

Our Future Dialogues **Focus Groups Feedback**

May 2014

**Comments in red are from the open ended responses in the questionnaires*

Summary

From January to April 2014 the EUROPARC Federation undertook its biggest consultation amongst the membership. Having postponed the exercise for almost 3 year , due to extended discussions with Eurosite. The survey "Our Future Dialogues" was an important opportunity to gauge views and comments and concerns for the future direction of the Federation as it prepares a new strategy for its function and structure.

With a current membership of 374 in 36 countries. The online survey received 272 returns. After filtering for non members and empty form there remained 182 valid entries from 28 countries. This represents 48% of the membership for all categories and most countries.

Six Focus group meetings were also held in, France(19), Hungary (14), Germany(6), Nordic Baltic(7), Low Countries (19), Atlantic Isles(19), totalling 84 participants. These meetings , facilitated by council members and directorate staff, went into survey and other questions in greater depth and provided extensive comments.

The main themes that have emerged from the focus group consultation appear to be, the following

- EUROPARC should remain a networking organisation but ensure a role for partner and project development across the network.
- Tension remains between developing EUROPARC's existing programmes and develop new lines of work. The council will need to direct the strategy to prioritise work areas in order that resources can be adequately allocated.
- Dissatisfaction was expressed in terms of EUROPARC governance, with the functionality of the council and delivery of the general assembly in particular needing some consideration.
- The role of sections within the organisation was an overall area prioritised as in need of change.
- Satisfaction was expressed on the networking and learning opportunities provided by EUROPARC
- Funding information and partnership were especially highlighted as areas in need of improvement, as was the lobbying work in Brussels.
- Communications across the network need to be more direct and highlight practical management information.
- No major changes to membership structure and fees was considered

These comments were generally inline with the overall results of the survey, although some differing degrees of emphasis were noted.

The texts(except for repetition) from the focus group reports, and the comments made in the online questionnaires are included in this report.

The council need to reflect on the responses given and with input from sections and the directorate agree themes, priorities and topics for the EUROPARC Federation. With that in mind, and identifying resources, a new management structure can be devised , if required, to meet the needs of the membership and deliver the agreed strategy.

Contents

Our Future Dialogues.....	1
Summary	2
Priorities.....	4
Open ended responses on priorities.....	6
Satisfaction/Improvements	7
Areas of work satisfied.....	7
Governance and Structure.....	10
Sections.....	10
Open ended responses on sections.....	11
Other governance	12
Open ended responses on other governance.....	12
Open ended responses on communication.....	15
Finances	17
To be included in fees:	17
Other comments/ideas.....	18
Other open-end responses.....	19

Priorities

- **EUROPARC should be like a broker, bringing together people and enable partnership**
 - This should include knowledge management, dissemination of project results from and in the network, using tested dissemination methods
 - Suggestion: Create a database (online-tool) for project partnerships, where project ideas are displayed and potential partners can sign up
 - **Meeting opportunities and networking** facilitation are a high priority even if not well understood or appreciated.
 - **Learning opportunities and the share of good practices** are highest priority also for the future and are highly valued and appreciated
 -
- **Develop standards for protected areas**
 - The work on an operative/technical level is seen as very beneficiary for the members. Knowledge management, dissemination of project results from and in the network, using tested dissemination methods
- **Partner finding / project development**
- **Focus on practical management issues of the protected areas and Natura 2000 sites, since the EUROPARC member organisations are the main management bodies of these sites**
- **Lobbying work and advocacy for protected areas on a European level**
 - Targeted representation of protected areas/members interests in Brussels, influence decision makers at different. The protected areas should be visible on European level.
- **Continue developing existing programmes**
 - Work on an operative/technical level is seen as beneficial for the members; develop material (informational, training, good practice) for different programmes like Junior Ranger, Transboundary, Charter
- Priority areas of work should include **Climate change, sustainability, landscape/seascape-coastal, biodiversity, people and communities, capacity building – leadership, collating evidence base.**

Federation should stand back from running own projects with which they compete with the protected areas and sections for more and more limited funding. Focus of the Federation should be strengthening the protected areas in order for them to run projects and programmes.

