



eurossite

*Central and Eastern Europe*

**Building Capacity in Wetlands Biodiversity  
Conservation in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania,  
Poland and Russia**





**EUROSITE PROGRAMME/DEVELOPPEMENT**

Postbus 1366 • NL - 5004 BJ Tilburg  
Tel: (31) 134 678 638 ; Fax: (31) 13 463 41 29;  
Email: [eurositenl@eurosite-nature.org](mailto:eurositenl@eurosite-nature.org)

**EUROSITE FRANCE**

"Le Riverside", Quai A. Giard • F - 62930 Wimereux  
Tel: (33) 3 21 87 29 24 ; Fax: (33) 3 21 32 66 67;  
Email: [eurositefr@eurosite-nature.org](mailto:eurositefr@eurosite-nature.org)

**EUROSITE MEDITERRANEE**

c/o Fundació Territori i Paisatge; Provença – 261-265, 26n-2<sup>a</sup> • E-08008 Barcelona  
Tel: (34) 93 484 7367; Fax: (34) 93 484 7364 ;  
Email: [fundtip@fundtip.com](mailto:fundtip@fundtip.com)

***[www.eurosite-nature.org](http://www.eurosite-nature.org)***

**Acknowledgements**

Special thanks to Mr. Adrian Colston and his team at Wicken Fen, whose organisational skills and hospitality made for the perfect working environment.

Special thanks also to the energetic input of all of the participants and contributors to this project so-far, it has been their spirit and enthusiasm that has made the project the great success that it is to-date.

Thanks are also due to the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for funding, and to the participants own organisations for contributing staff.

## Contents

### SECTION ONE: Account of the Workshop

Acknowledgements	page 2
1 Workshop Information	page 5
1.1 Workshop Location Details	page 5
1.2 Workshop Details	page 6
2 Project Background	page 6
3 Workshop Aims	page 6
4 Workshop Activities	page 7
5 Common Site Management/Management Planning Issues	page 8
6 Summary of Lessons Learned	page 8
6.1 Re-statement of objectives	page 8
6.2 Main Lessons & Statements from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Darwin Workshop	page 9
6.2.1 Lessons Learned	page 9
6.2.2 Country Specific Observations	page 10
7 Action Planning	page 11
8 Next Steps	page 11

### SECTION TWO: Country reports

9 Estonia	page 13
10 Latvia	page 15
11 Lithuania	page 16
12 Russia	page 20

### APPENDICES

A Brief Guide to the <i>Logical Framework Analysis</i>	page 21
B Notification of New Darwin Initiative logo	page 21
C List of participants	page 22



- The *EUROSITE*/Darwin project -

Building Capacity in Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation in Estonia, Latvia,  
Lithuania, Poland and Russia

*Workshop 2: Learning Together*

SECTION ONE

## Account of the Workshop



## **1. Workshop Information**

**Location:** Wicken Fen Nature Reserve, Cambridgeshire, England, UK

### **1.1 Workshop Location Details**

#### **Wicken Fen National Nature Reserve**

Wicken Fen National Nature Reserve (NNR) is one of the most important and well-known remnants of the original peat fens of East Anglia, the majority of which have been drained and given over to arable farmland. The reserve is owned and managed by the National Trust and supports a wide range of characteristic fen-land vegetation.

To the north of Wicken Lode is the original peat fen with communities of carr and sedge which support rare and uncommon fenland plants such as marsh pea, Cambridge milk parsley, fen violet and marsh fern. This part of the reserve can be enjoyed from a series of boardwalks.

To the south of the Lode is Adventurer's Fen with rough pasture, reed-bed and pools. This area is attractive to breeding wetland birds and wintering wildfowl, including teal, wigeon, shoveler, pochard and tufted duck. The dykes, abandoned clay-pits and other watercourses carry a great wealth of aquatic plants, many of which are uncommon elsewhere.

The rich invertebrate populations of Wicken Fen have long attracted enthusiasts and include notable dragonflies, spiders and snails. The site is important in a European context for its mixed fen characterised by purple moor-grass.

The present appearance of The Sedge Fen is a result of centuries of management by man. The crops currently taken are sedge over a relatively small area each year, and a larger acreage of fen 'litter'. Scrub is being managed to extend the areas of open fen. Wet pastures at Adventurer's Fen are managed by grazing stock, and conditions are being created to benefit the growth of reed.

