

CENTRALPARKS

Final Conference - 23rd - 24th March 2022

*Transnational cooperation for the sustainable
future of the Carpathian region*

*Round Table: “The significance of Protected Area Networks
for effective protected area management and nature-based
sustainable development in the Carpathians and beyond”*

FOLLOW UP

24 March 2022, 10:45 - 12:45

**eurac
research**



The round table was organized to explore the opportunities of transnational cooperation and networking for an effective protected areas' management beyond borders. Through this session, the networks of protected areas were invited to exchange information on their modus operandi, as well as to inspire each other by sharing information on activities and cooperation experiences in order to maximize their potential, initiate joint activities and closer cooperation.

In the discussion took part Mr. Mircea VERGHELET representing Carpathian Network of Protected Areas, Mr. Guido PLASSMANN representing the Alpine Network of Protected Areas, Mr. Georg FRANK representing DANUBEPARKS, Ms. Vladana VOJINOVIĆ representing the Parks Dinarides and Mr. Ján KADLEČÍK representing the Carpathian Wetland Initiative.

Within this session five topic crucial for PA Networks were discussed: Governance, Communication, Cooperation, Strengths and Weaknesses/good and bad practices sharing and Partnership. The summary of the deliberations is provided within the below table.

The round table was co-organized and moderated by Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention and the Eurac Research.

In addition to the panellist interventions, Mr Henk Zingstra, Eurosite, was invited to briefly present Eurosite - network of natural site managers bringing together non-governmental as well as governmental organisations, and individuals – under the discussion on Partnerships. Mr. Zingstra underlined that Eurosite's main mission to share ideas and good practices on subjects that are of interest to its members through its thematic working groups. Mr. Zingstra informed about the key webinars, workshops and activities planned for 2022 and finally mentioned about the various management support toolkit principles. Mr. Zingstra invited the networks of protected area for cooperation with Eurosite. More information about Eurosite is available on its [website](#).

Summary of the round table discussion

	CNPA	ALPARC	DANUBEPARKS	Parks Dinarides	CWI
<p>Governance – What is the governance model of your network?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. establishing 2. institutional structure 3. type of organization /legal status 4. number of staff 5. number of members 6. funding 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established in 2006 within the Carpathian Convention 2. CNPA Steering Committee (1 member per country-7); and CNPA Unit in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention 3. No legal personality 4. No staff, on voluntary basis 5. 105 6. Project based 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Founded in 1995 within the Alpine Convention 2. Operational Unit of ALPARC (2 active offices); ALPARC Board - executive body responsible for the administration and financial management of the ALPARC coordination unit; ALPARC Council – consisting of Alpine Protected Areas managers; and the Scientific Council. 3. status of an association since 2013 4. 3 employees 5. 50 Members representing 60 protected areas 6. Funds from France & Germany; funding from project and membership fee (based on the member's financial availability -three categories, up to 1500 euro/year) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established in 2014 2. Management Board, 2 active offices; employees (3Nos) 3. status of an association since 2014 4. 3 employees 5. 18 Members 6. Fixed membership fees + funds from projects 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established in 2014 2. Active office in Podgorica; Steering Committee (8 members); General Assembly (56 members) 3. association since 2014 4. 6 employees 5. 95 Members from 8 countries 6. Funding from projects + fixed membership fees/ 500 Euro per year 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established in 2004 within the Carpathian Convention 2. coordinated by the State Nature Conservancy of the SR; CWI Board consisting of representatives of relevant ministries 3. Regional cooperation network/initiative with no legal status 4. No staff; part time coordinator 5. - 6. Voluntary contributions

