

Le réseau des organismes pour la gestion du patrimoine naturel européen
The network of organisations managing Europe's natural heritage
14 to 18 November 2001

Workshop 1: Working together Central & Eastern Europe

***Building Capacity in Wetlands Biodiversity Conservation
in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland & Russia***
Darwin Project reference: 162/10/008

Contents

Section 1: Account of the workshop

1. Introduction
 2. Workshop aims
 3. What happened?
 - 3.1 Participants expectations & Questions
 - 3.2 Presentations from Target Countries
 - 3.3 Common Management/ Management Planning Issues
 - 3.4 Partnerships established
 4. Action Planning
 5. Summary of Lessons learned
 6. Next steps
- Acknowledgements

Section 2: Country draft Action Plans (sent also as a Word document)

- Estonia
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Poland
- Russia

Annexes

- Financial report (only for DEFRA)
- Summary of evaluation forms received
- Profiles of participants (CV, emails, photos). Sent in .pdf to all participants
- Preliminary list of resources (to be added to per workshop)

Report of Workshop 1: Working Together

Location: RSPB Vane Farm Nature Reserve, Scotland, UK

Loch Leven National Nature Reserve, Scotland, UK

Dates: 14 to 18 November 2001

Participants: 22 people participated from 7 countries. See participant profiles in annex

Hosted by: RSPB, Scottish Natural Heritage

1. Introduction

The *Eurosite*/ Darwin project to help key individuals from Poland, Russia and the Baltic States, to improve understanding and practical skills in the management of wetland habitats is led by a consortium of leading UK conservation organisations, ie the National Trust, RSPB, Scottish Natural Heritage, English Nature and the Wildlife Trusts under the *Eurosite* umbrella.

This is an account of the first workshop in the project

2. Workshop aims

1. To ensure that everyone involved in this Darwin project understands it and feels part of it
2. To allow everyone to understand the different country contexts in terms of nature management and management planning
3. To identify the participants' expectations of the workshop and the project
4. To help participants identify and clarify the action needed for their own country or natural site and define what can be achieved through this Darwin project
5. To partner members of the UK project team with their Central & Eastern European counterparts and to begin working together on identified actions in the target countries
6. To identify what participants have learned initially

3. What happened?

Project participants are welcomed by the Project leader. There follows a short session where participants are asked to spend 5 minutes talking to their partner and then to present their colleagues to the rest of the group. An introduction to the project, the *Eurosite* network and a short introduction to the Natura 2000 network follows.

Participants visit the Vane Farm Nature Reserve and Loch Leven National Nature Reserve and question the site managers about management.

The broad principles of the management planning process and the *Eurosite* management planning toolkit are introduced to participants followed by a session where they discuss the following questions in country groups (including the UK). See Action plan section.

- What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?
- What must be included within a useful Management Plan?
- Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?
- How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

The rest of the time at the workshop is spent describing and defining action plans for management planning per country in group sessions and in plenary. The final morning is also spent on a review of the workshop, what will happen next and an evaluation of the effectiveness of this workshop (see annex for summary).

3.1 Participants expectations & Questions

Participants are asked to write down 5 expectations/questions they have about the workshop. Common expectations are collected, followed by a short discussion to clarify expectations. A question box is made available for further questions throughout the workshop.

Participants expectations & Questions Participants expectations & Questions Participants expectations & Questions

- To establish a long-term communication between partners
- To get a better understanding of other countries situations
- To identify the essential/ obligatory elements of a management plan.
- To expect a 2-way exchange of experience and knowledge.
- To compare problems and find solutions.
- To identify the advantages and disadvantages of a participatory approach.
- To learn how to involve and activate local landowners.
- How to get positive results for site managers?
- To find good examples To find good examples
- To get new knowledge and experience of habitat management.
- To find examples of situations where there is a conflict between managers and other interests.
- To find information about the causes and destruction of nature.
- To find information on methodologies for site selection and identifying values•
Expect information about funding schemes and organisations Expect information
about funding schemes and organisations Expect information about funding schemes
and organisations Expect information about funding schemes and organisations
- How to set up partnerships?
- To plan project trips for 2002.
- To get information about restoration techniques.
- To learn how to identify appropriate restoration areas.
- What are the barriers to management planning?
- Monitoring and evaluation.
- To gain reassurance for management planning.
- To learn about planning as a process.
- To learn to manage expectations - be realistic!
- To see Scottish landscapes.
- To enjoy!