- **Communications:** have and communicate a vision for Europe, tell people what, how, why...
- **Facilitate:** build the network and make it work

Open ended responses on priorities...

- Thank you to the office in Regensburg for professional work
- Congratulations on this exercise's luck. Crucial prioritize well considering it is an organization with a limited budget but with much potential EUROPEAN communication
- What is said before: we regret STRONGLY EUROPARC is only interested in protected areas. should equally be concerned with Regional Natural Parks which are inhabited territories (1 comment FR)
- More transparency on priorities
- There should be more emphasis on working or joining/merging with similar organisations. I fear that the Federation will not be able to sustain itself as an independent organisation. Building a new and stronger organisation together with like-minded organisations will be helpful to be more influential on a European platform (e.g Brussels). This sort of discussions should be at the centre-point of discussions on the Federations future!
- More focus on priorities, more support to volunteering experts like travel cost coverage
- Nature 2000 sites have to be lifted in EUROPARC!
- We found this questionnaire disappointing as it was largely around smaller operational issues rather than the more strategic questions facing EUROPARC Federation, post collapse of the merger process . We would like to see a new constitution based on a more federal structure and which gives greater prominence to the sections in the governance of the federation. The so-called "brands" are less relevant to us specifically at present, with the exception of junior rangers, but we can see the value of them in given form and function to the network. A new "brand" around site management training and sharing good practice could be useful and would be attractive to Eurosite members. In terms of focus, we would encourage the Federation to be a stronger advocate for PAs at European policy level through campaigns and lobbying. The focus should be wider than Natura 2000 though (and include work on the European landscape convention)
- Work areas not current or up to date - questionnaire focuses too much on current / past activity. What about Climate Change issues, Biosecurity issues, European Landscape Convention, Access issues, Socio Economic values of PAs and PLs? Past activity has focussed too much on Biodiversity / Natura 2000 and not enough on landscape.
- Cooperation with other partners in Brussels in needed! It is a missed opportunity that the cooperation with Eurosite is aborted.
- Unfortunately, the entry of the reviews did not work. We would prefer more specialized information for protected area management , as well as continuing education opportunities or insight into the management of protected areas other protected areas
- suggestion: toolkit of information (brief text, images , etc. free of rights) for " self-service " Explanation: For our own newsletter or the news section of our website we often could also use good international information with NNL – reference
- Please take more care of new coming members - and not just be a club of old chaps. Please also be more professional in relation to the General Assembly. The one in Hungary 2013 was not a good one to take part in. I was really wondering, whether we should still be member.

Satisfaction/Improvements

Summary of comments received:

Areas of work satisfied

General Comments

- 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.
- 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 The Hungarian members agreed that there is a need about the renewal of the EUROPARC Federation strategy, structure and activities. The Hungarian members believe that first we need to try to strengthen the EUROPARC federation as the largest European federation for nature conservation

Areas to Improve

General Comments

- Representation of members/protected areas interest on a European level
- Changes in statutes at the Conference in Romania let to less participation/co-management through members. Participants wish for more transparency in the management of the Federation.

Governance/Sections

- Council, GA work needs to be improved an procedures changed
- Work of Consulting has to be improved
- Secondments might be a good way to contribute to effective delivery, together with closer cooperation among directorate and sections
- Section and Federation need to coordinate members data better
- Roles of Federation, sections and EUROPARC Consulting not clear, better coordination of activities necessary
- Section representatives (NB) emphasised that the cooperation with the Section is more successful than with the EUROPARC Directorate.
- The membership in Hungary is dissatisfied with this aspects of the management of the Federation, Elections of President and Council members, Contacts with Council members. The majority of the Hungarian members do not see much advantage in new possible roles, except for Vice Presidents and Youth representation. Current governance; block voting leading to Council not drawing upon the best people from across the Federation
- Sections under represented within Council: need to empower them, to recognise them within the structure of the organisation, go for devolution. (Some members might then consider to invest more resources to support the network, if roles and functions get more clear and closer to members)
- 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

