



## Session I | Integrated Approach | time available: 30 minutes

### Working group 1.a) Natura 2000-Management Plans – (other) examples

Moderation: Kristijan Čivić

1. Are there (other) best-practice-examples for Natura 2000-Management-Plans? (Which?) Have they proved themselves effective during implementation? Is there a gap between objectives and reality? Are there examples where those gaps were closed?
  - **Driver is economy/compensation/restoration not conservation. How to change?**
  - **Funding takes time**
  - Incentives to farmers for negative practice vs. conservation | cap versus conservation, e.g. wet meadows
  - Can Natura 2000 stimulate ecological restoration rather than compensation in cases of economic development?
  - Hamburg good example → How to multiply?
  - In estuaries conflict occurs | birds versus habitats directive
  - Natura 2000 is a good tool to get stakeholder (e. g. farmers) to talk to each other
  - Lack of space for compensation at some point, what then??
  - Hamburg approach (5 %) good solution – improve CS more quickly
  - Reaching FCS & Infrastructure Dev. → different speed
  - UK – lots! Natura 2000/Ems coordinator | Natural England Jan Maclennen (Ask Tania Davey for contact)



## Working group 1.b) The imbalance of sediment budgets in estuaries

### Moderation: Bernd-Ulrich Netz

1. Examples: How do the member states deal with the imbalance of the sediment budgets in estuaries?
  - **Integrative study**
  - Relocation scheme to balance sediment budget for all fractions
  - Large measures (sediment sink + ecological benefit)
2. How is the environmental impact assessment run, for the imbalance as well as for the ways to solve the problem?
  - **Relative assessment = first step**
  - **Excess of mud → which solutions (accommodation, extraction, source?)**
  - Managing sand and fine sediments differently
3. Is the environmental impact assessment part of the management plan?
  - **Relative assessment | Reference = actual situation incl. dredging and relocation**
4. May restoration measures lead to a change in European protective goods in a Natura 2000 area?
  - **Holland: Dredging is already part of the system. What is natural? | Only relative assessment**
  - Holland stopped sand extraction in Scheldt
  - Flanders (Scheldt) reduce sand extraction



## Working group 1.c) Dealing with natural dynamics

Moderation: Dr. Kirsten Wolfstein

1. How can the management of Natura 2000 sites (better) deal with natural dynamics (e.g. the effects of climate change or succession)??
  - **Management in exchange with scientists & stakeholders**
  - **Accept more dynamics at the sites & integrate it in management plans & monitoring**
  - **More focus on functions in management plans**
  - in dynamic areas dynamic should be accepted
  - Find a balanced way between species, aspects and important estuarine functions
  - Integrate more dynamic process/targets in the management plans
  - → management that is in exchange with science + land users
  - Greater emphasis in Natura 2000 management plans on occurrence of natural dynamics/removal of artificial structures (than on special occurrence)
  - Strengthen the dynamic aspects of conservation
  - Recognise importance of network of sites & enable link between e.g. protection for migrating fish
  - Allow sites space to adapt to change – difficulty with directive – Humber designated as an estuary & boundary drawn to flood defences
  - How stable should a dynamic system be?
  - Define functional morphology as the framework for site management.
  - Get more space along gradients
  - Create area (big enough) for new free dynamic
  - Recognise site level pressures + system level pressures + deal with them on the appropriate scale
  - 50 years + boundary to adapt to coastal change – UK. Difficult messages for stakeholders, e.g. if homes [are] within proposed boundary
  - Different sites/areas for different concepts (dynamic/conservation)



- In Estuaries: Recognise that they try to attain dynamic equilibrium which means an element and constant change
- Zoning of management for change – create dynamic boundaries. E.g. build in capacity for necessary intervention
- Management that allows: trad. Prof.; process prof., e.g. Heuckenlock
- Management that includes interests of part development



## Working group 1.d) Key success factors for implementing management plans

Moderation: Prof. Mike Elliott

1. What examples are there for successful integration of various uses and Natura 2000-goals? 2. What are the key factors for successful integration of uses and Natura 2000?

- **Prioritize problems**
- **tackle the low-hanging fruits**
- **Then build trust between the users, then the difficult ones**
- honest sharing of information
- in communication: take everyone seriously
- resources + responsibilities for execution of management plans
- pressure
- negotiation process
- multi-level governance
- border states / landowner issues
- overcome cultural differences
- The management plan has to be mandatory
- The competent authority has to take the lead in the planning



## Working group 1.e) Key success factors for implementing management plans

### Moderation: Prof. Dr. Patrick Meire

1. What examples are there for successful integration of various uses and Natura 2000-goals?
  - Elbe Dialogue?
  - Sigma Plan: Natura 2000 floods recreation
  - Scheldt Dev. Plan
  - Humber
  - Partnerships (Elbe)
  
2. What are the key factors for successful integration of uses and Natura 2000?
  - **Don't hide the conflicts and protocol them**
  - Involve all interested parties
  - Mutual respect
  - Inform and explain (also about process)
  - Take the time which is necessary
  - Involve bottom up approach with a clear idea
  - Involve stakeholder in responsibility
  - Be open for negotiation and compromise
  - Compare scenarios
  - Make sure, you don't lose your biodiversity goals
  - We have to learn constantly



## Working group 1.f) Natura 2000-management-plans – (other) examples

### Moderation: Frank Neumann

1. Are there (other) best-practice-examples for Natura 2000-Management-Plans? (Which?) Have they proved themselves effective during implementation? Is there a gap between objectives and reality? Are there examples where those gaps were closed?
  - Scheldt Estuary
  - Management plan in Cantabria
  - **Political will, commitment & financing**
  - **Good communication & consultation providing proper funding**
  - Difficulties for comparison
  - Many are still ongoing
  - Scientific base of plans
  - Gap: difficulties about cumulative effects
  - Need for: more political commitment, more money for implementing IMPs
  - Enough financial resources
  - Time for consultation | education | focus on local “problems”
  - People/stakeholder understanding of management plans
  - Stakeholder commitment
  - Public communication/information/education
  - Solve conflicts of interests
  - Look for synergies
  - Public participation



## Working group 1.g) Dealing with natural dynamics

Moderation: Dr. David Parker

1. How can the management of Natura 2000 sites (better) deal with natural dynamics (e.g. the effects of climate change or succession)?
  - **Follow a functional approach**
  - **Allow dynamic development**
  - **Build in resilience**
  - **Give space for natural dynamics**
  - Natural dynamics must become part of planning