Wicken Fen: '*One of Britains oldest nature reserves*': -

<http://www.wicken.org.uk/>

The National Trust homepage: -

<http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/>

JNCC Wicken Fen Site Classification (*classification document*): -

[http://www.jncc.gov.uk/ids/ramsar/supplmnt/sites/Wicken\\_Fen.doc](http://www.jncc.gov.uk/ids/ramsar/supplmnt/sites/Wicken_Fen.doc)

## **1.2 Workshop details**

---

<i>Dates:</i>	<b>12 to 16 June 2002</b>
<i>Participants:</i>	<b>22 participants from 7 countries*</b>
	<i>Estonia</i> (2)
	<i>Latvia</i> (3)
	<i>Lithuania</i> (2)
	<i>Netherlands</i> (2) ( <i>EUROSITE representatives</i> )
	<i>Poland</i> (2)
	<i>Russia</i> (3)
	<i>United Kingdom</i> (8)
<i>Hosted by:</i>	<b>The National Trust</b>

---

## **2 Project Background**

To help key individuals from Poland, Russia and the Baltic States improve understanding and practical skills in the management of wetland habitats. The project is lead by a consortium of leading UK conservation organisations and *EUROSITE*, National Trust, RSPB, Scottish Natural Heritage, English Nature and the Wildlife Trusts.

## **3 Workshop aims**

After the first workshop and country visits (designed to allow project leaders to become acquainted and familiarise themselves with the relevant wetland sites), the second workshop focused upon the following (*not ranked by importance*): -

- Summarising project progress to-date.
- Sharing of *EUROSITE* Darwin project experience gained so far.
- Refining draft action plans based on experience gained from the project.
- Planning the next phase of the project.
- Presenting the UK experience of stakeholder involvement.
- Discussing project difficulties and their solution.

In compliance with the needs and expectations of *EUROSITE* Darwin Workshop participants - emphasis was placed on issues of *stakeholder management*; a theme of particular relevance to partners in Central and Eastern Europe where the involvement of stakeholders in environmental management planning is currently not common practice.

**This report is an account of the second workshop in the project.**

## **4 Workshop Activities**

### **Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> June**

- Welcome and Introduction to the workshop and Wicken Fen by Project Leader, Adrian Colston (*Site Manager – Wicken Fen*).

### **Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> June**

#### **Session 1:**

- Summary and review of expectations and questions about the workshop at-hand.
- Review of participant nation progress with their management plans.
  - A management plan summary was provided by the co-ordinator of each project, which included a description of changes made as a direct result of Darwin Workshop country visits and co-operation with UK counterparts (Refer to *Section 2: Country Reports: pp 12-20*).
  - Description of problems and methods / plans to resolve them.
  - Questions from other participants.
- Clarification: Lessons learned and discussion of their likely implications on project methodology.

#### **Session 2:**

- Site visit: Identification of the main issues in management plan preparation.
- Review of site visit: Observations and lessons learnt - their application to site management plans.

### **Friday 14<sup>th</sup> June**

#### **Session 1:**

- Management Planning: *Discussion*
  - Who needs to be involved in the production of a management plan?
  - How will the management plan be integrated with *variables* such as land use *and* the objectives of land users?
  - What are the essential elements of useful management plans?
  - Communication and stakeholders.
  - The role of land acquisition.
  - The use of Logical Framework Analysis planning (*Appendix A: p 21*)
  - Review of the *EUROSITE* Management Planning Toolkit.
- Summary discussion.
- Country group discussions:
  - Identification: Problems / issues in each protected area subject to management planning.
  - Comparison: Problems / issues - similarities and common solutions.
  - Preparation of a log-frame management plan.
- Presentation of the 100 year vision of the National Trust to restore Wicken Fen and the Fens to the south.
- Site visit t: Ouse Washes (*RSPB Nature Reserve*) and a location to the south of Wicken Fen.

#### **Session 2:**

- How do UK nature organisations identify and involve important stakeholders in management planning and management plans?
  - Presentation by each UK organisation present at the workshop.
  - Discussion and questions.

### **Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> June**

- Session 1: Group work on management plans (in country teams).  
Session 2: Presentation of improved management plans and group feedback session (*using log-frame management process*).  
Session 3: Identification of required future actions and preparation for the next phase of the project.

## **5 Common Site Management/Management Planning Issues**

- Lack of appropriate management.
- Legislation: The range of factors open to positive influence from legislation is generally not matched by effective implementation of said legislation.
- Institutional and authoritarian apathy towards issues of nature conservation inhibits the implementation and success of management plans.
- Conflicts of interest: Nature conservation priorities and the interests of landowners and associated land use (*Farming, hunting, timber harvesting, industry, recreation etc.*).
- Budgets and finance: Insufficient funding for optimal management plans.
- Problems associated with weak or disenfranchised NGO's including a limited sphere of influence and the inability to gain sufficient funding and/or support from external institutions (*Governmental, non-governmental, industry, stakeholders, public etc.*). Site management plans reliant on the co-operation of external parties such as stakeholders are often implemented by *organisations* disadvantaged by a limited ability to influence key-players.

