



BPAN

PoWPA regional evaluation in the BPAN project

Presentation by the PoWPA specialist group:

Olle Höjer

Sanna-Kaisa Juvonen

Tore Opdahl

Irina Onufrenya

Oleg Sutkaitis

Anna Kuhmonen

Presented by

Tore Opdahl

The Norwegian Directorate for Nature
Management

Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) – Program Elements (PE)



Element 1:



Element 2:



Element 3:



Element 4:

1. Direct Actions for Planning, Selecting, Establishing, Strengthening, and Managing, Protected Area Systems and Sites
2. Governance, Participation, Equity and Benefit Sharing
3. Enabling Activities
4. Standards, Assessment, and Monitoring



PoWPA in BPAN – Why?

- To get an overall picture of what is going on with protected areas in the Barents Region
- To give the regions a chance to look at their protected areas in a comprehensive way

- Not to rank regions, but to have regions do a critical self-review of the situation within their protected area system
- Not to do national reporting, but to support it with input and ideas



Barents regional analysis using modified PoWPA reporting framework

- PoWPA expert group modified the PoWPA national reporting framework to be used as a tool for analysis of protected area network in the Barents Region
- Analysis was done in 9 regions:
 - Northern Finland (Lapland, Northern Ostrobothnia, Kainuu)
 - Northern Norway (Finnmark, Tromsø, Nordland)
 - Northern Sweden (Norrbotten, Västerbotten)
 - Northwest Russia (5 regions)
 - Murmansk Region
 - Republic of Karelia
 - Republic of Komi
 - Arkhangelsk Region
 - Nenets Autonomous District



Methodology of obtaining the results

- In each region a group of specialists filled out the BPAN reporting format
 - The composition of the group of specialists varied from region to region.
 - Some examples of representation in the groups: local and regional authorities, protected area authorities, non-governmental organizations, indigenous communities, universities and other research institutions.
- In the reporting format the Goals in the four Programme Elements of PoWPA were assessed through Quantitative assessments:
 - 0 – no progress
 - 1 – planning phase
 - 2 – initial progress
 - 3 – substantial progress
 - 4 – nearly or fully completed
- Example “1.1 What progress has been made in assessing the representativeness, comprehensiveness and ecological gaps of your protected area network?”



Ötsikko Meta Pro Bold 3opt?

Highlights of PoWPA analysis results





Programme Element 1

1.1 Ecological gap assessment

- GAP analysis or other studies have been done in most of the regions and taken into consideration in protected area planning
- New protected areas established in recent years, especially in Northwest Russia
 - Kamennyi Gorod Nature Monument, in 2011 (Nenets)
 - Voinitsa Landscape Reserve, in 2008, and Vottovaara, in 2011 (Republic of Karelia)
 - Onezhkoye Pomorye, 2013 (Arkhangelsk Region)
 - Also several protected areas in Norway, Sweden, Finland
- Protection plans, programmes and surveys, e.g. survey of high conservation value forests in Sweden





1.2. Connectivity and integration

- Some successful examples to increase connectivity in NW Russia:
 - Arkhangelsk Region - protection of forest landscapes in the frame of FSC
 - Komi Virgin Forest Natural Heritage Site
- Scandinavian countries reports more need to focus on connectivity
- BPAN can help to analyze connectivity in a transboundary context
- Sectoral integration needs more work in the Barents Region.
"Mainstreaming" of biodiversity conservation is important in this respect.





1.3 Regional networks and transboundary protected areas

- BPAN – good example of progress on work with regional networks!
- “Green Belt of Fennoscandia” and the “European Green Belt”
 - Connect PAs on the border areas of Finland, Russia and Norway - from the Barents Sea to the Baltic Sea
 - Continuing to Sweden as a “horse shoe”
- Good progress in work with transboundary protected areas between Finland-Russia, and some progress between Russian regions in the Northwest Russia
- Several transboundary PA between Norway, Sweden and Finland Scandinavian countries, but further analysis of potential areas should be considered.





Programme Element 2

2.1 Equitable sharing of costs and benefits

- Extensive compensation schemes for protected areas has been developed in the Scandinavian countries
- Local economic impact of national parks has been evaluated (Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services) for all national parks of Finland



2.2 Participation



- Public discussions in establishing protected areas in all regions in Russia
- Participation by local/regional community is a considerable part of the planning process for Protected areas in Norway.
- The management authority for National Parks and other large Protected Areas now becomes municipality administered in Norway: National Park/Protected Area management boards.
- "Consultation agreement" in Norway: between the Sami Council (Sámediggi/Sametinget), Sami organizations and the government in every community aspects regarding the Sami people
- Land use planning and management plans: involvement of stakeholders such as local communities and the Sámi people in Finland using the Akwé: Kon Guidelines (CBD)
- Advanced involvement of Sami people in Laponia; however governance and management need to be evaluated, also methods should be further developed, involving relevant stakeholders



Programme Element 3

3.2 Capacity for PA management



- Regional directorates for protected areas established in all Russian regions:
 - All the regions have own budgets for managing PAs
 - Earlier PAs were under several regional Ministries, now all in one organization, under Ministries of Natural Resources and Ecology
 - Also establishment of new PAs according to the regional plans
- Establishment of the State Nature Inspectorate in Norway





3.3 Relevant and appropriate technology for protected area management

- Finland:
 - Development of common GIS database
 - Habitat management and restoration - best practices and guidelines
 - Best practices disseminated quite effectively from one PA to another in Metsähallitus NHS and in collaboration with other PA managers





3.4 Financial sustainability of PAs

- Financing of implementation of protected area plans, programs and management actions varies but in general it is insufficient in the Barents Region





3.5. Public awareness

- Russia - good examples in federal parks, but not available for the public in general
- Finland - high priority for communication:
 - Increasing awareness - proposals for new national parks were asked from the public!
 - Assessments of the benefits/values of protected areas is very important
- Sweden – significant effort in 2009-2010 at the 100th anniversary of Protected Areas, but more work is needed.
- Norway – 14 Norwegian National Park Visitor Centers, Ramsar Center in Tromsø and information on Internet.





Programme Element 4

4.2 Effectiveness of protected area management

- Finland: International Management Effectiveness Evaluation of the PA system, State of the Parks Report





4.3. Assessment of protected areas status and trends

- Norway: database for protected areas developed, program for monitoring of PAs is under development
- Sweden: database for managing PAs
- Finland: A new PA information system is being developed
- Russian regions: monitoring needs to be developed, high priority area for the future work
- Karelia, Nenets, Arkhangelsk: Inventories of the PAs need to be implemented
- Researchers of the Republic of Komi have developed a method for PA inventories, it has been implemented in 87% of all protected areas in Komi





4.4 Scientific knowledge

- Research data on climate change impacts, ecosystem services would be needed in the Barents Region
- No comprehensive research program for protected areas in Scandinavian countries.





BPAN

Barents Protected Area Network

Thank you!

in English | по русски



photo © Olle Höjer