3.2 Presentations from Target Countries

Participants from target countries were asked to give a succinct 10 minute presentation on the nature conservation situation in their country, with the aim of giving all the project participants a broad understanding of each country's context. This would be matched with participant's expectations and therefore inform the workshop programme and the project itself. Issues common to all countries are established. Specific country issues are included in the Action Plan section.

3.3 Common Management/ Management Planning Issues

- Lack of real management
- Legislation - good coverage, but not implemented effectively
- Management is problematic as a result of many factors including no interest.

Knowledge

- Conflicts/ Opportunities
- eg Large Carnivores
- Conflicts with interest groups/ land users such as hunters, farmers, loggers, industry and all types of owners
- budgets/finances
- Organisation problems
- 'Weak' or disenfranchised NGOs
- Good level of commitment
- Enthusiasm for biodiversity conservation
- Having a greater impact that power/ size would imply (punching above weight)

3.4 Partnerships established

- Estonian Fund for Nature -:- Scottish Natural Heritage •
- Latvian Fund/ Kemeru National Park -:- The National Trust •
- Lithuanian Fund for Nature/ -:- The Wildlife Trusts •Metelai National Park
- EUCC Poland/ Lubusian Naturalist Club -:- RSPB •
- Russian North National Park/ -:- English Nature •Astrakan Biosphere Reserve/Biodiversity Conservation Centre.

4. Action Planning

Draft Action plans have been produced per country based on what happened at the workshop.

They are intended to be a resource for further development and do not claim to be definitive or 100% accurate. See section 2. Copies have been supplied to all participants as an editable Word document.

5. Summary of Lessons learned

At several points during the workshop, participants were invited to tell the group what they had learned during the day. A summary was produced and added to as we went along. Below is a list of all of the lessons learned. Several were stated more than once.

1. The introduction to the workshop and the presentations about each country were very helpful
2. There are striking similarities between countries and organisations
3. Legislation is different in each country
4. A high percentage of Russia is designated as Protected Areas
5. The realisation that stakeholders are important
6. It is important to find the appropriate way of involving stakeholders in management planning, eg a one-to-one discussion over the kitchen table can be very effective.
7. There are many educational opportunities at an intensively managed nature reserve (*refers to Vane Farm whilst not a large reserve, it is the RSPB's largest reserve based educational resource*)
8. There are opportunities to use volunteers effectively
9. The importance of management plans

10. There can be a financial profit from sustainable nature conservation management (*refers to the RSPB's low intensive use of Barley cropping to benefit seed eating birds in the winter*)
11. Conflict resolution
12. Group ownership of management plans can be achieved
13. Cultural ideology is different, eg. in Russia democracy is not a tradition and therefore the stakeholder involvement approach to management planning faces problems here
14. Inspiration from nature recreation projects
15. Involvement of the local community
16. Thinking globally and making things work locally
17. Keeping things simple
18. Opportunities for restoration
19. Learning together as a group
20. The *Eurosite* management planning Toolkit will be useful in Russia. (*There are plans to translate it into Russian*)
21. There are many possibilities to revise our ideas about management planning
22. There is a joint concern about loss of habitats in all countries
23. Participants in the Darwin project can work together to produce good results
24. The importance of personal relationships in a group situation - individuals matter
25. Learnt about cultural differences
26. An improved understanding about the Government and NGO situation in Poland
27. There should be a flexibility with management plan formats. They should be suited to the situation
28. Practice is a very good way of learning as opposed to learning facts (*learning by doing*)
29. The problems with management planning processes are common between countries
30. The scale of natural sites between participating countries (size) is different
31. It is important to consider the value of using natural processes instead of management intervention
32. There are not enough women in the group (not a lesson!) (this is very unusual for a *Eurosite* workshop)
33. We can change things - even with small numbers of people
34. The land ownership situation is different in the participating countries

6. Next steps

- UK partners will visit their counterparts for a stay of about 3 to 4 days to help facilitate the development of the action plans. This will take place between March and May 2002. Detailed plans will be made between partners.
- Work will begin on the identification of a reference of existing resources and materials for participants. During the workshop it was indicated from Latvian and Russian participants that they wish to translate the *Eurosite* Management Planning Toolkit into their own languages.
- The second workshop will be held from 12 to 16 June 2002 at Wicken Fen National Nature Reserve (UK) and hosted by the National Trust, with the aim of presenting lessons learnt from the first workshop and country visits.

