EUROPARC Federation, Council Meeting

Location:	Schwerin, Germany			
Date:	Thursday, 16 th June 2011	Duration:	8:00 – 9:30 and 18:00 – 19:15	
Attendees:	Council Members Present: Erika Stanciu (President), Eberhard Henne, Rolands Auzins, Dominique Leveque, Gábor Szilagyi			
	Co-Opted Council members present: Marian Jager-Wöltgens, Johannes Hager, Paulo Castro			
	Others Present:, Wilf Fenten (EUROPARC Consulting), Carol Ritchie (Director), Regina Schöfer (Executive Administrator), David Cameron (Internal Auditor)			
Apologies	Valter Zago, Pio Forte (Trea	asurer),		

Agenda	Notes	Decisions Taken	Actions
Item	TI Di e la		
	The Director opened the meeting and welcomed all participants.	The agenda was amended due to time constraints.	
	Due to time constraints it was decided to discuss agenda item 9, joint	Agenda item 9 was discussed first.	
	Eurosite/EUROPARC paper, first and conclude the meeting after the		
	joint Council/sections/working groups meeting later that afternoon.		
	going obtaining obtaining working groups mostling later that alternoon.		
	L. A. EUDODADO/E		
9.	Joint EUROPARC/Eurosite Paper		
	The Council had received a draft of the paper prior to the meeting.		
	The following two options were put to the Council:		
	Continued joint cooperation between EUROPARC and		
	Eurosite.		
	2. Merger by setting up a new organization, with both		
	EUROPARC and Eurosite as founding organizations.		
	Council members felt that as ELIBODADC hold a clear majority in		
	Council members felt that, as EUROPARC held a clear majority in membership, it would be easiest if Eurosite merged with EUROPARC.		
	It was decided to raise this point at the subsequent joint meeting.		
	the was assisted to raise this point at the subsequent joint mosting.		
	There was already a close and well-functioning cooperation between		
	both organization, but in order to realize Option 1 a more formal basis		
	would be needed in the form of a MOU or contract.		
	Option 2 could only be achieved through a three step transitional		
	process and it was discussed in detail which form each step would take		
	and where the process would end.		
	The Council agreed that it would be beneficial to establish one voice for		
	protected areas in Europe. In order to achieve this option 2 would be		

	preferable. Members would only have to pay one membership fee with all areas of worked being perfored by both organizations jointly.		
	The registered seat of the new joint organization would also determine the choice of legal options and the Council agreed that professional, neutral help should be sought to evaluate the different options, if the General Assembly chose this option.		
	In any case the cooperation should include representation of both sides at each others' General Assemblies this year to present the options to the members jointly.		
	me constraints the meeting had to be adjourned until later in the ev		
1.		Decisions Taken	Actions
		The minutes of the meeting held on 25 th March 2011 in Regensburg, Germany, were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	
2	Matters arising	Decisions Taken	Actions
	a) Risk Assessment This is now an appropriate document. Staff and directorate have done an assessment and council members will feed back any suggestions to DC by email.	The General Assembly will be informed that a risk	Recirculate to Council members for suggestions by email. All council members to feed back to DC by 1 July.
	b) NGO Report Feedback The directorate had asked the EU for feedback regarding the NGO grant application, which was given in a letter. The points raised will be taken into consideration when formulating the next application.		
	c) Natura 2000 Working Group GS still to present a Terms of Reference for representatives and draft a framework template.		GS to provide TORs and a draft framework template.
	d) Funding streams: PC still to look into list of countries and topics that are funded through E-grants, Swiss and Norwegian cohesion funds and send information		PC to send list of countries to CR