<p>using the benefits from the traditions and the "brand".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The overall opinion of the Hungarian members is that there are more potential in the network of the EUROPARC Federation as it looks like now. - The membership in Hungary is satisfied/moderately satisfied with this fields of work carried out by the Federation: Exchanges and networking, The E.P Conference, Learning possibilities through workshops 	<p>delivered by the Council. Would be useful, for transparency and to involve members, if the Council Minutes were sent directly to members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council (<i>need to be</i>) 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. The membership in Hungary thinks that the members of the council should be elected under the criteria of the regional area <p>Federation functions /Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dissatisfaction has been expressed in relation to finding information on funding sources and possible project cooperation possibilities. - 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 of the meeting - Open and constructive cooperation with other organisations shall be improved; in this sense the work of the Directorate has not been satisfactory. - Overall satisfaction is average. This would have been better if the merger process with Eurosite was better managed - The new strategy should address 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 '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. - 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 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. - Not enough staff in Brussels (esp. in relation to the main office in Germany). Need
--	---

	<p>to be more relevant to where the decision making process is happening.</p> <p>Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Communication between 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.- The high number of members requires more cooperation and communication on a regional/country level, which is very weak nowadays. Sometimes members do not feel that they are part of an organisation except for the annual conference, which is sometimes more formal than practical. Workshop outcomes are not efficiently fed back to the strategy and activities of the Federation.- Hungarian members are dissatisfied with overall communication within the Organisation (between members and Directorate/Council and between individual members/member organisations) as well as the lobbying and advocacy work at European level.- Access to official documents. Regulations, statutes, administrative issues, which are seen to be used to block / prevent changes. 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.- 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.- Every conference should lead to a declaration to point out that the Federation has a say in actual topics of nature conservation- Conference workshop that deals with organisational structure of the Federation would be good for those interested in further developing the Federation continuously
--	---

Governance and Structure

Sections

- The role of sections seems not to be clear. Their role, status and involvement in decision making processes in the Federation need to be agreed, written down and for all sections aligned. Strong wish for Sections to have say in Federation, be on the Council, be a member of the Federation, have voting right. It should be the same for all sections and statutes of the sections should be aligned as well. The role & purpose of a section is cohesion and strengthening of a region- Benefits of being a member of a section: European recognition, a higher level of abstraction
- Sections should be represented in EUROPARC Council by one of their own council members .Council members also could serve as some kind of Sections' representatives.
- Sections should be allowed to delegate their representatives to the Council, e.g. instead of the co-opted Council members. Co-ordinators of the work and activities of the Sections should be at least part time employed by the Directorate, and their place of work should be decided by the Sections, while the remaining (up to 3 persons) „central“ part of the Directorate should be positioned much closer to, or in Brussels. The most, if not the only task of the „central“ Directorate should be the lobbying activity, influencing policy making on the European level, while Sections should do this job on a regional/country level. Suggest to have at least one co-ordinator (EUROPARC/Section employee) for each regional Section focusing on the communication between the members and the Directorate/Council. In this framework we believe that there is a need to organise thematic workshops/exchange programs and produce management tools/materials for each region. We also suggest to show more power in the lobby activities in the European Union since EUROPARC Federation is the main NGO for nature nonsevation in Europe with more than 400 members.
- Exchange amongst sections on programmes Junior Ranger, Transboundary, Charter would be useful. The Sections should communicate more among themselves.
- Austrian members would prefer sections to work thematically There is a request for a more active role of the Sections, in order to work together on thematic priorities.
- With strengthened work of sections, possibility that members not organised in sections feel left out, danger of losing them
- The regional sections are more efficient and recommendable than the national ones.
- Strong need for active Sections based on biogeographic regions (or thematic issues) covering the whole area of Europe.
- The work in the Sections is very concrete and beneficial for everyday work. This structure should be introduced to areas where there are no Sections yet.
- Sections should contribute to elaborate positions and to disseminate key messages at national/regional level. This will give visibility to the Federation, encourage members to position themselves and facilitate their involvement.
- non-members can be a candidate section member for maximum one year
- EUROPARC section should play an active role in attracting more members
- The section should serve the purposes of the Federation
- Hungarian members are NOT part of any Sections but they see a high priority to develop existing and new Sections

Open ended responses on sections...

