5. Combat alien invasive species
6. Contribute to alerting

Actions for the aforementioned targets have to be time-specific.

For Target 1, the priorities are the following: complete the Natura 2000 network, securing the long-term management practices of the sites and ensure adequate financing of Natura 2000 sites (MFF, CAP, EMF...). Enhancing the cooperation with the key sectors, facilitating enforcement and implementing and the improving and streamlining the monitoring and reporting are needed. Establishing “Green Infrastructure” throughout the EU came up. It is still in the conception phase.

For Target 5, the objective is to control, eradicate IAS and their pathways by developing EU-level legislation.

There are a lot of upcoming handbooks, guidance books, (on farmlands, hydropower, climate change, wilderness, etc.). A study on permitting procedures soon be finalised. We have to inform the public throughout Natura2000 newsletters (like no. 34), economic benefits of Natura2000 fact-sheets, to show them it works (e.g. site managers). The ecological network is really a patchwork, made from stepping stones, buffer zones, core areas, etc. We shouldn't only concentrate only on Natura2000 sites, but the surroundings as well. Europarc and Eurosite should work together in an upcoming LIFE project, to create a seminar for experts from different countries.

The term “favourable condition” could be hard to explain to someone, who is not involved in nature conservation. A Natura2000 site manager can be a herdsman, an NGO, any local farmer, land-owner sees “biodiversity” from different views. We have to listen all these opinions, let them explain their stands, because we could learn from them, and we should interact with them, while creating the rules for managing the sites to find out the easiest way for all of us. Of course, many times this won't work, because of different interests. An award system, financial compensation for stakeholders can produce interests for example. In Hungary, during the management planning processes, the stakeholders are informed about it, but it's not the best way, because they could easily find it offensive, not informal. When it comes to find out the right way, experience means a lot. So, to change as many experiences as possible an upcoming international conference for professionals is urgently needed.

## WORKSHOP 2 Planning for action - Management plans that work for nature

### Presentation

A management plan is only as good as its implementation. How can we ensure our plans are fit for the future and deliver real actions? We look at work in the Hortobágy National Park and follow their journey from plan to action.

- *Field trip:* Angyalháza, Szelencés and Borzas areas
- *Workshop manager:* **Peter Ogden (UK)**, Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales
- *Speaker:* **Mateusz Grygoruk (PL)**, Warsaw University of Life Sciences - SGGW, Department of Hydraulic Engineering, Warsaw / Bierbrza National Park

#### Key words:

- Creating effective species/habitat management plans, how to make them fit for the future
- considering climate change mitigation, land use change
- successful techniques of management, define themes which need management, define partners to be involved etc.
- case study on management plan in Bierbrza NP reacting to climate change, Habit-Change project
- Field trip: Angyalháza, Szelencés and Borzas areas
  - species-specific conservation plans for the Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*) and other ground-breeding avian species connected to native grasslands and agricultural areas.
  - specific survey techniques, adapting management planning to agri-environmental schemes and predicted climatic variability
  - traditional breeds, invasive plants, grazing management, wetland management, ecotourism

#### Input:

#### **Mateusz Grygoruk (PL)**

Warsaw University of Life Sciences - SGGW, Department of  
Hydraulic Engineering /  
Bierbrza National Park

- What tips can we give PA managers to improve their management planning?
- case study on management plan in Bierbrza NP reacting to climate change, Habit-Change project

### Summary

To create a successful Management plan for Great bustard:

Three groups are working together as a :

1. Representative of Business (as land owners)
2. Representative of NGO's
3. Representative of National Park Authority

What would they expect to be included in a management plan?

Each group produced and communicated two key propositions to the other two groups. .

**1. NGO (national charity) -**

- A rise in the current breeding bustard population, with a continuous increase over time
- Opportunities for sustainable recreation of all.

**2. Business**

Develop farm buildings for tourism (accommodation, crafts, coffee shops, guided tours)

- Asking NGOs for advice + volunteers
- Asking Park Authority for funding assistance to restore and develop farm buildings

**3. Park Authority**

Goal: Great bustard protection by habitat enhancement. New Hatching and breeding programme in 5 years

*To land owners:*

1. Guaranteed income for 10 years
2. Achieve traditional land use, culture
3. Offer sites for bird watching
4. No pesticides or „industrial agriculture”

*To NGOs:*

1. Monitoring and analyse why Great bustard is not breeding
2. Volunteering work: foxes
3. Interview elderly people for info on traditional land use

**Each group responded to the propositions and expect:**

NGO:

1. sign up to a declaration + partnership agreement
2. They will provide funding for monitoring and land management for 5 years
3. Volunteer involvement

Land owners expect

1. cooperation with specialists, need information from NGOs and National Park
2. economy outcomes
3. Involved with the NP
4. A new use for their buildings

National Park want

1. an experimental farm in a designated zone for bustards and which also supports cultural heritage
2. Life long learning for all
3. volunteers involved

A simple clear management plan was created and agreed by all parties based on these principles.

## WORKSHOP 3 Nature that counts – Monitoring biodiversity

### Presentation

In order to make sound decisions on management issues, as well as capture current and future trends, we need good base data on the biodiversity that is out there. We will look at some examples of how wildlife is monitored in Hortobágy National Park.

- *Field trip: Zám area*
- *Workshop manager: Dr. Rozália Érdiné Szekeres (HU)*
- *Speakers:*
  - **Catherine Wynn (UK)**, Peak District NP
  - **Tiia Kalkse (NO)**, Pasvik Inari Trilateral Park

#### *Key words:*

- Effective survey techniques, monitoring methodology, management-oriented results for species and habitats.
- We will specifically examine some of the issue of monitoring species across border, with examples from a transboundary park
- Field trip: Zám area
  - Demonstration of various methods of monitoring
  - native, alkaline grassland interspersed with wet grasslands and marshes
  - Hortobágy-Halastó Fishponds, an extensively managed fishpond system with rich birdlife recognised as Ramsar site including a short walk in Malomháza Safari Park.
  - wetland management, extensive fishpond management, grazing management, ecotourism

#### *Input 1:*

##### **Catherine Wynn (UK)**

Peak District NP

- Do we need to rationalise European monitoring methodology
- How can we implement a cost effective and efficient monitoring system that informs park decisions
- Moor for the Future project
- Moor monitoring

#### *Input 2:*

##### **Tiia Kalkse (FI)**

Pasvik Inari Trilateral Park

- Pasvik-Inari Trilateral Park - experience across three countries Finland /NORW/Russia
- monitoring of brown bear and water fowl
  - how do we make monitoring work in a transboundary region
  - what monitoring programmes

- how to cooperate & in which fields

## Summary

Key word: advancing monitoring

Take home message: Knowledge based successful management of natural resources needs coordinated monitoring and common data sharing.

