



Fourth seminar for the Continental, Alpine, Pannonian, Steppic and Black Sea regions

Ministry of the Environment
of the Czech Republic



Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

A wide-angle landscape photograph showing rolling green hills under a blue sky with light clouds. In the foreground, there is a field of tall green grass with small white flowers. In the middle ground, there are several green hills with scattered trees. In the background, there is a prominent, rounded hill (a tuff cone) and a valley with yellow rapeseed fields. A semi-transparent blue box is overlaid on the center of the image, containing the text "Protected Area Targets" and "Discussion Day 1".

Protected Area Targets

Discussion Day 1



Group 1: How do we overcome the barriers for the national pledge for protected areas (technical/ political)?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

11 participants, Facilitator: Luna Milatovic

The group briefly identified the main barriers to brainstorm about the solutions, incl.:

- lack of political will,
- poor institutional capacity and administrative processes,
- stakeholder resistance,
- insufficient cooperation between sectors,
- lack of understanding of the importance of





Group 1: How do we overcome the barriers for the national pledge for protected areas (technical/ political)?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

Solutions/ideas:

- NRL as an opportunity for MS to identify synergies between areas to restore and areas to protect
- Collaboration with other stakeholders (NGOs, academia) to compensate for lack of capacity (e.g. Polish shadow pledge by NGO)
- Inclusive PA planning with communities and other stakeholders (learn from mistakes of N2K)
- Accessing funding for institutional reform (e.g LIFE)
- Incentives and compensation for stakeholders
- Communicating better the benefits of PAs (positive framing) and their spillover effects to areas around
- Sharing of best practices in the pledge preparation approach
- Clearer and stronger communication from DG ENVI vs DG AGRI
- Partnerships with private sector (possible OECMs)
- Focusing on improving the management objectives of existing areas to improve their effectiveness
- Communicating synergies between protection and climate change adaptation



Group 3: Ensure Implementation of the pledge

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

9 participants, facilitator: Paul Goriup

- How can we ensure that national pledges for protected areas will actually be implemented?
 - No government participants felt that some external enforcement procedure was needed as all were working to develop plans to reach the PA targets in line with national conditions (which included changes in domestic legislation).
 - It was generally concluded that implementation rather depended on creating an enabling environment consisting of:



Group 3: Ensure Implementation of the pledge

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- Building capacity in the Ministries since all were under-resourced for the scale of the task, including experts in communication and economics;
- Adequate collection and analysis of data made available to the public, and involving stakeholders at the earliest possible stage such as discussing PA commitments, proposals and boundaries, in order to build up trust and consensus;





Group 3: Financing the Protected areas

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- Several participants described examples from their countries of how financial incentives are offered to encourage nature-positive land management e.g. in forestry and restoring disused land to create nature reserves. The main conclusions were:
 - Instituting a system of long-term (20 – 30 years) incentives (financial and non-financial) to engage land users so that they can invest confidently and implement conservation measures effectively;
 - Achieving a more equitable balance between CAP subsidies and payments for ecosystem services.



Group 2: How to identify the best areas to improve the coherence and connectivity of the protected area network?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

12 participants, Facilitator: Barbora Chmelová

- EU-wide emphasis on the area targets, but we lack definition of habitats (or ecological networks) connectivity/ coherence and respective indicators
- Data availability and use:
 - How do we reach/ describe areas outside the PA? Lack of resources/ capacities for targeted mapping x its great potential
 - Remote sensing is not a panacea: suitable for mapping of specific habitats/ at specific scales only
 - Large amounts of data are being produced, but it's practical use and uptake has to be enhanced (policies, strategies, plans...)



Group 2: How to identify the best areas to improve the coherence and connectivity of the protected area network?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- Transboundary cooperation is limited x rivers are logical natural corridors to be used, better use of its potential
- Conflict of interests in landscapes: scientific knowledge x socioeconomic pressure





Group 4: How do we ensure that local communities benefit from the designation of protected areas?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

9 Participants, Facilitator: Irene Bouwma

Criteria were discussed:

- Consider: who forms the local community?
- Trust: needs time to built relationships so their needs to be a structure that enables long term relations (same people, long time employed)
- Recognition: both in terms of financial benefits as well as a relation based on equal partnerships





Group 4: How do we ensure that local communities benefit from the designation of protected areas?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

- Financial benefits
 1. Be creative in finding new sources of revenues for traditional management
 2. Provide support to deal with paperwork associated with subsidies and plan/project





Group 5: How can protected areas be effectively managed, with clear conservation objectives and measures?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

11 Participants, Facilitator: Csaba Mezei

1. Adaptive management is needed because of rapidly changing circumstances (e.g.: due to climate change), sometimes site-specific objectives are in contradiction with the national (or EU) objectives. Therefore, revisiting and update of the objectives on all levels time-to-time is necessary





Group 5: How to ensure good monitoring procedures for Protected areas?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

1. There is a declining trend of the stakeholders' quality and capacity (e.g.: young conservationists, partners, botanists, etc.) – to overcome this we shall use citizen science, digital nature monitoring, remote sensing, gamification – these can complement state-of-the art monitoring process
2. We need to find the way to better exchange knowledge and information (to learn from each other from different countries, and there and back with EU institutions) also to overcome discrepancies of the monitoring procedures. N2000 inflexibilities are a barrier to ensure good monitoring.



Group 6: How to identify the best areas for strict protection?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process



12 Participants, Facilitator Theo van der Sluis

Criteria were discussed:

- IUCN areas would qualify:
 - large areas, biodiverse, state owned
- Ecosystem based, so larger sites,
 - allowing for natural processes, may also contain enclaves with e.g. farmland;
 - or, smaller sites, surrounded by area under OECMs
- Conservation need
 - Either non-intervention, or management for conservation
- Permanence of the designation!





Group 6: How to identify the best areas for strict protection?

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

Other issues

- Definitions can differ, strictly protected in Poland may differ from Czech Republic: this requires flexibility
- People can still have some benefits from strictly protected, on the condition that management is aimed at conservation, and no detrimental impacts
- OECMs can be complementary (in space) to Strict protection (because OECMs often include human interference/management)



Group 5: FINALE MESSAGE FOR EU

Natura 2000 Biogeographical Process

Csaba Mezei: short wrap-up game,

General messages to the European Commission:

- More clear guidance regarding the objectives
- Measures should be designed for the outcome (do not give order)
- Give farmers the opportunity to learn about nature conservation objectives
- Whole society shall be interested in nature conservation
- Objectives, measures and costs should be clear and harmonized
- Give nature some freedom
- Adaptive legislative management
- Education of stakeholders (youth, farmers, locals)
- Targets/objectives/goals should be more concrete
- More detailed objectives needed
- More international and interregional cooperation