- Creating sections by category protection IUCN protected areas would be a good idea
- The Sections should have a stronger role in the Council than the present one-year rotating position. Part of the membership fees should be directed to the work of the sections as they deliver the benefits
- It seems very top down and out of touch with the membership. The Sections should play a much greater role.
- Governance is poor and nationalistic
- The Sections are the main interface with members. Sections should be taking a leading role in the governance and strategic direction of the Federation. This would lead to a more engaged membership and a stronger Federation.
- The strategy should include the idea of establishing sections in all the geographical areas where the Federation works, as the sections seem to bring concrete benefits to the members. EU lobbying should be left outside the field of work of the Federation as it is the responsibility of the governments that are EU member states. The role of the EUROPARC Consulting should be severely reconsidered and preferably, the Consulting business should be run down altogether. Focus in EUROPARC work should be clearer and all unnecessary work should be cut. Listen to the members ideas carefully. Focus your expertise networks on people who are actively involved in PA management work rather than people who have retired, as the new people are the ones who will benefit from increased expertise in their work.

Other governance

- Council does not secure the best people to manage a pan European organisation - some Council members are sleeping partners - some Council members are only there because of block votes, rather than having the appropriate skills to be a Council members
- The council should better listen to the members. Ask us more frequently what we want, not once a year at the General Assembly
- Before elections we would like to get more information about persons the present way were the most influential regions (with high membership) is not helping the aims of the federation at all
- What the Board's role would be? If it provides better representation of members views and helps guide the Council and the Directorate then it may be beneficial. But is this a workable and cost effective structure or will it just add bloat?

Open ended responses on other governance...

- Do not need to sit in the Council and decide. Council needs better advisory from a more / direct link with the working groups, which otherwise do not work in an effective way..
- After being involved from less than a year with the STWG ECST, I must say that there is LOT of room of improvements in terms of how the Federation is using the working groups. At this stage - I am being very drastic here - but in my opinion - at the time being the FEDERATION could easily do without the working groups, which are not in the condition to deliver usable and tangible material
- I have a long standing association and respect for the work of EUROPARC. But the GA last year was a disgrace. I happen not to agree with the decision re Eurosite but the way the arguments were presented were just awful and did great discredit to the organization and how it works. In my view, Council was dysfunctional. How could a President and a Chief Executive allow such an unbalanced set of information and specifically the risks be put to a GA? - You should be ashamed.
- We think that more vice presidents need to represent regions of Europe. Each of these 3 or 4 vice presidents must be elected by the competent regions only.
- Could we create EUROPARC 'Ambassadors' to promote and publicise EUROPARC. There are increasing numbers of experienced retired pa staff who may like to do this and often have time, experience and influential contacts
- move away from members of council being elected by their nation/region and having little competence to carry our role Limit to 1 vote per member and no proxies Need to get the right people for the role
- EUROPARC development group which include previous presidents. The group is advising council.
- That is if people want to work whole-heartedly for the case, and have the right abilities to join the team.
- The general assembly in Hungary was a fiasco. As a new member of EUROPARC I cannot see arguments of why EUROPARC and Eurosite should not merge.

- Honorary President : maybe , depends on person ; should at the political level - eg EU have held important function or hold and possess special network access ; also people from the business should be possible ; Objectives of all organizational and professional reorientation must be the increase in the impact strength and not increasing the number of bodies and official
- In general: the General Assembly should be better prepared and well structured, be carried out democratically. I hope for our future, a better perception of the EUROPARC federation in Europe through more joint projects , lobby and EU funding.

Communications

Participants expressed overall satisfaction with the work done in the field of communications. Just some fine tuning is necessary. Participants discussed both the channels of communication and paid attention to necessary improvements in the contents of the distributed messages.