<p>Communication What makes communication within your network and communication with outside partners particularly effective?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CNPA website under reconstruction; - CNPA activities communicated to PAs through steering committee, - Sharing information via Carpathian Convention (COPS, Implementation Committee meetings, WG Biodiversity); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Giving great emphasis on effective communication especially with its internal partners in the ministries, institutions and its employees; - ALPARC Website (five languages)- main communication tool; - Annual activity report (4 Alpine languages) is the most comprehensive means of communication; - Communication consistency is key for success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linguistic & cultural diversity played important role in unifying Danubeparks; - currently communication only in English; - Well connected on a personal level to members, stakeholders and partners; - Need for focal point for informal communication in every network for continued cooperation. - In 2015 Danubeparks won the Natura 2000 award for the outstanding achievements for cross-border networking and cooperation for Natura 2000 – communication was key 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Challenges of effective communication in a large network; - language barriers; Communication via mailing lists, newsletters, social networks, blog and website); - Annual conference to bring networks together to share experiences, common interests and discuss issues and ideas relating to a specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communication in English only via website; - email exchange; Annual reports in cooperation with other partners; - promoting global and European meetings of the parties; thematic international conferences; - CNPA meetings
<p>Cooperation Why do protected areas cooperate within your network – what are the main benefits for them?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common platform; - knowledge exchange, - webinars, trainings; - coordination and media involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematic cooperation is key to all networks for making a difference; - Joint Common activities or events (Youth at the Top event) benefit all necessary to solve common issues (e.g. connectivity); - cooperation with Danubeparks and CNPA is relevant for future common activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identifying essential qualities that define networks brings added value to all networks; - additional funding resources required for bigger initiatives; - need for focal contact point to facilitate cooperation between the networks; - strategic initiatives are needed to voice the needs/ideas on policy level; - existing MoC between ALPARC and CNPA schude support common projects; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange of information on activities/events withing the PAs; - the network offers a successful grant program for protected supporting micro project implemented directly by PAs (e.g. for improving cooperation with local communities); - Cooperation with Danubeparks and CNPA is desirable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation MoC between Ramsar and Carpathian Convention; - shares information, best practices, build capacities and commitment in the organization of training activities, workshops and seminars and creation of technical docs to that effect

<p>Strengths and weakness What are the main strengths and the main weaknesses of your network (including best experiences, projects, activities)</p>	<p>Weakness – Lack of permanent staff of the network; project implementation difficult (non-EU countries, lack of EU programmes covering the whole region); financial constraints; language barriers</p> <p>Strengths – MoC with ALPARC and Danubeparks, good cooperation with partners WWF, Carpathian Convention; Support from various CC Ministries & personal connections</p>	<p>Strengths – Financial stability – Switzerland 5-year contract; personal connections and interaction with partners</p> <p>Weakness- Different goals on national level; financial contribution limited from donor countries, only project based; financial constraints for routine activities of the network; Alpine countries hardly finance ALPARC initiatives</p> <p>Suggestion- Two pillars of strength of every network are personal connection and interaction</p>	<p>Strengths – Key players; excellent partners cross sectors; very committed and achieves concrete results</p> <p>Weakness – lacks political support that a convention can provide; reduced budgets; Less contacts on management level: specialists and rangers</p>	<p>Strengths – Huge network, which is closely connected</p> <p>Weakness– lacks support of a convention; language barriers</p>	<p>Strengths – Good contacts with the secretariats of Carpathian & Ramsar Convention; Governments & intergovernmental organizations; financial support from Czech, Hungary & Slovakia; close interaction with various working groups</p> <p>Weakness – Lack of capacities for coordination and organization of events; lack of legal status</p>
<p>Partnerships In which areas and projects would you like to partner with the CNPA or other networks?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing MoC between CNPA, ALPARC and Danubeparks, especially relevant for fostering ecological connectivity; - Ongoing cooperation with ALPARC on educational project 'Youth at the Top;' - Former cooperation with ALPARC on projects related to forest management, Natura 2000, large carnivore management, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Regional Platform – ALPARC CENTR'ALPS' (to adapt their approach to the local context, guaranteed concrete work on the ground, fostered local initiatives and created a closer proximity with protected areas managers); - the platform provided opportunities for smaller protected areas and local managers of biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal for establishing a single contact point for informal communication among networks. - MoC between CNPA, ALPARC and Danubepark, asks for identifying joint best-practice actions to improve ecological connectivity. - projects such as the Danube free sky, 	<p>Proposed MoC among networks or a joint umbrella document as a guide for fruitful exchange of experiences and practices among networks.</p>	<p>MoC between Ramsar & CC Convention. Closely works with CNPA (facilitation of effective cooperation between the environmental, water management & other relevant sectors; development and reinforcement of the capacities in areas involving wetland</p>

	<p>expressing the will for further cooperation.</p> <p>- Despite the difficulties in engaging all CC countries in the EU funding programmes, CNPA is eager to cooperate with other networks on a joint Interreg project</p>	<p>and natural sites to get involved in the ALPARC network.</p>	<p>DanubeparksConnected and Wildisland were briefly presented.</p>		<p>management, especially of sites of international importance and capacities in raising public awareness on the role of wetland services; organization of information campaigns, education and training activities</p>