- *Eurosite* is involved in a project funded by the Government of the Netherlands to assist the process of SPA Establishment in Estonia. Part of this project involves setting up a demonstration management plan on a particular site (as yet not defined). It is suggested that this Darwin project and the Dutch project use the same site if possible to make the most of scarce resources. This is acceptable to the Estonian participants.

Acknowledgements

During the workshop, an incredible amount of ground was covered in a very short time. This would not have been possible without everyone's spirit, enthusiasm and willingness to participate. So, the biggest acknowledgement is to everyone who was there. Of at least equal importance were the organisational skills of Ken Shaw and his RSPB team at Vane Farm and Paul Brooks and the local staff of Scottish Natural Heritage.

Thanks are also due to the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for funding the project and the participants' own organisations for contributing staff time in kind.

Estonia

Background

The principle piece of legislation is the *Act on Protected Nature Objects (1994)*. There is also a regulation on what should be included in a management plan (Decree on Management Plan Compilation Order (1998)).

There is a land management support scheme (19 million EEK). Some important externally funded projects are listed below.

- Life project: Boreal-Baltic coastal meadows preservation
- Life project: Recovery of *Mustela lutreola* in Estonia : captive and island populations
- Life project: Restoration and management of the Häädemeeste wetland complex

More information on Life projects from:

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/life/nature/databas.htm>:

- DANCEE: Implementation of the Natura 2000 network in Estonia in regard to freshwater species and habitats
- Matra Initiative (Netherlands): Establishment of a network of SPAs in Estonia.

The management planning process in Estonia

In Estonia, there is a management planning commission, which is chaired by the Ministry of the Environment. This body recommends & approves plans for protected areas. Final approval is by the Minister of the Environment.

1. Resources programme and budget proposed to Commission
2. Confirmation of resources programme and budget given
3. Management plan is further detailed
4. Revised plan is returned to Commission
5. Management plan confirmed
6. Management plan published
7. Management plan implemented

Several management plans have been prepared with several in preparation, including action plans for certain species e.g. European Mink, Grey Seal and large carnivores (Wolf, Lynx, Bear)

Management planning Protected Areas in Estonia

Existing

Lahemaa National Park
Matsalu wetland
Alam-Pedja Nature Reserve
Käina bay landscape reserve
Karula National Park
Soomaa National Park

In preparation

Otepää landscape reserve
Pangodi landscape reserve
Muraka Nature Reserve
Vilsandi National Park
Haanja Nature Park
Viidumäe Nature Reserve

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

- To set out why the area has been protected, what its values are and the negative and positive factors
- To identify how these values should be protected and managed
- To show what must be realistically done
- To identify priorities

- Management plans are not used as legislative tools, but used as agreements between people

What must be included within a useful Management Plan?

- A statement of the purposes of protection and why the area has been identified
- A spatial analysis of conservation values using a Geographic Information System (GIS)
- An analysis of positive and negative impacts on the important values
- A realistic action plan
- Priorities of actions and a realistic timetable
- An evaluation of the approximate costs
- A list of the organisations and key players in implementation

Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?

- The manager of the Protected Area
- The Ministry of Environment
- Local People and landowners
- Scientists and experts
- The process must be opened for all interested groups and people

How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

- By understanding the site in its National and International context

Draft Action Plan: Estonia

Action during the Darwin project will concentrate on the Emajogi Suursoo Mire area. The aim is to resolve problems within the area. However, there are 2 other possibilities for sites as below:

Site name	Size	Land ownership	Comments
Koiva mustjoga river basin	1500	Complicated	Stakeholder conflicts?
Siiksaare- Oessaare Iahed	3000	Not complicated	
Emajogi Suursoo Mire	20000	A large, nationally and internationally important wetland complex in the South East of Estonia, recognised as a Ramsar site and IBA of about. The site is a State-owned forestry area. There is a high level of logging and not much information about the effects on important features. Special species include White-tailed Eagle and Bear.	