- The most important channels for receipt of information for members are emails, E-News and the Facebook. E-News can be forwarded further to a large number of colleagues in each country, so it is a very good way for distributing information. The Facebook is not used by many, so therefore it is ok, but cannot be a very important information channel.
- The Federation website should be updated as much as possible. The website shall have all background information coming into the E-News.
- Regular post and SMS are not necessary at all.
- In relation to the type of information, it is not so necessary to include updates of activities of other organisations. More attention should be paid on EUROPARC activities, including more internal information. Also more information is needed on protected areas management and how protected areas are promoted in Europe.
- Because the amount of information on various tools, projects etc. is collected on the website, the Directorate could organise it more user friendly and provide a note from time to time about the latest developments.
- There should be information available to members on development of EUROPARC brands, members' events, campaigns, and funding resources.
- More lobbying work for protected areas and knowledge on how to do it is necessary. The members would like to have more information and training on these issues.
- There should be a platform for finding partners for projects and future networking. It should be made possible to put offers there, as well to see the offers and obtain contact details.
- The communication between and for members could be more similar to the Life+ Platform meetings, scaled to broader European level.
- The Federation could organize regular international meetings together with the Commission and other organisations, with subjects based on their directives, etc.
- More internet-based communication conferences should be organised, as they save time, money and nature resources, but face to face meetings are necessary, if people do not know each other.
- Clear difference between main issues and detailed information
- Updates from Brussels Office should be more clear: EUROPARC statements and EU issues on the home page.
- Content should be focused on influencing policy (not focussing on the general public) - who is the audience of the website?
- More translation
- Cultural differences, together with language barriers, have to be considered within the management of the organisation (council, management of workshops, initiatives...) Those are still an obstacle for many members to access easily the services and opportunities offered by the Federation. There is also a communication problem in terms of language. EUROPARC's publications, website, E-news should be available in multiple languages

- The members identified a problem/lack of communication, members are not aware of EUROPARC's programmes and activities => EUROPARC should promote/make them more visible and in the same time engage more all members across EUROPE. EUROPARC should have a common project for all members and this project should unite them.
- Development of the direct mailing and the website. The membership in Hungary specified the following priorities for available information through communication: Calls for Funding proposals. Update on E.P. activities . Management of Natura 2000 sites and Specific Protected Areas

Open ended responses on communication....

- Promoting knowledge of national / regional areas protection
- Develop multilingual communication and not exclusively English(x2) Section dedicated in Italian
- I suggest, that the EUROPARC News or E-news have more stabile headings (groups for articles) wich will be the same in each issues. These can be organised also by topics, also by regions etc...And the articles come from everywhere in Europe must be grouped to the headings which are linking to
- The Newsletter as it is now contains too much information. Communication should always be carried out at the conditions and in the way to target audience preferences. Please avoid advertising the events, publications and jobs of other organisations, including the EU and focus on the news of the EUROPARC Directorate, Programmes and Members, including the sections. At present too much time is consumed by the reader in finding the essential news in the affluent flow of news in the newsletter. Update the website and store the newsletter on the website before sending so that we know that it can be found even if one needs to delete the email. The website should always be updated. Please put your efforts in that work rather than trying to find news of other organisations for the newsletter
- Develop a graphic that will draw the attention of those who read the news you submit. Often communications pass in the cavalry because not sufficiently able to be "read" in an appropriate manner
- Identify common management tools for all protected areas that put in place the first conservation and research as a primary absolute value
- Develop key messages of the value of European protected areas (including N2000) for European citizens. Produce promotional material for European political parties
- Linking the study of protected areas with certain university degrees (eg geology of the national parks and the USA) More advertising of protected areas for the knowledge of the public
- Regular press releases 4-6 per year on selected topics with more than national importance!
- There are too many e-mails (which is the plague and cholera at the same time) - therefore information should be sent by paper of (again) the increasing importance! Even, therefore, no interest in information, where it is expected that I as a user not sure if there is something new. Important are critical reports: Where something goes wrong, where support against intervention is called for, especially in this case the internationality is important because often national "barriers" exist and internationally, there is a greater independence

