

Work Programme 2008-2010

CEEweb for Biodiversity

1. Societal vision
2. Organisational vision
3. Mission
4. Values
5. SWOT analysis
6. Strategic questions and answers
7. Strategic actions, their timing and financial implications
8. The structure and decision-making competences within the organisation

1. Societal vision

This statement defines the ideas of CEEweb about an ideal society; a world for which everyone within the organization works. This vision is set up for 20-50 years.

We vision a sustainable society, which realises social equity and lives in harmony with nature. Basic needs shall be ensured to everyone in the whole world, and all living creatures shall be given the same rights to live and flourish. We shall also provide space for nature without any human interference.

Members of the society shall live in peace with themselves and with others, and realise a high level of regional cooperation. They shall think and act responsibly, also implying environmental consciousness and conscious consumption decisions. Our world shall be truly impartial and independent of industrial and political interests, pushing technocratic approach into the background.

For building up a sustainable society, however, we shall adopt holistic thinking, and values shall shift away from material values. Consequently society shall redefine the terms "wellbeing" and "development" and also give space for the spiritual growth of humankind.

2. Organisational vision

It defines the ideas of CEEweb about the future of the Network for the next 3-5 years. This vision reflects on the followings:

1. *Activities and programs*
2. *Image*
3. *Infrastructure*
4. *Human resources*
5. *Financial resources*
6. *Organisational structure*

1. Activities and programs

- Integrative, international, transboundary programmes are realised
- Political lobby at European (and national) level as the main focus
- CEEweb position papers on national, regional and EU levels
- CEEweb is an important factor in policy making, decision makers shall be also actively seeking our opinion when decisions are made
- Stronger representation of the CEE region, which is also emphasised in lobbying
- Saying something new instead of staying within the existing framework in the policy work
- Working more proactively
- CEEweb first of all aims at the cooperation among members instead of being a project-based NGO working on its own projects in the office
- Common project(s), in which all WG members can be involved in their country, so that later everybody can see the results and reasons why the WG was created
- Work of WGs also benefit the whole network (not necessarily in financial way)
- Long-term programmes instead of short-term activities, which are not driven by financial resources
- Activities in the following fields: Natura 2000, biodiversity conventions and EU biodiversity policies, EU sustainable development policies, rural development, agriculture, CITES, tourism
- Improved position and work of members in non EU countries through CEEweb activities
- When preparing development (investment) projects in the region, CEEweb is invited as an expert in the CEE region by institutions
- Model projects (e.g. in tourism), visiting sites of practical work (e.g. Natura 2000 sites)
- Strengthening relationships with social, youth and other organisations, trade unions, etc.
- Cooperation with numerous organisations through the outreach activities of the members (e.g. with 200 organisations in tourism field)
- Capacity building in order to "speak a common language"
- Monitoring the activities of those platforms, organisations, which deal with biodiversity
- Better communication, also on the main CEEweb mailing list about the WGs
- CEEweb can provide a platform, where concepts and different opinions on sustainability can be discussed with other international organisations

2. Image

- Giving proactive, characteristic and critical opinions, vs. reactive and fundamental approaches
- Being innovative, effective, professional
- CEEweb is well-known, being the leading NGO network in biodiversity conservation in CEE
- Strong network with several big, well recognised and respected members
- Independent organisation (branding)
- Emphasising the CEE characteristic
- Providing valuable services
- Showing some key persons, who make CEEweb known and recognised
- Strict business appearance
- New name while keeping the CEEweb acronym and logo

3. Infrastructure

- Common data bases
- The website shall better reflect the network, e.g. the materials from members shall be also seen on the main site
- Environmentally friendly equipment
- The computer system developed to the needs of the common work within the Working Groups

4. Human resources

- There is a staff member in the office for every activity field
- The core team in the CEEweb office includes programme coordinators, who are renowned EU experts in their fields, and assisted by project coordinators and assistants in the office or at member organisations
- Volunteers, as well as interns from universities join to write their thesis at CEEweb
- International internship with the involvement of members
- Project based staff can be employed both in the office and at members
- Continuous presence in Brussels through a staff member

5. Financial resources

- Funds are secured from different resources on different levels (national, regional, EU, global funds) and in different ways (project applications, consultancy, provision of professional services)
- There is well established cooperation with some donors (governments, foundations)
- Costs of operation is secured for half a year in advance
- The salaries provide financial stability for staff members
- Long term programmes are running, which ensure financial predictability
- Knowledge is provided at market prices
- The core funding does not cause fluctuation in the finances
- Membership fee is raised
- Secure investments (e.g. government bonds)
- WGs also apply for funding
- Fundraising Strategy is developed
- Ethical code of fundraising for private fundraising
- Money and in kind contribution of members are used as seeds money for fundraising

6. Organisational structure

- Working Groups (3-7) function
- Support is provided to each WG by a WG officer at the CEEweb office or at a member organisation
- Web-like structure, which flexibly adapts to circumstances
- Experts as supporting members are connected to CEEweb
- Annual meetings are connected to events
- Ad hoc meetings on specific issues

3. Mission

The mission defines the identity of the organisation, helps to differ from others. It is developed with consensus within the organization and everyone needs to know it by heart. It answers the following questions:

1. *WHY WE WORK: general goals (based on the societal vision)*
2. *WHAT WE DO: concrete goals*
3. *HOW: projects and services*
4. *FOR WHOM: target group(s)*
5. *WHERE: geographical scope of the activities*

The mission of the Central and East European Working Group for the Enhancement of Biodiversity (CEEweb) is the conservation of the biodiversity through the promotion of sustainable development.

