4th Natura 2000 Boreal Seminar
Helsinki, Finland

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

Conservation Status and Protected Area Targets Discussion

Day 1

- What are the barriers for preparing and submitting the pledge (technical/ political), and how can they be overcome?

- From planning to implementation: how can pledges be used to achieve the Biodiversity Strategy targets?

- How to align pledges between Member States and organise cross-border implementation?

- What would be required to scale up restoration efforts for species and habitats?

- For which species / habitats is deterioration considered to be unavoidable?

- Process, and how this is shaped;
  - it is a long process, many new concepts, stakeholder participation
- Option: Bottom-up process, with neutral facilitator; more time; tools, to convince and motivate participants (e.g. Helmi and Metso programme)
- Many other complicating factors;
  - Time to implement, clarity process, funding (decreasing!), lack of ownership, a
- Lack of support; upcoming elections complicating things
- Increase awareness, there is support for nature (but less for the measures). Better communication with owners, and general public. Clarify consequences
- Buy-in of landowners,
- Flexibility. Metso and Helmi are voluntary programmes, with different time horizons: 10-20 yrs or for ever!

- Involve all stakeholders from the beginning, especially landowners (through voluntary agreements). For that, specific and quantitative targets should be previously established.

- Expert knowledge is needed throughout the whole process—feedback from experts is important for correct methodologies and actions.

- Funding is paramount!

- For prioritization cost-effectiveness is of primary importance; also, the biogeographical region level must be considered when establishing national scale targets.

How to align pledges between Member States and organise cross-border implementation?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- Co-operation – important to discuss process, to share methods and best practice. But this does not work in selection of species and habitats which are specific in regions.

- It is hard to set up criteria for values, define areas and measures in MS - hesitation how to reach the goals, lack of financial resources

- Different interpretation leads to conflict inside MS and/or between MS

- Cross-border action: INTERREG, LIFE, regional seminars and events
  - Contacts, cross-sectoral awareness
  - Political commitment
  - Lack of konwledge of the species
  - Organize meetings in small groups, invite in working groups – knowledge will be transferred

Every invested EUR should bring 10 EUR to the society!

- Focus on quality, not quantity.

- Act at landscape level.

- Decrease bureaucracy.

- Engage land owners at all steps, from the beginning.

- Propose reachable targets.

- Funding

- Time-scale for species restoration and for habitats restoration is different; the effects of actions may take time.

- Funding from private companies should be procured—as part of compensation (Carbon credits, etc.). It should be distributed trough an environmental centre (government).

- Foundations can help in this process, by using the money thus obtained to acquire land, for instance.

- The main threats to the species: climate change, invasive species, diseases, land abandonement, intensive managemet, consumption

- Examples of deterioration: Arctic and Alpine species (eg. Arctic fox), grayfish, moths, migaratory birds, *Bufotes viridis*

- Solutions:
    - Need to know the requirements of the species
    - Changes on CAP system
    - LIFE projects for species
    - Feeding - golden eagle, sea eagle, Arctic fox
    - Umbrella species – fixing the habitat get several targets
    - Hunting rules – change the list of hunted species
    - Re-introduction
    - Knowledge excahnge and best practce

At first fix the habitat, then re-introduce the species, use the know how!