Conclusions of the information gathered from W3:

Most important key activities of monitoring:

- **E** encourage data acces, enlarge database, efficiency, effectivity, evidence-based, effort
- **U** useful data, user friendly, uniformity, useful, understandability
- **R** research, realibity, rare species, reporting
- **O** perability, open-minded, organisation, open acces, operational
- **P** partnership, practical, presentable results,park, protected areas
- **A** applicability, accessibility, availability, attractivity
- **R** rationalization, remote sensing,research
- **C** co-operation, collaboration, coordination,cost-effectiveness, communication, common species, CRANES

Financing sustained data series is difficult but essential for understanding long term natural processes . This is a key issue for an economic solution for long term security and data management.

Knowledge based successful management of natural resources needs coordinated monitoring and common data sharing.

Partnership with people living around, volunteers, NGOs and scientists etc. helps monitoring . Public data access improves monitoring, gets better results, more knowlegde, so it is in mutual interest of scientists and nature conservationists.

Diverse national systems make challenging to discuss data so long term monitoring needs common classification, in the near future. Good interpretation and communication are crucial for public relationships.

Directive interpretations differ between countries, so before any research, harmonisation of interpretations, understanding of system is essential for efficiency.

## WORKSHOP 4 Working to bring nature back - Restoration in a changing landscape

### Presentation

Europe has lost much of its natural landscape, but here is now a strong fight back to restore ecosystems and habitats. N2000 sites and protected areas will be affected by climate change so how do we plan for a changing landscape? We see an example of a restored marsh in the Hortobágy National Park.

- *Field trip:* Egyek-Pusztakócs Marshes Demonstration Trail
- *Workshop manager:* Ignace Schops (BE)
- *Speakers:* Andris Širvos (LV), Kemeru National Park

#### *Key words:*

- restoration in a changing landscape
- What do protected areas need to prepare to manage changing landscapes?
- climate change is affecting the distribution and structure of ecosystems
- How do we restore the integrity of wetland, grassland and forest habitats in a changing environment?
- Field trip: Egyek-Pusztakócs Marshes Demonstration Trail:
  - restoration of a network of alkaline marshes by artificially managing its hydrological system, grazing and restoring original vegetation.
  - traditional breeds, fire management, ecosystem monitoring, ecotourism

#### *Input:*

**Andris Širvos (LV)**

Kemeru National Park

#### Restoring forest landscape in Latvia

- What do protected areas need to prepare to manage changing landscapes?
- working with the local community

### Summary

(workshop 4 and 14 merged because the two topics are closely related to each other. We both had the benefits to of sharing ideas)

- We were inspired by the field trip yesterday in the Egyek-Pusztakocs marches, jointly together with workshop 4
- The advantage of LIFE projects is the ability to work on a landscape scale
- Investing in nature pays off.
- (workshop 14) There were two presentors in the workshop: one on how to design the integrated LIFE projects in the future (László Bécsy of the Life unit of EU's DG environment) and one on how

Natura 2000 can be an asset for more fuding besides EU LIFE. The examples Mikko Tiira presented of Finland were inspiring for the EUROPARC network.

- (workshop 4) There was one presentor for workshop 4, Andris Sirovs out Latvia. He presented a case study of bog restauration and flood plain restauration in Kemeru National Park. The restauration of wildlife is not only succesful for habitat diversity and climate adaptation, it also benefits humans wellbeing.

## **EU LIFE program**

- Guidelines are prepared at the moment. In next period the application will have two steps: concept note and the full proposal.
- Be prepared for the first call
- Budget: 855 million euro for 7 years, 637 million euro for environment
- Valuable imput of EUROPARC members is appreciated
- In next program of LIFE, projects should be considered as catalysts, and be a excellerator for integration other EU funds
- LIFE program is extended with financial support for „intgrated projects” and Climate change
- Capacity building and including NGO's is a positive element
- Even partnes outside the EU can be involved (...)
- Important tool will be the Prioritized Action Frameworks (PAF). PAFs are an essential tool to find solutions to the funding requirements of Natura 2000 network & identify key actions and potential funding sources

## **Integrate financing of Natura 2000 sites Finland**

- Several good practices of Finland were highlighted. The combination of serveral funding mechanisms are operational and succesful.
- Metsahallitus, a governmental organisation in Finland works nationwide with a staff of 800. The main objectives are the management and plannig, cooperation with diff stakeholders, promotion of recreational use and promotion of nature tourism activities. Since 1995 they have coordinated 18 projects.
- Finland has 37 national parks with annualy 2.09 million visitors
- Co-funding for EU projects is currently managed within the organization

The active discussion clarified a lot of questions of members of EUROPARC federation and will take into account in the LIFE unit to provide good guidelines. ESpecially the integrated projects of LIFE are an opportunity to combine and integrate funds of other EU policies.

The Natura 2000 network has the capacity and the ambition to bring all Natura 2000 sites a favorable status of maintenance and tackle the problem of biodiversty loss. Good practices like Metsahallitus were inspiring for the attendees.

Climate Change adaptation and mitigation can be an opportunity for a better maintenance of protected areas. At the moment the policies are too separate. It is a good idea EUROPARC federation takes the initiative to make to connection!