It was observed that the common site management/management planning issues described by the participants were similar to those of recorded at Darwin Workshop 1; it is therefore apparent that further work is needed to resolve these issues.

## **6 Summary of Lessons Learned**

### **6.1 Re-statement of Objectives**

To serve as a reminder the main objectives of participants from Workshop 1: Working Together (*14<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> November 2001: Loch Leven, Scotland*) are listed below (*not ranked*).

- To learn the essential elements of management planning.
- To develop habitat and species management techniques.
- To develop habitat restoration techniques.
- To improve communication with, and participation of, partners and landowners.
- To develop monitoring and evaluation skills.
- To become competent management planners.



## **6.2. Main lessons and statements from the second Darwin Initiative workshop**

During the proceedings participants were invited to share with the group the lessons they had learned at the workshop, below is a summary of this information (*not ranked*).

### **6.2.1 Lessons Learned**

- It is imperative to identify *and* understand site management conflicts for them to be effectively resolved by a site management plan. A management plan is a tool designed for solving problems, therefore we must first ask – *what is the problem?*
- A management plan is unlikely to have a universal application; this is to say that individual sites and countries represent unique problems that most likely require the attention of a specifically tailored management plan. Although, this does not conclude that all management plans should be different – it is possible that select elements of a management plan can produce positive results outside of the site where the plan was conceived – thus the mutual advantages of information sharing.
- The aims of the management plan must be stated clearly *and* consistently; this will help reassure third parties of the intentions and professionalism of the project – the co-operation of stakeholders is reliant on *their* understanding and acceptance of work that needs to be done. Further - maintaining a transparent management plan can reduce the suspicion that rural communities often view new projects/developments with.
- It is important to remember that a management plan will often encroach on traditional social and cultural practices – a management plan should encourage mutual respect.
- A management plan is ongoing, and should therefore include long-term planning – realistic short, medium and long-term goals should be established, based on contemporary and historical knowledge – a plan should allow room to accommodate unexpected developments.
- A management plan should be kept as simple as possible, with clear aims and objectives – limit the potential for project failure by setting realistic targets (*quantitative and qualitative*).
- The management plan will be subject to a budget, it is essential for the long term success of the project that sensible use is made of the available finances. Cost efficiency and informed investment are essential.
- The sensible distribution of responsibility for a management plan can be beneficial; understanding the dynamics of a project group allows for the appropriate allocation of responsibility – strengths and weaknesses differ from person to person, use this to the advantage of the management plan.
- A management plan should not be rushed; *investment in a management plan* should translate as an *investment in management* – a quickly drafted management plan may provide immediate return, but failing to consider all of alternatives can result in an unsustainable solution to a continuing problem.
- The *EUROSITE* Management Planning Toolkit should be used according to need. It is possible that parts of the toolkit are not needed/require site specific adaptation.
- It is important to understand the legal implications of all activities undertaken, as these can influence the outcome of some or all of the elements incorporated in a management plan. It is important to consider the legal implications of actions proposed by a management plan – on the national, regional and local level.
- It is important to develop the ability to extract information of real use to the management plan, and not waste time attempting to understand everything.
- Maintaining a clear view of the overall objectives of a management plan is essential for the long-term success, and limits the potential for the project to lose direction.
- Conservation priorities are essential to make best use of available resources.

## **6.2.2 Country Specific Observations**

### **Estonia**

- There is currently no legislation on Natura 2000 in Estonia, but implementation is planned for the autumn 2002.
- The Estonian project has been successful because: -
  - Problems were identified.
  - They own the site for which the management plan is designed.
  - The management plan is implemented with strong commitment and personal involvement.

### **Poland**

- Polish farmers welcome financial support for grazing, but their lack of interest in the project inhibits the potential success of grazing projects.
- Polish national parks are not permitted to undertake private conservation activities (*e.g. grazing*) unless their involvement guarantees financial gain.

### **Russia**

2. In Russia there is wide use of the *EUROSITE* Management Planning Toolkit but there is no legislation for management planning and no control over the implementation of management plans.
3. The majority of nature conservation work in Russia is overseen by governmental organisations.
4. Financial analysis of nature management plans is uncommon in Russia.
5. The funds supplied by the Russian Government for the purpose of nature conservation are limited and there is a history of inefficient use of these funds.
6. Some areas in Russia do not require complex management plans, as there are many 'closed areas' with intact habitats, where natural processes dominate the ecosystem and human impact is negligible.