CEEweb works through advocacy, influencing decision making, common projects, capacity building, networking and awareness raising.

It targets its members, local, national and international decision makers, NGOs and NGO networks, companies and the scientific community.

Central and Eastern Europe* is the MAIN region of interests, but larger project scope and members from other regions might be also allowed, as nature knows no borders.

*CEE is defined as: Albania, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, The Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine

4. Values

CEEweb is striving for the appearance of the following values within its operation and relationships.

Sustainability: CEEweb is striving to highlight the sustainability implications of problems and promote the tackling of root causes.

Courage: Courage to face new challenges and to search new ways and means to achieve our goals.

Faith: Believing in the achievability of our goals.

Common goals: There is a high cohesion within CEEweb, and CEEweb strives for common goals, which everybody can identify with.

Recognising the values: We are able to recognise true values and stand up for them in our work.

Following strategy: We are striving to ensure that all our activities directly or indirectly serve our strategic goals.

Cooperation: CEEweb is striving for cooperation with its members and external partners during its work.

Respect: We leave space for self-expression of colleagues and listen to each others' opinions, arguments, as well as take into account each others' personalities and methods of works.

Reliability: The tasks and commitments are met according to the agreements, taking into account the circumstances.

Efficiency: CEEweb is using the available resources, such as time, money and knowledge efficiently, i.e. in a way to reach the maximum and best outcomes with the lowest costs of these resources.

Professionalism and knowledge: CEEweb is striving for high quality and competence, i.e. for professionalism in all aspects of its work, which is based on up to date professional and scientific knowledge.

Development: CEEweb is learning from its own experiences and strives for their future use.

Environmental awareness: We are striving to keep the ecological footprint of the organisation as low as possible.

Good personal relationships: The work relationships within CEEweb are based on friendly atmosphere, trust and mutual appreciation.

Transparency and free access to information (documents, reports, decisions, etc.) generated within network for all member organizations.

Equal chances are given for all the member organizations and representatives to participate in CEEweb activities and in the decision making.

5. SWOT analysis

SWOT Analysis is a strategic planning tool used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats involved in an organisation. It identifies the internal (strengths and weaknesses) and external factors (threats and opportunities) that are favourable and unfavourable to achieving the mission of the organisation.

Strengths

Strengths are those characteristics of the organization that are helpful to achieving the objectives (both in abstract, e.g. human skills and qualities and in concrete sense, e.g. financial background).

- CEEweb is a well known umbrella organisation with strong, experienced, well known members
- There is a great diversity within the network, members and countries
- There is clear regional focus for work
- CEEweb operates in CEE countries, where there is less developed the NGO sector
- Sustainability concept provides a framework
- There is a common understanding of the problems
- CEEweb has a leadership and existing policy
- Existing and functioning institutional and organisational structure with WGs, Annual Meeting (AM) and the office is appropriate, WGs enable cooperation among members
- Flexible work in the WGs, members can also propose new issues during the implementation of the work programme
- Cooperation with experts (supporting members)
- There is willingness of members to cooperate, joint lobbying, actions, projects are realised
- CEEweb can ensure coordinated efforts of CEE NGOs
- Most of the activities are well prepared, based on members needs and with some input from experts
- There is a communication system, providing knowledge and information about current biodiversity related issues, data and events
- Enabling members to participate on events, conferences, meetings of international significance (e.g. biogeographic seminars)
- There is good staff in the Budapest office and an internship programme
- There is capacity within the office to provide information, connect people, highlight important issues (because the main office is not strictly project-based)
- CEEweb is a link between the member NGOs and certain regional (European) and global organizations, institutions and processes
- CEEweb can provide assistance and linkage between financing (foundations, intergovernmental organizations, etc) and implementing bodies (NGOs)
- Capacity building, transferring know-how through workshops, seminars, CEEweb Academies
- CEEweb facilitates experience sharing among EU member states and others
- CEEweb provides opportunities for establishing useful contacts in CEE and for exchanging knowledge and lessons learned from projects among members at CEEweb events
- Meeting people whom one can trust, which is very important when preparing projects
- Good social relationships among members, e.g. at AMs
- Financial stability (with core funding)

Weaknesses

Weaknesses are those characteristics of the organization that are harmful to achieving the mission.

- There is a poor understanding of sustainability
- Written policy is lacking
- CEEweb is a light weight organisation and not known enough
- The potential of the network is misused to formulate EU policy
- No clear understanding of what CEEweb is and how it works, about the structure and the sharing of tasks within the office and cooperation with other international NGOs
- Low coordination of the whole network, neither real coordination, nor true independence of WGs and programmes (middle way does not work)
- WG activities are not always supported enough, without an active WG Chair actions are not taking place
- Tendency to develop a bit overambitious work plans (e.g. in a WG)
- Constant change of the group members of WG(s)
- Lack of continuity, fluctuations within the office, some colleagues with long involvement and experiences left
- Insufficient communication between office and members, and of WG activities in other WGs
- Networking among members is insufficient, communication among members is low on WG e-mail list(s)
- Lack of national coordinators and networks
- Lack of special approaches to the members based on their special needs
- Low level of showing initiatives for new actions and interests of members to get involved in proposed actions or in WGs
- Low capacity of taking actions, as a lot of voluntary engagement is needed from members to participate on meetings, give comments to papers, write articles, etc.
- It is very hard for members to participate in more than one WG
- Insufficient (active) participation of members at AMs and other events
- Low willingness of members to take responsibility and low reliability
- Some inactive WG members slow down the work and increase the costs
- Low activity of the Board and the International Advisory Committee
- Lack of common CEEweb identity and cohesion
- Needs and expectations of (potential) members are not known enough, while there is too high expectations towards the office and members
- Many important problems are not really tackled despite the general agreement that they should be addressed
- Lack of long term funding policy
- Memberships are not paid by all members
- Not enough international projects, campaigns, actions
- Name of CEEweb is complicated

Threats

Threats are external conditions that are harmful to achieving the mission (negative changes in the legal, political, economic, social environment).