## WORKSHOP 5 Managing Wild – Working with wilderness

### Presentation

Management and wilderness: are the two compatible? What kind of management do we need to restore or to help wilderness survive? Are wilderness and wild areas accepted /promoted by the European countries as part of their conservation programmes? We shall look at the new EU guidelines for the management of Wilderness and Wild Areas in Natura 2000 sites, the EU Wilderness Register, the initiatives of Wild Europe and PAN Parks. You are invited to contribute case studies of wilderness protection and restoration. The field trip will illustrate conservation work with Przewalski's horses and Heck cattle in Hortobágy National Park.

- *Field trip:* Pentezug area
- *Workshop manager:* **Erika Stanciu (RO)**
- *Speaker:*
  - **Zoltan Kun (HU)**, PAN Parks Foundation
  - **Toby Aykroyd (UK)**, Wild Europe

#### *Key topics:*

- Managing wilderness? Practical case studies to examine if we need management for wilderness and wild areas
- new EU guidelines for the management of Wilderness and Wild Areas in N2000, the EU Wilderness Register
- discuss / develop the wilderness agenda and work plan of the Federation, i.e. agree how we can best contribute to the protection and restoration of wilderness areas in coordination with the WILD Europe initiative and PAN Parks.
- Field trip: Pentezug area
  - Conservation using large herbivores (Przewalski's Horses, Heck Cattle) with very little human intervention for maintaining alkaline grasslands by grazing
  - contributing to the conservation programme of wild horse species,
  - Issues related to practical management: grazing and fire management, ecosystem monitoring
  - study of prehistoric grazing systems
  - the Malomháza Safari Park.

#### *Input 1:*

#### **Zoltan Kun (HU)**

PAN Parks Foundation

#### *Input 2:*

#### **Toby Aykroyd (UK)**

Wild Europe

- EU guidelines for managing wild and wilderness areas in Natura 2000 sites
- Wilderness Register for Europe
- Wild Europe Initiative
- WILD10
- practical issues, case studies

## Summary

**Key word:** FREE

**Key message:** Be aware that WILDERNESS is and can be part of NATURA 2000 sites and promote the essential wilderness values to PEOPLE.

### I. General considerations:

- Wilderness in Europe:
  - o the policy framework for wilderness is shaping up (see presentation)
  - o there is a definition and criteria for wilderness, accepted by the EC and reflected in the guidelines for wilderness management in Natura 2000 sites
  - o there is a vision paper developed by a few organization
- there were/are on-going projects at the European level in support of the wilderness movement:
  - o developing a wilderness register
  - o Guidelines for wilderness management in Natura 2000 sites developed
  - o An initial wilderness map developed by PAN Parks
- There should be a joint effort and a platform to coordinate the mapping / maps on wilderness to avoid confusion (parallel initiatives)

### II. Discussions:

- Wilderness needs management
  - o Law enforcement
  - o Interpretation
  - o Visitor management
  - o Monitoring
- Rewilding:
  - o is about restoring natural processes (allowing them to happen or help the start again. Not every rewilding action will have as a result wilderness.)
  - o Rewilding should aim Nature and People (hearts and minds)
- Communication and education for Wilderness acceptance and for valuing it:
  - o is essential and should aim the general public at large
  - o the small group of supporters should grow!!!
  - o We have to work through EMOTIONS
  - o Adapt the language for:
    - The general public (inhabitants of cities, towns and villages)
    - Land and resource users
  - o Should be very careful and cautious in using the Wilderness and Rewilding terms:
    - Use more the word Nature for the general public
    - Learn from the experience of others (Ireland and the Netherlands) where the use of these terms created animosity and not support
- Protecting and rewilding means to work with the decision makers. That should be done with a clear strategy, using the definition, vision, adapted communication, etc.
- Very difficult to protect existing wilderness in Europe, especially Eastern Europe (case study Tarcu Mountain Natura 2000 site in Romania). Support is sometimes desperately needed.

### **III. What should the Federation (we) do?**

1. Use and promote the EC Guidelines for wilderness management in Natura 2000 sites (see presentation for the link)
2. Develop and communicate case studies on how to best communicate Nature
3. Bring in others to our events: e.g. create a clear spot for governments to come and say what they are doing, bring them in to listen to what we do, make them part of our event
4. Fundraising event at the next conference (conferences): e.g. silent auction to support “desperate” cases members have to manage in their areas. Idea will be presented by workshop leader to the Council.
5. Put the Wilderness definition paper on the website of Europarc.

## WORKSHOP 6 Nature in the wrong place – Management of invasive species

### Presentation

Many N2000 sites and protected areas are under a growing threat of invasive species, but how can we monitor, eradicate and predict their future with changing climatic conditions? We look at how Hortobágy NP is tackling this problem in their area.

- *Field trip:* Great Forest of Debrecen (Hajdúság-Dél-Nyírség Landscape Protection Area)
- *Workshop manager:* **Marian Jager-Wöltgens (NL)**
- *Speaker:* **Dr Piero Genovesi (IT)**, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA),  
IUCN SSC Specialist Group on Invasive Alien Species

#### Key words:

- How do we monitor and measure the expansion of invasive plants?
- Combined effects of land use change and climate change on the accelerated spread of alien plants.
- Field trip: Great Forest of Debrecen (Hajdúság-Dél-Nyírség Landscape Protection Area)
  - ecological threats, control techniques of False Acacia, Black Cherry, Short Ragweed and Common Milkweed
  - management problems of the highly invasive Indigo Bush
  - forest management

#### Input:

**Dr Piero Genovesi (IT) / Andrea Monaco (IT)**

Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA),  
IUCN SSC Specialist Group on Invasive Alien Species

- What is the new EU strategy on invasive alien species?
- How can we work toward better border control and biosecurity?
- Guidelines for invasive species management in protected areas

### Summary

- Nature conservation should not fight against all the alien species: concentrate on invasive species that are the most dangerous.
- Communication: important to explain why we do this.
- Education: why is it important/ it is a part of prevention /website, school programmes, involve junior rangers/.
- Damage analysis /cost and benefit.
- Clear management strategy needed and this is a never ending process.

- Climate change facilitate spreading of alien species - Southern part of Europe affected most.
- More research is needed focused on more practical aspects on treating of invasive species.
- This is a very important theme for European projekt and also a Europarc theme for the Strategy.