Issues

- Recreation pressures
- Hunting and Fishing
- Lack of management of floodplain areas
- Lack of resources
- Monitoring to get information
- Eutrophication
- Lack of information on the effects of logging on priority species
- Lack of information on the effects of hunting on priority species (both are potential sources of conflict)
- What is the optimum level for these and other activities?
- What techniques can be used?

- What financial support needs to be used?

Aims

1. To conserve wetland habitats and species
2. To maintain traditional land use and cultural heritage through sustainable management
3. To develop environmental education

Objectives/ identified Actions

1. To conserve wetland habitats and species
 - 1.1. Conservation of wetland complex
 - 1.2. Maintenance of wetland habitats
 - 1.3. Maintenance of forest areas
 - 1.4. Management of semi-natural habitats
 - 1.5. Maintenance of important bird species
 - 1.6. Proper management of large carnivores
2. To maintain traditional land use through sustainable management
 - 2.1. To maintain traditional land-use
 - 2.2. To maintain cultural heritage
 - 2.3. To preserve natural resources
3. To develop environmental education
 - 3.1. To demonstrate sustainable management and restoration of the floodplains
 - 3.2. To provide access and interpretation facilities

Suggestions from the group

- Consider undertaking a sociological analysis of why people are leaving the area.
- What are the (sustainable) economic opportunities for the natural area, such as game hunting? This could encourage people to stay.
- Local people's knowledge is important. How can this information be captured and used especially if they are leaving the area?
- Integrate habitat and species conservation. Connect species management to habitats. Using a species as a focus for a conservation message can be very effective
- Consider what would happen if nothing was done in the area.

Latvia

Background

A good base of legislation which is now mirroring the EU system. However, implementation is lacking because of a number of reasons including lack of manpower, resources and skills.

Life Nature Projects

- Protection and management of two Important Bird Areas of Latvia
- Measures to ensure the nature conservation management of Teici Area
- Implementation of management plan for Lake Engure Nature Park

More information on Life projects from:

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/life/nature/databas.htm>:

The management planning situation in Latvia

National issues

1. Lack of historical information about site management - no records
2. Storage of information
3. Lack of publications giving guidance about management planning and wildlife
4. Scientific background missing
5. Lack of involvement of local communities in site management
6. Integrated approach needed

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

1. As a statement of Vision and Policy
2. As a description of important features
3. To identify problems & solutions

What must be included within a useful Management Plan

- Activities with costs
- Source of financing
- Monitoring and indicators of success

Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?

- Whoever implements the plan
- Landowners
- Experts on biodiversity
- Local authorities and other responsible authorities
- Stakeholders in the territory and its surroundings

How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

Firstly consult the national strategy because it defines the goals which need to be reached.

Identify what the interests of the local people are. This is of great importance.

Set the management plan within its broader context - what other plans are there?

Draft Action Plan: Latvia

Participants will concentrate on the preparation of a management plan for an area where preparation of a plan has just begun.

Name of site: Adazi Military training site

Description: This is a coastal military site. There are clean, mesotrophic lakes, vast areas of wetland and dry heaths. The area is rather small. The most important area is concerned with hydrology

Vision: Strong wildlife living alongside military activities

Issues

- Overgrowing of open areas
- Recreational activities along the smaller more valuable lake causing damage to woodland and plant communities of national and European importance, ie species included in the Birds and Habitats Directives.
- Military use is going to continue on the site. How can this be integrated with the natural interests?