- More and more misuse of the concepts we work for (e.g. sustainability)
- Other policies overwrite the importance of biodiversity (e.g. climate change)
- Growth is more important than development (=becoming better, not bigger)
- Greenwashing is popular
- Lack of understanding of the complexity of issues on the side of decision makers
- Bad image of greens
- Strong political influence on environmental issues, corruption
- Hectic and rapidly changing environment (social, legal, economic)
- The region is losing its importance
- Lack of clear and constant funding policy and practice of donors
- Donors more and more move to EECCA countries
- Too high expectations from donors
- Competitors will appear if we become bigger
- Overlaps with work of other NGOs (IUCN, WWF, Birdlife)

Opportunities

Opportunities are external conditions that are helpful to achieving the mission (positive changes in the legal, political, economic, social environment).

- Environment is becoming a public issue
- Biodiversity is seen more and more important
- Worsening situation in the field of biodiversity
- Legal environment, e.g. regional conventions as legal means to work with
- Europe becomes a global player
- There is a growing need for policy work
- Being the only biodiversity network in CEE - have better access to info, financial support and bigger weight as such
- Cooperation with other similar NGO networks
- Relation to key NGO, governmental and intergovernmental players (e.g. Green 10 in Brussels)
- Existing expertise in the region
- New potential members
- Enabling financial environment (e.g. with EU core funding and other EU funding opportunities) both for the CEEweb network and for the WGs as such

6. Strategic questions and answers

Based on the first steps of the strategic planning, decisions need to be made on the identified strategic questions, which will define the ways to follow in order to implement the common goals. These questions should reflect upon the following:

- *Activities and programs*
- *Finance and structure of the organization*
- *Communication of the organization (PR, image, visual appearance)*
- *Culture and relationships*
- *Human resources*
- *Infrastructure*

Activities and programs

Do we want CEEweb to be mainly project or policy focused, or both? (Do we want to serve our members directly (through providing common projects, money, capacity-building, etc.) or indirectly through policy work in pursuing common goals, which change the EU and regional policy environment helping our members on the long term?)

CEEweb shall be mainly policy focussed (about 60% policy, 40% project work, if it is possible to estimate). Projects shall as much as possible support policy related work. In addition CEEweb shall continue its work on training and capacity building (e.g. Academy).

Do we want to work proactively or reactively?

Proactively as much as possible. It means:

- we have our policy, which we push for, and thus try to set the agenda for policy makers
- we push for our policy through reactions to the actual decisions on the table
- we give our comments into actual decisions even if we are not asked

It shall be identified in what fields, issues we would like to set the agenda and develop our policy both for these fields/niches and for the existing policy topics (e.g. actual issues in N2000).

Do we want to work needs or resource driven?

Needs driven (as much as possible)

Do we want to focus on local activities?

CEEweb itself shall not **focus** on local activities. However, local activities can be allowed, if they support policy work (e.g. provide good practices), or it concerns more members or countries (transboundary projects).

Do we want to focus on lobbying and policy work with a fast reaction on everything?

Yes, in issues that CEEweb covers (e.g. topics of the WGs).

Having a common level of understanding is an aim or added value?

It shall be aimed to develop and resources shall be devoted to that on a long term.

Do we want to deal with climate change?

Yes, but only as much as climate change is connected to biodiversity (e.g. adaptation, ecological networks / IAS, habitat transformation, succession, mitigation).

Do we want to realise expert work within the office or shall we mostly rely on our members (also in Hungary)?

Expert work (rather in a holistic way) shall be also kept in the office, but CEEweb shall more and more rely on the expertise of members and WGs. People in the office shall have a holistic approach and find the interrelations among issues.

Finance and structure

Do we want to keep the current organisational structure or change it?

Keep it

Do we want the office to also implement some activities, or only to coordinate them?

In policy issues the office shall firstly focus on coordination, and more and more member involvement in implementation shall be encouraged. But the office might also need to implement policy work, if there is no interest among the members to get sufficiently involved. At the same time it will also implement things like capacity-building, services to the network, etc.

In Hungary CEEweb shall only get involved in implementation (similarly to a member organisation) if: 1. the activities are relevant to the international policy work, 2. CEEweb is not competing with its own members 3. all these activities are covered from national funds and not from international funding which could be used for international activities

Do we want to maintain and actively facilitate non-active WGs?

Financial resources shall be not pumped into non-active WGs and extra (human) resources either. However, they shall be kept as sleeping ones (and not abolishing them), as they might wake up if circumstances change.

In case of already made commitments when no capacity is available from inside the WG and the whole network, the policy office should rely on external assistance, by contracting independent experts or expert groups for the implementation of the tasks for which the CEEweb committed itself.

Do we want to pay for members for their involvement in our work or rely on their voluntary contributions?

For basic work within CEEweb (participation in WG meetings, articles, answering to questionnaire, etc.) it should be their duty. For extra contribution work shall be financially remunerated.

Do we want the CEEweb network be small but active, or big but with sleeping membership?

On the long run only those members can stay, who fulfil their statutory obligations (e.g. membership fee).

