

**Strengthening the Capacity
of Governments to
Implement Priority Activities
of the CBD PoWPA**

**Eastern Europe Regional
Workshop**

Isle of Vilm, 17-21 June 2007

WORKSHOP REPORT

Developed with the support of the *MAVA Fondation pour la Protection de la Nature*, WWF's *Protected Areas for a Living Planet* programme is working in key ecoregions to help governments meet bold targets for biodiversity conservation. Launched in January 2007, the programme brings together partners and stakeholders to support and monitor implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity's Programme of Work on Protected Areas – an historic commitment by 188 governments to create a global network of comprehensive, well-managed, and representative terrestrial and marine protected areas.

Protected Areas for a Living Planet is WWF's contribution to helping governments achieve the 2010 Target to reduce the current rate of biodiversity loss. Meeting this target is not only essential to safeguard our world's unique species and habitats, but also essential to improving the food security, health, and income of poor communities worldwide, and therefore to achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

This training workshop was a joint collaboration among WWF, TNC, IUCN/WCPA, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the International Academy for Nature Conservation of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation.

This report was prepared by the workshop facilitator, Meg Gawler – *ARTEMIS Services for Nature Conservation and Human Development*.

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Background.....	1
Workshop Purpose	1
Workshop Objectives	1
Expected Outputs	1
Organization of the Workshop.....	2
CBD PoWPA and Natura 2000	2
Protected Area System Master Plans	2
Ecological Gap Analysis	3
Management Effectiveness.....	5
Sustainable Financing.....	13
Wrap-up.....	18
Recommendations to the CBD Working Group on Protected Areas	22
Documentation.....	24
Workshop Outcomes	24
Annex 1. Agenda	26
Annex 2. Participants	32
Annex 3. Questionnaire	36
Annex 4. Reporting Template	44
Annex 5. Workshop Evaluation	45
Annex 6. Acronyms and Abbreviations	49

Executive Summary

In February 2004, at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-7) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 188 countries endorsed a comprehensive Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), including an ambitious set of time-bound action targets aimed at establishing and maintaining comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional protected area systems by 2010/2012. At the COP-8 governments recommended capacity building workshops to help Parties implement the PoWPA by providing practical, hands-on tools, information, and training.

This workshop was intended to provide an overview for countries in Eastern Europe of three of the most critical elements for implementing the CBD PoWPA: ecological gap analysis, improving management effectiveness, and sustainable financing, and it set the following objectives:

- (1) Review the progress in implementing the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), including challenges and obstacles, for input to the second meeting of the CBD Working Group on Protected Areas (February 2008)
- (2) Increase the capacity of government officials to implement the PoWPA
- (3) Demonstrate the relevance of national Master Plans for implementing the programme of work on protected areas
- (4) Develop national workplans for developing national Master Plans for achieving progress on targeted themes that complement the activities of the Protected Areas for a Living Planet programme (PA4LP) at the ecoregion level
- (5) Identify the necessary resources and capacity as well as gaps and obstacles at the national level for developing national master plans.

The workshop was organized by WWF's Protected Areas for a Living Plant programme in cooperation with the Secretariat of the CBD, The Nature Conservancy, IUCN/WCPA, and the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation. It was held in June 2007 at the International Academy for Nature Conservation on the Isle of Vilm in Germany.

Obstacles in awareness, political will, capacity, and sustainable financing were identified during the workshop. These four areas are clearly interlinked. Lack of awareness and understanding of the values of protected areas means that there is little political will to put protected areas in place, develop capacity, allocate funding, revise conflicting legislation, and reform institutional problems such as high staff turnover or poor qualifications. At a more local level, greater awareness of the value and benefits of protected areas needs to be achieved if protected areas are to be supported by local people.

The final session of the workshop summarized the key obstacles faced by governments for PoWPA implementation; how these obstacles could be addressed at national level and the external support needed from the CBD and international organizations. Based on the output of this session, specific wording for recommendations to the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas (WGPA-2) were drawn up by the workshop facilitators after the workshop. Specific recommendations were made in the areas cover the areas of Governance (building political will and awareness raising); capacity building and sustainable financing.

From feedback from the participants, it is clear that this capacity building workshop made a valuable contribution to the implementation of the CBD PoWPA in the region. The workshop did generally accomplish the objectives and outputs set out, and achieved the following outcomes:

- ✓ Twenty-two participants responsible for protected areas in 12 countries in Eastern Europe (Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Ukraine) gained practical knowledge in developing national Master Plans for achieving the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas, with particular emphasis on ecological gap assessment, management effectiveness and sustainable financing.
- ✓ These twelve countries provided a review to the CBD Secretariat on the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas in their countries.

- ✓ The twelve countries elaborated workplans to develop national Master Plans to achieve the CBD PoWPA, including gap assessment, threat assessment, management effectiveness assessment, capacity assessment, equity and benefits assessment, governance, policy environment, sustainable finance, and monitoring of PA systems. For each of these elements, they rated the actual status of implementation, its priority for the country, next steps, what is needed to take the next steps, and obstacles.
- ✓ Participants developed recommendations for the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas.

Strengthening the Capacity of Governments to Implement Priority Activities of the CBD PoWPA

Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007

Background

In February 2004, at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP-7) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 188 countries endorsed a comprehensive Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), including an ambitious set of time-bound action targets aimed at establishing and maintaining comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional protected area systems by 2010/2012. At the COP-8 meeting in March 2006, governments adopted Decision VIII, which recommended capacity building workshops to help Parties in implementing the PoWPA. These workshops are intended to provide practical, hands-on tools, information, and training to help governments complete some of the key early actions in the PoWPA.

In November 2006, members of the NGO consortium, the IUCN-WCPA and the CBD Secretariat agreed on organizing workshops in sub-regions to enhance capacities for implementation of priority activities identified by COP 8, and to review implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas.

Workshop Purpose

This workshop was intended to provide an overview for countries in Eastern Europe of three of the most critical the elements for implementing the CBD PoWPA: ecological gap analysis, improving management effectiveness, and sustainable financing.

Workshop Objectives

- (1) Review the progress in implementing the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas, including challenges and obstacles, for input to the second meeting of the CBD Working Group on Protected Areas (February 2008)
- (2) Increase the capacity of government officials to implement the PoWPA
- (3) Demonstrate the relevance of national Master Plans for implementing the programme of work on protected areas
- (4) Develop national workplans for developing national Master Plans for achieving progress on targeted themes that complement the activities of the Protected Areas for a Living Planet programme (PA4LP) at the ecoregion level
- (5) Identify the necessary resources and capacity as well as gaps and obstacles at the national level for developing national master plans.

The questionnaire attached in Annex 3 on the level of implementation of the PoWPA in each country was sent to all participants in advance of the workshop, with a request that they complete it during the workshop.

Expected Outputs

The workshop intended to produce three essential outputs:

- A. Completion by each country of the attached questionnaire, which is based on the essential information required by the CBD Secretariat (this will be extremely helpful for CBD meeting groups and COPs)
- B. A plan of action for each country outlining next steps for the development of national gap assessments; sustainable financing plans; management effectiveness and capacity building plans; and overall PA Master Plans (format in Annex 4)
- C. Recommendations for the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas.

Organization of the Workshop

This workshop was organized by WWF's Protected Areas for a Living Planet programme in cooperation with the CBD Secretariat, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), IUCN/WCPA, and the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation. Funding and in-kind contributions were provided by the organizers, with co-financing by the German Federal Ministry of the Environment.

The general structure of the workshop was as follows, and the detailed final agenda is attached as Annex 1.

- Day 0, Sunday: welcome, participant introductions, general over-view of the workshop and get-acquainted ice-breaker
- Day 1, Monday: overview of the CBD PoWPA, introduction to developing Master Plans, and ecological gap analyses
- Day 2, Tuesday: management effectiveness assessment and capacity development action planning
- Day 3, Wednesday: sustainable financing
- Day 4, Thursday: national presentations of next steps to develop national action plans; wrap up and finalization of inputs to the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas and other regional processes; workshop evaluation.

Rolf Hogan (WWF International) and Sarat Babu Gidda (CBD Secretariat) took the lead, and expert input was provided by Jamie Ervin (TNC), Jason Spensley (TNC) and Barry Spergel (consultant for WWF), together with nine other resource persons. Twenty-two participants came from 12 countries: Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Ukraine. The full list of participants with their contact details is given in Annex 2.

Day 1

CBD PoWPA and Natura 2000

The CBD and Natura 2000 share similar objectives and many areas of common approaches. The CBD has a wide definition of biodiversity, and addresses alien species, illegal exploitation, equity and benefits sharing, and capacity building. The CBD strongly highlights the importance of marine and freshwater ecosystems, areas beyond national jurisdiction, and transboundary PAs. Natura 2000 is focused on lists of protected species and habitats, and is legally binding; public support is very important. The CBD emphasizes large remaining natural areas, while Natura 2000 more site specific. Natura 2000 has a sizeable budget and an enforcement mechanism.

Protected Area System Master Plans

A protected area system master plan is a holistic, comprehensive summary of the activities and strategies needed to ensure a fully representative and functional network of well managed and sustainably financed protected areas. While a comprehensive master plan typically includes three core components – a plan for improving the protected area network, protected area management, and the enabling environment – the following is a list of all of the elements of a protected area system master plan:

1. Assessing and filling ecological gaps
2. Assessing and abating key threats
3. Assessing and improving management effectiveness
4. Assessing and addressing capacity needs
5. Assessing and improving equity and benefits sharing
6. Assessing and improving governance
7. Assessing and improving the policy environment
8. Assessing and improving sustainable finance
9. Monitoring protected area systems.

This workshop focused on elements 1, 3 and 8.

For a quick guide, please refer to: Ervin, J. 2007. "Protected Area System Master Planning – A quick guide for practitioners." At:

<http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/patools/resources/pasystem1/masterplanningdocs/mpquickguide>

One of the ambitions of this workshop was to develop national plans for developing a Master Plan in each country.

In a number of countries these Master Plans are called a strategy plan, a system. Some countries have a number of elements, but it is rare to see a country that has integrated all of them. Master Planning is a tool to improve PA systems, and that can accelerate the process of implementing the PoWPA.

The workshop did an informal assessment – a pulse-taking of where each country is thought to be with respect to the nine elements of a Master Plan:

INFORMAL ASSESSMENT OF STATUS OF PA MASTERPLANNING ELEMENTS									
As this was an unofficial assessment, the names of the countries have been removed.									
Key to level of advancement: 0=0; 1=less than ¼; 2= ¼-¾; 3= ¾-1									
Country	Gap Assessment	Threat Assessment	Management Effectiveness Assessment	Capacity Assessment	Equity and Benefits Assessment	Governance Assessment	Policy Environment Assessment	Sustainable Finance Assessment	Comprehensive Monitoring Plan
A	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
B	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
C	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	2
D	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
E	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	2
F	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
G	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
H	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
I	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	1
J	2 (0)	1	0	1 (0)	0	1	0	1	0
K	3	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	2
L	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	1
M	2	3	1	2	0	1	3	2	1
N	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
O	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
P	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	0.5	1
Q	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	2
Total	35	28	17	15	6	17	20	19	14

The results of the table above indicate which elements of PA Master Plans are most advanced in the countries represented in the workshop, from most advanced to least advanced:

- Gap assessment
- Threat assessment
- Policy assessment
- Sustainable finance assessment
- Management effectiveness assessment and governance assessment
- Capacity assessment
- Comprehensive monitoring plan
- Equity and benefits assessment.

Ecological Gap Analysis

Background (TNC, Jamie Ervin):

The major steps in conducting an ecological gap assessment are:

1. **Assess biodiversity status:** Identify focal biodiversity features (species, natural communities, ecosystems and the ecological processes that sustain them). Include terrestrial, freshwater and marine systems, and irreplaceable and vulnerable species. Assess the viability of biodiversity features, including size (population, patch size), condition (composition, structure), landscape context (connectivity, ecological processes) and threat status. Determine the optimal number, distribution, and design for each biodiversity feature to ensure long-term persistence.
2. **Assess protection status:** Map the the boundaries and designation of protected and other conserved areas. Map the results of management effectiveness assessments by creating a gradient from well-managed to poorly-managed areas.
3. **Analyze results:** Identify ecological gaps, including biodiversity features that are absent or under-represented, or are of insufficient viability to ensure long-term persistence. Identify management gaps, including protected areas that require improved management effectiveness or stronger legal designation.
4. **Fill ecological gaps:** Prioritize ecological gaps based on threat, urgency and irreplaceability. Develop strategies and estimate costs to fill ecological gaps. Prioritize these strategies based on opportunities and feasibility. Develop an action plan with timelines, budgets, responsibilities and indicators of success.