- Creation of a communication concept for the European Charter , this works as a management guide and certification for protected areas , but not as a label for touristic provider or consumer - corresponding benefit - even profit - but expect business owners when they perform the second charter member and the third part is for over 10 years, a construction site , where it is not clear whether benefits and costs at all in a favourable ratio for the protected areas

Finances

- included in the basic membership fee should be : Voice of Nature lobby, management and exchange of knowledge
- We would be willing to pay extra for consultancy advice, supporting with EU funded projects
- a strategy for growth should be implemented and evaluated. An open discussion should be held about the level of responsibility / amount of steering from the board.
- For other EUROPARC services such as Charter and Transboundary they should stay as separate services
- No need to change membership fees or to include Charter within the membership. These days it is easier for a PA to pay once 5000, rather than 1000 every year. And there are opportunities to include the Charter fees in projects.
- would like to have mainly managing bodies as members of the EUROPARC Federation (NP Directorates, NGO's, Government Agencies etc.) in spite of companies or individuals
- The Hungarian members pointed out, that if „reforms“ can renew the Federation, more Hungarian members could (re)join (2-3 more NP directorates, some of them are former members). On the other hand, if we can not see positive and relatively quick changes (relevant statute changes approved by the 2015 General Assembly at latest) towards the above described decentralization and restructuring goals, there is a high risk of decreasing membership in Hungary.
- The majority of the members pointed out, that even a higher membership fee would be acceptable if there were major structural changes done (e.g. at the level of regional cooperation) within the organisation, to cover higher costs.

To be included in fees:

- Current services are OK. Seems comprehensive
- Those are now provided sufficient
- Information - Preliminary stages of planning for research funding - Finding partners - Networking
- Teleconferencing equipment
- Good governance.
- Single fee for Section and Federation - collected via Section
- Support in the management of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism
- participation fee at least for one training/workshop a year

- administration costs of regional/thematical working groups
- E-news, opportunities to engage in events/conferences, to attend regional meetings and to exchange ideas and best practice
- Apart from the annual conference (which we rarely attend due to budget restraints) the services that we utilise come via the Section (which is much better value for the fee)
- Focus on close links to EU Policy, and promotion of protected areas at EU level. Plus assisting improving networking and information exchange by members. Reduced costs at the centre and promote more action by regional groups.
- website, conferences, newsletters, contact with EUROPARC Consulting
- website, newsletters, organisation of conferences and workshops, quick advice Euroconsulting, Juniorrangerprogramm
- Plan, fund and organise a free annual training seminar to members. (we do ..its siggen CR!)
- Access to all information; working groups, conference and sections, brands and related materials etc
- Discounts
- Search for the continued development of existing programs and new ones that will benefit

Other comments/ideas

- Cooperation is necessary in the early stages of projects and cooperation. It could be interesting to make a prioritized gap analysis of the needs of members and the Federation to see which projects or what kind of work is needed.
- As a cooperation tool, Study tours could be offered within the network. Also more attention should be paid to work with the best practices both in habitats and visitor management and cooperation
- The main selection criteria should be to agree with the organisations goals, statutes and purposes
- To obtain more members should be a goal
- The council of each country should play a role in attracting more members
- Another area that is not so well developed in many places of Europe is volunteering and spreading the best practices in this field, by means of tours, interactive workshops and exchanges of volunteers and their mentors.
- There could be a voluntary "charity fee" for the arrangements and tours, conferences, thus getting additional money to pay for another participant or to bring up something that has not been yet financed (because of lack of finances). This can also be something to engage people and work outside the Pan-European area (South Mediterranean is one).

Other open-end responses...

- To make (on internet based) data base of good practise PA management, activities.
- Cooperation with Eurosite. Make a new start! (x3)
- Mounting European cooperation program co-financed by the EU
- the publishing of a general document outlining the areas involved in the ECST
- identify common management tools for all protected areas that put in place the first conservation and research as a primary absolute value
- Search for synergies with other initiatives present in spaces that are also EUROPARC MAB area, Global Geopark