Do we want to change geographical focus of CEEweb (widen it to a European network, not only in CEE)?

No, it shall remain CEE.

Do we want own business (e.g. seminars, workshops for fees, consultancy, CEEweb products)?

Yes, e.g. carry out "consultancy" work in the long run. It can also provide services for money (e.g. non-members could pay for participating at seminars).

No CEEweb products (except publications)!

Do we want to increase the membership fee?

Yes, but only if it does not become a financial barrier for any NGO to be a member.

Do we want more strategic partners?

Yes, based on the needs and in line with our goals to achieve better results. It does not need to be a declared partnership, though on a case-by-case basis could be.

*Communication of the organization (PR, image, visual appearance)***Do we want to be known by the general public?**

It is not an aim, so no special resources shall be devoted to that. But through media work (done for policy work anyway) and with the help of members (publicising their membership on website, publications, etc.) public could know us better.

Do we want to run campaigns?

It shall not be a focus, but the option shall not be excluded, e.g. on the International Biodiversity Day, or response to our members' needs.

Do we want to invest more into international staff than we did so far?

No special efforts.

Do we want to change the name?

Yes, it shall be considered, with keeping the CEEweb abbreviation within the new name (e.g. CEEweb- Biodiversity Network, or CEEweb - Nature Network or CEEweb-CEE Biodiversity Conservation Alliance). Or: CEEweb (Central & Eastern European Web)

Do we want to change the logo?

No

*Culture and relationships***Do we want to be constantly influenced by the members' needs?**

Through the well established ways, like strategy planning, Work Programme planning, AMs, BIAC, site visits. However, this shall not be done constantly in order to ensure coherence.

Do we want to be grass root or elite organisation?

A network, which carries out professional work (is it elite then?)

Do we want to bring in more cultural interpersonal aspects into our work?

Yes, more. An idea is to charge members from the same country to organise something special at the AM, like dancing, or singing or playing or anything else. Thus every year the cultural focus would be on other country.

Do we want to be strict business or easy-going?

Business

*Human resources***Do we need jolly jokers or specific task managers?**

Jolly jokers, with broad understanding of topics

Do we want to coordinate everything from the office or do we want to build working capacity (e.g. project staff, WG officers) outside the office as well?
It can be possible to have capacities outside (paid staff) at members.

Do we want to have national coordinators?

Not in the near future. It shall be revisited later, when the strategy is revised.

Do we want to keep people by giving competitive salaries?

Yes, on a reasonable level.

Infrastructure

Do we want infrastructure which produces income (e.g. an education centre which can be used for tourism)?

No

Do we want to put emphasis on quality, price, or environmental performance?

Best combination of all this on the same level

Do we want to have our office in a sustainable house?

No

7. Strategic actions, their timing and financial implications

7.1. Cross-cutting policy issues

Introducing proactivity into CEEweb's work through a common policy

Objective

- Develop common understanding on policy issues among CEEweb members
- Clarify our policy and push it at all levels
- Raise awareness of the effective ways of biodiversity conservation at all levels
- Change EU, regional and national policies

Activities

- Develop a written CEEweb Policy through joint meetings
- Establish a Policy Working Group and create *ad hoc* WGs as appropriate
- Investigate the socio-economic trends and new policy agendas
- Point out the real causes of biodiversity loss and the failure of the 2010 target
- Promote the integration of ecosystem services into all development decisions, e.g. into the criteria for getting EU funding in the next budgetary period and into CAP
- Facilitate the use of the ecosystem approach of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in all EU policies

Results

- Developed written CEEweb policy
- Higher public awareness of sustainability and the CEEweb policy
- Better policies at EU and national levels

Pro-active lobbying and awareness raising for better policies and implementation

Objective

- Work toward a value change in society and redefining development and wellbeing
- Gain public support for our goals
- Gain recognition of CEEweb among decision-makers
- Effective lobbying at all levels
- Raise public/governmental profile of CBD/PEBLDS in the region for implementation

Activities

- Campaign on biodiversity loss and its link to human well-being
- Organize public campaigns to get public support behind our goals (e.g. Earth Day, International Biodiversity Day, Pan-European Biodiversity Picnic, etc)
- Find out the upcoming ideas of stakeholders, governments and EU and prepare to debate the ideas
- Research how CEEweb can influence any process going on at the COP, participate in COPs, PEBLDS and Ministerial Meetings (within delegations if possible) and make national assessment before meetings on implementation
- Detect the needs of decision makers, establish and develop professional and personal contacts with them in order to be taken seriously and raise their awareness through publications, materials, fact sheets, public hearings, committee hearings, inviting them to professional events as well as to personal meetings and give positive feedback to after good results
- Lobby for effective implementation under PEBLDS, activate especially CEE governments and NGOs to enhance implementation of CBD decisions in international, regional cooperation

- Identify those members who have contacts on national and international level, develop a common contact database and have a (part-time) CEEweb staff member in Brussels
- Cooperate with international NGOs (EEB, IUCN, etc.) on the policy that we are pushing for

Results

- Shift in the values of the society
- Higher awareness of biodiversity and biodiversity commitments, as well as their linkages to human well-being
- Better Pan-European and EU policies for the conservation of biodiversity
- A more complex contact-network with political decision-makers
- Developed channels and tools for effective lobbying

7.2 Thematic issues

Monitoring the implementation of CITES/ EU Wildlife Trade Regulation

Objectives

- Gather information on the current situation of wildlife trade in the CEE region and promote better enforcement

Activities

- Monitor the internet and retail commerce of CITES listed species in CEE countries