A number of strategies exist for filling ecological gaps, e.g.:

- Revise protected area designations: The IUCN categorization system ranges from strict protection (Category I) through multiple use areas (Category VI). Changing protected area designation can be an efficient way of filling critical ecological gaps and increasing protection levels.
- Explore alternative governance: When creating new protected areas is difficult because of financial, political or societal constraints, governments may want to encourage community conserved areas, tribal and indigenous areas, co-managed areas and private protected areas.
- Encourage 'other conserved areas': Areas that have long-term conservation status, but are not legally designated as protected areas (e.g., certified forestry operations, wetland reserve areas, organic farms) can help fill critical gaps within the protected area network.
- Expand existing protected areas: Even a small change to the design of a protected area, such as expanding the boundaries to include more elevational gradients, can make a major contribution to filling ecological gaps, and meeting critical breeding, feeding and migration needs of species.
- Create ecological corridors: In many cases, it may be necessary to create corridors that allow species movement and ecological processes to occur. Although the overall area of these corridors may be small, the benefits to the overall protected area system can be substantial.
- Create new protected areas: Governments should consider the most critical, irreplaceable, under-represented species and ecological systems – typically areas of high productivity that have already been largely transformed across the landscape – as priority candidates.
- Restore protected areas: The restoration and expansion of remnant patches of fragmented ecosystems, the rehabilitation of ecological structures and processes within a partly functioning system, and the reintroduction of extirpated species can help fill ecological gaps.

Key resources available for conducting gap assessments include:

- Dudley, N., and J. Parrish, 2006. *Closing the Gap. Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity*. CBD Technical Series 24. Montreal, Canada. 116 pp. At: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-24.pdf>
- The Gaps Guide: <http://www.protectedareas.info/index.asp>.

Case Study on Gap Analysis from the Dinaric Arc Ecoregion (Boris Krystufek):

The project aims to help the five countries in the ecoregion to fulfil their commitments under the PoWPA, with three general objectives:

1. Collect and systemize the data on biodiversity and protected areas in the region
2. Identify gaps and build capacities of governmental institutions responsible for CBD implementation
3. Develop a protected area business plan in each of the countries, to demonstrate sustainable funding.

As a result of the war in the former Yugoslavia, the Dinaric Arc Ecoregion faces particular challenges especially for collecting data, many of which were lost during the war. In addition data that do exist are often semi-private, and tend to be dispersed and not organized. Areas that seem to have low species density are often simply areas with few data. Much information is prior to 1970 and has never been updated.

Case Study on Gap Analysis in the Carpathians (Hildegard Meyer and Anna Guttova):

The major players in the region are the Carpathian Convention, WWF Danube-Carpathian Programme, Carpathian EcoRegion Initiative (CERI), and Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA). Early actions towards Pan-Carpathian Conservation include developing a GIS database with experts from all seven Carpathian countries, including both socio-economic and biodiversity data, and synthesizing these to delineate areas important for biodiversity and ecological corridors. The existing gap analysis shows that about one third of priority areas are already protected. A joint project is under way which will: establish a Carpathian Biodiversity Information System; develop the Carpathian Ecological Network with special emphasis on Ukraine, Romania and Serbia; increase capacities of NGOs in in the Carpathian region; and strengthen organizational structures and capacities of the CERI to support the implementation of the Carpathian Convention, which provides a unique policy environment for developing an integrated network of PAs for the ecoregion. The final product will be an interactive map with zonation and management recommendations. More information is available at www.carpates.org.

Plenary Example of Assessing Progress on Ecological Gap Analysis (Jamie Ervin):

In preparation for the break-out groups, progress on gap analysis was assessed with the help of Andrej Sovinc, looking at three basic questions for Slovenia:

1. Where are we in gap assessment?
2. What are the obstacles and challenges?
3. Which are next steps to be taken to move the process forward?

Biodiversity and PA analyses have been done, but not really on a scientific basis. Slovenia has a national biodiversity strategy, as well as a national plan for further PAs, but now the country is protecting less and less land. The main problem is political will and securing enough funding, and there is very weak cooperation between scientists and politicians.

Break-out groups on assessing progress in ecological gap assessment in each country:

The groups examined and prepared brief reports on: status / situation; challenges / obstacles; next steps (technical or political) to advance ecological gap analysis.

Day 2

Synthesis of break-out group reports on assessing progress in ecological gap assessment (Pierre Galland): Countries were at very different levels regarding their PA network, and there seemed to be a north-south gradient regarding the level of implementation and functioning of national PA networks. In general:

- All countries have done inventories, in most cases related to Natura 2000; however there is a need for a stronger scientific bases and/or validation of the data.
- Most countries have legal frameworks and strategies, but a few need improvement.
- All countries have a PA network; some are still under development (< 10 % of the territory), while others have reached the level of confirming management effectiveness.

Obstacles and challenges include:

- Insufficient funding, capacities and trained people
- Need for capacity building, but more specific topics must be identified
- Data exist but are dispersed, not processed and sometimes not available → need for centralized data coordination units
- Legal basis needs improvement in a few cases
- Increased PA coverage meets some resistance from politicians and/or from local people and authorities.

Suggested next steps would be to:

- Improve communication at all levels: between ministries, among responsible management bodies, across borders
- Harmonize international conventions and programme agreements
- Improve legal frameworks in some countries (e.g. BiH is facing a very complicated system with dispersion of responsibilities)
- Work on processes for data sharing at all levels (within and between institutions and countries)
- Get commitment from authorities and political support for the CBD PoWPA.

Management Effectiveness

Background (TNC, Jason Spensley):

Protected area management effectiveness is the extent to which a protected area achieves its objectives, mitigates threats, and protects biodiversity features. Assessing protected area management effectiveness is a key step in developing a protected area system master plan. Such assessments can also: reveal management gaps in a protected area system; guide protected area strategy and capacity development; enable adaptive management; guide effective resource allocation; promote accountability and transparency among key stakeholders; and build support for protected area management.

The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has developed a framework for developing management effectiveness assessment methodologies. While any particular assessment methodology will have an array of indicators, management effectiveness is generally measured by the following indicators:

- Context – protected area significance; threats and pressures; policy environment
- Planning – PA system and PA site design and legal status
- Inputs – the resources needed to carry out protected area management (staffing, funding, equipment)
- Processes – management planning; information and data management; financial management; monitoring
- Outputs – the implementation of management programs, actions and services (e.g. law enforcement, boundary demarcation, work plan, education, restoration)
- Outcomes – the extent to which objectives have been achieved (e.g. ecological condition of the PA).

There are several different approaches for assessing management effectiveness:

- An in-depth evidence-based approach uses the results of monitoring and stakeholder surveys to assess the degree to which management actions have achieved management objectives. Such assessments typically involve the creation of a detailed baseline of key desired outcomes, and the assessment is designed to measure changes in these outcomes over time.
- A system-wide peer-based approach includes most or all of the protected areas within a given system. Participants assess a range of indicators related to key threats and critical management needs, typically in participatory workshops with peer review by protected area managers and others to reduce biases.
- A rapid scorecard-based approach uses a scorecard to elicit expert opinions about protected area management, usually with a set of four or five pre-defined thresholds for each indicator. Such assessments can be very rapid, and require few resources.
- A categorical assumption-based approach draws on available data and develops assumptions to determine potential management effectiveness. Usually there is little interaction with field staff to corroborate results, but there is often some review of the assumptions by administrative staff. This approach, which applies to an entire category of protected areas, should not be treated as equivalent to a more comprehensive assessment.

The choice of assessment approach and methodology will depend on several factors, including the available time, financial and human resources, and the specific purpose of the assessment. In general, an in-depth, evidence-based approach is best suited for a comprehensive assessment of a few important protected areas and for setting thresholds for adaptive management, a site-level scorecard-based approach for tracking progress related to conservation investments, a system-level approach for developing system-wide strategies, policies and capacity needs, and a categorical approach for a cursory assessment of the major management gaps within a protected area system. In many cases, planning teams may want to use a mix of approaches within a single protected area system, and adapt existing indicators and methodologies to suit local circumstances.

The critical steps in assessing PA management effectiveness are:

1. Defining the purpose, objectives and scope of the assessment
2. Identification of resources (financial and technical)
3. Ensuring stakeholders' support, team building
4. Doing the assessment
5. Analysing the results and prioritizing challenges
6. Identifying underlying capacity challenges and developing an action plan to address them
7. Communicating and institutionalizing the action plan.

Management assessment is a vital learning process that can transform management, *but...* i) management effectiveness assessments commonly stop at analysis and do not identifying underlying capacity issues; and

ii) capacity development actions are commonly not based on supply and the conventional wisdom of need, but are designed ad hoc.

Developing a capacity action plan involves the following steps:

1. Form a working group
2. Gather and analyze existing information from management effectiveness assessments
3. Identify priorities management effectiveness issues (significance, urgency, feasibility)
4. Identify strategies to resolve issues
5. Identify underlying capacity needs
6. Design and institutionalize action plans
7. Implement actions!
8. Review progress.

Following are some lessons learned from assessing management effectiveness:

- Need for a clear champion and staff point person.
- Involve the right people and agencies from the start.
- Don't wait long between assessing and designing an action plan.
- Prioritize threats, management weaknesses, and policy impediments.
- Prioritize actions rigorously to avoid "wish lists".
- Don't over-assess or over-plan.
- Actions should first meet minimum standards (staffing, management planning, infrastructure, funding).
- Review progress and adapt actions annually.
- Institutionalize actions within annual plans and budgets.
- Involve donors and other support organizations.

Key resources available for assessing management effectiveness include:

- Hockings, M., S. Stolton, F. Leverington, N. Dudley and J. Courrau. 2006. *Evaluating Effectiveness: A framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas*, 2nd Edition. Queensland, Australia: World Commission on Protected Areas. 136 pp.
- Dudley, N., A. Belokurov, L. Higgins-Zogib, M. Hockings and S. Stolton. 2007. *Tracking progress in managing protected areas around the world*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF International. 29 pp.
- Ervin, J. 2003b. *Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM)*. Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature. 61 pp.

Comment: In this part of Europe the assignment of the proper category to the PA needs to be clear before going into assessing management effectiveness. In Europe there are PAs that do not have correct management goals. The role of WCMC and the national focal points should be highlighted. This region first needs a database of PAs with appropriate management objectives.

Case Study from Romania in Managing PA Networks (Mihai Zotta):

A Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) was carried out in Romania in March 2006. The method consisted of a rapid evaluation through an interactive seminar with 25 protected area administrations, key stake holders, and responsible institutions. The assessment was based on a questionnaire and discussions with the workshop participants. The vulnerability of Romania's PAs was attributed to:

- Low number of rangers, and the low capacity for enforcing the legislation
- Lack of repressive measures in the laws
- Corruption and the inefficiency of the judicial sector, which have encouraged illegal activities
- Restitution of forests in PAs, and the trend of new owners obtaining high income from the forests in short period of time.

Major Findings of PA Management Effectiveness in Romania		
Criteria	RAPPAM Findings	Changes since the RAPPAM in March 2006
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some PAs do not have clearly defined objectives. • Only two parks have approved management plans; at the rest management planning is on going. • Most PAs have work plans, but priorities relate to available resources and not necessarily to PA management objectives. 	
Status of the parks and stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The forest restitution process is on-going. As a result, the surface of state forests may decrease from an initial 80% to below 50%. • Lack of compensation from the government will lead to illegal use and to acute conflicts with local communities. • Personnel are not trained and equipped enough for law enforcement. • Capacity of PA personnel must be improved to better communicate with local communities. 	
Planning and projecting	Redefining the internal zoning of the parks is needed.	
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficiency of personnel. • Even if there is already experience in relevant activities, there is a lack of qualified staff in some domains and training is needed (planning, public awareness, tourism, education, communication). • There are no permanent possibilities to train the personnel. • Salaries have to be increased. • Specific systems to evaluate personnel should be created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of personnel was increased from 220 employees to about 300 in the parks administrated by the National Forest Administration (NFA). Three parks administered by other entities still do not have an administration. • Training courses in tourism and planning were performed, some experience was acquired, change of experience took place. • Salaries were increased in June 2007 by 22%.
Communication and information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological information generally exists, but socio-economic studies have to be conducted. • There is a lack of technical communication tools in the field. • Facilities for data collections are of a low or medium level in some cases • Communication with the local communities should be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A socio economic study on tourism was conducted in the NFA parks • At three parks the system of technical communications was improved • Small improvements took place (GPS tools at all NFA parks) • Brochures and leaflets for communities are elaborated and will be printed this year
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of visitor centre and information points at the parks (only Danube Delta has centres in place). • Each park administration has at least one means of transportation. • Field equipment is reduced or does not exist. • Some parks have offices that are in rented buildings or apartments. • There are no research centres or training centres belonging to the parks. • There is a lack of tourism facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some visitor centres are under construction (international projects). At four parks new visitor centres and information points are in place. • The minimum number of cars increased to two. • Some field equipment was delivered. • The number of educational trails, camp sites, informational panels has increased, but not enough.
Financing resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were considered low and not enough in recent years. The only component which is stable is the salaries paid by the NFA, but the level is considered low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2007 there is still no financial support from the national budget for the parks.
Management planning process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is on going in 90% of PAs. • At some parks the inventory of natural and cultural resources should be improved. • The analysis of the threats should be improved for some PAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2006 the parks administered by NFA did improve the management plans projects, but there is a gap at the level of approving the plans by the responsible authority.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participatory decision process is better in the case of the national parks, but has to be improved in the case of natural parks where it is also more important. 	
Research, monitoring, evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most PAs there is no monitoring of impacts generated by human activities. • Low level of annual scientific research in most PAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of research is slowly growing, but financial resources are still strongly needed.
System of protected areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping biodiversity at the national level • Including in the protected areas of some already identified valuable natural areas (pristine forests) • Creating ecological corridors • Promoting sustainable use of resources in the neighbourhood of PAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new law project establishes the legal basis for ecological corridors.
Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national strategy for PAs is strongly required. • A programme of public awareness should be developed and implemented. • Inter-sectoral cooperation is needed • A system of training and research for PAs should be created, with financial resources assured. • Solutions are needed for improving the absorption of European funds. • A new analysis of the system of managing PAs. 	
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative coherence is necessary. • Proper financing is needed. • Compensation for the land owners is necessary. • Environmental education programmes are required in schools. • National programme for public awareness has to be created and implemented. • Transparency in the management of the protected areas is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A New law of environment protection and a new law on protected areas were issued in June-July 2006, and park administrations can enforce the legislation. • Some compensation to forest owners given, due to ministerial order • The role of the consultative councils has increased.

