

Scope



- Objective critical NGO assessment, looking into details
- Analyzed countries and regions

Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Nord-Rhein-Westphalia, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Wallonia

7 Questions on management

Conservation objectives on site/ national level

- most Member States: no detailed, sitespecific objectives
- Generic objectives are the norm
 "maintenance of a favourable conservation
 status of species and habitat of community
 interest and restoration in case of
 inappropriate conservation status"

Conservation objectives on site/ national level

- some forerunners: FR, SW (in the framework of MPs), Salzburg and Lower Austria, Nord- Rhein-Westphalia
- on the way: the Netherlands (estimates on the national level), Finland (regional priorities)
- national level conservation objectives: no country (exc:Netherlands)

Implementing institutions

- confusing variety of bodies responsible environmental, fisheries, forestry authorities, agencies, Local governments and municipalities, associations, NGOs, consultancies, individual farmers, land owners
- in many countries it is unclear who is responsible, or multiple bodies responsible
- low human and financial resources
- many Natura 2000 sites across Europe are left unmanaged

Implementing institutions

- Austria: 110 of 218 Natura 2000 sites have managing staff
- The number of managed sites depends on the Bundesland: In Carinthia only one of 13 sites has an appropriate site management, whereas in Styria 36 of 41 have a coordinating managing team.

Management measures



Coverage of sites with management plans: between
 0-95%

country	2011	2013
SW	100	100
FR	52	100
AUT	60	70
PL	0	50
EE	20	40
IE	10	10
PT	<5	na

Quality of management instruments



- <u>Austria</u>: minimal standards since 2002, still management plans vary widely in quality and are often vague in the formulation of conservation objectives and measures.
- <u>Cyprus:</u> MPs only contain prohibitions of HD or national legislation. No site-specific objectives or measures
- <u>Poland:</u> forestry N2K measures: in many cases not different from the "normal" forest management measures. +: also applied in forests outside Natura 2000

Management measures 🏄



- Approximately two-third of the analyzed countries have a legal obligation to draw up management plans, in the rest this is voluntary.
- Most widely used: MP + contracts
- management measures implemented:
 no answer or 0% (except one country)

Overall conclusions



- huge differences between MS
- Some old MS very much behind
- New MS made good progress in short time
- pressure to satisfy EC obligations and show up nicely in reports: some choose to make it "quick and dirty"
- Investing the time and resources pays off better

Some recommendations ***

- Generic conservation objectives and measures should not be acknowledged for SAC designation
- No management planning without clear site-specific conservation objectives
- Set realistic deadline to complete conservation objectives
- Huge delays in case of old MS should not be tolerated any longer
- Set national level conservation objectives
- Apply common obligatory standards for management planning
- Invest in high quality management plans to avoid difficulties of implementation and verification in the future
- Set up a clear legal framework to define management responsibilities
- Increase significantly the financial and human resources for %2000 site management

To be continued...



- monitoring and control measures,
- funding of management,
- public participation in management planning

Final publication: November 2011

Thank you for your attention!

Sarolta Tripolszky
European Environmental Bureau
Bureau Européen de l'Environnement

Boulevard de Waterloo B- 1000 Brussels Belgium

Tel: + 32 2 289 10 90 Fax: + 32 2 289 10 99

E-mail: sarolta.tripolszky@eeb.org

Site Web: www.eeb.org

An international non-profit association