Objectives

- To maintain xx hectares of heathland in its current state
- To restore xx hectares of heathland to its former state
- To protect xx hectares of important forest stands
- To restore the hydrological regime of mires
- To optimise recreational pressures around lake (achieve a situation where recreation pressure is at optimum levels).
- To maintain populations of key species *Arenaria stenophylla*, *Gypsophoila fastigata* and *Bufo calamita* in xx ha on the site
- To control hunting
- To monitor populations of species, flagship species and rare habitats/ communities

Suggestions:

- In the UK, there has been success in integrating military activities with conservation management. The UK Ministry of Defence quite keen to demonstrate that they are happy to co-operate in conservation management
- The EU Water Framework Directive may be helpful with the hydrological issues.
- Should objectives set a specific target of the number of hectares or not? There are benefits and advantages of both approaches

Lithuania

Background

Principle nature conservation organisations in Lithuania

- Ministry of Environment
- Nature Conservation department
- 8 Regional Departments (will be reforming with above to form nature conservation agency in early 2002)
- Department of Forests and Protected Areas
- Environment Protection Agencies
- Administrations of Protected Areas
- Municipalities (44) - each has a conservation expert
- Lithuanian Fund for Nature
- Birdlife partner

Main Nature Conservation Legislation

The Law on Environment Protection (1993, 1996)

The Law on Protected Areas (1993, 1995)

The Law on Protected Plant, Animal and Fungi Species and Communities (1997)

Special Provisions on Land & Forest Use (1992, 1997)

The Law on Forests (1995, 2001)

Protected Areas of Lithuania

National Parks 20%

Municipal managed reserves 2%

Regional Parks 55%

Managed Reserves 20%

Strict Nature Reserves 3%

International obligations

- Convention on Biological Diversity
- Ramsar Convention
- Bern Convention
- CITES Convention

Factors hindering nature management activities

- Conservativeness
- Lack of knowledge and experience
- Lack of resources
- Resistance to active management
- Lots of owners causes problems in agreeing management

Key national issues

- Low standard of living
- Intensive Forest use
- Declining agricultural sector

- 'Suitcase' atmosphere
- Lack of knowledge and experience

- Decreasing levels of funding and increasing requirements

Management Planning

Management plans - Nemunas Delta developed with EUCC and Lithuanian Fund

Natura 2000

Active through Dutch Government and DANCEE (Danish Government) funded projects

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

- To protect identified elements of the site
- To inform and involve society
- To use limited resources effectively
- To get additional resources

What must be included within a useful Management Plan?

- General information - present and past status
- Evaluation
- Objectives and priorities
- Action plan
- Summary
- Approval
- Reliable sources of necessary data and information

Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?

- Stakeholders
- Active NGOs
- Administrative institutions
- Good planning team

How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

- Look at priorities
- Analyse information

Draft Action Plan: Lithuania

Action: Preparation of a species management action plan for a special species within one site

Name of site: ??

Description: Mosaic wetland area and hills with forests important for pond turtle. The plan is to increase the numbers of this rare and important species. A lot of habitat has been lost through drainage, so the main objective is to create new habitats of a good condition. The area is protected as a reserve.

Vision: To increase population of Pond Turtle

Objectives

- Increase population of Pond Turtle by 20% over 10 years
- Increase understanding and value of the species in the local area

Issues

- Choosing restoration areas which do not have other rare species.
- No problems with legislation
- There is enough information
- Stakeholders should be involved - lots of small landowners
- Leaflet and counts by school children have been produced already
- Do not know what local people think of plans.
- Funding has come from local municipalities

- National afforestation plan is a threat. Forests can be planted on poor soils, the implication of which is many important biodiversity areas. There is a sensitivities map in preparation showing sensitive wildlife areas.

Activities

Aim: To increase population of Pond Turtle by 20% over 10 years

<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Priority</i>	<i>Resources</i>
• Dig 20 new ponds	Company	April 2002	High	
• Remove 90% trees 5m around existing ponds -		April 2002	Medium	Job exchange
• Remove trees/ shrubs from existing and potential egg laying places	- October 2003	?	Local unemployed	
• Reduce predation of clutches from 80 to 20% Metelai Regional Park	- December 2003	?	Hunting clubs/	

Increase awareness and understanding of the value of the species in the local area

- Involve 5 schools per year in site management activities
- Establish an education programme for schools
- Prepare and deliver information for local communities
- Develop a community involvement strategy

Issues:

- How to find the balance between management and no management
- A lack of knowledge and experience
- Lack of data
- Gaps in legislation
- Stakeholders do not participate in the process
- Resources
- Problems with consensus
- Lack of interest and awareness of the stakeholders
- Approval for management plans is not clear - no clear procedure
- Management planning is a low priority for the Ministry
- A management plan is perceived as presenting new restrictions locally
- Natural site management gives rise to conflicts
- External factors

Suggestions from the group

- Reconsider priorities of activities
- Set in context of a national biodiversity strategy for pond turtle
- Consider water quality and quantity issues
- Is pond digging a sustainable activity? Would it be better to have natural features?