As shown in this case study, the RAPPAM assessment did help to make changes in Romania, and put pressure on the Ministry of Agriculture. One lesson is that it is an advantage to have PA staff who in general are relatively young and willing to do things.

Management Effectiveness Case Study – Finland (Kari Lahti):

A comprehensive Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE) of the Finnish Protected Area System, commissioned by the Natural Heritage Services (NHS) of Metsähallitus, was carried out in 2004. The MEE covered the “big picture” related to the state of the environment and the socio-economic conditions, but it also paid particular attention to the performance of the national parks agency. The elements of the management cycle considered were: context (status, threats, vision), planning, resources, process (implementation), outputs and outcomes. The international evaluation team: reviewed literature; used the RAPPAM method on 70 protected areas; and finalized the evaluation by a field assessment, which included visits to representative protected area sites, and meetings with the NHS staff and representatives of supervising Ministries, local stakeholder groups and NGOs. The entire MEE process was participatory and involved assessment, recommendations, dissemination, and an action plan. The evaluation used the Balanced Score Card approach: strategic goals, critical process factors, indicators, action plan. It looked at efficiency/effectiveness, processes/structures, learning/development. One lesson is that it is important that there are not too many strategic goals.

The MEE not only pointed out the major challenges of the protected area system and its management but also indicated the strengths of the NHS which should be kept and reinforced.

The evaluation gave Finland's protected areas the general rating of being well managed. With some exceptions, PAs appear to be achieving their aims of conserving biodiversity. However, the evaluators also made a number of recommendations for improvements.

Strengths:

- ✓ Strong leadership and efficient business management in the NHS (as part of Metsähallitus group) has shown positive general results. The NHS acts like a service company relying on “happy customers”. It has borrowed new tools and techniques from business management (e.g. branding, project portfolio, use of external consultants).
- ✓ The efficient knowledge management of the NHS is a cornerstone of its success.
- ✓ Thanks to the efficient knowledge management and the organization of the NHS, it can really act as a national organization with global goals and local actions. It has top-level expertise combined with a practitioner approach, resulting in credibility at all levels.
- ✓ The NHS works in partnership with local entrepreneurs and big industries, local, regional and national authorities, NGOs, and with research institutes and universities. It is also active in international cooperation (at transboundary, Nordic and Baltic, European, global levels).

Metsähallitus is a state enterprise, with business units: forestry, tree nurseries, tourism, sand/soil/gravel, etc. The state is the biggest landowner and has these business units. Oulanka NP gets all its funds from the state budget, and is not allowed to make a profit. The park gives all the support it can to local governments. This is really important. It is constantly seeking to increase its support to local economies. The park emphasizes sitting at the same tables with tourism associations, etc. sharing information and giving them support – this is the only way to make sure PAs will survive.

Recommendations and → subsequent actions:

1. The first recommendation dealt with ecosystem approach. While the protected areas are usually well-integrated in the wider landscape in the north, thanks to the regional natural resource planning of Metsähallitus, there is a huge challenge in integrating the protected areas to the wider landscape in the south where most of the surrounding lands are privately-owned. Innovative partnerships with local landowners, local communities and other land managers were recommended.
2. It was suggested that the existing management plans of the protected area system should be complemented by national strategies on alien invasive species and on climate change.
3. Due to the large number of areas and the on-going process of purchasing areas to implement the conservation programmes, the NHS is falling behind schedule in management planning. Thus, a more strategic approach and periodical risk assessment were proposed by the evaluation team.
 - The planning processes were separated (not centralized) from other main processes to address the importance of wider planning schemes; to make the process more efficient, and to make it easier to apply the ecosystem approach in wider landscape planning.
4. The conservation aims and outcomes should be more clearly articulated. More attention should be paid to declining habitats and sustainable use of natural resources (e.g. local overgrazing by reindeer in the north).
5. Community outcomes: Specific efforts should be made to poll opinions, and to build arguments for protection with rural local communities to reduce the still continuing antipathy towards protected areas.
 - A comprehensive regional stakeholder survey was conducted in 2006 as a basis for training involving manager and expert level employees.
6. The evaluation team emphasized the assessment of visitor impact, although the visitation rates are still low. Some attention was paid to the harmonization of some practical matters within the NHS regional units with regard to the visitor services (waste services, provision of firewood).
 - The Limit of Acceptable Changes tool has been piloted in two National Parks and will be taken up in wide use in the most visited parks.
 - A new organization supports the harmonization of practices.
 - A GIS-based infrastructure management solution has been developed and used nationally.
7. The evaluation team provided some comments on sustainable financing, although the funds provided by the Finnish government were generally seen as adequate by international comparison.
8. The active international role of the NHS was further encouraged (e.g. transboundary protected areas, Northern European cooperation).

- Transboundary Natural World Heritage site with Sweden (High Coast/Kvarken archipelago) in 2006
- Increased funding for co-operation with Sweden
- Two new Neighbourhood programme funded projects between Finland and Russia
- Three national parks became independent members of the Europarc federation.

9. Although the scientific basis of actions is generally good, some proposals were received, e.g. for a strategy on cultural values, and to continue underwater habitat inventories.

- Three new regional positions have been established to take the responsibility to protect the Cultural Heritage values/sites within PAs in Finland
- One new regional marine biologist position was established to fill the gap in the western coast of Finland.

10. The NHS has a well-operating process-based reporting system. The evaluation team suggested that the NHS should use a complementary tool, State of the Parks reporting, on a regular five-year basis. The State of the Parks reporting is a useful tool for improving adaptive management, for understanding the conservation targets and outcomes, for cost-effective reporting against international commitments and for raising public awareness. It helps to focus on the protected areas in greatest need of action.

- The first State of Parks report will be published in September 2007.

These recommendations and actions have already been included in the next National Biodiversity Action Plan 2006-2016. Most recommendations were small improvements to the current policies and practices. The NHS included these recommendations into its annual work plan, and they are and will be implemented and followed up by the respective core processes of the NHS. To facilitate adaptive management, sharing of best practices and harmonization of PA management, the NHS re-arranged its organization, and strengthened its core processes in the beginning of 2006. The recommendations of the MEE were taken seriously. In Finland, the MEE has proved to be a useful tool to implement the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas and to prioritize actions needed.

Management Effectiveness Activities of PAN Parks (Vlado Vancura):

PAN Parks is a network of elite European protected areas. To qualify as a PAN Park, a PA must be an important area for conservation, minimum 20'000 ha in size, with a non-fragmented core-zone (which is the best existing representative of pristine ecosystems) of at least 10'000 ha. The backbone of the PAN Parks initiative is its principles: rich natural heritage, nature management, visitor management, sustainable tourism development strategy, and partnerships. PAN Parks has developed a method to evaluate PA management effectiveness, and has developed a recognized golden standard upon which to award its coveted certification label after independent verification audits. PAN Parks provide models of well-managed parks, which can then be marketed for sustainable tourism, thus increasing park revenues. For the complete PAN Parks Principles and Criteria, click on the links at the very bottom of this page:

<http://www.panparks.org/Introduction/Verification/Principles>.

Brainstorming Trends in Threats, Management Weaknesses and Institutional and Policy Constraints (Jamie Ervin):

In plenary, participants were asked – for a protected area they are familiar with – to think of one threat, one management effectiveness issue, and one institutional or policy constraint. The results of the brainstorming were as follows.

Threats:

- Inadequate or non-existing spatial plans; development inside PAs
- Economical development without a proper EIA/SEA to include biodiversity aspects, with the result that all kind of investments are made in PAs
- Land privatization; high fragmentation of the lands inside of PA (too many owners)
- Infrastructure investments and construction (roads, energy, resorts, settlements)
- Uncontrolled activities
- Uncontrolled tourism development (number and behaviour); visitor pressure; mass tourism; expanding skiing centres; off-road motorized recreation
- Land-use changes in neighbouring areas; urbanization; fragmentation
- Intensification of agriculture
- Illegal harvesting; illegal logging; illegal fishing and hunting; overuse of natural resources
- Climate change.

Management weaknesses:

- No clear conservation objectives; unclear vision
- Inappropriate government structure; lack of management structures under state administration
- Lack of management plans for PAs; management plan not approved
- Inappropriate zoning
- Insufficient knowledge about long-term impacts of various treatments / activities
- Management plans not implemented in daily work; they remain just theories
- Lack of resources (human, infrastructure, financial); lack of money for financing of PA administration
- Understaffing; inappropriate, inexperienced / undereducated / untrained staff; expert staff overloaded with red-tape work; overlapping responsibilities
- Lack of tourist guidance and control; PAs becoming tourism agencies
- Insufficient involvement of local communities in PA management; lack of activity ownership
- Taking sides and serving interests
- Lack of public awareness
- Corruption.

Institutional and policy constraints:

- Lack of political support because of few short-term results; low level of importance in national policies; lack of PA strategy; no zoning; lack of commitment to PAs
- Lack of coordination of the (inter)sectoral strategies (transport, agriculture, energy etc.)
- Forest management plans that do not reflect national PA needs
- National policy of increasing the number of tourists in PAs
- Administrative obstacles
- Regional disagreements
- Inadequate structures for PA administration; management structures not subordinated to the Ministry of Environment
- Lack of financial means; insufficient budget allocations for PA management
- Legal system; weak conservation legislation; lack of or weak law enforcement; contradictions in laws, e.g. hunting vs. forestry in PAs
- Poor business plan.

Results of a Global Study of the Most Common Challenges Faced by PAs (Jamie Ervin):

Threats:

- invasive species
- climate change
- infrastructure
- resource harvesting / management
- unregulated tourism.

Management weaknesses:

- staffing
- management planning
- community relations
- threat assessments abatement
- research and monitoring
- law enforcement
- natural resource management.

Policy constraints:

- interagency coordination
- conflicts in resource use
- political will
- zoning in land use planning.

Plenary Exercise in Small Groups on Identifying Strategies to Respond to Challenges (Jason Spensley):

This was a learning exercise using hypothetical examples and the data were not recorded. Small groups of two or three people identified strategies to develop corrective actions in response to a challenge important to them, and then reported back.

Small Group Work on Management Effectiveness (Jason Spensley):

Participants broke into small groups by country and examined the following questions for input into the final reports to be presented by all countries on the last day (format in Annex 4):

1. What is the status of conducting management effectiveness assessment and capacity action planning?
2. What are the challenges in conducting this process?
3. What are your 2-4 next steps in advancing this process?
4. What specific support is needed to take these steps?

The country groups then worked together with neighbouring countries to identify trends, similarities among countries and examples, and the neighbour groups reported back in a plenary discussion.

Summary of Management Effectiveness in Eastern Europe (Jason Spensley):

Status:

- Three countries have done a system wide assessment using RAPPAM for a percentage of their protected areas.
- One country has used the WB tracking tool for five parks.
- These countries defined some initial recommendations based on their assessment.
- No countries have defined actions and institutionalized them in a capacity action plan.

Challenges:

- No design of a systematic, adaptive approach to management effectiveness assessment and capacity action planning
- Lack of commitment and leadership at the political level to make this happen
- Lack of technical know-how to design and manage the process
- Raising awareness of CBD commitments to management effectiveness assessments and capacity action planning
- Need to link these commitments to EU integration commitments.

Next steps:

- Design a systematic approach to management effectiveness assessment and capacity action planning.
- Encourage the national body that should be responsible, as well as NGOs, to participate.
- Develop concepts to harmonize with EU legislation.
- Ask CBD Secretariat to facilitate encouragement of governments to conduct management effectiveness assessment and capacity action plans
- Strengthen skills of in-country expertise to conduct this process.

Support needs:

- Training and/or knowledge sharing opportunities to support in country specialists
- Articulate links to the management of Natura 2000 sites and other and EU standards
- Encouragement of CBD Secretariat to country focal points
- Translate more of the manuals into national languages.

Day 3

Sustainable Financing

Background (TNC, Jamie Ervin):

A sustainable finance plan is a plan that will ensure that the full costs of a protected area system are met, both now and into the future. A sound financial plan should ensure that the growth of income matches or exceeds the growth of expected costs of establishing new protected areas, and managing new and existing protected areas.

There are a number of mechanisms for sustaining the long-term economic viability of a protected area system, including:

- **Bilateral and multi-lateral funding**, where a fund is established to finance environmental projects, and remains a significant source of funding for creating and improving protected area systems for many countries.

