

УДК 316.722:630*28:502.4:630*624

INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR PROTECTED AREAS – FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

* Michael Jungmeier and ** Bohdan Prots

* E.C.O. Institute for Ecology, Klagenfurt, Austria

** WWF Danube Carpathian Programme, Lviv, Ukraine and State Museum of Natural History, Lviv, Ukraine

Jungmeier M., Prots B. Integrated management plans for protected areas – from theory to practice.

Protected areas comprise large areas and hence touch many different stakes, interest and notably rights. Participative planning processes take a lot of resources and time, but usually come up with better results, since existing knowledge is integrated into the solution and different perspectives are considered. The degree of potential stakeholders' involvement into management planning is considered. Development of integrative management planning procedures for eight focal protected areas of Ukraine Carpathians will support more standardised planning to EU parks.

Юнгмейер М., Проць Б. Г. Інтегровані плани управління для природо-заповідних територій - від теорії до практики.

Природно-заповідні території складаються з великих за об'ємом площ, що є полігоном зіткнення різних форм власності, інтересів та, особливо, прав. Процес участі зацікавлених осіб у процесі планування природно-заповідної території хоча потребує значних ресурсів й часу, але, як правило, забезпечує кращі результати, оскільки існуючі знання інтегруються в рішення та розглядаються різні сценарії планування. Розглянуто ступінь залучення потенційних зацікавлених сторін до планування природно-заповідної території. Розробка інтегрованих процедур планування для восьми модельних природно-заповідних територій Українських Карпат сприятимуть більш стандартизованому плануванню й функціонуванню цих територій до моделі, прийнятої у країнах ЄС.

Introduction

The scholars, donors and international organisations increasingly advocate „integrated management planning“ for protected areas. A broad variety of tasks, information, points of view and interests of different stakeholders as well shall be integrated into the management plan in order to make it an „effective“ tool for developing the park. Numerous international policies, guidelines and requirements address the issue (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend 2013, Dudley and Philipps 2006, IUCN 2014, UNESCO 1996, UNESCO 2016) and provide technical or conceptual support (Getzner et al. 2010, Lange and Jungmeier 2014, Wagner et al. 2005)

The current situation in protected areas management does not look efficient. Being in crisis for a long time, the Ukrainian protected areas are beginning to lose their unique values. In a detailed analysis of the nature protected areas, we found that the full implementation of all the required tasks by the responsible administrations are prevented by the following factors: (1) absence or low quality of equipment, infrastructure and transportation etc; (2) poor work conditions in some units; (3) lack of funding (only little more available than necessary to cover the basic salaries); (4) low level (insufficient) of training of nature protected areas personnel; (5) insufficient (weak) cooperation with local stakeholders (including local communities, authorities and forestry); (6) poor conservation management of particular habitat types (lack of knowledge and skills to perform certain key tasks); (7) ineffective communication in the field and practical environmental management; (8) lack of attention to the cultural heritage both inside and outside of nature protected areas; (9) almost complete absence of knowledge about the ecosystem services of nature protected areas.

The large-scale project „Support of Nature Protected Areas in the Ukraine (SNPA)“, supported by the German Development Bank KfW provides the opportunity to go for a next level in the country’s management planning standards. The objective of the project is to improve management and effectiveness of selected protected areas in Ukraine, mainly in the Carpathian. These outputs are to be achieved: (1) selected protected areas have the necessary planning documents for their development; (2) selected protected areas have the necessary infrastructure, equipment and personnel (according to the relevant planning documents); (3) the local people around the protected areas accept the relevant regulations and restrictions and benefit from investments into socio-economic measures in the vicinity of the parks; and (4) the administration and management of the national protected area system is strengthened through investment.

In the frame of the project eight management plans for the country’s PAs (like Carpathian Biosphere Reserve, Gorgany Nature Reserve, Uzhanskyi, Karpatskyi,

Verkhovynskiy, Yavorivskiy, Vyzhnytskyi, Synevyr National Nature Parks) shall be developed and implemented. This article focuses on these activities and emphasises on the process to develop integrated management plans.

Conceptual considerations

The management planning is based on the new regulation (MENR 2014) that is currently legally binding for management planning in Ukraine. The directive indicates the steps that need to be gone through and the results that need to be achieved. Based on (1) a data collection, (2) the priorities, challenges and needs for action are to be identified to (3) come up with a park development strategy for 10 years. This shall (4) be the basis of a five-years action plan and (5) an estimate of required tools and resources. The Paragraph 2.1. of the decree explicitly draws on the necessary „cooperation with the special park administration, representatives of its scientific and technical council and representatives of the stakeholders “. Besides national regulations also international requirements are to be met (e.g. Ramsar, CBD, UNESCO). In particular, the provisions of the World Heritage „Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe“ play an important role. Four target protected areas, like Carpathian Biosphere Reserve, Gorgany Nature Reserve, Synevyr and Uzhanskyi NNP, got the UNESCO status territories. Since Ukraine is approaching European Union the EU Directives on nature conservation (Habitat/Bird Directives) need increasingly to be considered.