## WORKSHOP 7 Rural alliances – Working with agriculture

### Presentation

How can protected areas and agriculture collaborate for mutual benefits and find funding tools to enhance nature conservation and sustainable food production? What will the effect of the new CAP be on these rural alliances? We will look at an agri-environment project where Hortobágy NP works in partnership with local farmers to improve the area's birdlife.

- *Field trip:* North-Hortobágy and Nagyszik LIFE project area
- *Workshop manager:* **Dominique Leveque (FR)**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Clunie Keenleyside (EU), IEEP**
  - **Jacques Decuignières (FR), CECTD - Cité Européenne de la Culture et du Tourisme Durable**

#### *Key words:*

- agriculture and protected areas as integrated partners for protection & funding
- Finding ways to apply agriculture and nature funding tools to enhance conservation programmes available in agro-environmental schemes and Environmental Sensitive Areas.
- An examination of current and possible new opportunities arising from the CAP and integrated funding mechanisms of the EU.
- Field trip: North-Hortobágy and Nagyszik LIFE project area
  - alkaline steppe and wader breeding sites
  - privately owned arable lands offering bustard-friendly fields and sites
  - agricultural management providing habitats for crane and geese
  - wetland and grazing management, ecosystem monitoring, ecotourism, traditional breeds

#### *Input 1:*

**Clunie Keenleyside (EU) IEEP**

- European Commission /IEEP: new guidelines "Management of Farmland in Natura 2000", practical examples from PAs.
- Funding guidance
- Design & implementation of EU policies for high nature farmland
- case study: Limousin
- parks & farmers working together

#### *Input 2*

**Jacques Decuignières (FR)**

CECTD

### Summary

Bullet ponints:

- Create projects aiming to sustainable development shared by farmers in protected areas.
- Share these experiences in the transboundary protected areas or through transnational projects.  
Among such projects:
  - refer to different nature habitats
  - refer to new commercial short circuits
  - refer to knowledge transfer
  - refer to specific investments
  - refer to small farmer schemes, organic farming etc.
  - refer to branding by protected areas could contribute to a better living for farmers
- Lobby to national authorities for these projects, because pillar 2 of the new CAP is very flexible for a few months. This flexibility could be either an opportunity or a threat.
- Put the stress on farmland conservation and never forget that the farmers need consideration and sustainable earnings.

### **Conclusion:**

Mutual understanding between farmers and protected areas would be profitable for all and should contribute to mutual benefits.

## WORKSHOP 8 Working with others for nature – Involving partners beyond the protected area

### Presentation

What makes a good partnership? Who do N2000 and protected areas need to work alongside to ensure wider support for nature conservation? We look at one area in Hortobágy NP and explore what makes this partnership work for mutual benefit of all involved.

- *Field trip:* Kunkápolnás Marsh and Nagyiván area
- *Workshop manager:* **Eric Baird (UK)**
- *Speaker:* **Marianne Lang (IT)**, MedPan

#### *Key words:*

- What do protected areas need to put in place to ensure positive, healthy and sustainable partnership with stakeholders?
- We look at other partnership examples from marine protected areas
- Stakeholders, land owners & partners from other sectors for sustaining biodiversity outside state protected sites
- forming new partnerships as a primary element of integrated conservation planning and management
- Field trip: Kunkápolnás Marsh and Nagyiván area
  - Participation of local farmers' alliances in bustard conservation
  - agri-environmental issues focusing on the conservation of alkaline wetlands and Great Bustard
  - grazing management, local breeds, ecotourism.

#### *Input 1:*

**Marianne Lang (IT)**, MedPan

- New focus: partnerships with fishermen
- partnership examples from marine protected areas

### Summary

#### *Response to the field trip:*

"If we want a park: work with people. People are part of the protected area."

"HNPI preserves a CHANGED nature. It is not an original nature, but people love it and do not want to change it."

"Different kinds of landscapes serve well."

1. partnership

2. motivation
3. pride
4. connection
5. respect: people <-> nature
6. communication
7. ownership
8. human activity
9. collaboration

*Response to presentation:*

- From problem to solution – stakeholder may have the answer
- Share info/knowledge/values – stakeholder is your equal
- Add extra resources – may need to break impasse

Who do we need to work alongside to get wider support for protected areas?

**Definition of stakeholder (in a wider aspect): can influence, are influenced (CIAO)**

Control -> Influence->Anticipate->Observe

Who can influence the PA and who is influenced by the PA?

How stakeholders influence PAs	->	<-	How PAs influence stakeholders
<b>policy</b>  campaign, lobby, sabotage, bribe			
<b>management</b>  persuade, poaching, contribute, knowledge, hands-on activities			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• income</li> <li>• techniques</li> <li>• give responsibilities and duties</li> <li>• awareness raising</li> <li>• status</li> <li>• happiness</li> </ul>
<b>direct action</b>  volunteer, transmit message, service provision, partner, pay-back, €			

What makes a good partnership?

When? Timing  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge</li> <li>• informing about goal and process</li> <li>• ask help</li> </ul> at all stages	Why? Motivation->good results  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• satisfaction</li> <li>• outcomes</li> <li>• mutual trust, understanding</li> <li>• education - make them feel important, feel informed, make them interested, make them special thus</li> </ul>
--	---

	proud
How? Method	What? Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• simplicity</li> <li>• improved knowledge</li> <li>• small steps</li> <li>• follow-up</li> <li>• appropriate language</li> <li>• equals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• equitable power, resource and trust</li> <li>• try to share equally</li> </ul>

### Critique your process

#### *Arnstein's ladder – Ladder of participation*

- citizen control
- delegated power
- partnership
- placation/reassure
- consultation
- informing
- therapy
- manipulation

### Messages

- Motivation and participation works.
- Make partners from stakeholders.
- If you win, then I win.
- Make them proud, give ownership.
- Collaboration.
- If we want to be loved, be loveable.
- Connecting people-nature-people.

## WORKSHOP 9 Working with wood

### Resolving conflicts of interests with commercial forestry in protected areas

#### Presentation

Can forests be managed for commercial use and conservation simultaneously in an N2000 or protected area? How do we resolve management issues when there are conflicting objectives? We examine forestry management in the Hortobágy NP.