- **Biodiversity enterprises** are investment funds that provide capital to small and medium-scale enterprises that contribute to biodiversity conservation in or around protected areas (e.g., shade-grown coffee, ecotourism).
- **Biodiversity offset projects** are mechanisms that are intended to mitigate or offset land-conversion activities, such as forest clearing, dam creation, and road building. Biodiversity offsets may be voluntary or regulatory.
- **Biodiversity prospecting** is the search for biochemical and genetic materials from nature that can be applied commercially to pharmaceutical, agricultural, cosmetic and other applications. Provided that intellectual property and traditional knowledge is adequately protected, biodiversity prospecting can be an alternative to intensive resource extraction.
- **Carbon offset projects** are market-based mechanisms intended to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere through a range of activities. Examples include emissions trading, which enables countries to purchase emissions units from other countries; joint implementation, which give credits to countries who invest in emissions-reducing activities in another country; and removal units, which provide credits for forestry-related activities.
- **Debt-for-nature swaps** are a mechanism whereby a creditor (typically an industrialized country) renegotiates the terms of a developing country's debt to fund biodiversity conservation. Debt-for-nature swaps often result in the creation of a privately-controlled conservation trust fund.
- **Environmental funds** are a permanently endowed fund created by grants from governments and donor agencies, as well as by ongoing user fees or taxes, earmarked for conservation and protected areas.
- **Foundation grants** are funds provided by private, charitable organizations. Foundations typically fund time-bound projects that are consistent with their own missions, and do not typically fund operational, overhead or recurring costs.
- **Market and tax incentives** provide financial incentives to individuals, communities and corporations for actions that improve biodiversity conservation. Examples include tax breaks to land owners who keep their land forested, market premiums to certified ecotourism operations, and subsidies to communities who practice sustainable land use planning and water use.
- **Payments for ecosystem services** are financial mechanisms that capture economic value from the services and benefits provided by nature. These services can include watershed services (e.g., drinking water storage, flow regulation, erosion and flood control), climate control (e.g., regulation of temperature and precipitation), and agricultural services (e.g. soil formation and protection, genetic resource conservation, and crop pollination), among others.
- **Taxes, fees and fines** are recurring sources of revenue that can fund protected area establishment and management costs. Taxes may come from a range of sources, including sales, property and income taxes, and publicly issued bonds. Fees may come from direct users, including both visitors and commercial operations (e.g., forest concessions, ecotourism lodges, recreational facilities), as well as indirect users, such as communities that depend upon drinking water from the protected area. Fines from illegal activities can also be directed toward protected area creation and management.

Developing Sustainable Financing (Barry Spergel):

Sustainable financing, according to the CBD, is defined as the ability to secure stable and sufficient long-term financial resources and to allocate them in a timely manner and appropriate form to cover the full costs of protected areas (direct and indirect) and to ensure that protected areas are managed effectively and efficiently.

Elements of sustainable financing include:

- Stable long-term financing
- Cost reduction
- Co-management models with private sector or community participation

- Diversified funding sources
- Revenue sharing
- Redistribution of revenue based on prioritization
- Contingency funds to counter external shocks and revenue shortfalls,

The following steps are recommended for developing a sustainable financing strategy:

1. Create a working group or committee to guide development of the strategy, composed of key stakeholders
2. Define the scope of the strategy: protected areas; biodiversity
3. Conduct baseline research to:
 - project long-term financing needs based on management plans and conservation priorities (gap analysis)
 - map economic flows and values of ecosystem services
 - analyze institutional, legal and regulatory framework for conservation finance
4. Identify the most promising sustainable financing mechanisms based on researching each one's feasibility and the potential amount of funding that could be generated
5. Develop a work plan and ToRs for technical work to establish selected priority mechanisms
6. Raise awareness and build political support for the sustainable financing strategy and the priority financing mechanisms.

For more information on sustainable finance, see:

- Conservation Finance Alliance (CFA): <http://www.conservationfinance.org>
- Biodiversity Economics: <http://biodiversityeconomics.org>
- Ecosystem Marketplace: <http://ecosystemmarketplace.com>
- WWF Conservation Finance: <http://www.worldwildlife.org/conservationfinance>.

PAN Parks - Tourism Companies Providing Funds for Protected Areas (Vlado Vancura):

The PAN Parks Foundation (PPF) develops the possibility for people to enjoy Europe's wilderness by: increasing the management effectiveness; developing nature-based high quality tourism packages; and creating a role model of sustainable financing for nature conservation. Options for financial sustainability include: PAN Parks Accommodation; cooperation with tour operators; working with local businesses; Trust Fund for Europe's Wilderness, etc

The vision of PAN Parks Accommodation (PPA) is to preserve Europe's nature in a commercially viable manner by: providing appropriate accommodation; generating income for shareholders; stimulating the local economy; and providing financial support for nature conservation through PPF. PPA does not compete with existing businesses, but contributes to the development of local tourism.

Cooperation with tour operators is based on a partnership model to channel funding to conservation activities through wilderness travels. To date there are six travel agencies that have signed a partnership contract with PPF. Exodus is a company promoting responsible travel, for example:

- low impact small group tours
- employing, and when necessary, training local staff as much as possible
- only working with locally owned accommodation
- carrying out all rubbish on treks
- contributing financially to small projects.

PPF has signed contracts with 45 local tourism providers in order to gain support for the management goals of the protected areas, and implement a Sustainable Tourism Development Strategy in each PAN Park region. This does not provide direct financial benefit for the protected areas in this partnership, but it reduces conflict.

The overall objective of the Trust Fund for Europe's Wilderness is to set up a financial mechanism, which helps to realize the vision of PAN Parks Foundation throughout Europe. The target of the trust fund is to have 25 independently audited, well managed protected areas in Europe by 2015. The Trust Fund for Europe's Wilderness has a great promise to set an example for the implementation of the CBD, and to fund PA management, which normally is not "sexy" enough for typical corporate sponsorship.

EU Funding Lines (Peter Torkler):

The EU estimates that 6.1 billion Euro per year will be needed to fund Natura 2000. A number of different funds contribute to this, especially the Rural Development and the Fisheries Funds. The Europe Social Fund has a lot of money and supports management of Natura 2000 sites. The Regional Development Fund is the most important, and funds the development of management plans; sustainable tourism; environmental education; “information society” actions for monitoring; and can compensate farmers with agri-environment plans, etc. Some of the challenges are that nature conservation actors have doubts that the complementary use of funds will work in practice. The Ministries must force the government to ensure that these opportunities are not lost. There has been no systematic analysis of use of this funding, and a more systematic approach is needed to analyse complementary funding options. One good baseline tool is <http://financing-natura2000.moccu.com/pub/index.html>.

Comment: The government of Switzerland has committed to make a contribution to new EU members, and has one billion CHF available for the ten additional EU countries (but not Bulgaria or Romania). This can be an important source of co-financing for new EU member countries. Note that Switzerland is especially encouraging trans-national programmes.

Conservation Trust Funds (Barry Spergel):

Over 50 conservation trust funds have been established world-wide, half of them in Latin America. Most have been legally created as “foundations”. Issues in designing a trust fund include:

- > Purposes of the Fund
 - What activities will the Fund support? Who can apply for grants?
 - What is the geographical scope of the Fund?
 - What is the role of the Fund in national policy and planning, and in relation to existing government agencies and ministries?
- > Legal Structure
 - Will it be a trust fund? a foundation? or created by a special law?
 - Will the Fund's income from investments be tax exempt? Under what conditions can the Fund be dissolved?
- > Governance: board composition and selection procedures; rules for board meetings, including voting rules, and conflicts of interest
- > Operational procedures: number of staff; limits on administrative costs; grant-making procedures; monitoring, evaluation, and reporting to donors and to the Board.
- > Financial structure: endowment, sinking fund, or revolving fund? What is the minimum capital and/or minimum annual income required in order for the Fund to achieve its purposes?
- > Investment policy (for endowments and sinking funds):
 - Need to balance risk and return: What kind of diversified mix of stocks, bonds, and other types of investments? What financial markets? What currencies?
 - Competitive recruitment of an outside investment manager
 - Whether to screen investments by social/ environment criteria?
- > Fundraising strategy: identification of potential funding sources and plan for raising funds from donors or investors, or introducing new PES mechanisms
- > Audit requirements
- > Long-term and short-term strategic plan
- > Monitoring and evaluation plan.

Slovenia Case Study: Sečovlje Salina Nature Park (Andrej Sovinc):

This park was declared a Ramsar site in 1993, a cultural heritage monument in 2001, and a Natura 2000 site in 2004. Before the transfer of management to the private sector, the park had fallen into disrepair: water management infrastructure was not maintained; there was no visitor infrastructure, and salt production nearly ceased because of high production costs, and the competition of cheap salt from North Africa. In 2002 the mobile telecommunications operator MOBITEL acquired the company SOLINE. In 2003 the responsibility for the management of the protected area was given by the Republic of Slovenia to the private company Mobitel/Soline by concession contract. This business relationship presents an innovative form of PA management with a private company as the park manager. Note that the land in the park remains state property, and management follows the Governmental Decree on the designation of the Park, and the government-approved management plan. As a result of private investment, dykes have been restored, buildings reconstructed, salt-pans renovated, new jobs created, the number of visitors doubled, and conditions improved for habitats and wildlife. In addition, trade mark programmes (food, cosmetics, park) have been developed, and Mobitel has burnished its image. Interestingly, one will never see the logo of the

phone company in the park, but the phone company uses the park for promotion, and everyone in Slovenia knows the mobile company supports the park. Mobitel does not plan to support the park indefinitely, and has developed a plan for sustainable financing where Mobitel will support only a small part of the costs.

Brainstorming on Sustainable Financing (Jamie Ervin):

A sustainable finance plan is how you get from your current funding situation to the critical amount needed, and hopefully to the optimal amount required (vision). There are six major steps:

- Conduct financial gap analysis
- Assess PA management effectiveness and capacity needs
- Develop 10-year cost estimates
- Screen mechanisms
- Formulate financing plans
- Implement and measure progress.

Participants contributed ideas on other possible sustainable finance mechanisms, e.g.:

- Voluntary exit donations when leaving parks and coin drops in airports
- Local governments
- Community investment
- Departure taxes at airports
- Cruise ship donations
- Merchandizing online
- Special fund for nature protection managed by Ministry Environment
- Volunteers working in PAs
- Replacement for military service
- Special funds
- Reduction of costs of operations; more efficient budgets
- Labelling
- Patents
- Voluntary contribution on bill of hotel guests, e.g. one Euro (the hotel offers to take it off the bill if the customer so desires, but they are always too embarrassed to say no).

Workshop participants then looked at various sustainable financing mechanisms, and recorded how good a fit each possible mechanism would be in their country, with the following results:

Suitability of Sustainable Financing Mechanisms by Country												
Key: Y = Definitely a Good Fit; N = Definitely Not a Good Fit; ? = Intrigued												
	Alb	BH	Bul	Cr	Sv	Mn	Cz	Svc	Mc	Ro	Ser	Uk
Government budget	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bi/multi-lateral donors	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?
Patents	Y	?	Y	?			N		?	Y	?	Y
NGOs and donors		Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conservation trust funds		Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y
Volunteers working in PAs	Y	?	?	?			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	?
Debt-for-Nature swaps	?	?	Y	?			?	?		?	Y	N
PES	Y	Y	Y	Y		?	?		Y	Y	Y	Y
Tourism/concession fees	Y	Y	Y	Y		?	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conservation taxes and fees	Y	Y	Y	Y		?	?		Y	?	Y	?
Scheme to hire unemployed		?	Y	?			Y	?	?	?	N	?
Royalty payments			Y	N			N		?	Y	N	?
Right-of-way fees		Y		Y			Y		Y	N	Y	?
Corporate sponsorship	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
Biodiversity offsets		Y		?			Y	?		Y	Y	?
Reducing costs	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y			Y	N		Y
Environmental fines		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
Labelling		?	Y				Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y

“Voluntary” taxes				?			?			?	?	Y
Commercial investments		?		?			?		Y	Y	Y	Y
Lotteries		N	?	N			Y	?		?	N	?
“Voluntary” hotel surcharges	N	?	?	N			?	?	Y	Y	?	Y
Biodiversity prospecting		N	Y	N			?		?	?	Y	Y
Tax incentives	Y		?	Y			?			Y		N
Carbon offset projects			?	?			Y	?		Y	N	?
Exit donations, coin drops			Y				?	?		Y	?	Y
Budgets from local governments		?	?	Y			Y			Y	?	Y
Cruise ship donations			?	Y			N	?		Y	N	Y
Merchandising online			Y	?			?			?	N	?
Special funds		Y	?	?		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y

Break-out Groups on Sustainable Finance (Jamie Ervin)

Participants worked in country groups to explore the following questions on sustainable financing, and then shared their results in groups of neighbouring countries.

1. What is the status in your country?
2. What are the challenges and obstacles?
3. What are your 2-4 next steps?
4. What specific support is needed?

Day 4

Wrap-up

Summary of Break-out Group Work (Jamie Ervin and Jason Spensley)

Obstacles to Master Planning	Capacity Building Needs
<p style="text-align: center;">GAP ASSESSMENT</p> <p>No comprehensive approach No political will / public awareness Low funding Lack of communication Law enforcement Lack of data</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p>Weak understanding by authorities Lack of political interest Lack of funding No PA conservation objectives</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CAPACITY ASSESSMENT</p> <p>Lack of government staff</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SUSTAINABLE FINANCING</p> <p>Legal framework unclear PA funds not for conservation</p>	<p>External support – technical advice Workshops, examples, international agreements / methodologies Roundtable: scientists + decision makers Approve legislation Raise awareness</p> <p>Pressure on government Present models Establish advisory body Guidelines Promote – all sectors Tourism – best practice</p> <p>More organized approach National organization Public campaign to influence law enforcement Support / pressure Training workshops</p> <p>Outreach other sectors External pressure</p>

Lack of expertise Low political priority Transparency of funds	Training / compilation of best practice Raise awareness Facilitation Funds
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

National Reports

Participants worked hard to complete their questionnaires for the CBD Secretariat (format in Annex 3) and their national reports back to the workshop plenary (template in Annex 4). Each country presented its results back to the plenary. As the questionnaires and the reports were still in draft form, participants requested that they not be attached to this workshop report. Instead, participants used these workshop outputs as living documents to take back to the CBD Focal Points in their countries, in order to stimulate discussion and accelerate the implementation of the CBD PoWPA. These documents, however, can be requested from the Chair of the workshop, Rolf Hogan at WWF International.