Results

- Updated methodology for monitoring
- Data from monitoring collected
- Data from monitoring
- Report on the internet and direct trade in CEE

Awareness raising on CITES/ EU Wildlife Trade Regulation

Objectives

- Higher public recognition and awareness on CITES / EU Wildlife Trade Regulation in the CEE society
- Appropriate tools for educational and training activities undertaken by the WG trainers are available

Activities

- Build up a photo-base for the use of the WG members in their educational and awareness raising activities
- Organize photo exhibitions in nine CEE countries for awareness raising in 2008
- Thematic regional campaign each year
- Prepare national versions of an educational film on CITES/ EU Wildlife Trade Regulation
- Design and print targeted educational materials each year

Results

- Photo base established
- CEE campaigns organised
- Raised awareness on CITES / EU Wildlife Trade Regulation in CEE

Capacity building on implementation of CITES/ EU Wildlife Trade Regulation

Objectives

- Ensure the existence of a network of expert trainers on / EU Wildlife Trade Regulation in the CEE region

Activities

- Organize “train the trainers” process, in 2008 concentrating on general issues regarding implementation of CITES / EU Wildlife Trade Regulation (Romania)

Results

- Common level of understanding (on a high level) among Working Group members
- Capacity developed to organize general CITES/ EU Wildlife Trade Regulation trainings for implementing and enforcement agencies
- Specific knowledge built up among already trained trainers about particular problems

Influencing decisions at CITES CoP15th

Objectives

- Ensure that the decisions of the CITES CoP 15th are conservation minded and they are in line with the conservation interests of the CEE region

Activities

- Two preparatory meetings for the CoP 15th in 2009 and in 2010
- Participation of WG delegates on the EU preparatory meetings (2009)
- Identify endangered species of CEE relevance threatened by international trade, which qualify for upgrading
- Preparation of fact-sheets/posters/lobby materials for the CoP
- Participate at the 15th CITES CoP in Qatar
- Support priority issues of partners and likeminded organizations and safeguard the support of partners and likeminded organizations for our own priorities

Results

- Priority and “obligatory” issues on the draft agenda of the CoP identified
- Priority issues for the CEEWEB CITES WGs are decided
- List of species for upgrading identified
- Action Plan for the activities/ participation at the 15th CITES CoP developed
- Conservation minded EU level decisions regarding the proposals and working documents of CoP 15th
- Up-listing of endangered species of CEE relevance threatened by international trade

Cooperation in the CITES Working Group

Objective

- Functional and effective CITES Working Group

Activities

- Coordinate, organize and communicate for the purposes of the WG
- Organize Working Group meetings

Results

- A more effective and successful Working Group
- Keeping of deadlines, precise and on time work
- Enhanced relations with partners due to regular contacts and communication
- Evaluation of ongoing activities (photo exhibition, educational materials)
- Agreement on list of species that should be monitored in 2008/09
- Agreement on details of CEETES monitoring 2008/09
- Detailed plan for the Thematic Year 2009 and task division

Public support for Natura 2000

Objective

- Raise awareness among stakeholders on Natura 2000 to create greater public support

Activities

- Create a CEEweb database on best practice examples of Natura 2000 implementation (all possible kind of examples, also collected by the STWG and RDWG), which can be used by member organisations to better communicate Natura 2000
- Produce and distribute communication materials at national level (also for the use of other WGs)

Results

- Stakeholders better understand Natura 2000 and its benefits
- Enhanced public support for Natura 2000

Natura 2000 designation

Objectives

- Ensure that Natura 2000 site designation is based on purely scientific ground, and the sites are sufficient to maintain favourable conservation status of the species or habitats which they host
- Promote NGO involvement in the Biogeographic seminars and in bilateral negotiations following the seminars and provide feed-back to the NGO community as well as to the EU and the European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity

Activities

- Coordinate NGO input and participation in new MSs into the bio-geographic seminars, through organising meetings in Bulgaria and Romania based on the experiences and positive feed-back during the similar work done for the EU-10¹
- Enable the participation of local CEEweb members in the Seminars in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania, also facilitate observers from candidate countries (Croatia, Macedonia and Turkey)
- Follow up the site designation process in Poland and ensure that NGO considerations are taken into account at national and EU levels
- Lobby for better involvement of NGOs in the bilateral negotiations in all new Member States, where applicable

Results

- Two preparatory in Bulgaria and Romania for NGOs organized
- NGOs' participation in the Biogeographic seminars and input to bilateral negotiations
- Improved list of proposed Natura 2000 sites

Natura 2000 fact sheets

Objective

- Strengthen the exchange of knowledge on the national implementation of Habitats, Birds and Liability Directives among members

¹ EU-10 defined as Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Activity

- Continue to provide national level information through the update and further development of the 'Natura 2000 fact sheets' and make available this information

Results

- Better understanding and communication of the common problems related to implementation in new MSs

Enforcement of EU biodiversity legislation

Objective

- Strengthen the exchange of knowledge between CEEweb Member organisations and the European Commission on the implementation of EU biodiversity legislation in MSs, with special focus on Habitats and Birds Directives and the Liability Directive
- Better enforcement of EU legislation in MSs

Activities

- Organise Brussels lobby meetings (also identify common interest with rural development and tourism) for CEEweb members
- Coordinate the parallel submission of complaints from CEE or submit a strategic complaint (for a number of CEE countries) if common regional problems make it necessary
- Strengthen capacities of NGOs to support adequate implementation of the LD at national level through organising trainings on relevant issues to WG members
- Follow-up the implementation of the LD in MSs, focusing on legal cases