	to CR.			
	NATO grants are closed at the moment. DBU are sending a representative to the conference in September, with whom funding opportunities could be discussed.			
	e) NGO Grant Mechanism: The Director had drafted a joint petition letter from Eurosite, EUROPARC and WWF to the EU. Reply/comments from WWF were still outstanding.	Directorate to send letter, even if WWF does not wish to be a signatory.	ES to discuss with WWF.	
	The Council suggested elaborating more on the multi-year grant aspect.			
	MJ-W reported that she had contacted an MEP with regard to this issue, who was waiting to receive a copy of the letter.			
	f) PAME Follow-on Project As the main sticking point was input from the Sections, it was decided to ask the Sections for participation at the meeting the next day.			
3.	Report from President	Decisions Taken	Actions	
	The President had mainly been working on the Wilderness working group. The group had finalised a definition of the term "wilderness" which would be agreed and released at their next meeting.			
4.	Cooption of Temporary Treasurer	Decisions Taken	Actions	
	Pio Forte had informed the President that due to poor health he could not continue as Treasurer to the Federation.	The Council agreed to co-opt Angelika Beranek as Temporary Treasurer, subject to her consent, and	ES to ask Angelika Beranek if she would become Temporary Treasurer	
	Under Art. 7.a.6 in case of incapacity of a member of the Council, the Council may co-opt a replacement for the rest of the current term of office of the Council, The involvement of new council members shall be ratified during the first following General Assembly.	asked the President to approach her as possible post holder for the new Council in September.	and if she was interested in the post after the elections.	
	Angelika Beranek from WWF DCP was suggested as Temporary Treasurer and the Council asked ES to approach her formally.			

5.	Approval of French Charter Methodology	Decisions Taken	Actions
	a. French Charter Methodology The French section had submitted a proposal for a methodology which brings together the various methodologies currently in existence.	A decision on the French methodology will be made by email consent taking into account the CEC recommendations.	WF to put French and Swedish methodology on the CEC agenda and request formal recommendation to Council.
	WF explained that normally each section prepares their own Part 2 methodology. This is then passed to the Charter Evaluation Committee to check whether the methodology is in accordance with the procedure. They issue a recommendation to the Council who considers approval.		
	b. Implementation of the Charter for Sustainable Tourism in France		WF to clarify with CEC and STWG.
	Sometimes parks have to prepare reports and measures for the French Charter and EUROPARC Charter at the same time, which imposes a huge workload on the park administration.		
	The Council was sympathetic to this problem and asked WF to investigate.		
6.	Conference 2012	Decisions Taken	Actions
	A proposal had been received from Hoge Kempen National Park in Belgium. Due to school holidays in Belgium the conference date would have to be in October 2012.	The Council unanimously agreed Belgium as the conference venue for 2012 but asked for the proposal to be revised to give it more content and	CR to ask Hungary and France to submit their proposals for 2013.
	For 2013 both Hungary and France are interested in hosting the conference.	depth.	
7.	Directorate's Report	Decisions Taken	Actions
	Due to time constraints the submitted report could not be discussed. It was agreed to wait for the next quarterly report instead and feed any comments back by email, if necessary.		

	Project Developments: A project status sheet had been circulated to all Council members prior to the meeting detailing current projects and projects in development. Parks & Benefits project: Diana Gallrapp, the project coordinator, is seriously ill and cannot conclude the project. There are three outstanding tasks: Two could be completed in-house but there is no capacity to complete the third task. A discussion arose on the role of the sections with regard to project funding and whether EUROPARC should be a facilitating and networking organisation or should submit its own project proposals. There was consensus that the income should be as diverse as possible and should include contributions from sections. One possible option is to ask for a percentage of any project management fee to go to the Federation. The Council decided to raise this issue with the sections at the strategy meeting the next day.		CR to speak with Olaf Ostermann to see if third tasks could be re-allocated.
8.	Alfred Toepfer Awards	Decisions Taken	Actions
	a. Alfred Toepfer Medal The following medal nominations had been received: Rolf Löfgren (SE) Hans Bibelriether (D) Srdjan Stefanovic (SP) Jens Enemark (D)	The medal was unanimously awarded to: Hans Bibelriether (D)	
	b. Alfred Toepfer Scholarships	The Council decided to award scholarships to:	
	20 from 13 countries scholarship applications had been received and the Directorate had done a pre-assessment along the ATS-guidelines and conditions.	Ross Watson (Scotland) Tünde Ludnai (Hungary) Robbert Cassier (Belgium)	
	Six applicants were presented to Council: Ross Watson (Scotland) Tünde Ludnai (Hungary)		

	Simon Hirst (England) Robbert Cassier (Belgium) Montserrat Bau Puig (Spain) Jana Planek (Germany)	
9.	Any Other Business	
	Date and Location for next meeting: 21 st September 2011: Biosphärenreservat Schwäbische Alb, Germany	
Preside		