Overall Conclusions (Pierre Galland)

In the final session of the workshop, participants reviewed and provided comments and input on a summary of the main obstacles to PoWPA implementation, the proposed solutions and proposed external support required to implement the solutions. The summary was prepared based on the national reports to the plenary. The table below summarizes the main conclusions.

Obstacles/Challenges to PoWPA implementation	Proposed Solutions and Next Steps	Proposed External Support from Regional and International Organizations and the CBD
GOVERNANCE		
Lack of political will to implement the PoWPA or support PAs at the national and local level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a national working group of key stakeholders for PoWPA implementation; Launch a media campaign on PAs and an advocacy campaign among decision-makers. The campaign should increase awareness of the benefits of PAs and link PAs to current international issues (climate change, etc.); Ensure adoption of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan by government. Carry out an in-depth analysis of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment to raise awareness of its conclusions; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International organizations such as the EC and the CBD Secretariat can help to build political will for PoWPA implementation by supporting national efforts.
Lack of understanding by governments of the benefits of PAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raise awareness of benefits of PAs and ecological services Develop methodologies to assist with identifying the benefits of PAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of PoWPA through inter-governmental agreements at the regional level; Provision on training on identifying and promoting the benefits of PAs.
Lack of systematic long-term approach to PAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop action plans for national PA activities. 	
At site level state funding is often allocated to promoting tourism in PAs rather than protecting biodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage central government to ensure PA funding goes to protecting biodiversity. 	
Administrative procedures can be very slow and can hamper efforts to collaborate e.g. on gap analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve administrative procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support capacity building and improvement of governmental bodies dealing with PAs e.g. through funding.
Contradictory legislation and legislation which promotes the destruction of biodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerate harmonization of national legislation with EU legislation. Clarification of roles and competencies between ministries and departments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide external legal advisers Provide grants to NGOs to hire local lawyers to identify problems and suggest solutions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out an analysis of existing legislation to identify problems Accelerate drafting of by-laws and procedures to implement legislation 	
Lack of stakeholder involvement in PA management and local resistance to PAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness campaign Increase involvement of local people in PA management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist with capacity building for the involvement of local people in PA management.
Lack of coordination between government bodies at national level with other governments at regional level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foster information exchange Establish a biodiversity information system Establish/support transboundary coordination mechanisms to support PoWPA implementation at the regional level; Governments should identify central coordinator for PoWPA implementation. Governments should also nominate joint focal points for biodiversity-related conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support training Increase efforts to harmonize the biodiversity-related conventions Each of the biodiversity-related conventions should promote and assist greater coordination at the national level. Support the exchange of experience and lessons learned in transboundary cooperation
Private landowners do not want to get involved in biodiversity conservation activities adjacent to PAs or to allow their lands become part of PAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raise awareness of private landowners on biodiversity conservation Develop incentives to involve farmers in biodiversity conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote the exchange experience and lessons learned especially models for working with private landowners from other regions.
FUNDING		
Lack of funding for PoWPA implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build political will to allocate funds. Develop proposals for EU funds. Develop joint fundraising activities between NGOs and government – e.g. through donor roundtables. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide training to government PA agencies on how to access EU development funding for PAs.
PAs are a low priority for governments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raise the political priority given to PAs e.g. through awareness raising campaigns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBD COP should appeal to governments to prioritize biodiversity conservation
Low government capacity to absorb funds and lack of capacity to prepare targeted funding proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop bi-lateral and multi-lateral cooperation to develop joint funding proposals. Develop public-private partnerships Work with consulting firms to prepare proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide training on EU funds COP should prioritize capacity building in this area.
Lack of diversity of income sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop national strategies to diversify funding sources; Develop national strategy on tourism Train staff to identify and use alternative funding sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide technical assistance in sustainable financing. Hold an international workshop for PA managers on sustainable income generation.
CAPACITY		
High level of staff turnover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop teams on biodiversity protection and PAs to retain capacity and institutional knowledge despite staff turnover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support environmental ministries in the establishment of structures to retain staff.
Lack of training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out capacity needs assessments Use civil society capacity Set up a multi-stakeholder advisory committee on PoWPA implementation Establish an PA information exchange system Provide training, including on-site training, in: gap assessments including marine; the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; and site specific data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate training activities between international organizations Support development and distribution of regional case studies Support translations of key tools (manuals, strategies) Provide technical support Provide external experts to build capacity. Establish a training of trainers network Support development and follow-up to capacity needs assessments.
Lack of model guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use RAPPAM methodology to assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the translation, distribution and

and methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> management effectiveness; Carry out site-level pilot projects to implement methodologies (e.g. sustainable finances). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site-level testing of existing methodologies; Support development and distribution of regional case studies on use of methodologies
Lack of coordination on training between international organizations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring together international organizations and conventions to coordinate training activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CBD could facilitate a coordination meeting.
Lack of data management systems and poor exchange of existing data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve data systems to ensure the availability of quality data Hold roundtables between government departments to identify data holders and promote sharing of data. Develop central data management units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute models and lessons learned for the establishment of data management systems.
Lack of implementation of the results of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build support for implementation through advocacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote implementation of the results of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
Small sized PAs are often excluded from national PA activities such as training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out a capacity assessment of large and small PAs 	

The summary of the discussion on the above table at the workshop is organized around four main obstacles which appear throughout the above table. These are:

- 1) Lack of political will
- 2) Lack of awareness
- 3) Lack of capacity
- 4) Lack of financing.

These four areas are clearly interlinked. Lack of awareness and understanding of the values of protected areas means that there is little political will to put protected areas in place, develop capacity, allocate funding, revise conflicting legislation, and reform institutional problems such as high staff turnover or poor qualifications. At a more local level, greater awareness of the value and benefits of protected areas needs to be achieved if protected areas are to be supported by local people. The discussion around these four main issues is summarized below:

Building Political Will

Participants noted that international organizations and agreements such as the CBD can be instrumental in influencing political will. Also, with many countries in the region being EU members or candidates for EU membership, the European Commission has a large amount of influence in the region of Eastern Europe. For example, the Executive Secretary of the CBD could work with the European Commission to develop a partnership with other international organizations and an action plan for building political will for implementation of the PoWPA in the region and linking it with Natura 2000.

Building Awareness of the Importance of Protected Areas

Participants suggested public awareness campaigns, including the analysis and promotion of the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment as they relate to the region, as well as other key studies and methodologies for demonstrating or assessing the importance of biodiversity and protected areas. International organizations have a role to play in assisting with the interpretation, translation and dissemination of the results of key materials at the regional and national level. They can also provide support and build capacity for awareness raising campaigns.

Building Capacity

From feedback from the participants, it is clear that this capacity building workshop made a valuable contribution to the implementation of the CBD PoWPA in the region. There is a need for additional ongoing capacity building efforts if the PoWPA is to be implemented effectively in the region. This should also focus at the national and institutional level. There is also a need for greater collaboration between actors in the

region involved in capacity building on protected areas, The CBD PoWPA offers an opportunity to create synergies around capacity building for the achievement of individual targets of the PoWPA, for example, by developing and implementing national capacity building action plans. International organizations could increase efforts to coordinate future capacity building initiatives. For example, key institutions could establish a network of trainers and institutions, and coordinate activities around the PoWPA targets.

Financing

There is a lot of funding available in the sub-region from EU and other bi-lateral funds, and although a portion of these funds could be made available for protected areas, there is often a lack of knowledge of how to apply for this funding. In addition, there is also a lack of political will to spend this funding on protected areas, rather than on structural development projects such as roads or industrial development. This shows a clear link between the lack of resources and lack of political will. International organizations have a role to play in building this political will, and thus in releasing funds for protected areas. EU and bi-lateral donors could work together in the region to promote the allocation of development funding to biodiversity and protected areas. For example, a donor roundtable could bring together the key donor funding lines, local governments and other stakeholders to address the issue.

It was clear at the workshop that there are not many examples of sustainable financing initiatives in the region (it was very difficult to identify potential case studies). However, there are many opportunities in the region, such as tourism and payment for environmental services. These opportunities will also serve to build awareness of the value of protected areas and biodiversity.

Recommendations to the CBD Working Group on Protected Areas

The following recommendations were written after the workshop. They are based on the discussion held during the final session of the workshop summarized above.

The meeting of the 2nd open ended working group on protected areas (WGPA-2) should consider making the following recommendations to the 9th Conference of the Parties (COP 9):

Governance

1. *Considering the lack of political will to implement the PoWPA in many countries, the WGPA-2 urges COP to:*

Request Parties to:

- (i) Prioritize biodiversity conservation and implementation of the PoWPA;
- (ii) Establish multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms at the national level to coordinate implementation of the PoWPA among different sectors of government, NGOs, scientists, international organizations and local community organizations;
- (iii) Work with neighbouring countries to establish, or support existing, transboundary coordination mechanisms to support PoWPA implementation at the regional level;
- (iv) Identify a central coordinator for PoWPA implementation;
- (v) Develop action plans for national PA activities;
- (vi) Review existing administrative arrangements for implementing the PoWPA and make recommendations for improvements, for example, by clarifying roles and responsibilities of different ministries and departments;
- (vii) Review and resolve conflicting legislation;
- (viii) Accelerate drafting of by-laws and procedures to implement PA legislation;
- (ix) Develop incentives to involve farmers and private landowners in biodiversity conservation;
- (x) Increase involvement of local people in PA management;
- (xi) Promote information exchange on PAs for example by establishing a biodiversity information system;

- (xii) Implement awareness-raising campaigns to demonstrate the value and benefits of protected areas to local people as well as to national and regional economies;
- (xiii) Nominate joint focal points for biodiversity-related conventions;
- (xiv) Urgently adopt National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans.

Urge international organizations and regional organizations to:

- (xv) Share lessons learned and build capacity for awareness raising activities and make available tools, methodologies and other publications that can help to demonstrate the tangible and non-tangible benefits of protected areas;
- (xvi) Demonstrate support for protected areas and engage in awareness-raising activities, high-level meetings etc.;
- (xvii) Provide external legal advisors to support efforts to strengthen government institutions through the review and revision of procedures and conflicting legislation;
- (xviii) Make small grants available for efforts to implement the PoWPA such as the review of conflicting legislation.

Urge the COPs of the the biodiversity-related conventions to:

- (xix) Promote and assist greater coordination at the national level on implementation of the biodiversity-related conventions.

Request the Executive Secretary to:

- (xx) Support awareness-raising campaigns by participating in events and providing materials and lessons learned to Parties via the Clearing House Mechanism;
- (xxi) Raise awareness and promote implementation of the PoWPA among inter-governmental agreements and bodies at the regional level.

Finance

2. *Considering the lack of funding to implement the PoWPA in many countries, the WGPA-2 urges COP to:*

Request Parties to:

- (i) Request funding for PoWPA implementation from EU regional and rural development funds;
- (ii) Develop joint fundraising activities between NGOs and government;
- (iii) Convene donor roundtables to bring donor together to coordinate on supporting PoWPA implementation;
- (iv) Develop public-private partnerships to support PoWPA implementation;
- (v) Develop national strategies to diversify funding sources;
- (vi) Train staff to identify and use alternative funding sources.

Urge international organizations and regional organizations to:

- (vii) Provide technical assistance and capacity building in sustainable financing;
- (viii) Provide training on how to apply for PoWPA implementation from regional and rural development funds.

Capacity Building

3. *Considering the need to build capacity for the implementation of the CBD PoWPA, the WGPA 2 urges COP to:*

Request Parties to:

- (i) Urgently carry out an implement a national protected area capacity needs assessment, and until such an assessment is ready, prioritize capacity building, including on-site training, in the following key areas:
 - a. involvement of local people in PA management especially private landowners;
 - b. awareness-raising and communicating the tangible and non-tangible benefits of protected areas;

- c. review and revision of procedures and conflicting legislation;
- d. how to apply for EU regional and rural development funds for PAs;
- e. development of public-private partnerships to support PoWPA implementation;
- f. Identification and use of alternative funding sources and Develop of national sustainable financing strategies;
- g. gap assessments including marine and site specific data collection;
- h. data management systems;
- (ii) Avail of the capacity of civil society through the multi-stakeholder advisory committee on PoWPA implementation identified in paragraph 2 above;
- (iii) Improve data management systems to ensure the availability of quality data and the sharing of data between government departments;
- (iv) Put in place mechanisms to support the retention of PA staff in government agencies;
- (v) Carry out site-level pilot projects to implement methodologies (e.g. sustainable finances).

