

**EUROPARC
Federation**



**Report to Council
May 29th 2010**

Title:

Aspects to be considered in relation to proposal from Eurosite

Summary :

Some points to consider in relation to the proposal from Eurosite calling for a new organization to be created.

Recommendations :

For discussion

On 7th April 2010 the EUROPARC president received a letter from the president of Eurosite. This was circulated previously. Council will be discussing a response to Eurosite.

In light of that discussion, I would suggest the council need to consider the following aspects.

- The EUROPARC brand has been established for over 30 years. This could be both be favourable and unfavourable.
- The logo name for EUROPARC and its subsidiaries, sections consulting, and products are all registered. Any change would require cancellation and re-registration. This incurs costs
- There are constitutional and state complexities where the future of the federation sections would need to be considered
- EUROPARC Federation would be required to deregister completely as an association in Germany. Dissolve its entire membership and everyone would have to reapply as a member of the new organization.
- Current EUROPARC contracts would need to be dissolved this would include personal, project, service provider, tenancies etc
- During any transition period there may be some issues where EUROPARC could not take on any new contracts, such as projects until legal situation was confirmed.
- In EU commission term only association that have been established for 2 years or more can apply for the NGO grant. We would have to check the regulations for other funding streams
- The debts and obligation of both organisations would need to be fully examined and then taken by the new organization
- All promotional material would need to be rebranded
- The future of Federation products and programmes such as Charter and Transboundary would need to be considered
- These would all incur costs

We think 35 members of EUROPARC are currently also members of Eurosite. We do not have a membership lost for Eurosite to compare. The double membership payment issue predominately affects large government agencies. These make up about 4% of our membership compared to 65% individual protected area members. I understand these proportions are considerably different in Eurosite. National agencies make up around 31% of our membership income. (some discrepancies as to the definition of a national agency...maximum of all agencies would be 41.36%)

Whilst none of these issues are insurmountable, I could not in good conscience recommend this current course of action to the council.

I do however think the analysis of the duality of two protected areas networks provided by Eurosite has elements that need to be given serious consideration. I do think Protected Areas in Europe would be better served by one organization. Bear in mind EUROPARC and Eurosite and NOT the only two. Such an organization that serves the varying aspects of Protected areas in Europe. EUROPARC is however the largest in membership.

I am not however convinced that the solution provided by Eurosite i.e. the dissolution and reformation of a new organization is wise in the present climate.

The ideal solution is for Eurosite to merge with EUROPARC. And that the functions of Eurosite are fully absorbed and incorporated in the EUROPARC organization. Or as that seems unpalatable to some Eurosite members that a "coalition" agreement to be drafted between us that would formalize fully a joint approach.

It is however for council to agree a response and a way forward, with discussion withn sections nad if necessary the full membership.
However I should add I emailed all members to alert then to this issue and received not a single reply.

Carol Ritchie
EUROPARC Director
14th May 2010