



# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

**Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process**





# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

## Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

Chair: Yannis Kazoglou

- Which active management measures are compatible with the definition of strict protection? (Irene Bouwma)
- What is a limited and well controlled activity, which can be undertaken in strictly protected areas? (Carlos Sunyer)
- How to manage strictly protected areas for management-dependent species and habitats? (Rui Rufino)



# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

## Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### Which active management measures are compatible with the definition of strict protection?

- Hunting for ungulate control
- Eradication of Invasive Alien Species
- Do nothing option
- Habitat restoration
- Extensive grazing/overgrazing controlled/avoided
- Water management
- Maintaining good conservation status
- Carbon sequestration



# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

## Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### What is a limited and well controlled activity, which can be undertaken in strictly protected areas?

Well-controlled activities directed towards the ultimate conservation goal:

- Hiking (possibly with some limits on number of people to avoid disturbance) – Ecotourism
- Low intensity grazing and specific agricultural practices (e.g. to favor groups like farmland birds / *relevant to CAP measures/eco-schemes*)
- Habitat management and restoration (including forestry practices for forest bat species)
- Prescribed fire
- Control of certain species (non commercial hunting)
- Control of Invasive Alien Species

In this case there are two alternatives for the 10% objective



# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

## Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- If an area may support such amount of activities, then it should not be a good candidate for strict protection
- Criteria to strict protection could then rather focus on areas that do not require active management
- In some MS there are difficulties in eradicating all these activities from a site. In this case, there are two alternatives for the 10% objective:
  - Strict Protection (no extraction): In this case, with difficulties, they may reach 1% of the MS surface area
  - Strict Protection (including controlled activities): In this case, they could reach the 10%
- If natural processes should be left undisturbed, natural wildfires should be left without intervention?
- The Roadless Areas processes and criteria, as well as those of the NaturaConnect Horizon project, could be used to select sites to be included in the “strict protection” considering special characteristics in each MS (core areas of National Parks may also be good candidates).



# Theme 1: Pledges and strict protection

## Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

### How to manage strictly protected areas for management-dependent species and habitats?

- The wilderness areas should not be subject to management (no management is also management)
- Is the idea of the Strategy 2030 to let the areas evolve naturally to a positive state or management will always be necessary?
- Management will depend on the species/habitats you want to protect
- Management can be a way to facilitate natural processes
- Shall we consider a gradient of intervention in the 10% to be included in the strictly protected areas?



Thank you!

[Natura2000platform@wur.nl](mailto:Natura2000platform@wur.nl)

**Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process**



<https://twitter.com/BioGeoProcess>