Results

- Closer cooperation with EU institutions for enforcement of EU legislation
- Strategic complaints/ parallel complaints from CEE countries if necessary
- Enhanced capacity of NGOs regarding the LD and enforcement work

Military Training Areas Programme –developing the information base

Objective

- Collect scientific information on biodiversity values in military training areas of CEE countries as a basis for future conservation action and analyze threats, trends and possibilities which are common in the region

Activities

- Complete the information for the four Visegrad countries so that it can serve as a basis for planning follow-up conservation actions
- Start /continue to gather information from other CEE/SEE countries including non-EU countries as well

Results

- Information, common database is publicly available for designing further activities in CEE countries

Military Training Areas Programme – developing cooperation

Objective

- Strengthen mutual and cross-border cooperation among NGOs and state institutions (Ministries of Defence, Ministries of Environment) involved in nature

conservation and the maintenance of the Natura 2000 network in actively used Military Training Areas

Activities

- Facilitate exchange of scientific knowledge and experience on the conservation planning and management in Military Training Areas
- Raise public awareness on nature conservation (and Natura 2000) issues in Military Training Areas

Results

- Cooperation is established or strengthened among the involved stakeholders
- Awareness on this subject is raised through different communication materials and media

Natura 2000 in (potential) candidate countries

Objective

- Help to introduce the system of EU biodiversity policies, especially Natura 2000 for non-EU countries in Europe through transferring knowledge to these countries

Activities

- Create a "Task Force" of the best EU 10 experts who are ready to transfer knowledge
- Contact target countries, screen their needs and offer transfer of knowledge
- Organize meetings and seminars for biodiversity experts (NGO, GO and other) to facilitate knowledge transfer

Results

- Non-EU European countries have a better and deeper understanding of EU nature legislation, especially Natura 2000
- The capacity of national NGOs is strengthened

Cooperation in the Natura 2000 WG

Objective

- Strengthen the implementation of the Natura 2000 part of the Work Programme through creating and establishing capacity at national level
- Strengthen the capacities of the Working Group through identifying the most important expertise of WG Members and making this information widely available for other WG members

Activities

- Create a network of national focal points for Natura 2000 who are responsible for the fulfilment of tasks which have to be completed at national level
- Visit possible future focal points in those countries where an active focal point could not be determined in order to explain CEEweb activities and the possibilities of cooperation
- Screen the activity of member organizations and identify 2-5 areas of expertise of each organisation
- Make this information available on the CEEweb website (for members or the wider public, as appropriate)

Results

- Two groups of countries defined:
 1. Countries with active focal points
 2. Countries where an active focal point could not be determined
- Network of national focal points is established in CEE

Sustainability in rural development

Objective

- Greater understanding of sustainability among decision makers

Activities

- Promote understanding of the developed common CEEweb policy among decision-makers through personal meetings with members of EU institutions (European Parliament, European Commission, Permanent Representations, etc.) and lobby for the CEEweb policy
- Lobby meetings with the Natura 2000 WG
- Follow closely the decision making process (e.g. identify the key persons, timing of events, decisions)

Results

- Better information background for future decision making at CEEweb
- Better understanding among decision makers of sustainability in rural development
- Established working contacts with decision makers

CAP Health check

Objective

- Strengthen EU rural development policies

Activities

- Explore the CAP Health Check initiative and the available opportunities for debates
- Gather information about cross-compliance scheme in EU-15, the set-aside obligations in EU-10, funding for Natura 2000 and other fields of CAP Health Check (e.g. decoupling and modulation)
- Channel the developed CEEweb position into the CAP Health Check

Results

- Better EU rural development measures and environmental considerations
- Developed CEE positions in relation to CAP Health Check

CAP mid-term review

Objective

- Strengthen EU rural development policies

Activities

- Explore the mid-term review and the available opportunities for debates
- Gather information in EU 8+2
- Channel the developed CEEweb position (developed in cooperation with the N2000 WG when it comes to Natura 2000 payments and agri-environmental and forest-environmental measures) into the mid-term review

Results

- Better rural development measures and environmental considerations
- Developed CEE positions in relation to CAP mid-term review

Addressing non-compliance with EU funding requirements

Objective

- Full implementation of EU agricultural funding requirements

- Improve the state of environment in agricultural and surrounding areas

Activities

- Investigate if non-compliance is a serious problem in EU-10 and if yes, then find the weaknesses of the control system and draw attention to them at national and EU levels

Results

- More information on national compliance with agricultural funding requirements
- Better compliance with EU funding requirements
- Improved environment through keeping requirements

Funding for rural development

Objective

- Better use of EU funding for improved rural livelihood and environment, not prioritizing exclusively one area (e.g. tourism) as THE solution
- Smooth switch to the EU funding system in the countries joining the EU in the future

Activities

- Gather information on the allocation and accessibility of funding for rural development in EU-10
- Gather information on what could be achieved for better Natura 2000 payments
- Gather information on public participation in the planning process and share best practices
- Influence the national financial allocation in the (bi-)yearly reviews
- Influence EU financial allocation in the next planning period 2014-2020 also in order to ensure proper funding for N2000 and agri-environmental and forest-environmental measures (in cooperation with the N2000 WG)
- Explore the national budget support for agriculture in non-EU countries and build capacities of (potential) candidate countries for the EU funding system

Results

- Effective and proper funding for rural development at EU and national levels
- Better understanding of EU agricultural funding in non-EU countries

Biomass and biofuels

Objective

- Formulate common CEEweb policy about biomass use for energy and biofuel production
- Better EU policies on these issues