- *Field trip:* Ohat Forest, Nagy Kácsa floodplain forest
- *Workshop manager:* **Rolands Auzins (LV)**
- *Speaker:* **Gerald Plattner, (AT)** Österreichische Bundesforste AG

*Key words:*

- conflicting interests of conservation management and commercial forestry management
- how can we resolve conflicts, ensuring collaboration with stakeholders
- working together for a quality forest, certified forests, forest certification systems
- Field trip: Ohat Forest Nagy,Kácsa floodplain forest
  - alkaline oak forests, amongst the most endangered plant communities in the Carpathian Basin
  - struggle against alien plants
  - ecosystem monitoring

*Input 1:*

**Gerald Plattner (AT)**

Österreichische Bundesforste AG

- Experiences from the Austrian Federal Forests, case studies
- cooperation of forestry & protected area
- positive effects on forest management
- practical work with stakeholders

#### Summary

Working with wood – Resolving conflicts of interests with commercial forestry in protected areas

Keyword: mutual understanding

Take home message: Mutual understanding, building trust and working together in order to maintain biodiversity values and improve forestry practice.

- Forestry needs long-term thinking
- Raise awareness among foresters and general society
- Work together with NGOs, municipalities and other stakeholders

- Use power of media in behalf of you
- Forestry traditions of foresters can be changed through explanation in economical terms
- Nature conservationists and foresters have to cooperate and work together
- Use foresters knowledge to improve values of forest biotopes

## WORKSHOP 10 Communication comes naturally – or does it?

### Presentation

Communication is the single biggest challenge and opportunity facing N2000 and protected areas. So how can we do it better? What skills are needed for the modern protected area staff? We analyse communication skills needed and tools we can use to communicate effectively considering how we plan and execute our communication with stakeholders. We meet some stakeholder of the Hortobágy National park and hear their perspective.

- *Field trip:* Angyalháza and Borzas areas
- *Workshop manager:* **Dea Mijakovac (HR)**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Marcus Bauer (DE)**, Responentour
  - **Laura Istrate (RO)**, ProPark

#### *Key words:*

- Communications skills - what are we saying to whom and how?
- What makes good communications planning?
- Let's hear from local stakeholders what communication they need!
- Social media is a tool that can be useful, but what else is at our disposal?
- Field trip: Angyalháza and Borzas areas
  - Cooperation and communication with stakeholders in Natura 2000 areas with a special respect to the management of ground-nesting birds.
  - traditional breeds, invasive plants, grazing management, wetland management, ecotourism

#### *Input 1:*

##### **Marcus Bauer (DE)**

responentour

- cooperation & communication skills
- Which media are at our disposal?
- How do you apply these skills in modern social media
- does & don'ts, opportunities, practical examples

#### *Input 2:*

##### **Laura Istrate (RO)**

ProPark

- ProPark N2000 LIFE project: Efficient Managers for Efficient Natura 2000 Network, "How to improve our messages" = part of the project

## Summary

- Introduction to the topics, icebreakers, 2 speeches
- Sharing of example from projects
- Combination of 3 elements which need to have for nature conservation : heart- brain-hands
- Communicate very precisely – know what you want to say, have an exact message
- Always develop and improve your knowledge – important to be open minded, learn on mistakes
- Take forward good examples and share best and worst practices as examples
- Find a perfect way to reach local people, stakeholders
- Choose the best communication tools: it depends who you are talking to.
- Think about the benefit, linkage for the local people
- Take into account the consistency of the message
- Know your audience
- Get feedbacks – two way process
- How does the perfect communicator look like?
- What are the necessary skills of the perfect communicator – 3 top: listening, engaging and being creative
- Combine means and models of communication according to the audience but stick to the consistency of the message
- Get attention- surprise – important to keep the attention – jelly effect
- Team work, creative game- invent the perfect communicator – presenting the team ideas
- Tips and tricks when communicating - ppt

## WORKSHOP 11 Tourism works for nature

### Joining forces for sustainable destinations and ecotourism

#### Presentation

N2000 and Protected areas have natural assets, wildlife, landscape, peace and quiet that many visitors like to experience. How can we develop a common understanding about the quality and sustainability of a tourism destination based in a protected or classified area? We should look at how other awarding schemes have developed their methodology and at how the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism matches the same concerns. Through an exploration of tourist attractions and the growing “bird tourism” in Hortobágy we see ecotourism in action.

- *Field trip:* Visitor Center, Máta Stud, Hortobágy-Halastó
- *Workshop manager:* **Paulo Castro (PT)**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Anders Bergström (SE)**, Lake Hornborga Nature Reserve
  - **Andrei Blumer (RO)**, Eco Romania

#### Key words:

- Protected areas as ecotourism destinations, management concerns, goals and best practice
- How can we manage to highlight protected areas to be sustainable tourism destinations?
- Joining forces of award systems (Charter, Eco Romania, Pan Parks, Geoparks, MAB Reserves and World Heritage-Landscapes) to develop and promote sustainable tourism destinations
- Field trip: Visitor Center, Máta Stud, Hortobágy-Halastó
  - Visitor Center, local small guage railway, crane and bird tourism as a model of ecotourism
  - Bird watching tour operator (Sakertour)

#### *Input 1:*

##### **Anders Bergström (SE)**

Lake Hornborga Nature Reserve

- Regional development based on crane tourism

#### *Input 2:*

##### **Andrei Blumer (RO)**

Eco Romania

- How to develop a protected area as a destination for ecotourism?
- “Ecotourism” platform, sustainable tourism management organisation / forum

## Summary

During the workshop, the following subject were discussed:

Visitor management concept vs tourism development

**Conclusion:** Often the park administration does not have the skills for tourism development, so it is necessary to look for cooperating partners, businesses, tourist experts and local stakeholders.

The eco tourist destination can be applied through Charter Parks, Geo parks, PAN parks, national initiatives and could drive this new development paradigm.

Local/slow down/quality nature experience.

ETLS standards could be used and adapted to the needs of the regions, countries. It has to be highlighted that certification itself will not attract visitors.