Urge international organizations and regional organizations to:

- (vi) Coordinate capacity building activities between international organizations and consider the establishment of a regional network to train trainers;
- (vii) Support the translation and distribution of key tools and site-level testing of existing methodologies;
- (viii) Support development and distribution of regional case studies including on the use of methodologies;
- (ix) Provide technical support including external experts to build capacity;
- (x) Support development and follow-up to capacity needs assessments.

Request the Executive Secretary to:

- (xi) Bring together international organizations and conventions to coordinate training activities.

Documentation

Participants were provided with a CD containing a wealth of documents on the nine elements of PA System Master Plans, together with copies of all the workshop presentations and workshop documents.

Workshop Outcomes

- ✓ Twenty-two participants responsible for protected areas in 12 countries in Eastern Europe (Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Ukraine) gained practical knowledge in developing national Master Plans for achieving the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas, with particular emphasis on ecological gap assessment, management effectiveness and sustainable financing.
- ✓ These twelve countries provided a review to the CBD Secretariat on the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas in their countries.
- ✓ The twelve countries elaborated workplans to develop national Master Plans to achieve the CBD PoWPA, including gap assessment, threat assessment, management effectiveness assessment, capacity assessment, equity and benefits assessment, governance, policy environment, sustainable finance, and monitoring of PA systems. For each of these elements, they rated the actual status of implementation, its priority for the country, next steps, what is needed to take the next steps, and obstacles.

- ✓ Participants developed recommendations for the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas.

Thus the workshop did generally achieve the objectives and outputs set out.

Annex 1. Agenda

	Agenda Item	Lead/Technique	Outcomes/Output	Comments
Day 0				
Afternoon	Arrival of participants			
6.30-7.30	D I N N E R			
8.00-8.45	1. Welcome, introductions and general overview of meeting , expected outcomes and follow-up.	Lead: Meg Gawler	Participants understand the objectives, get to know each other, become familiar with the agenda, and formulate expectations.	Organizers check that all participants have sent in their questionnaires
8.45-9.15	Introduction to Vilm	Lead: Judith Jabs		
Day 1				
8.30-8.40	Overview of agenda for Day 1.	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Presentation and facilitated discussion		
8.40-9.10	Overview of CBD programme of work on protected areas (PoWPA) and CBD reporting process. Progress in global implementation	Lead: Sarat 'Babu' Gidda Technique: Presentation and facilitated discussion	Participants understand the background to the development of the PoWPA, its purpose and expected outputs	
9.10-9.40	Linkages between CBD PoWPA and Natura 2000	Lead: Rolf Hogan Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants understand what the CBD PoWPA brings in addition to Natura 2000 and how Natura 2000 contributes to the CBD	
9.40-10.10	Overview of WWF's Protected Areas for a Living Planet programme	Lead: Rolf Hogan, Stella Satalic, Hildegard Meyer Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants understand the Protected Areas for a Living Planet approach, its potential to assist national implementation of the PoWPA and ongoing activities in the Carpathian and Dinaric Arc ecoregions	
10.10-10.30	C O F F E E B R E A K			
10.30-11.30	3. Exchange of experiences and developing Master Plans including: (i) ecological gap analysis (ii) managing PA networks (iii) sustainable finance Overview and experience in developing national Master Plans or "National Strategic Plans"	Lead: Jamie Ervin Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	For national systems of protected areas, what are the critical action steps and tools for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • filling ecological gaps • managing the PA network • sustainable finance How do these steps vary in country-specific settings? Should these steps be integrated into some type of "Master Plan" or "National Strategic Plan"? How?	

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

			What are the practical considerations for completing these steps (e.g., timing, participants, costs, etc.)? Participants understand the approach and benefits of developing national Master Plans, and the elements of a comprehensive Master Plan.	
11.30-12.30	3 (i) Ecological gap analysis: introductory presentation by expert conducting ecological gap analysis, including case studies and different approaches and tools	Lead: Jamie Ervin Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants gain an understanding of the issue, relevant tools and critical action steps.	
12.30-2.00	LUNCH BREAK			
2.00-2.30	Existing case study from the Dinaric Arc on ecological gap analysis: plans and obstacles and how to move forward	Lead: Boris Krystufek Technique: Presentation & facilitated plenary discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What can we learn from real-world case studies in terms of success factors, overcoming obstacles, etc.? ◆ What are the concrete steps that belong in a practical work plan designed to advance progress? ◆ For each country, what problems are being encountered in implementing these steps, and how can these problems be overcome? 	
2.30-3.00	Existing case study from the Carpathians on ecological gap analysis: original Carpathian gap analysis, and how the ecological network was developed based on this gap analysis	Leads: Hildegard Meyer and Anna Guttova Technique: Presentations & facilitated plenary discussion		
3.00-3.45	New case study from the region on ecological gap analysis. Instructions to break-out groups	Lead: Jamie Ervin Technique: Facilitated plenary discussion	Participants gain understanding of how to develop and plan an ecological gap analysis.	
3.45-4.00	COFFEE BREAK			
4.00-5.15	Break-out groups develop plans for national gap analyses for 4 countries, and countries give each other feedback on their plans	4 groups of 7-8 persons each (3-4 countries per group).	Participants elaborate plans of action to complete the national gap analysis in their countries.	Each group selects a facilitator and a scribe who captures the results on their laptop. Each country looks at how this applies to them, and what the next steps should be in their countries.
5.15-5.30	Feedback from participants on Day 1	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary discussion	Input on how to improve the workshop	
6.00-7.00	DINNER			
7.30-8.00	Informal presentation on "Introduction to the UNEP/IUCN Module on Protected areas"	Jutta Stadler		

Day 2				
8.30-8.35	Agenda for second day	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary discussion		
8.35-8.45	Summary of the break-out group work on gap assessment from the first day	Lead: Pierre Galland Technique: Plenary discussion	Understanding of the key outcomes of the group work on gap assessments	
8.45-9.45	3 (ii) Managing PA networks: Introduction to	Lead: Jason Spensley	Participants gain an understanding of the	Most countries have done management

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

	management effectiveness assessment and capacity development action planning	Technique: Presentation & discussion	issue, relevant tools and critical action steps. ♦ What are the concrete steps that belong in a practical work plan designed to advance progress?	effectiveness assessments. The focus should be on how they have used the results strategically. We need to communicate this to the countries in advance so that it is not a surprise. Ask every country to bring them.
9.45-10.15	Existing case study from Romania of managing PA networks. Presentations of RAPPAM results and how they have been used.	Lead: Mihai Zotta Technique: Presentation & discussion	♦ What can we learn from real-world case studies in terms of success factors, overcoming obstacles, etc.?	
10.15-10.45	Management effectiveness case study – Finland	Lead: Kari Lahti Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion		
10.45-11.00	C O F F E E B R E A K			
11.00-11.30	Management effectiveness activities of PAN Parks	Lead: Vlado Vancura Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion		
11.30-12.30	Brainstorming on trends in threats, management weaknesses and political constraints	Lead: Jason Spensley / Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary exercise with cards and 3 pinboards	Generate ideas from all participants and synthesize in clusters	Threats = pink Management weaknesses = yellow Political constraints = white Red = clusters
12.30-2.00	L U N C H B R E A K			
2.00-3.00	Exercise to plan action on one challenge	Leads: Jason Spensley, Jamie Ervin, Pierre Galland, Kari Lahti Technique: 4 facilitated break-out groups	Participants gain experience in planning a step-by-step approach to advance on a challenging issue	
3.00-3.15	C O F F E E B R E A K			
3.15-3.45	Country groups to plan next steps	Leads: Jason Spensley Technique: 13 individual country groups		
3.45-4.30	Country groups share next steps in Neighbour Groups	Leads: Jason Spensley Technique: 4 break-out groups as on Day 1		
4:30-5.15	Reports back from Neighbour Groups	Leads: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary session: reports back and facilitated discussion		
2.00-3.45	Development of a new case study national action plan for managing PA networks Instructions to break-out groups	Lead: Jason Spensley Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants choose a country and elaborate a plan of action to ensure adequate management of the PA network.	
3.45-4.00	C O F F E E B R E A K			
4.00-5.15	Break-out groups develop action plans for improving management of PA networks for four countries	4 groups of 7-8 persons each.	Participants elaborate plans of action to complete the planning for managing PA networks in their countries..	Each group selects a facilitator and a scribe who captures the results on their laptop

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

5.15-5.30	Feedback from participants on Day 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Taking the Pulse” • What was most useful? • What could we do better tomorrow? 	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Facilitated plenary discussion	Input on how we feel, and how to improve the workshop	
6.00-7.00	D I N N E R			
7.30-8.00	Icebreaker game: Two truths and one lie	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary fun		
8.00-8.30	Informal presentation on 'Governance of Biodiversity' Research Project - Success and Failure Factors for Biosphere Reserve Management in Central and Eastern Europe"	Rainer Schliep		

Day 3				
8.30-8.45	Summary of the second day and agenda of the third day	Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary discussion		
8.45-10.15	3 (iii) Introductory presentation on developing sustainable financing including case studies and different approaches and tools	Lead: Barry Spergel Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants gain an understanding of the issue, relevant tools and critical action steps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What are the concrete steps that belong in a practical work plan designed to advance progress? ◆ For each country, what problems are being encountered in implementing these steps, and how can these problems be overcome? 	B: Look at the presentations made in Miami and St Lucia.
10.15-10.45	EU Funding Lines	Lead: Peter Torkler Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion		
10.45-11.00	C O F F E E B R E A K			
11.00-11.30	PAN Parks	Lead: Vlado Vancura Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Introduction to concept and focus on sustainable financing activities & relations with industry that contribute to supporting PA budgets	
11.30-12.30	Development of a new case study national action plan for sustainable financing Instructions to break-out groups	Lead: Barry Spergel Technique: Presentation & facilitated discussion	Participants choose a country and elaborate a plan of action to ensure adequate management of the PA network.	
12.30-2.00	L U N C H B R E A K			
2.00-3.30	Break-out groups develop action plans for sustainable financing of PA networks for four countries	4 groups of 7-8 persons each.	Participants elaborate plans of action for sustainable financing of PA networks for their countries.	Each group selects a facilitator and a scribe who captures the results on their laptop
3.30-3.45	C O F F E E B R E A K			
3.45-5.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of progress on country-level implementation of the programme of work on protected areas, identification of constraints and opportunities to 	Lead: Jamie Ervin Technique: country-specific groups	- For each country, what are the major accomplishments to date and likely catalysts/opportunities to advance	Participants finalize the questionnaires that had been submitted in draft before the workshop.

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

	<p>promote implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Synthesis of national action plans 		<p>implementation of the programme of work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the major obstacles faced in implementing the programme of work? - How can these be addressed by the CBD? e.g. message to Working Group on Protected Areas/COP 9) <p>Participants synthesize action plans for their own county, and prepare 5-10 minute presentations.</p>	
5.15-5.30	Feedback from participants on Day 3	<p>Lead: Meg Gawler</p> <p>Technique: Plenary discussion</p>		
6.00-7.00	D I N N E R			
19.30-21.00	Guided Walk around the island	Janet Jabs		

Day 4							
8.30-8.35	Summary of the 3rd day and agenda of the 4 th day	<p>Lead: Meg Gawler</p> <p>Technique: Plenary discussion</p>					
8.35-9.25	<p>Presentation of next steps to develop national action plans:</p> <p>Albania Bosnia and Herzegovina Croatia Montenegro Slovenia</p>	<p>Lead: CBD Secretariat / Meg Gawler</p> <p>Technique: Country group presentations and plenary discussion</p>	<p>Participants get an overview of implementation in the region and common areas of concern. Opportunity for feedback and discussing general problems with implementing the PoWPA.</p>	<p>14 country presentations of ten minutes each – will need very strict time management.</p> <p>Give participants standard powerpoint presentations to fill in ahead of time, and get these all loaded up before we start on Day 4.</p> <p>Do 4-5 presentations, then pause for discussion.</p>			
9.25-9.35	Discussion						
9.35-10.25	<p>Presentation of next steps to develop national action plans:</p> <p>Czech Republic Hungary Poland Romania Serbia (including Kosovo)</p>						
10.25-10.35	Discussion						
10.35-10.50	C O F F E E B R E A K						
10.50-11.20	<p>Presentation of next steps to develop national action plans:</p> <p>Slovakia Ukraine Bulgaria</p>						
11.20-11.30	Discussion						
11.30-12.15	<p>4. Wrap up and finalization of inputs to the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas and other regional processes</p>				<p>Lead: Sarat 'Babu' Gidda and Pierre Galland</p> <p>Technique: Plenary discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What are the major "take-home messages" and insights from this Workshop? ◆ What are the key resources that can be 	

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

			<p>drawn upon when participants return home (e.g., funding, roster of experts, guides)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Following this Workshop, how can momentum be maintained (e.g., ongoing peer learning network)? ◆ What can we expect at the second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Protected Areas and the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties meeting (both scheduled for 2008)? What might be some desired outcomes of these meetings? 	
12.15-12.25	Workshop evaluation	<p>Lead: Meg Gawler Technique: Plenary</p>		
12.25-12.30	Closure	<p>Lead: CBD Secretariat / WWF</p>		
12.30	LUNCH			