Participative management planning

Generally, protected areas comprise large areas and hence touch many different stakes, interest and notably rights as well. Participative planning processes take a lot of resources and time, but usually come up with better results (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2013, Getzner et al. 2010), since existing knowledge it integrated into the solution and different perspectives are considered. Since results are not surprising for the stakeholders it is easier to reach acceptance. However, during the planning all stakeholders and partner must be very clear, whether they are in a (1) decisive function, or (2) asked for their opinion or advice or just (3) given access to proper information. Not everybody can decide on anything, but any stakeholder should at least be informed sufficiently. Most relevant stakeholders to be considered are:

1. Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR)
2. Park administration, park staff and park scientific-technical council (PS)
3. Communities and local politician (CP)
4. Land-owner and holders of landuse rights (OH)
5. Local businesses (in particular tourism) (LB)
6. Nature conservation NGOs (NN)
7. Scientific institutions (SI)

8. Educational institutions (EI)
9. International organisation and institutions (IO)
10. Further stakeholders (FS)

The following table indicates to possibility to involve different actors and stakeholders into different step of the management planning (cf. Getzner et al. 2010). The character indicates degree of potential involvement (d: decisive, a: advising, i: to be informed).

Nr.	Step	1ME	2PS	3CP	4OH	5LB	6NN	7SI	8EI	9IO	10FS
1.	Data collection										
1.1.	General information	a	d	a	i	i	i		i		
1.2.	Basic investigation	a	d	a	i		a	a	i		
1.3.	Field work and research	a	d	a	i		a	a	i		
2.	Identifying priorities, challenges and need for action										
2.1.	Assessment of situation	d	d	a	a	a	a	i	i		
2.2.	Analysis of values, assets, priorities, potentials	d	d	a	a	a	a	i	i		
2.3.	Analysis of threats, weaknesses, problems (ranked list)	d	d		i	i	a	i			
2.4.	Need for action (prioritised catalogue)	d	d	a	i	i	i	i	i		
3.	Park development strategy - 10 years										
3.1.	Vision and mission	d	d	d	a	a	a	i	i	a	
3.2.	Development of management strategy and principles	d	d	d	d	a	a	i	i	(a)	
3.3.	Functional zoning and spatial planning	a	d	a	a	i					
3.4.	Planning of conservation and restoration of natural systems and sites	a	d	a	a		a	a			
3.5.	Planning of preservation and protection of natural systems and sites	a	d	a	a		a	a			
3.6.	Planning of environment research and observations	a	d	a	a		i	a	i		
3.6.	Planning of environmental awareness-raising and educational work	a	d	a	a		i	a	a		
3.8.	Planning of recreational activities	a	d	a	a	a	i	a			
3.9.	Planning of administrative and organizational activities	a	d								
3.10.	Detail plans for identified problems	a	d	a	a	i	i			(a)	
4.	Action plan - 5 years										
4.1.	Catalogue of concrete, effective measures for the park development	d	d	i	i						
4.2.	Workplan (table) for five years (priorities, templates, costs)	d	d								
4.3.	Monitoring plan (indicators, methods, guidelines)	d	d								
5.	Tools and resources required										
5.1.	Capacity needs assessment	a	d								
5.2.	Financial planning (investments, recurrent costs, incomes)	d	a	a		i					
5.3.	Planning of capacity development (organisational, individual)	d	d						a		

The table is presented as matter of discussion; positions and functions are due to further changes and should be based on a proper stakeholder analysis (Wagner et al. 2005).

Further perspectives

Currently, the Term of Reference for technically tendering the management plans are elaborated. The process involves experts from very different institutions, public administrations, universities, NGOs and companies as well. It shall be finalised at

the end of the year and shall allow for implementing integrative management planning procedures in pilot protected areas in the Ukraine Carpathians.

References

- Borrini-Feyerabend G., Dudley N., Jaeger T., Lassen B., Broome N.P., Phillips A., Sandwith T. (2013): From understanding to action: Governance of Protected Areas. Best practice protected area guidelines series 20. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- Dudley N., Phillips A. (2006): Forests and Protected Areas- Guidance on the use of the IUCN protected area management categories. Best practice protected area guidelines series 12.
- Getzner M., Jungmeier M., Lange S. (2010): People, Parks and Money. Stakeholder involvement and regional development. A manual for protected areas. Klagenfurt, 216 S.
- Ibisch P., Geyer J., Schmidt L., Pokynchereda V., Gubko V., Kirchmeier H. (2011): Carpathian Biosphere Reserve: Challenges and solutions for protected areas management in Ukrainian Transcarpathia. Aachen, 242 S.
- IUCN (2014): The promise of Sidney. www.iucn.org
- Kirchmeier H., Kovarovics A. (eds.) (2016): Nomination Dossier "Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe" as extension to the existing Natural World Heritage Site "Primeval Beech Forests" Klagenfurt, 409 S.
- Lange, S. & Jungmeier M. (2014): Park 3.0 - Protected Areas for the Next Society. Klagenfurt.
- MENR - Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (2014): Regulation on the Project for planning the territory of the national nature park, conservation, restoration and recreational use of its natural systems and sites. Decree of MENR No. 273 of 21.08.2014.
- UNESCO (1996): Biosphere Reserves – The Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework of the World Network. Unesco, Paris.
- UNESCO (2016): Lima Action Plan for UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme and its World Network of Biosphere Reserves (2016-2025).
- Wagner J., Jungmeier M., Kühmaier M., Velik I., Kirchmeier H. (2005): IPAM-Toolbox. An Expert System for the Integrative Planning and Management of Protected Areas. Klagenfurt, 34 S.