Anders Bergström – lake Hornborga Nature Reserve

Case study with visitor management – special situation, where there is a high visitor pressure in a short period. Cooperation with tourist offices, local authorities and NGOs. There is a need for tourist development, in order for tourist development work was done with other partners to create a common

## WORKSHOP 12 Working for nature

### Volunteering in protected areas: benefits for nature, benefits for people

#### Presentation

How should N2000 and protected area managers invest in the management and training of staff and volunteers so that all benefit? What are the real benefits of volunteering for protected areas, staff, volunteers themselves and society? What means and management tools exist in order to create a better win-win-situation in terms of volunteering in protected areas? How to measure the impact of informal learning? We discuss these questions as well as actual case studies and meet some volunteers working on Hortbág National Park.

- *Field trip:* Vajda Kurgan (burial mound)
- *Workshop manager:* **Federico Minozzi, EUROPARC**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Anna Broszkiewicz (UK), RSPB**
  - **Mattia Sprianza (IT), National Park Foreste Casentinesi**

*Key words:*

- management needs when working with volunteers
- benefits of volunteering for society, protected areas, staff and volunteers themselves
- lifelong learning gains of volunteering for nature
- the role of volunteers within the management and monitoring of sites
- possible means of increasing a win-win-situation through volunteering
- Field trip: Vajda Kurgan (burial mound)
  - Active restoration of the vegetation
  - invasive plants

*Input 1:*

**Mattia Sprianza (IT)**

National Park Foreste Casentinesi

- Case study from Grundtvig project  
Volunteer Management in European Parks
- Experience of parks and people who benefited from the project;
- Case study: the LIFE+ Farmlands Birds Project managed by RSPB in UK
- Experience in working with volunteers in a wide nature conservation project to contribute to the implementation of the EU Habitats and Birds directives.
- Benefits for the environment and for the people, from a lifelong learning perspective

*Input 2:*

**Anna Broszkiewicz (UK)**

RSPB

## Summary

### Preliminary questions:

How should N2000 and protected area managers invest in the management and training of staff and volunteers so that all benefit? What are the real benefits of volunteering for protected areas, staff, volunteers themselves and society? What means and management tools exist in order to create a better win-win-situation in terms of volunteering in protected areas? How to measure the impact of informal learning?

### Preliminary key words:

- management needs when working with volunteers
  - benefits of volunteering for society, protected areas, staff and volunteers themselves
  - lifelong learning gains of volunteering for nature
  - the role of volunteers within the management and monitoring of sites
  - possible means of increasing a win-win-situation through volunteering
- 

### 1. Introduction

#### 2. Minozzi's preface:

Required outcomes, Europarc project of volunteering and lifelong learning: Case study from Grundtvig project

Volunteer Management in European Parks, results

#### 3. Input 1:

Mattia Sprianza (IT) National Park Foreste Casentinesi

*Volunteering project in Foreste Casentinesi* – Starts May 2011, camps, 120 volunteers, recruiting evaluating and selection process. **Benefits for nature:** cleaning and monitoring paths and facilities, tourists assistance, M2000 habitats restoring, fauna-flora signals advising, fire watching and water keeping surveillance: *a precious and helpful presence on territory + citizens involvement and environmental consciousness.* **Benefits for people:** training, education and supervision, discovering of a protected area, interacting with park employees.

*So get an understanding how the Park work and what for.*

**Problems:** difficulties on promotion, building a long term project, lack of communication with locals, funding. **Main questions:** how to plan a right programme, how balance limits and challenges, feedbacks, working/study gains. **Future:** long-short camps, locals, creation of a net, EU stimulation – *Grundtvig Project (training in Mallorca)*: aims and activities – planning projects, managing volunteers. Guidelines for quality volunteer management.

**Questions – debate:** local and remote people contribution; no volunteers in the larger local villages, lack of communication, how to involve them, Roumania the same situation, Netherlands – they like to contribute. Urban people are more interested in conservation issues. It is also related to social/welfare questions.

#### 4. Input 2:

Anna Broszkiewicz (UK) RSPB

Case study: the LIFE+ Farmlands Birds Project managed by RSPB in UK

Experience in working with volunteers in a wide nature conservation project to contribute to the implementation of the EU Habitats and Birds directives.

*“Promoting the importance of the EU birds Directive in conservation management on farmland (2010-13)”*  
collaboration with more than 3000 farmers (across all UK)  
communicate to more than 7000 members of public

**Motivation in general:** Nature is in trouble, absolute loss of birds 297 millions in farmlands (in contrast to seabirds, woodlands,...)

**Main part of project:** Volunteer and farmer alliance: (UK quite a nature living nation, lots of bird loving people)

Project contacted people who admire birds and are highly skilled (associations, volunteers,...)

So: project did training courses, vol get maps with tracks to walk along while observing birds and documenting what they do

It was felt that the vol spoke about it as “my project” – high identification

Vols get equipped with maps and key words about the species to be observed

RSPB did a lot of promotion for the farmers which led to a better public perception of farmers in general (can you say so)

**Benefit for vol:** nice and peaceful experience in nature

Vols share skills

Exchange of experience informally

### **Benefit for farmers**

Farmers share knowledge

Situation has turned from farmers and RSPB being enemies into them being the greatest allies.

### **Discussion**

What could be recommended by the RSPB project to the Park of Mattia?

You need to meet the needs of the stakeholders (here: farmers and RSPB).

Farmers can also be volunteers, we should broaden our scopes regarding volunteering, not only think of PA-close people in uniforms to be vols in parks.

### **Discussion**

The aim should not be to produce new volunteers but to enhance a culture of active citizenship which also (mainly) can be realized by collaborating with groups of local communities like the farmers in the project of RSPB

### **Take home message:**

*The success of volunteering in parks is also depending on quality communication with local communities. Both interest and passion as well as meeting each others needs should be parts of it.*

*Volunteering in PAs crucial to raise awareness and passion of general public, while contributing to Nature Conservation.*

## **Key words**

- *Communication with and Involvement of local communities: Local ownership!*
- *Volunteering in PAs as part of a national and international culture of active citizenship*
- *European Volunteering Service – EVS*
- *Nature Conservation and Awareness*

## WORKSHOP 13 Natural Capital – Making money work for nature

### Presentation

How can N2000 sites and protected areas be more creative in sourcing money, are there existing sources that could be used for nature conservation? We look at a non-Life funded project in the Bihar region and examine why they were successful and what they did with their money.