Annex 2. Participants

No.	Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/Fax/e-mail
1.	Vaclav Braun	Administration of National Park and Protected Landscape Area Sumava	ul.1.Máje 260 38501 Vimperk	Czech Republic	Tel.1: +42 (0)388/450209 Tel.2: +42 (0)388/434004 Tel.3: +42 (0)731530248 Fax: +42 (0)388/413019 e-mail: vaclav.braun@npsumava.cz
2.	Emilian Burdusel	UNESCO Pro´Natura	Calea Plevnei no.61 Bucharest	Romania	Tel.: +40 21/311-2644 Fax: +40 21/311-2644 e-mail1: emil@pronatura.ro e-mail2: emilburdusel@yahoo.com
3.	Vasilije Buskovic	Institute for the Potection of Nature	Trg Vojvode Becir-bega Osmanagica 16 81000 Podgorica	Montenegro	Tel.: +382 81/622992 Fax: +382 81/620848 e-mail: vasob@cg.yu
4.	Juan Chang	InWent - Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung gGmbH	Gutenbergstrasse 32, Haus 1 37075 Göttingen	Germany	Tel.: +49 160/2088523 Fax: +49 34202/845-777 e-mail: jchangolivas@gmail.com
5.	Vildana Djonko	Centre for Environmentally Sustainable Development (CESD)	Stjepana Tomica 1 71000 Sarajevo	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Tel.1: +387 33/212-466 Tel.2: +387 61/252-972 Fax: +387 33/212-466 e-mail: vildana.djonko@heis.com.ba
6.	Aleksandra Doslic	Advisor for protected areas and development of national parks Ministry of Environmental Protection	1, Omladinskih brigada str. 11070 New Belgrade	Serbia	Tel.1: +381 11/3131-569 Tel.2: +381 63/633-078 Fax: +381 11/3131-569 e-mail: aleksandra.doslic@enoserb.srgov.yu
7.	Snezana Dragojevic	The Regional Environmental Center (REC) REC Country Office Montenegro	Ivana Crnojevicica 16/2 81000 Podgorica	Montenegro	Tel.: +381 81/210-225 Fax: +381 81/210-226 e-mail: sdragojevic@recmontenegro.org
8.	Marine Elbakidze	Ivan Franko National University of Lviv	Dorostrenko str., 41 79000 Lviv	Ukraine	Tel.1: +380 322/964744 Tel.2: +380 322/527064 Tel.3: +380-987766187 Fax: +380 322/722644 e-mail: marine.elbakidze@smsk.slu.se
9.	Jamison Ervin Speaker	The Nature Conservancy	1061 Mountainview VT 05676 Duxbury	United States of America	Tel.: +1 802/244-5875 Fax: +1 802/244-6257

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

No.	Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/Fax/e-mail
					e-mail: jervin@tnc.org
10.	Dr. Pierre Galland Organization	Consultant / IUCN	Chesaulx 6 2035 Corcelles	Switzerland	Tel.: +41 32/72554-57 Fax: +41 32/73101-93 e-mail: pierre.galland@bluewin.ch
11.	Meg Gawler Facilitator	<i>ARTEMIS Services - for Nature Conservation and Human Development</i>	590 Route d'Ornex 01280 Prévessin-Moens	France	Tel.: +33 4/5040-7870 Fax: +33 4/5040-7379 e-mail: meg@artemis-services.com
12.	Sarat Babu Gidda Organization	Secretariat Convention on Biological Diversity	413 Saint-Jacques, Suite 800 H2Y 1N9 Montreal QC	Canada	Tel.: +514 287/7026 Fax: +514 288/6588 e-mail: sarat.gidda@biodiv.org
13.	Anna Guttova	CERI - Carpathian EcoRegion Initiative	Podunajska 24 82106 Bratislava	Slovak Republic	Tel.: +421 2455/240-19 Fax: +421 2455/240-19 e-mail: guttova@daphne.sk
14.	Rolf Hogan Chair	WWF International	Avenue de Mont Blanc 1196 Gland	Switzerland	Tel.: +41 22/364-9391 Fax: +41 22/364-8307 e-mail: rhogan@wwfint.org-e-mail2:
15.	Liz Hopkins Speaker		24 rue de Zurich 1201 Geneve	Switzerland	Tel.: +41 22/7385735 Fax: +41 78/6347577 e-mail: lizhopkins@bluemail.ch
16.	Judith Jabs Organization	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation International Academy for Nature Conservation	18581 Putbus	Germany	Tel.: +49 38301/86-115 Fax: +49 38301/86-117 e-mail : judith.jabs@bfn-vilm.de
17.	Zrinka Jakl	Association Sunce	HNP7/II Obala	Croatia	Tel.: +385 21/360-779 Fax: +385 21/360-779 e-mail: zrinka.jakl@sunce-st.org
18.	Boris Krystufek Speaker	University of Primorska Science and Research Centre	Garibaldijeva 1 6000 Koper	Slovenia	Tel.: +386 31/210074 e-mail: boris.krystufek@zrs.upr.si
19.	Kari Lahti Organization	IUCN / HQ Programme on Protected Areas	Rue Mauverney 28 1196 Gland	Switzerland	Tel.1: +41 22/999-0159 Tel.2: +41-795843400 e-mail: kari.lahti@iucn.org
20.	Hildegard Meyer Speaker	Project Assistant WWF International, Danube- Carpathian Programme CERI Carpathian Ecoregion Initiative	Mariahilfer Str. 88a/3/9 1070 Vienna	Austria	Tel.1: +43 1/524-547020 Tel.2: +43 650/2763764 Fax: +43 1/524-547070 e-mail: hmeyer@wwfdcp.org

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

No.	Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/Fax/e-mail
21.	Alken Myftiu	The Regional Environmental Centre (Rec) Albania	Rr. Ismail Qemali, No. 27 Tirana	Albania	Tel.: +355 4/232928 Fax: +355 4/232928 e-mail1: rec@albania.rec.org e-mail2: alken@albania.rec.org
22.	Dr. Leonid Protsenko	Charity Organization "InterEcoCentre"	2, Tereshchenkivska str. 01601 Kyiv	Ukraine	Tel.1: +38 044/235-7374 Tel.2: +38 044/238-2263 Tel.3: +38-050-3867733 Fax: +38 044/238-2263 e-mail1: interecocentre@post.com.ua e-mail2: interecocentre@ukrpost.ua
23.	Stella Satalic Speaker	WWF European Policy Programme - Dinaric Arc Ecoregion-2012 Protected Area Prog.	Kestercanekova 1 10000 Zagreb	Croatia	Tel.1: +385 1/2361-653 Tel.2: +385-99-2101679 Fax: +385 1/2361-620 e-mail: ssatalic@wwfmedpo.org
24.	Vesela Valentinova Savova	Ministry of Environment and Water	Blvd. "Marija Luiza" 22 1000 Sofia	Bulgaria	Tel.: +35 92/940-6114 Fax: +35 92/940-6127 e-mail: ves_s@abv.bg
25.	Rainer Schliep	GoBi Research Project Humboldt-Universität Berlin Institut für Agrarökonomie und Sozialwissenschaften	Luisenstr. 53 10117 Berlin	Germany	Tel.: +49 30/209-36561 Fax: +49 30/209-36565 e-mail: schliep@biodiv.de
26.	Samad John Smaranda	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Bd. Libertatii no. 12, sector 5 Bucharest	Romania	Tel.1: +40 744/347-699 Tel.2: +40-21-3160287 Fax: +40 21/316-0287 e-mail1: john.smaranda@mmedin.ro e-mail2: jsamad@parks.ro
27.	Andrej Sovinc	Republic of Slovenia Ministry of Environment	Pod kostanji 44 1000 Ljubljana	Slovenia	Tel.: +386 41/738-624 Fax: +386 566/37-710 e-mail: andrej.sovinc@guest.arnes.si
28.	Jason Spensley Speaker	The Nature Conservancy	42 St Joachim Powte Claire, Québec	Canada	Tel.1: +1 802/862-2432 Tel.2: +1-520-247-5367 Fax: +1 802/862-2432 e-mail: jspensley@tnc.org
29.	Barry Spergel	Independent consultant for WWF-	5203 Falmouth Road	United States of	Tel.: +1 301/229-0058

Protected Areas for a Living Planet — delivering on CBD commitments
 Eastern Europe Regional Workshop, June 2007 – Workshop Report

No.	Name	Institution	Address	Country	Phone/Fax/e-mail
	Speaker	International	Bethesda, MD 20816	America	e-mail: bspergel@aol.com
30.	Jutta Stadler Speaker	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation Biodiversity Department	18581 Putbus	Germany	Tel.: +49 38301/86134 Fax: +49 38301/86150 e-mail: jutta.stadler@bfn-vilm.de
31.	Daniela Stefkova	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning Agency of Environment	Drezdenska 52 1000 Skopje	Macedonia	Tel.1: +389 70/278-330 Tel.2: +389-2-3068930-128 Fax: +389 2/3066-931 e-mail1: d.stefkova@moepp.gov.mk e-mail2: danielastefkova@yahoo.com
32.	Gisela Stolpe Organization	Federal Agency for Nature Conservation International Academy for Nature Conservation	Insel Vilm 18581 Putbus	Germany	Tel.: +49 38301/86113 Fax: +49 38301/86150 e-mail: gisela.stolpe@bfn-vilm.de
33.	Martin Strelec	DAPHNE CZ - Institute of Applied Ecology	Husova 45 370 05 České Budejovice	Czech Republic	Tel.: +420 774 650 592 e-mail: martin.strelec@daphne.cz
34.	Peter Torkler Speaker	EU-Policy WWF Germany WWF Berlin Office	Hackescher Markt, Große Präsidentenstr. 10 10178 Berlin	Germany	Tel.: +49 30/30 87 42 -15 Fax: +49 30/30 87 42 -50 e-mail: torkler@wwf.de
35.	Vlado Vancura Organization	PAN Parks Foundation	Hviezdoslavova 150 03301 Liptovsky Hradok	Slovak Republic	Tel.: +421 907816067/ e-mail: vvancura@panparks.org
36.	Stojan Dimitrov Vergiev	Ministry of Environment and Water	22 "Marija Luiza" Blvd. 1000 Sofia	Bulgaria	Tel.: +35 92/940-6109 Fax: +35 92/940-6127 e-mail: Stojan_Ver@moew.government.bg
37.	Aleksandar Vlajic	NGO Ecolibri Belgrade	Sindjelicova 7 11000 Belgrade	Serbia	Tel.: +381 631080707/ Fax: +381 113446580/ e-mail: svlajic@ptt.yu
38.	Mihai Iancu Zotta	Romanian National Forest Administration "Romsilva"	Bd. Magheru, No. 31 Bucharest	Romania	Tel.: +40 7430/22112 Fax: +40 2131/69848 e-mail: mzotta@pcrai.ro

Annex 3. Questionnaire

Evaluation Matrix for the Review of Implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas

N.B.: Key evaluation questions for review of implementation of the programme of work on protected areas are indicated in **bold**. All Parties are encouraged to answer these questions. The other questions provide underlying guidance to assess evaluation, and Parties are encouraged to answer them to the extent that they are applicable to their national circumstances.

Country		
Date		
Contact person and email		
Goal and Target	Key evaluation questions and national considerations	
<p>Goal: To establish and strengthen national and regional systems of protected areas integrated into a global network as a contribution to globally agreed goals.</p> <p>Target: Establish a global network of comprehensive, representative and effectively managed national and regional protected area systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the existing national protected area system comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed (provide number of existing protected areas, total area covered, and type and percentage of biomes covered)? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the definitions of “comprehensive”, “ecologically representative” and “effectively managed” in your country? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the progress made in quantitative and qualitative terms against the national targets relating to “comprehensiveness”, “ecological representation”, and “effective management”? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What biomes are adequately represented? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What biomes are underrepresented or not represented? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What IUCN categories of protected areas are included? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do new protected areas established since COP-7 cover underrepresented ecosystems and biomes (number of new protected areas since COP-7, area covered by them, type and percentage of biomes covered by them)? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are there plans for the establishment of additional protected areas by the year 2010 (terrestrial) and 2012 (marine)? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have plans or actions for protected area system (incorporating elements for filling ecological gaps, securing financial resources, capacity-building, addressing policy, legislative and institutional barriers) been developed? 	
<p>Goal: To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function.</p> <p>Target: All protected areas and protected area systems are integrated into the wider land- and seascape, and relevant sectors, by applying the ecosystem approach and taking into account ecological connectivity and the concept, where appropriate, of ecological networks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What measures have been taken for developing enabling environment (legislation, policies, tools) for integrating protected areas into broader land and seascapes and sectoral interests (i.e. agriculture, infrastructure, energy)? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are the needs of protected areas taken into account in the wider land and seascape to address the need for connectivity, including ecological networks? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has the concept of the “ecosystem approach” been applied while developing protected area system? 	

<p>Goal: To establish and strengthen regional networks, transboundary protected areas (TBPAs) and collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries.</p> <p>Target: Establish and strengthen by transboundary protected areas, other forms of collaboration between neighbouring protected areas across national boundaries and regional networks, to enhance the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, implementing the ecosystem approach, and improving international cooperation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What collaboration across national boundaries has been implemented in relation to protected areas? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has any consultation process been established to identify potential transboundary, including marine, protected areas? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How many protected areas feature in regional networks and how many of these are transboundary? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has the potential for regional cooperation under relevant conventions been utilised for the establishment of migratory corridors? 	
<p>Goal: To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management.</p> <p>Target: All protected areas have effective management using participatory and science-based site planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percentage of protected areas (area and number) have up-to-date science-based management plans that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Are under development? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Are under effective implementation? 	