Activities

- Develop policy on biomass and biofuel and accumulate expertise in these fields
- Communicate the developed policy and disseminate the translated summary of the existing publication "Biomass dilemma"
- Lobby on EU level for the CEEweb policy

Results

- Clear CEEweb policy on this issue
- Better understanding of the sustainability implications of biofuel and biomass
- Changes in EU policy on biomass for energy and biofuel production

Land ownership and use

Objective

- Land ownership and use in new EU MSs for local community benefits and biodiversity

Activities

- Gather information on the regulations of land ownership and use in the accession treaties of EU-10 and other legislation
- Build coalitions with small farmers and raise the issue to the political level

Results

- Both short term and final long-term solutions developed at the EU level

Direct delivery and marketing of local products

Objective

- Well-functioning local market for (organic) products in EU-10

Activities

- Collect and share good examples, experiences of direct delivery and marketing (e.g. in relation to local branding in cooperation with the STWG) and information on the legislation in EU-10

Results

- Better understanding of the pre-conditions of direct marketing in EU-10
- Best practices are spreaded in EU-10

Supporting Leader programmes

Objective

- More sovereignty for local communities through properly designed and implemented Leader programmes (which also means the proper integration ecosystem services)

Activities

- Learn about good international experiences in Leader programmes through establishing contacts through RDWG and STWG
- Lobby at national level for providing capacity building for Local Action Groups

Results

- More knowledge on Leader programmes in EU-10
- Capacity-building programmes initiated by the states

Labelling organic products

Objective

- Clear and correct information for consumers about organic products

Activity

- Look into national legislation and sharing good experiences in EU-10 about the transposition of the relevant EU regulation adopted in June 2007

Results

- Full implementation of the EU regulation on organic product labelling

Partnerships with farmers

Objective

- Alliances with farmers' organizations for joint lobbying on rural development also including Natura 2000 and tourism

Activities

- Establish contacts through personal meetings, events, etc. with farmers' organizations (European Landowners Organisation, association of young farmers, etc.)
- Form alliances with these organisations related to current issues

Results

- Well-established contacts and new allies for lobbying

Cooperation in the Rural Development WG

Objective

- Stronger NGOs in the CEE region and enhanced cooperation among them

Activities

- Recruit new members for the WG and re-activate the former ones
- Identify members responsible for particular issues (lead NGOs), as appropriate
- Work out at least one common project for upcoming call for proposals in one year
- Provide information regularly to all the members and share national experiences among members
- Provide background documents before WG meetings
- Organise trainings on relevant issues for NGOs
- Exchange information and experiences between the RDWG and Natura 2000 WG through visiting each other's meetings

Results

- Expanded and stronger RDWG
- Members actively participate in the WG activities
- Increased capacities of CEE NGOs

Creation of understanding on sustainable tourism

Objective

- Build understanding of the idea of sustainable tourism among stakeholders (including businesses and local authorities)

Activities

- Carry out awareness raising campaigns (this includes publications, the Internet webpages, participation in relevant meetings, etc.), whenever necessary combining with information on Rural Development, CITES and Natura 2000
- Develop and apply tools/methodologies for how to change behaviour of selected stakeholders

Results

- Increased awareness of sustainable tourism among stakeholders
- Tools/methodologies developed, shared among CEE NGOs and applied

Influencing tourism development in CEE countries

Objective

- Influence legislation, planning and implementation of tourism in CEE, aiming at the integration of sustainability principles into all processes

Activities

- Enable NGOs to participate in and influence decision-making processes on national and international level (e.g. EU, Carpathian Convention, Balkan Convention)
- Raise awareness and provide information on national tourism situations in CEE through compilation and promotion of best and worst practice examples in order to support the work of NGOs
- Enhance opportunities of action for NGOs through helping national NGO networks to be more active

Results

- At least six workshops/seminars on issues related to planning, implementing and influencing decision-making in sustainable tourism are implemented
- A database on best and worst practice examples exists and contains at least 40 examples in total
- Cooperation in the area of sustainable tourism among national NGOs is well functioning
- The impact of the STWG (and its members) is increased on national and international level (e.g. under the EU and the Carpathian Convention)

Building capacities of the Sustainable Tourism Working Group

Objective

- Enable NGOs to play an active role in the implementation of CBD Guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development on the ground

Activities

- Build understanding of NGOs of sustainable tourism issues
- Create best practice examples for the implementation of the CBD Guidelines (focussing on the role of NGOs in the process) through actions on the ground in three selected sites
- Prepare a manual on tourism development based on CBD Guidelines, which enables NGOs to act as facilitators/multipliers
- Promote the manual as tool for CBD Guidelines implementation: distribute the manual and conduct trainings on the use of the manual at international and local levels and encourage pilot project initiation based on the manual

Results

- Manual on tourism development based on CBD guidelines is developed, put online, printed (languages: English, Bulgarian, Serbian, Romanian; copies: app. 1000 in each language) and distributed
- Tourism development in three pilot sites based on the manual and the CBD Guidelines takes place
- Training of Trainer seminar held on the use of the manual
- Three Trainings on the use of the manual have been conducted by the local NGOs trained in the TOT

7.3 Capacity-building and strengthening the network

Communication inside and outside of the network

Objective

- Make the communication more efficient inside and outside the network

Activity

- Develop a strategy for the work with the media (including establishing good contacts with the media and if necessary, organize workshops for journalists to get their support for the issues we work for)
- Appoint a CEEweb Office member to be responsible for international communication and frequent updating of CEEweb website
- Regularly inform members on CEEweb issues in the office and membership (including member news, staff changes, etc.)
- Make available of database of contacts and the collected member profiles
- Send more information to organisations outside the CEEweb network through regular and ad hoc publications, e.g. (bi-)annual report
- Use the Clearing House Mechanism more effectively (e.g. for the Joining the Dots project)
- Harmonise the design of publications