- *Field trip:* Konyár area (Bihar region)
- *Workshop manager:* **Hans Schiphorst (NL)**, coordinator Dutch national parks
- *Speakers:*
  - **Lennart Graaff (NL)**, Nationale Landschappen
  - **Alberto Arroyo (HU)**, EHF, WWF Europe

*Key words:*

- how can protected areas be more creative in sourcing money
- who can help with funding the Natura 2000 network
- what could structural funds offer to the financing of nature management
- Field trip: Konyár area (Bihar region)
  - EU financed KEOP project
  - restoration of former alkaline wetlands
  - visit of one of the best Great Bustard areas of the region
  - traditional breeds, ecotourism

*Input 1:*

**Lennart Graaff (NL)**

Nationale Landschappen

- new ways of funding, help from the EU, help from structural funds, creative approaches, case studies from national landscapes protected areas in the Netherlands

*Input 2:*

**Alberto Arroyo (HU)**

EHF, WWF Europe

- publication “Our natural Capital” about funding for N2000 – example where it is working

### Summary

### H.S.:

- everybody uses the ecosystem, but does everybody pay for it?
- Lot of studies on ecosystem services (ess)
- are people familiar with the concept of ess? Half of them are.

- What is the purpose of using concept of ess?
- Agenda of ws

#### A.A.:

- introduction of the presenter
- biodiversity threatens our existence or economy? People for care eeconomy.....have to learn the use of the term and the tool of economy!
- examples: normafa – how can we protect it? Not so much biodiversity value only one butterfly)...lets try money! How much does it cost to do that project? + EC political advices and discussions about natura 2000 sites
- examples of debate, discussions (nat.cap declaration, conference)
- how can we introduce nat.cap and ess to business and financing? Perhaps just to enlight the risks?
- Key issues: implementation and integration
- we have to change our mind about the importance of nature (basic, not an idealic something)
- conclusions: ad-hoc tools (could be used carefully! e.g. subsidies), language which side is emphasised of the problem?), communication (try to agree with stakeholders), socio-economic examples (emphasize the benefits of certain levels)

H.S.: Lets try to use another language to make them hear!

#### Discussion:

- everything loops back to nature, we have to find the link
- slovenian examples: communications mainly show the negativ results only and no benefits! (car crash, smoking) – which is the best?
- Saving the planet is not working – lets try saving the human's certain level of life quality
- happy planet index vs e.g. carbon footprint, hpi is more complex
- have to find the balance of communicating negative and positive results

#### L.G.:

- introduction of the presenter
- national parks vs national landscapes: Is. Are bigger and more connected to economics
- whats hot and whats not
- new green business models and practices: e.g. sponsoring, adopting parts of a national park, landscape auction, nature cemeteries, green guarantee, region account, green-blue services (public-private partnership)
- share of private funding is expected to rise
- opportunities: q- model: 1, economic possibilities, 2; organization of working system
- public->private funding; subsidies->investments

#### Discussion:

- how to handle bad companies when they do good for us
- have to try donor relationship turns into a business relationship with tangible products to sell

- save to find money for filling in the gap budget (e.g. natura 2000 goals)

### **Key Issues:**

- how to handle bad companies when they do good for us (clear contract for marriage)
- sustainable business relationships
- insurance of alternative resources (in case of divorcing or when they are doing wrong) to keep the possibilities to jump out
- local involvement and continuity
- make clear massage

### **Key Word:**

- credibility
- partner integrity
- communication

Take home message:

### Presentation

Life + is the major funding instrument for nature conservation work in Europe, but its structure, rules and guidelines are changing. How do N2000 sites and protected area design successful projects that deliver long term sustainable results? We see how one project in the Hortobágy National Park is working.

- *Field trip:* Borzas and Kunmadaras areas
- *Workshop manager:* **Petra Schultheiss (DE)**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Mikko Tiira (FI)**, Metsähallitus
  - **Laszlo Becsy (EU)**, EU LIFE Nature Unit

*Key words:*

- develop integrated projects, across various EU funding programmes to fund Natura 2000 areas
- management and funding of LIFE+ projects
- successful application, organisation, management
- develop new ideas for sustainable and successful project applications
- Field trip : Borzas and Kunmadaras areas where
  - LIFE+ project: rehabilitation of a former aviation bombardment area of the Soviet Air Force in the middle of the national park.
  - traditional breeds, grazing management, wetland management, ecosystem monitoring.

*Input:*

**Mikko Tiira (FI)**

Metsähallitus

- Using several EC funding sources for managing Natura 2000 areas
- the future of LIFE+ as integrated projects will be part of the new LIFE era 2014-2020).
- some 35 projects ongoing with funding from several national and EU sources (Structural funds, ERDF, Interreg, ENPI, Social Funds ...).
- Successful application, management, project monitoring
- EU-Life programme, good practices and experiences

*Input 2:*

**Laszlo Becsy (EU)**

EU LIFE Nature Unit

## Summary

(workshop 4 and 14 merged because the two topics are closely related to each other. We both had the benefits to of sharing ideas)

- We were all inspired by the field trip yesterday in the Egyek-Pusztakocs marches, jointly together with workshop 4
- The advantage of LIFE projects is the ability to work on a landscape scale
- Investing in nature pays off.
- (workshop 14) There were two presentors in the workshop: one on how to design the integrated LIFE projects in the future (László Bécsy of the Life unit of EU's DG environment) and one on how Natura 2000 can be an asset for more funding besides EU LIFE. The examples Mikko Tiira presented of Finland were inspiring for the EUROPARC network.
- (workshop 4) There was one presentor for workshop 4, Andris Sirovs from Latvia. He presented a case study of bog restoration and flood plain restoration in Kemeru National Park. The restoration of wildlife is not only successful for habitat diversity and climate adaptation, it also benefits humans wellbeing.

## EU LIFE program

- Guidelines are prepared at the moment. In next period the application will have two steps: concept note and the full proposal.
- Be prepared for the first call
- Budget: 855 million euro for 7 years, 637 million euro for environment
- Valuable input of EUROPARC members is appreciated
- In next program of LIFE, projects should be considered as catalysts, and be a accelerator for integration other EU funds
- LIFE program is extended with financial support for „integrated projects” and Climate change
- Capacity building and including NGO's is a positive element
- Even partners outside the EU can be involved (...)
- Important tool will be the Prioritized Action Frameworks (PAF). PAFs are an essential tool to find solutions to the funding requirements of Natura 2000 network & identify key actions and potential funding sources

## Integrate financing of Natura 2000 sites Finland

- Several good practices of Finland were highlighted. The combination of several funding mechanisms are operational and successful.
- Metsähallitus, a governmental organisation in Finland works nationwide with a staff of 800. The main objectives are the management and planning, cooperation with different stakeholders, promotion of recreational use and promotion of nature tourism activities. Since 1995 they have coordinated 18 projects.
- Finland has 37 national parks with annual 2.09 million visitors
- Co-funding for EU projects is currently managed within the organization

The active discussion clarified a lot of questions of members of EUROPARC federation and will take into account in the LIFE unit to provide good guidelines. Specially the integrated projects of LIFE are an opportunity to combine and integrate funds of other EU policies.

The Natura 2000 network has the capacity and the ambition to bring all Natura 2000 sites a favorable status of maintenance and tackle the problem of biodiversity loss. Good practices like Metsahallitus were inspiring for the attendees.

Climate Change adaptation and mitigation can be an opportunity for a better maintenance of protected areas. At the moment the policies are too separate. It is a good idea EUROPARC federation takes the initiative to make to connection!

### Presentation

N2000 sites and protected areas can be green islands in a sea of a developed European landscape. Are our Parks becoming Arks? So how can we create a more connected green infrastructure to deliver sustainable ecosystem service for European citizens? We look at an example of conservation work by a local NGO, happening outside but with support from Hortobágy National Park and how this extends the scope and functionality of the protected area.

- *Field trip:* Andaháza and Peres areas (Bihar region)
- *Workshop manager:* **Carles Castell (ES)**
- *Speakers:*
  - **Marco Fritz (EU)**, European Commission
  - **Carles Castell (ES)**, EUROPARC Spain

#### Key words:

- creating a network of green infrastructure as a backbone for ecosystem services for society, European protected areas and the Natura 2000 network provide that infrastructure
- understanding EU policy as a background for this
- green infrastructure, ensuring integrated management of protected and non-protected areas
- how EU policy is translated into protected area network on the ground
- that network needs to be connected and functional
- how do we create connections to ensure sufficient capacity to ensure this green infrastructure supporting Europe's biodiversity and people
- Field trip: Andaháza and Peres areas (Bihar region):
  - One site is protected and managed by the national park directorate and the other one (a joining wetland) is managed by a local NGO. It extends the scope of the National Park, is a migratory hotspot, good for wetland creatures, extending the functionality of PA.
  - The National park works with them and supports their work.
  - wetland restoration area managed by buffalo grazing involving cutting-edge green infrastructure technology
  - traditional breeds, local food

#### *Input 1:*

#### **Marco Fritz (EU)**

European Commission

- leading the process at European Commission green infrastructure programme at the EU

#### *Input 2*

- green infrastructure plan, connecting

## Summary

**What is green infrastructure?** A strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas with other environmental features designed and managed to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services

- using land in an efficient way
- elements of green infrastructure: local scale, regional scale, Eu level,
- multiple benefits: 1. usually high return on investments 2. sustainable no-regret investments,3. Delivering high-level skilled jobs for planning, innovation, management and monitoring, and lower level skilled jobs for restoration activities, and managing
- GI in urban development: clean water and air, water retention, attractive recreational areas, health related and social benefits, cost effective solutions, (e.g. air cooling, flood control)
- GI in rural environment: promoting GI solutions into agricultural, and forestry management)
- Why is the Commission acting?
- GI strategies: key policy areas: regional development, climate change, disaster prevention, agriculture, forestry, urban, water, and biodiversity protection and enhancement.

Tasks: promotion, improve knowledge base, better access to finance assess opportunities for TEN-G, progress report on implementation in 2017, GI guidance, promotion: promote GI approaches in communications to citizens

## Presentation 2.

### Presenter: Carles Castell

An Introduction of the GI Network

## Discussion

- GI communication at the EU level (emphasising top key GI issues) but the regional and local authorities are the key group to communicate GI ideas

## When you have Project ideas how to get financing?

- There is no special GI fund but it can be financed through agricultural, structural, cohesion, socialfounding, or LIFE programmes
- Member states will participate in a working group on how to implement GI on national, regional, and local levels
- In the UK they are connecting hot spots
- Is there an opportunity to map GI in Europe? How to go to a higher level? For each level to have the relevant kind of information
- geographical information the connectivity approach in agricultural areas is not very developed but the new agricultural policy gives opportunities to apply the regional GI mapping approach for the definition of ecological focus areas.

## Green corridors- what to do to secure species migrating?

- produce maps which shows the natural corridors

- in denmark they have developed the nature corridors planned for all kinds of species and habitat types (dry, forest, wet, marine)

### **Nature corridors dont respect the borders.**

- the role of regions: F.E. in australia they have a state assessment. If its needed the state sends experts to each regions to support them this way. (Perth regional action)
- In Denmark they are finding ways to influence the politicians to make efforts on farmers to apply GI Ideas
- In Austria there is a project, where they want to connect national parks to each other (financed by Switzerland) The ministry takes parts in the meeting

### **The definition of GI**

- GI has no borders
- GI concerns everybody's quality of life
- GI helps to make protected areas more relevant
- GI could help the protected areas to get more support.
- GI is not only about nature
- rethinking land use
- any opportunity to improve any kind of land there shouldn't be differences in the way we are treating it.
- Protected area managers should be more active to promote GI
- GI helps people to live a better quality life in a beautiful landscape