### **United Kingdom**

- 5 The UK Government is changing its management plan policy. Formerly the chain of events leading to a management plan saw the relevant bodies decide on a management plan, *announce* the management plan and then *defend* the plan to those that questioned it. The UK Government is moving towards a policy that involves consultation with stakeholders during the creation of the management plan.

## **7. Action Planning**

During the course of the workshop it was established that participant management plans have advanced since the beginning of the Darwin workshops, although it was acknowledged that further improvements are required.

The workshop provided the opportunity for participants from CEE countries to learn from their UK partners. It is the task of the CEEC participants (*with assistance from UK partners*) to follow-up the workshop by completing a management plan for stakeholder involvement.

## **8. Next steps**

Country teams will continue working together on their Management Plans. The experience gained and lessons learned during this second Darwin Workshop will be used to further develop management plans. The up-dated management plans and the results of continued co-operation will be presented at the next Darwin Workshop.

Country team members will receive the *EUROSITE* e-news and will have access to the *EUROSITE* Intranet (*via password login*). The *EUROSITE* Intranet provides information on site management and site management issues for nature conservation.

As *EUROSITE* partners, Darwin Initiative participants will be kept up-to-date with all the activities of the *EUROSITE* Network.

The Progress Report of the Darwin Initiative was presented to the Eurosite Board and Council and to all members, during the Annual General Meeting in Warsaw, Poland (*10-13 October 2002*). The theme of the meeting was "Addressing the Challenges of Natura 2000 in an Enlarged EU". Representatives from Poland were asked to take an active role in the discussing the role of *EUROSITE* in an Enlarged EU.

**The next Darwin Workshop will be held in the UK from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> of November 2003. This workshop will focus on *communication* and will be hosted by English Nature.**



- The *EUROSITE*/Darwin project -

Building Capacity in Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation in Estonia, Latvia,  
Lithuania, Poland and Russia

*Workshop 2: Learning Together*

SECTION TWO

## **Country Reports**



**DARWIN INITIATIVE**

**Building capacity in Wetland Bio diversity Conservation in Baltic States, Poland & Russia**

**9 Mission Report**

**-----ESTONIA-----**

<b>Name of Project Team member</b>		<b>Country visited</b>
Michael Shepherd (SNH) Paul Brooks		Estonia
<b>Dates of Mission:</b> 27 April – 4 May		
<b>Purposes of Mission</b>	13 Make contact with potential new participants in the Darwin project. • Identify new site for management plan development.	
<b>Participants and other contributors</b>	Kaja Peterson: Nature Management Programme Director, Swedish Environmental Institute Tallin Centre, Estonia Institute for Sustainable Development. Veljo Volke: Chairman of Saaremaa Bird Club/potential participant Marika Kose: LIFE Nature Project Manager/potential participant Mati Kose: Estonian Ornithological Society/potential participant Kadri Moller: Senior Officer, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation Department. Merit Otsus: Senior Officer, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation Department.	
<b>Main activities carried out during the Mission</b>	Meeting in Tallin with our intermediary Kaja Peterson; discussed objectives of the visit and finalised logistics.  Site visit to Tagamoisa Peninsular potential Special Protection Area (pSPA) on the island of Saaremaa; met with Veljo Volke on site and discussed issues relating to the management plan he is currently involved in preparing for the pSPA, as part of the Dutch Government MATRA-SPA project.  Site visit to Rannametsa-Soometsa nature reserve/pSPA nr Haademeeste; met with Marika Kose and Mati Kose on site and discussed site management issues and progress with the development of a management plan they are preparing for the pSPA as part of a LIFE Nature project. Meeting in Tallin with Kadri Muller and Merit Otsus from the Estonian Government's Nature Conservation Department to explain the objectives of the Darwin project and inform them of the outcome of our visit.	
<b>Main results accomplished</b>	Signed up two new participants to the Darwin project, Veljo Volke and Marika Kose. Both agreed to attend the second UK workshop at Wicken Fen in June. Mati Kose also expressed a desire to become involved in the project but was unable to make the forthcoming workshop because of other commitments.  Identified Rannametsa-Soometsa pSPA as a suitable site to act as a focus for management plan development. Developed preliminary ideas for management of reedswamp habitat at Rannametsa-Soometsa pSPA, through restoring system of water level control on the site of a disused fish farm. Liaised with Government officials, raising awareness of the Darwin project and informing them of our findings and recommendations from the visit.	

<b>Recommendations to Darwin Team</b>	<p>Veljo Volke, Marika Kose and Mati Kose should be invited to participate in the Darwin project. They are currently working on site management plans in relative isolation, and so should benefit from the opportunities afforded by the Darwin project for interaction with UK staff and other participants from Central &amp; Eastern Europe. The involvement of these individuals would also result in collaboration between the MATRA-SPA project, LIFE Nature project and the Darwin project.</p> <p>Rannametsa-Soometsa pSPA should be the primary site on which to focus our efforts in developing a management plan. The site contains wetland habitats with significant management issues to address eg. raised bog, coastal grasslands and reedswamp. Marika Kose has the security of LIFE funding covering a similar period as the Darwin project, which will enable her to advance work on the management plan between UK workshops.</p> <p>The timetable for completion of the management plan for Tagamoisa Peninsular pSPA has a much tighter deadline (November 2002) but we could nonetheless try and assist with this plan where possible.</p>
<b>Further work to be carried out before next workshop</b>	<p>Provide Veljo Volke and Marika Kose with additional background information about the Darwin project and arrange their travel to the next workshop.</p>

**DARWIN INITIATIVE**

**Building capacity in Wetland Bio diversity Conservation in Baltic States, Poland & Russia**

**10 Mission Report**

**-----LATVIA-----**

Name of Project Team member: Adrian Colston (NT)		Country visited: Latvia
Dates of Mission: 25 <sup>th</sup> May - 31 <sup>st</sup> May		
Purposes of Mission	Familiarisation with the three sites and their employees involved with the Darwin initiative.	
Participants and other contributors	26 <sup>th</sup> May - Adaxi Military Training Area - accompanied by Ivars Kabucis of the Latvian Fund for Nature 27 <sup>th</sup> - 29 <sup>th</sup> May Kemer National Park - accompanied by Janis Kuze of Kemer National Park 29 <sup>th</sup> -30 <sup>th</sup> Lake Pape - accompanied by Valdimarts Slaukstins of WWF	
Main activities carried out during the Mission	Detailed visits to all three sites, this enabled the main ecological interest to be identified and discussed. This was followed then by discussions regarding the main nature conservation management issues and problems along with the proposed solutions	
Main results accomplished	Good understanding of the three sites, management issues and problems along with discussion re. Progress regarding production of Management Plans also discussed.	
Recommendations to Darwin Team	All three projects have high levels of ecological expertise and a good understanding of the issues and problems. Issues relating to visitor management and stakeholder involvement less well developed.	
Further work to be carried out before next workshop	Nothing identified	

## DARWIN INITIATIVE

### Building capacity in Wetland Bio diversity Conservation in Baltic States, Poland & Russia

#### 11 Mission Report

#### LITHUANIA

Notes from Lithuanian visit – May 2002-06-12

**Personal notes of Mr. Mike Deegan** (Staffordshire Wildlife Trust) on his visit to Lithuania and meetings with Darius Mr. Darius Stoncius and Mr. Arunas Pranaitas.

#### **Site with management input from Lithuanian Fund for Nature – north of Kaunas**

Site Description: Island in artificial lake – scrub controlled and nettles cut.  
Primary feature: Breeding black headed gulls  
Secondary feature: Associated species – terns & some waders. Potential for more numbers

#### Management Issues:

Want to maintain/increase breeding population and associated species. Management has shown that reducing the vegetation has increased the vegetation. Unfortunately, the density of birds and droppings encourages dense growth of nettles that possibly reduces the potential for breeding pairs.

#### Management Options:

**Re-profiling:** The island has a concave profile. This could be mechanically re-profiled to lower & level the island. The remaining soil could be either re-sown or covered with gravel (nettles might still be a future problem).

Following a bathometric survey, the soil could be re-profiled around the edge of the island to create emergent vegetation and muddy areas for waders. This would be best carried out in late-summer/ autumn.

**Burning:** Could be regularly burnt at end of each autumn or in early spring to remove any rank vegetation. This would require a skilled and controlled operation.

**Chemicals:** A number of approved pesticides (ie. asulox or glyphosate) could be used to control nettles. Not a long-term solution and would be best carried out in conjunction with another option such as grazing. Would be best option for controlling scrub.

**Grazing:** Although access is limited and the area is small, this is the optimal long-term management regime. Browsing stock such as goats (or a hardy breed of sheep) would graze off nettles and any re-growth from the scrub.

The animals could be used in early spring, before the gulls breed, to eat the nettles and scrub growth when they are young and tender. They could then be re-introduced in mid-summer to control any subsequent re-growth. A willing



grazier/farmer would have to be found, but the animals would not require tethering and would perform a sustainable Management role.

**Cutting:** As long as you have adequate resources/volunteers, continued manual cutting is a reasonable short-term option. However, this work is laborious and dependant on the availability & good-will of volunteers.

**Information required by Darius:**

- Examples of English Biodiversity Action Plans
- Land Acquisition Strategies - to buy or not to buy nature reserves!
- Evidence of the ecological and economic benefits of 'larger' biodiversity areas - including facts and figures.
- Advice/support on marketing and fundraising issues - including industries, government membership, sponsorship, profile/image.
- Veteran trees - guidelines for foresters on managing deadwood/saproxyllic species.

**Relevant conservation and rural issues noted:**

- Rural communities suspicious of formal projects / advice - former collectivism
- People sick of words and suspicious of new initiatives/incentives - 'empty drumming'
- Aging rural pop. Apathy of older generation - legacy of soviet regime
- Low standard of living - environmental issues are not a high priority
- Many people gone back to farming small plots
- Large expanses of abandoned agricultural land / collective farms. Problems - loss of traditional grassland habitats / rural traditions. Also opportunities for encouraging sensitive management or even land acquisition where necessary.
- No extensive use of fencing
- Mainly dairy cattle - no herds, individually tethered. Some horses. Lack of appropriate grazing stock (ie. beef cattle) - never saw any sheep!
- Cattle only have 7 months grazing because of climate
- Potential threat from future western farmers? - but land very fragmented ownership. Also changes from EU membership / CAP
- Rural communities / villages - no gentrification / commuters / retirement
- Woodlands - no ride management. High forest structures, but remarkably good ground flora. More mature trees (esp. veteran oaks) than expected
- Forestry currently a real threat - insensitive management of 'natural' stands and considerable encroachment onto other semi-natural habitats.
- Lithuanian Fund for Nature - small NGO and thinly spread. Greatly under resourced and tending to be funding / project-led.
- Excellent ecologists within organisations (ie. Darius and Arunus) but lack of support and management / implementation infra-structure.

**Zuvintas**

- Strict nature reserve - no intervention
- Strong influence from academics / scientists prevails
- Attempt to maintain a natural system in an unnatural environment
- Problems of lack of management - excessive succession, water pollution, predators - leading to declines in key habitats and species.
- Limited intervention would be more appropriate and greater input from those with practical management knowledge and experience.
- Wonderful surrounding meadows outside nature reserve - rank and with scrub encroachment - habitat loss and species change - aquatic warblers. Enormous potential to utilise local farmers / community to cut or farm - this would sustainability maintain the habitat, rural traditions and create valuable local employment

#### **Community work already done by Arunas**

- Leaflets and press releases asking for information on pond turtle sites
- Superb education centre
- Work with schools/ follow-up

#### **UNDP – UN Development Programme**

- Funded by the global env facility (Turkey, Poland & Lithuania)
- Environmental projects with strong community factor
- 50% funding for projects, 25% in kind, 25% money from any other source
- 1-3 years with a very quick turn-around (2-3 months)
- Only NGO's, but can collaborate with govt orgs
- VAT money back to NGO's for capacity building
- 3 focus areas:
  - i. Biodiversity for protection
  - ii. Internal waters/pollution prevention
  - iii. Climate change

#### **Management planning seminar**

Toolkit – possibly to be adopted as national guidelines. Lithuanian Fund for Nature (Darius) has produced a booklet.

My talk outlined broad recommended structure. Makes clear management policy, the managers role and the resources/ work required. Key principals to follow:-

- i. Continuity
- ii. Review
- iii. Consultation/ consensus
- iv. Flexibility
- v. Keep it simple

#### **Management Plan for Pond Terrapins**

Arunas has completed the plan for this species, using the toolkit format and ideas established in the first workshop. It should, however, be possible to further develop the plan and make possible amendments over the course of the project.

#### **Meeting with G. Jodinkas, Senior Specialist – Min. Of Env:**

- Lithuania has a Biodiversity Action Plan (1998), but no real mechanism for implementation. Now up for renewal.
- Inadequate resources (people and funding) to implement plan.
- EU membership will be a double-edged sword – beneficial grants and legislation, but more intensive agriculture.
- Good working relationship with NGO's and regional parks. However, municipality authorities are not particularly progressive or amenable.

**Challenges**

- Maintain the landscape, culture and biodiversity, whilst raising the standard of living.
- Utilising EU membership to enhance biodiversity and not destroy countryside (ie. silage)
- Important to prioritise and establish sustainable future structures and processes for NGO's and govt organisations
- Utilising international funds such as the UNDP

**My possible future input**

- Further support in developing Man Plans – maintaining plan structures, focus, targets and key principals
- Funding/ marketing opportunities
- Access/ community initiatives

**DARWIN INITIATIVE**

**Building capacity in Wetland Bio diversity Conservation in Baltic States, Poland & Russia**

**12 Mission Report**

**-----RUSSIA-----**

Name of Expert: Dr T J Bines (EN)		Country visited: Russia
Dates of Mission: 15 April to 18 April 2002		
Purposes of Mission	See attached objectives and programme.	
Participants and other contributors	Dr Yuri Bouivolov, Dr Dmitry Katz, Dr Alexander Gorbunov, Dr Natalia Vinogradova, Dr Victor Popov, Lev Emel'yanov, Dr Nicolai Sobolov, Dr Armen Grigorian, Dr Alexey Zimenko, Jonnathan Rudge (consultant RHS Associates) and other staff of the Biodiversity Conservation Centre in Moscow.	
Main activities carried out during the Mission	1. In depth comparison of the current Russian management planning system with the Eurosite Toolkit and identification of differences. 2. Consideration of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• management planning differences and identification of way forward and publication position</li> <li>• staff training and adoption requirements.</li> <li>• development of normative document and adoption of management planning system within the Russian Federal system for National Parks and Zapovedniks following adoption of the Management Strategy for National Parks.</li> <li>• auditing and reporting requirements to assess quality, fitness for purpose, common standards, and assessment of progress in delivery.</li> <li>• Discussion with BCC about joining Eurosite.</li> <li>• Development of new projects to cover workshop findings and extend the work into effective change.</li> </ul>	
Main results accomplished	Better understanding of the Eurosite Management Planning Toolkit and the opportunities for usage. Clarification of the way forward to achieve legislative adoption at a national level.	
Recommendations to Darwin Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work at the next workshop for the Russian contingent needs to concentrate on producing clear outputs including: a. Normative documentation. b. Audit methodology.</li> </ul>	
Further work to be carried out before next workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation by BCC (Yuri Bouivolov leading) of drafts of the way forward for adoption of management planning by the Ministry of Natural Resources.</li> <li>• Consideration of auditing methodology suitable for National Parks and Zapovedniks.</li> </ul>	

-----Appendix A-----

**Brief Guide to the Logical Framework Analysis**

Logical Framework Analysis (*also known as a 'log frame' and 'project framework'*) is a planning tool specifically designed for development projects. Resembling a table (*or framework*) it aims to be a logical way of completing and presenting information about projects in a concise, logical and systematic way. A *log frame* summarises in a standard format: -

- What your project is trying to achieve
- How your project aims to do this
- The elements required to achieve success
- Ways of measuring progress
- Potential problems along the way

More information about this useful management-planning tool can be found at the following URL: -

<http://www.bond.org.uk/ite/guidancenotes/logframes1/html>

---

This information was adapted from – 'BOND – British Overseas NGO's for Development Publications: *BOND Guidance Notes Series 1: 'Beginner's Guide to Logical Framework Analysis – What is a Logical Framework?'*. BOND 2001.  
<http://www.bond.org.uk/ite/guidancenotes/logframes1/html>

---

-----Appendix B-----

**Notification of New Darwin Initiative Logo**

The Darwin Initiative logo has been updated, therefore the following information has been provided to avoid confusion when viewing Darwin Initiative documentation, on-line or otherwise. Future *EUROSITE/Darwin Initiative Workshop* reports or notices will adopt the new logo.



Old Darwin Initiative logo



New Darwin Initiative logo

-----Appendix C-----

**List of Participants**

**UK Facilitators**

**Dr. Tim Bines:** tim.bines@english-nature.org.uk  
*General Manager*, English Nature, Coldharbour Farm, Wye, TN25 5DB, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1233 812 525 Fax: +44 (0) 1233 812 520 Mobile: +44 (0) 7711 733 512

**Mr. Paul Brooks:** paul.brooks@snh.gov.uk  
*Site Manager*, Loch Leven Lab, The Pier, Kinross, KY13 8UF, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1577 864 439 Fax: +44 (0) 1577 865166

**Mr. Adrian Colston:** awnusr@smtpl.ntrust.org.uk  
*Site Manager - Wicken Fen*, The National Trust, Wicken, Ely, LB7 5XP, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1353 720 274 Fax: +44 (0) 1353 720 274

**Mr. Mike Deegan:** mdeegan@staffswt.cix.co.uk  
*Reserves Manager*, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, Courts House, Sandon Stafford, ST18 0DN, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1889 508 534 Fax: +44 (0) 1889 508 422

**Mr. Philip Eckersley:** phil.eckersley@english-nature.org.uk  
*Conservation Officer - SW Yorkshire Dales, North & East Yorkshire Team*, English Nature,  
Asquith House, Leyburn Business Park, Hamby Road, Leyburn, DL8 5QA, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1969 623 447 Direct: +44 (0) 1969 621 288 Fax: +44 (0) 1969 621 298

**Mr. ET Idle:** edward.idle@virgin.net  
*Inch Consultancy*, 19 High Street, Rippingale, Bourne, PE10 0SR, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1778 440 015, Fax: +44 (0) 1778 440 015, Mobile: +44 (0) 7979 800 498

**Mr. Ken Shaw:** ken.shaw@rspb.org.uk  
*Site Manager*, RSPB, Vane Farm Nature Reserve, Loch Leven, Kinross, KY13 8UF, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1577 862 355 Fax: +44 (0) 1577 862 013

**Dr. Mike Shepherd:** mike.shepherd@snh.gov.uk  
*Area Officer*, Scottish Natural Heritage, Battleby, Redgorton, Perth, PH1 3EW, UK  
Work: +44 (0) 1738 444 1 777

### Russian Participants

**Mr. Yuri Bouivolov:** bouivolov@bcc.seu.ru  
Chief Specialist, Biodiversity Conservation Ctr, Vavilova St., 41-2, Moscow, RU-117312, Russia  
Work: +70 952 450 22 Fax: +70 951 247 178

**Mr. Alexander Gorbunov:** abnr@astranet.ru  
Astrakhanskiy Biosphere Reserve, Naberezhnaya Reki Tsarev, 119 Astrakhan, 414021, Russia  
Work: +78 512 301 791 Fax: +78 512 301 764

**Mr. Dmitry Katz:** dkatz@vologda.ru  
Russian North National Park, Pobeda av. 37, Vologda, Russia, RU -160001  
Work: +78 172 725 241 Fax: +78 172 725 241

### Latvian participants

**Mr. Ivars Kabucis:** kabucis@lanet.lv  
Latvian Fund for Nature, Kronvalda bulvaris 4, Riga, LV-1010, Latvia  
Work: +37 173 228 52 Fax: +37 178 202 91 Mobile: +37 194 353 03

**Mr. Janis Kuze:** janis@kemeru.apollo.lv  
Kemeru National Park, Meza Maja, Kemeru Jurmala, Latvia, LV-2012  
Work: +37 177 653 86

**Mr. Valdimarts Slaukstins:** vslaukstins@wwf.org.lv or valdimarts@e-apollo.lv  
WWF Latvia, Elizabetes Str. 8-4, Riga, Latvia, LV-1010  
Work: +37 175 056 40 Fax +37 175 056 51

### Estonian Participants

**Ms. Marika Kose:** marika.kose@mail.ee  
LIFE project co-ordinator, Estonian Ornithological Society, Häädemeeste, Pärnu mnt. 40 8600,  
Häädemeeste Pämumaa  
Work: +372 (0) 44 65 228

**Mr. Veljo Volke:** veljo.volke@hotmail.ee or veljovolke@mail.ee  
Vahtra, 93813 Kuessaare, Estonia  
Work: +327 453 9451 Fax: +327 453 9451 (active from Jan 2003) Mobile: +327 561 750 88

**Polish Participants**

**Mr. Pawel Pawlaczyk:** pawpawla@poczta.onet.pl  
Lubusian Naturalists Club, Lesnikow 2c/5, Drawno, PL - 73 – 220, Poland  
Work: +48 957 682 119 Fax: +48 600 482 119

**Mr. Igor Szakowski:** szakow@sus.univ.szczecin.pl  
Secretary to the Board, EUCC Poland, Felczaka 3A St. Szczecin, PL - 71 – 412, Poland  
Work: +48 942 108 20 Fax: +48 914 210 820

**Lithuanian Participants**

**Mr. Arunas Pranaitas:** zuvintas@alytus.omnitel.net  
Zuvintas Biosphere Reserve, Aleknoniai, Simno Past, 4583 Alytus Distr. Lithuania

**Mr. Darius Stoncius:** darius.s@glis.lt  
Manager, Lithuanian Fund for Nature, Klaipedos 5-16, Vilnius, LT – 2001, Lithuania  
Work: +370 262 5152 Fax: +370 262 5152

**EUROSITE Representatives (Netherlands)**

**Mrs. Nicole Nowicki:** nnowicki@eurosite-nature.org  
**Mr. Matyas Prommer:** mprommer@eurosite-nature.org  
Postbus 1366 – 5004 BJ, Tilburg, The Netherlands  
Work: +31 (0) 13 467 86 38



---

WHITMORE, G. 2002 gwhitmore@eurosite-nature.org

**EUROSITE**