Poland

Background

There is a long tradition of nature protection in Poland.

Protected Areas:

- National Parks (23)
- Nature Reserves ca. 1000 (450 management plans are prepared)
- Landscape Parks ca. 100 (50 management plans are prepared). Some plans are good, some are not!
- Landscape Areas
- Nature Monuments (for species protection)

Management Planning

- There is a regulation in an Act of Law to establish management plans for National Parks
- There is about 10 years of experience in preparing plans
- Revision of the law in 2001 will lead to cancellation of all previous management plans.
- It is not allowed to take factors outside a protected area into consideration when deciding management.

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

1. As a legislative tool - determination of the land use
2. To identify and solve conflicts
3. As a basis for short term planning
4. To enthuse/ activate others to be involved in the management planning process
5. To clarify plans for the General Public

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

1. To make an analysis of the current situation within the Protected Area - natural, economic, social and possibilities for the manager

What must be included within a useful Management Plan

- Vision - Set the site in its context in Poland and Europe.
- Aims
- Strategic and Operational objectives
- Evaluation and monitoring systems.

Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?

- The people who will implement the plan
- Everyone who has knowledge about the area
- Everyone with interests in the area
- Everyone who's activity is necessary for plan implementation
- Users of the plan

How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

- Set site in Poland and European context
- Examine typical elements
- Examine missing elements
- Examine opportunities

Draft Action Plan: Poland

Action: The action is to be based on preparing a management plan for the site mentioned below.

Name of site: Czarnodin, NW Poland

Description: A grassland area of 400 ha which is of importance for birds such as Aquatic Warbler (*Acrocephalus paludicola*), Corncrake (*Crex crex*) and White-tailed Eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*)

Overall Aims:

1. To maintain and enhance the mosaic of biotypes of wet & dry grassland, swamp and other habitats. Understanding of the ecology of these habitats is good.
2. To create good conditions for populations of important European bird species such as *Crex crex*

Issues

- Lack of interest in the area from local people
- Technical difficulty in monitoring water levels

Positive factors

- NGO ownership of the area
- Support from the local authority and Governmental Agencies
- Local volunteers (from Szczecin)
- International interest and support eg from Vereniging Natuurmonumenten in the Netherlands (*and now from the UK Darwin Initiative!*)

Aims:

1. To build a hydrological model to optimise site condition
2. To improve habitat management
3. To influence local people
4. To improve environmental education
5. To promote the model of planning and management

Proposed methods to achieve aims

1. To build a hydrological model to optimise site condition

This will aim to improve a crucial problem on site, which is to control water levels. A hydrological model will be built based on the collection of historical data about the site through maps and remote sensing (GIS). A network of observation points will be built to develop the model, which will be ground- truthed to test its effectiveness.

2. To improve habitat management

A system of grazing is proposed, beginning with 50 ha at a low intensity (70 cows). Again, the effectiveness of the system will be monitored (birds and vegetation) and the management adjusted accordingly. Optimal proportions of habitats are 40% wet grassland, 30% dry grassland, 20% swamps and 10% open water.

3. To influence local people

Local people (5) will be employed to look after the grazing animals thereby improving local employment a little. Related activities are the organisation of a social event to increase understanding of the aims of management and to organise a local celebration involving NGOs. It will also be necessary to develop and promote local products such as butter or vodka.

4. To improve environmental education

School visits will be organised (about 50 per year). There will be promotion of student learning projects and birdwatching trips. The former will improve understanding of the area and the latter will provide some local income to hotels and restaurants.

5. Promote our model of planning and management

This will be done through various media including a leaflet, through collaboration with local journalists and other as yet undefined methods. Visits from Government officials will be promoted and the area may be used as an example to influence management planning elsewhere.