<p>processes that incorporate clear biodiversity objectives, targets, management strategies and monitoring programmes, drawing upon existing methodologies and a long-term management plan with active stakeholder involvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have consultation been undertaken involving protected area functionaries, local stakeholders and researchers to identify science-based biodiversity conservation targets? 	
<p>Goal: To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas.</p> <p>Target: Effective mechanisms for identifying and preventing, and/or mitigating the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas are in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What measures have been put in place to identify, prevent and/or mitigate the negative impacts of threats? 	
<p>Goal: To promote equity and benefit sharing.</p> <p>Target: Establish mechanisms for the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What legislative or policy frameworks are in place to establish frameworks for the equitable sharing of costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have assessments been made of the economic and socio-cultural costs and benefits of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What measures have been taken to avoid and mitigate negative impacts on indigenous and local communities? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What mechanisms have been put in place to identify and recognize community conserved areas and how many such areas have been integrated into the national protected areas system? 	
<p>Goal: To enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities, and relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Target: Full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, in full respect of their rights and recognition of their responsibilities, consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, and the participation of relevant stakeholders, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What mechanisms have been implemented to ensure full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, in full respect of their rights and recognition of their responsibilities, consistent with national law and applicable international obligations, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What measures have been taken to support areas conserved by indigenous and local communities? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders, in the management of existing, and the establishment and management of new, protected areas? 	
<p>Goal: To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the appropriate policy, institutional and socio-economic frameworks in place to value goods and services and enable more effective establishment and management of protected areas? 	

<p>Target: By 2008 review and revise policies as appropriate, including use of social and economic valuation and incentives, to provide a supportive enabling environment for more effective establishment and management of protected areas and protected area systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of social and economic valuation methods and incentives for more effective establishment and management of protected areas are developed and incorporated into national policies, institutional and socio-economic structures? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the main impediments to effective establishment and management of protected areas? Have measures been taken to overcome these? 	
<p>Goal: To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas.</p> <p>Target: comprehensive capacity- building programmes and initiatives are implemented to develop knowledge and skills at individual, community and institutional levels, and raise professional standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a comprehensive capacity-needs assessment for protected areas management been carried out? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ • What capacity-building programmes have been undertaken or are being undertaken. How successful have the completed programmes been? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does your country consider a multidisciplinary approach to protected areas management? 	
<p>Goal: To develop, apply and transfer appropriate technologies for protected areas.</p> <p>Target: development, validation, and transfer of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What new innovative approaches and technologies have been identified, developed and implemented for protected areas establishment and management on the national and regional level? 	

<p>appropriate technologies and innovative approaches for the effective management of protected areas is substantially improved, taking into account decisions of the Conference of the Parties on technology transfer and cooperation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has there been collaboration within the country and/or with other countries to share information and technologies? 	
<p>Goal: To ensure financial sustainability of protected areas, and national and regional systems of protected areas.</p> <p>Target: Sufficient financial, technical and other resources to meet the costs to effectively implement and manage national and regional systems of protected areas are secured, including both from national and international sources, particularly to support the needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition and small island developing States.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Have financial needs been identified? What are the results of this needs assessment (quantitative and qualitative)? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What strategies are in place to meet these needs, and in particular to secure long-term funding for the national protected areas system? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What financial support has been given to developing countries and countries with economies in transition and small island developing States? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What proportion of the budget is dedicated to supporting the national protected areas system (What proportion of the total funding for the national protected areas comes from private and public funding sources, and how much from the state budget?) ○ Have studies been made on the efficient use of the resources in contribution to financial sustainability of protected areas? 	
<p>Goal: To strengthen communication, education and public awareness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is there a review mechanism for public education programmes to measure if they have been effective in communicating the basic biodiversity values of protected areas? 	

<p>Target: Public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the importance and benefits of protected areas is significantly increased.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What education measures and programmes have been developed and implemented regarding protected areas, including for raising public awareness? 	
<p>Goal: To develop and adopt minimum standards and best practices for national and regional protected area systems.</p> <p>Target: Standards, criteria, and best practices for planning, selecting, establishing, managing and governance of national and regional systems of protected areas are developed and adopted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Have standards, criteria and best practices for a) site selection, b) management, c) governance, and d) long-term monitoring of outcomes been applied and documented? (Please provide a reference). 	
<p>Goal: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected area management.</p> <p>Target: Frameworks for monitoring, evaluating and reporting protected areas management effectiveness at sites, national and regional systems, and transboundary protected area levels adopted and implemented by Parties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Has your country evaluated management effectiveness of protected areas in a systematic way? If yes, 	
	<p>(a) What percentage of national protected area system surface area has been evaluated?</p>	
	<p>(b) What are the conclusions for the national protected areas system, and to what extent were results incorporated into management plans and strategies?</p>	

Annex 4. Reporting Template

Element of master plan	Status (0-3)	Priority (low, medium, high)	Next steps	What is needed to take these steps	Obstacles
Gap assessment					
Threat assessment					
Management effectiveness assessment					
Capacity assessment					
Equity and benefits assessment					
Governance					
Protected area policy environment					
Sustainable finance					
Monitoring of protected area system					
Overall master plan					

Who is the person/persons in your country who will be most influential in advancing the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, and how will you communicate the results of this workshop?

Annex 5. Workshop Evaluation

Evaluation of the Eastern Europe Regional Workshop: Strengthening the Capacity of Governments to Implement Priority Activities of the CBD PoWPA Isle of Vilm/Germany, 17– 21 June 2007

1. What were your expectations for this workshop?

- to get knowledge (to learn about CBD PoWPA, Master Plan, effective management, PAs management) 14x
- to get new working contacts, to see other countries' experiences, Explaining possibilities for cooperation 7x
- and how to implement in my country 4x
- to be inspired by new ideas 2x
- increase capacities in gap analysis
- I hoped to learn about new strategic issues in which our NGO could be involved.
- steps to improve and capacity building

2. Which parts/speakers' presentations were the most important, relevant and why?

- Master plan 4x
- Gap assessment 4x
- Assessments of NPs management
- Management effectiveness 6x
- UNEP/IUCN Module on PA 2X,
- RAPPAM – Methodology is very applicable/ results of RAPPAM (in Peru) 3x
- Pan Parks. It might be applied in the Pas in my country 6x
- Sustainable financing 7x
- Financing instruments 2x
- linkages between Natura 2000...
- Case studies
- Case study from Dinaric Arc 2x
- Case study from Finland
- Case study Romania (M. Zotta) 2x
- Concrete examples of implementation
- Innovative approach of the Slovenian PA management 2x
- Country presentations 2x
- Working in groups-sharing of experience and knowledge,

In words:

- master planning – it explained the overall logic of the process and made me realize how various actions ongoing in my country fit to this concept; PAN Parks – it showed a working example of making use of PA benefits for the people an creative cooperation with business; management effectiveness – it gave survey of available tools applicable on different level of detail; sustainable finance – it emphasized the importance of multi-source funding to which it provided various practical examples; issue-based modules – an attempt to make the bunch of conventions better structured
- All of them were important for me to get a better insight of the possibilities how to implement the CBD PoWPA.
- J. Erwin "Exchange of ...(not readable)"

3. What was missing in terms of content or methods?

- Nothing 3x
- To show that this complicated system works in practise.
- maybe more interactive work with the audience in terms of dialogue on practical aspect of methodologies
- Practical examples of the topics discussed
- More time to address financing issues and country examples
- maybe were too much issues to deal with and not so much time to understand everything
- EU Financial mechanism for non-EU countries
- I missed setting clear borders of actually performed analysis/assessment. Overlaps between management/governance/capacity/threat assessment were confusing for me and sometimes caused the debate to be rather shallow. I prefer being more focused, conduct detailed analyses and then find links. Generally I have missed the equity & benefit-sharing assessment, which I consider the biggest challenge. I would appreciate more detail on management effectiveness assessment methodology, e.g. RAPPAM.
- Some recommendations regarding who should lead the national processes of assessment of gap analysis and management effectiveness.
- the participant perhaps were not chosen for the content (too demanding for the participants selected)
- Recommendation regarding the institutions which must be responsible for this report
- I don't know
- very well structured!
- the content was excellent
- Everything included and balanced – presentations, working group work

4. Which topics should have been given less importance or ignored?

- All the topics were very useful 6x
- There were just too many topics and, at the same time, they are all important
- maybe working groups for neighbouring countries and presentations of working groups work that were not in relation with country specifics
- perhaps more coordination for working groups
- some presentations not directly related to CBD
- Section of sustainable financing would be more relevant if many EU countries were taken into consideration

5. How will you apply the knowledge gained in your country back home?

- I will share with focal point of the CBD ([trying to find a long term cooperation (preferably resulting in a project e.g. for management effectiveness assessment) 4x
- I will share the information with park managers in the Carpathian region/others 3x
- Reporting to the Ministry 2x
- prepare a report for NGOs
- refer in my NGO about CBD & PoWPA problematic, finding ways how to contribute (there will definitely be several); developing additional next steps; learning about other previously done actions that would fit into various analyses within Master Plan
- Promote any kind of meeting with people working in PA in order to review the status of the implementation of the CBD
- I will prepare report with recommendations for my Director!
- As much as I can I practice lobbying for specific issues from CBD, to develop projects and put pressure on government
- spreading out information and experience trying to improve my own organization's work in field of biodiversity, if I will be allowed
- will use for lectures at the University
- in my everyday work – when it comes to the topics of the workshop 3x
- I will give protected areas managers the contacts of the speakers, as well as the participants
- To promote and work more with PoWPA on MP
- I established useful contacts
- That has to be explored together with Nat. Focal Point, Potential Initiation of any step for ??? situation
- Through implication in the process of implement CBD requirements
- not sure yet

- The WS provides good background information for the 2012 Protected Area for a living planet programme in terms of the status of the different countries and certainly will help to raise the importance of the CBD PoWPA in the area.
- Involvement in management effectiveness evaluation

6. Participation: To what extent do you feel you had an adequate opportunity to contribute your own views?

1: Not at all 2: Little **1x** 3: Average **2x** 4:Very good **8x** 5: Excellent **7x**

Comments:

- WS was organized in a way that participants could have given their opinion on all the topics discussed
- I have very little own experience with topic of biodiversity
- If we were notified in advance to prepare for filling in questionnaires, matrix etc., we would have provided more robust and reliable information.

7. Were you satisfied with the facilitation?

1: No 2: Poor 3: Average **4x** 4:Very good **9x** 5: Excellent **6x**

Comments:

- Sometimes it was a bit confusing, but at the end it did not influence the WS results

8. Were you satisfied with the daily time schedule?

1: No 2: Poor **1x** 3: Average **8x** 4:Very good **7x** 5: Excellent **3x**

Comments:

- too intense **3x**
- too long **2x**
- It was ok, but long. However, there was nothing else to do here.
- Is better to begin at 9.00
- when the daily agenda was changed it should have been clearly written on a board or flipchart and available for the whole day; deadlines for hanging in and times for filling in the questionnaire and matrix were not very clear in advance
- not enough time for personal exchange

9. Were you satisfied with the organization of the seminar?

1: No 2: Poor 3: Average 4:Very good **10x** 5: Excellent **9x**

Comments:

- target audience – big part of it missing, no representative from Poland & Hungary, missing agenda of the workshop prior to arrival – the scope of the workshop was not quite clear beforehand
- Densification of activities could more people feeling more active

10. Were you satisfied with the length of the seminar?

1: No **1x** 2: Poor 3: Average **2x** 4:Very good **13x** 5: Excellent **2x**

Comments:

- too long
- Three days is needed for so many information and work
- Too intense
- only 1 weakness – 5 days seminar requires providing better internet access for participants, preferably wireless connection

11. Were you satisfied with the venue, its facilities, service and food?

1: No 2: Poor 3: Average **1x** 4:Very good **8x** 5: Excellent **10x**

Comments:

- little bit too far
- it would be nice if there is more points of access to web (to allow connect participant's notebooks)
- see previous point

12. Any other comments:

- we have to be serious and also to have fun for enjoying company of each other more!
- Isle of Vilm is very interesting place for work. Very good choice!

- Congratulations! The workshop was very inspirational for me.
- Could we be informed about (or could we comment on) at the final draft of the report – or its part presenting workshop results – before its published and given to national focal points?
- I would suggest first to promote country workshops where the information of the questionnaire can be completed and then a Regional workshop to share information between countries and send a more “solid” recommendation to CBD
- Vilm seminars rules!
- If you will call me again in the future... Here I am.. You are the best
- Thanks x capacity building
- Thank You!
- Thanks to organizers very much!!!

Annex 6. Acronyms and Abbreviations

BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CERI	Carpathian EcoRegion Initiative
CHF	Swiss francs
CNPA	Carpathian Network of Protected Areas
COP	Conference of the Parties
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EU	European Union
GIS	Geographic Information System
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MEE	Management Effectiveness Evaluation
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NFA	National Forest Administration (Romania)
NHS	Natural Heritage Services (Finland)
NP	National Park
PA	Protected area
PA4LP	Protected Areas for a Living Planet programme
PAN	Protected Area Network
PES	Payments for Environmental Services
PoWPA	Programme of Work on Protected Areas
PPA	PAN Parks Accommodation
PPF	PAN Parks Foundation
RAPPAM	Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management
SEA	Social Impact Assessment
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WB	World Bank
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature