

Our Future Dialogues
Directorate Feedback

May 2014

<p>Areas of work satisfied with</p>	<p>Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EUROPARC is an interesting network that enables exchange on a technical/operative level • Easy access to information through the network • Federation useful for communication work on a European scale • Conference serves as main platform of exchange, increase in quality noticeable over the course of the last ~ 5 years (exception Hungary) • The network has the potential to carry the European idea into protected areas • Projects and programmes that EUROPARC started (Junior Ranger, Charta...) • Potentially high USP • Network is motivating to cooperate better internationally • overall satisfaction has been expressed for the management of EUROPARC programmes, such as the Junior Rangers Programme, Transboundary Programme and European Charter. They work very successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation of members/protected areas interest on a European level • EUROPARC needs long term strategy that can be followed no matter who is in Council/Directorate, should not be based on personal interests/people • Changes in statutes at the Conference in Romania led to less participation/co-management through members. Participants wish for more transparency in the management of the Federation. • Section and Federation need to coordinate members data better • Communication between 	<p>Looking for guidance form strategy on way forward.</p> <p>Staff couldn't agree more and would liked to have started this process 2 years ago had we not been diverted by merger, but we are delighted to be looking at a way forward for the Federation</p> <p>Unclear how this has arisen, so needs some discussion</p> <p>A communication issue we need to address</p> <p>Yes, please! We can only work with the information we are provided from the member/section</p> <p>Sections receive the same information as members and can</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfaction with the work done in the field of communications. Just some fine tuning is necessary Overall the meeting was positive and work of the Federation and its benefits as an international network 	<p>Federation and Section needs to improve: Sections should receive the same information as members in order for them to know what's going on and to be able to speak to section members about these topics or clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles of Federation, sections and EUROPARC Consulting not clear, better coordination of activities necessary Section representatives emphasised that the cooperation with the Section is more successful than with the EUROPARC Directorate.(NB) Council, GA work needs to be improved an procedures changed Work of Consulting has to be 	<p>have access to members area, and receive more and additional information across all topics. Nothing is held back, but often we don't know what you don't know. :) People need only ask But we will clarify and rectify immediately</p> <p>Yes again clarity and communication needed on both sides.</p> <p>All in Directorate very sad to hear that as we hoped we had good relation with sections so we don't know specifically what is being referred to. But we will endeavour to ensure we offer the best service possible.</p> <p>Staff agree and need to look at what can be done differently.</p> <p>Staff agree</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>improved. Role of EUROPARC Consulting unclear; in case of Grundtvig project unsatisfactory quality of EUROPARC Consulting work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="949 619 1442 810">• Dissatisfaction has been expressed in relation to finding information on funding sources and possible project cooperation possibilities. <li data-bbox="949 970 1442 1394">• An opinion by the Finnish members has been expressed that the lobbying work on the European level should be done by members (as it is their duty implemented through corresponding ministries), and not by the EUROPARC Federation as it has not responsibility and no official mandate for this. On the other hand all other participants 	<p data-bbox="1469 580 1984 847">Yes, this information is presented in members area and in e-news , we need to profile this and improve this service, and consider the value of the members specialist area. We look for direction and priorities from council/section on this</p> <p data-bbox="1469 970 1984 1161">We note this. The mandate for lobbying comes from the agreed lobbying and advocacy strategy voted by members. This will need to be renewed.</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>of the meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open and constructive cooperation with other organisations shall be improved; in this sense the work of the Directorate has not been satisfactory. <p>- Overall satisfaction is average. This would have been better if the merger process with Eurosite was better managed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new strategy should address 	<p>We are disappointed in this the level of service and will seek to improve, both how we work and how we communicate it. We work very closely and constructively with many organisations across Europe, a full list is available on the website, with many strong partnership. The Directorate staff hope the experience of the merger, as perceived does not override what we hope is actually, we hope, a very positive area of work.</p> <p>There are a lot of lesson about the merger process that need to be learned, for many parts of the federation, but staff have certainly taken on board and wish to move forward.</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>PAs, policy, information and communication, to produce concrete outcomes for people and nature. The strategy should clearly highlight who is in charge of delivering the different outputs and of the document</p> <p>'Networking for Nature' is to be considered as the baseline for it and its priorities and objectives included within the new strategy. The new strategy needs to have a clear, simple and short version, to take account of the needs of a variety of different audiences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In term of priorities EUROPARC should focus on PAs but with a wider vision on the landscapes: protection with people and for people. Need to engage with the European Landscape Convention. Become the leaders in this area. Create a link with wider landscape – build working partnerships. Have a focus on 	<p>Staff are looking forward to the development of the new strategy and clarity and focus it can bring to priorities and outcomes.</p> <p>Staff agree and look forward to clear and better priorities being agreed, and further discussion on these issues</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>landscape/seascape and climate change. Create learning opportunities and exchanges. The aims and objectives would include: gain resources, serve members, share good practices and support members. Address decision makers and engage with wider society.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council more engaged in specific issues and priorities rather than be looking at governance all the time. Council too remote at the moment, it is not reflecting the views of the members, and not expressing a European vision for PAs. Find and involve the right persons and not those who are available at the moment. • Current governance; block voting leading to Council not drawing upon the best people from across the Federation 	<p>The role, duties and expectation of council members would be most helpful in enabling staff to work better together with council to ensure better delivery of the Federations aims and services for members.</p> <p>Staff are not aware of substantial block voting (given staff see and count votes) the use of proxies has been substantially reduced in recent statute changes However it is</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough staff in Brussels (esp. in relation to the main office in Germany). Need to be more relevant to where the decision making process is happening. • Regulations, statutes, administrative issues, which are seen to be used to block / prevent changes • Sections under represented within 	<p>incumbent on members to scrutinise candidates and present candidates. Guidelines for elections and candidates are available and have been sent to all members.</p> <p>Cost in Brussels are very high, as well as cost of redeploying staff, and this is one deterrent to posting staff there, but it is something that can be considered again. Once the roles and functions and priorities of EUROPARC have been made clear then the functions of the offices and their relevance can be determined.</p> <p>There seems to be gap between reality and perception and some work needs to be done to ensure accurate information and facts are properly presented to ensure motivations and actions are better understood across the network.</p> <p>Directorate would welcome a bigger "management team" to share work</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>Council: need to empower them, to recognise them within the structure of the organisation, go for <u>devolution</u>. (Some members might then consider to invest more resources to support the network, if roles and functions get more clear and closer to members)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sections should play more important role in the management, e.g. in the Council, where they should have a more permanent and influential position. Representation of the Sections in the Council for a period of only one year is too short. The Section representative can mostly function as a mediator of information, but is not able act as a real representative of the Sections. Regular section meetings with clear structure/order of hosting wished for 	<p>across the Federation.</p> <p>Staff are aware that the current system of section representation (which section themselves recommended) is not effective. However we are also aware f a lack of response and functionality of the sections with commitment to tasks/meetings within the Federations. Directorate is more than willing to share tasks, actions and responsibilities but there needs to be clear commitment and responsibility on section to fulfil these roles,.</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="949 507 1411 703">• Secondments might be a good way to contribute to effective delivery, together with closer cooperation among directorate and sections <li data-bbox="949 799 1435 1378">• Moreover it would be useful that the President deputise specific thematic functions to Council members, giving them the role of vice-presidents. That would facilitate their representation role and give them a clearer function/role. The Council members should also be involved in lobbying towards the EU institutions. There is not clear understanding and knowledge among members of the role and work delivered by the Council. Would be useful, for transparency 	<p data-bbox="1469 544 1966 651">The question is raised if "section" is the correct terminology/name and should be addressed.</p> <p data-bbox="1469 820 1989 1238">Directorate staff would support more clarity in the role of council. Council minutes are made available to all members through a link in e-news/newsletters to members on website/members area. But we need to look overall at the functionality of communications systems and determine which is the optimum means of storing and disseminating information.</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	<p>and to involve members, if the Council Minutes were sent directly to members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also the functionality and effectiveness of work of and within the Directorate should be evaluated by some kind of feedback or evaluation process for Council considerations. The Directorate activities should be more defined, so that it is more understandable, who does what and to whom turn to for which question. The work of working groups and Sections should be more coordinated by the Directorate. <p>There are some remarks on the governance/work of the Head Quarters in Regensburg. The appraisal of the HQ has to be a key issue of the council/president.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In times of financial restrains maybe only every two years a big conference and in between just 	<p>The Federation has a strong performance appraisal system based on competencies and workplan objectives. All staff, including the director are appraised annually. We accept there is some confusion about the structure and functionality of the HQ team, this we think is due to fact that all staff are performing multiple tasks:) and the preference for some members/sections to discuss in 1st language. Who are keen to work towards a simpler structure for the new strategy.</p> <p>Directorate have been wishing for this for years :) but we are bound by the legal need for an annual GA. We</p>

Areas of work satisfied with	Areas to Improve (summary of comments received)	Comments
	brief General Assembly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of transparency in financing/budget of Federation 	<p>will take further advice on this, as we may be forced to operate this in 2015.</p> <p>We are slightly confused by this as we publish the accounts annually in the annual report in 3 languages and present it at the GA and all papers are sent to all members. There are no hidden finances, other than those matters subject to data protection or personnel confidentiality?</p>