Suggestions from the group

- Consider restoring hydrology in a natural way (rather than using artificial means)
- Choose indicator species to measure management success
- The flowchart model for action which was presented is a useful planning tool. However, this may not be the best communication tool for stakeholders
- Match up with other initiatives in the Oder Delta
- Relate objectives to Biodiversity targets and the EU Accession process

Russia

Background

Protected Areas in Russia (*numbers*)

100 Zapovedniks

35 National Parks

30 Zakazinks

Strengths

- Lots of wilderness
- Agricultural declines
- Pesticide/ fertiliser application reduced
- Water quality improved
- Peat-mining suspended
- Cost of natural resources is low
- Number of protected areas has increased

Weaknesses

- Management planning is complicated with conflicts with local communities
- There is not a good acceptance of the use of management plans as a tool in Russia

Opportunities

- People are beginning to understand and recognise the importance of planning for management
- As the standard of living improves with economic growth, there will be a greater need to conserve nature and an increasing Governmental interest in real benefits for the population
- Most people recognise the need to coordinate nature conservation with socio-economic development and improvement of living standards

Threats

- Industry increasing
- Reform of Government bodies
- Not enough support for NGOs
- Outdoor recreation is a threat in some areas and is increasing

Management Planning

The first management plan was produced in 1997 under the WWF Orpheus project for a Zapovednik. Out of 21 Biosphere Reserves, 3 management plans have been prepared. There are now management plans for 7 National Park in Russia, 5 being produced through a GEF project and 2 through a TACIS project. There are 2 more in preparation. Management plans can only be prepared for protected areas. Management planning is complicated with conflicts with local communities and there is not a good acceptance of the use of management plans as a tool in Russia

What uses do you want to make of a Management Plan?

- To define a strategic and medium term goals
- To analyse social and economic information in the region, so that decisions can be made effectively

- To understand real and potential conflicts
- To make work more effective through identifying priorities

What must be included within a useful Management Plan?

- Information about all aspects of natural and human activity in the area
- A zoning scheme to help land use planning
- A clear programme of goals
- A business plan
- Realistic targets
- A monitoring system to assess what outputs were produced and what went wrong

Who needs to be involved in the production of the Management Plan?

- The staff of the Natural area
- Stakeholder groups (users, neighbours, landowners, statutory bodies, interest groups, regulatory bodies, funders, private sector)

How do you set a vision for a Management Plan?

- The vision involves all of the planning team
- The vision is formed through discussion
- A SWOT analysis can help (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)
- By using business games - where examples of a bad Park and a good Park encourage ideas

Draft Action plan: Russia

Action: To focus on changing the system of management planning in Russia, (rather than concentrating on one National Park)

5 point plan

1. Improve the legal status of the management plan
2. Define what should be in a management plan
3. Identification of plans
4. Development of Guidelines
5. Audit structure

National Issues:

1. Management plan status and role is not clear in Russia
2. The procedure for the approval of management plans is not clear
3. No independent analysis of eg management plan for Russian North National Park
4. Government information is very bad eg about monitoring or available resources.
5. Information is not 'real'
6. Not enough money to implement plans - just enough for survival eg Russian North National Park's annual budget is \$40,000. Required amount is 20 times as much.

Objectives/ Identified action

1. Legislation

To make the legislation in Russia more applicable

by:

1. *Undertaking a review of nature protection legislation in European countries.*
The group is requested to supply a short summary of the legislative situation in each country so that Russian participants can compare the situation with Russia and improve it.

2. Improve legal steps

Hold a workshop for high level Government with the aim of improving the conditions for management plans

2. Staff training

To hold training events on:

1. Development of management plans
2. Implementation of management plans

3. Development of management planning Guidelines

1. Translation of Eurosite toolkit into Russian

4. Other activities

Investigate the possibility of making links between countries involved in the project to help the development of management planning guidelines in Russia

Suggestions from the group

- Consider flexibility in management plans
- How can existing computer-based management planning systems be used/ adapted in Russia
- Review of legislation - Eurosite has undertaken a review (1998) of nature management in 12 Central & Eastern European countries including a review of legislation funded by the LNV Ministry of the Netherlands. This will be circulated to all participants.