Results

- Quicker circulation of information, transparent system of responsibilities for circulating information, organizing events, etc. inside the CEEweb network
- More active membership
- Better mutual exchange of info/experiences

Capacity building of the network

Objectives

- Generate broader understanding of issues related to biodiversity conservation and sustainability
- Stronger CEE NGOs, which can raise issues towards the general public

Activities

- Apply interdisciplinary approach for capacity building trainings (e.g. Natura 2000 and Tourism)
- Revive the CEEweb Academy
- Organise trainings on
 - campaigning, media work and electronic tools to be used in related processes (e.g. blog, open source),
 - moderation, facilitation and communication skills for members of CEEweb,
 - lobbying skills,
 - conventions, e.g. CBD
- Organize study trips to promote CEEweb through direct contacts

Results

- More capacities for interdisciplinary work in the WGs
- Better skills and more solid knowledge of CEEweb members for proactive stance

Networking, activating members for implementation

Objective

- Strengthen professional and personal ties between member organizations
- Improve team spirit
- Increase the number of people dedicated to CEEweb
- Activate sleeping members

Activity

- Carry out needs assessment in the network
- Inform regularly members about the outcomes of CEEweb and WG meetings, ongoing and future projects, invite them to join
- Cooperate among WGs on collecting case studies and make links of the data bases to the different WG activities

- Exchange publications for commenting among the WGs if relevant
- Establish contacts on national level among members /lead NGOs in different WG areas
- Organize field visits to (all) member organizations in one country in order to increase the number of CEEweb related persons
- Actively search for possible projects to be implemented by members among themselves
- Approach new people, new groups (not only environmentalists, as always) with different backgrounds
- Make meetings more attractive, e.g. include team building days/activities, good food, dancing

Results

- More organized and formalized contacts between members and the office
- Increased number of projects between CEEweb members
- More decentralized structure
- Higher motivation, better understanding of what the network/members really do
- More personalised contacts, which are important for effectiveness of work

8. The structure and decision-making competences within the organisation

CEEweb maintains its currently existing structure in the future as it is also laid down in the Articles of Association.

Annual Meetings

The Annual Meeting is the main decision making and planning instrument of the Network. It approves the Articles of Association and its amendments and decides about the dissolving of the organisation and merging with other organization by two-third majority. The Annual Meeting approves the financial report, the annual report and the public benefit report, the reports of the managing organs and officers, discusses and approves the annual work programme and determines the membership fee by simple majority.

It elects the President, the Vice-President and the additional member of the Board, as well as the members of the Advisory Committee and the Supervisory Committee and is entitled to dismiss these persons from their positions.

The Annual Meeting decides about the applicant's membership and the expulsion of members. It also approves the establishment of Working Groups, their work programme and decides about their dissolution.

Board

The Board is the decision-making body in between the Annual Meetings except for the issues in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Annual Meeting. The Board consists of the President, Vice-president and one regular member elected by the Annual Meeting. It has meetings together with the Advisory Committee.

The President has the right for representing the organisation in accordance with the Hungarian general civil law. The Vice-President has no legal representation right, but can substitute the President in any other matters.

Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee is an opinion forming and advisory body of the organisation. It consists of three members elected by the Annual Meeting, as well as of the Chairs of the Working Groups elected by the WG members themselves. The Advisory Committee has meetings together with the Board, and formulates recommendations before all Board decisions.

General Secretary

The General Secretary is appointed by the Board and reports at least once a year to the Board on his/her activities. The employment rights over the General Secretary are exercised by the President.

The General Secretary works for CEEweb on a daily basis, leads and organises the Policy Office and exercises the employment right over CEEweb employees. Within this jurisdiction he/she is entitled to act on behalf of the organisation in front of tax and other authorities, and can represent the organisation. The General Secretary has the right of signature within the jurisdictional scope specified by the President. Without specific authorisation from the President, he/she can represent the organisation with full rights in the course of preparing applications. The General Secretary manages the economic activity of CEEweb, being responsible for the decisions made with regards to economic and financial issues, and for the execution of the decisions. The General Secretary is entitled to sign contracts in individual legal cases up to the limit of 25.000.000 HUF.

The General Secretary is responsible for convening and preparing the Annual Meetings, the Board and the Advisory Committee meetings, informing about the decisions and ensuring their implementation. The General Secretary participates in the Board and Advisory Committee meetings with the right of opinion and right of motion.

The General Secretary represents the organisation towards state and civic organizations and in international relations and lobbies for the realisation of the policies determined by the CEEweb network and the Board. The General Secretary is responsible for delivering appropriate information to the members of the CEEweb network, and that the CEEweb' website is regularly updated with information.

Supervisory Committee

The CEEweb has a Supervisory Committee of three individuals that monitors the operation and management of the organization. The meetings are called by the Chair and any member of the organisations can request the chair to convene the meeting in writing indicating the reason and the purpose.

Working Groups

Working Groups are created upon the proposals of the member organisations or the General Secretary. They shall involve at least five member organisations participating in the activities, decide about the joining of new members to the Working Groups and elect their Chair. They shall develop their work programme, which shall be approved by the Annual Meeting.

Offices

The headquarters of CEEweb is in Budapest, while there is a branch office in Miskolc (with no employees working there).