The role and experience of NGO’s in site designation (and biogeo seminars)
Why NGO’s like Natura 2000?

• because it works!

• first system which requires real results

• possibility to find financing for nature conservation;

• possibility of important extension and improvement of network of protected areas;

• EC and ECJ additional level for appeal;

• fascinating idea of European Nature Conservation
Why governments (usually) don’t like Natura 2000?

• because it works! *We always protect nature in Polish forestry but Natura 2000 is a terrible system – we will have to protect nature really!* (source: Polish foresters, 2004 y.)

• investments will be more difficult ...

• block national development ...

Not true – Natura 2000 is only a kind of filter separating stupid and wise investments projects – making development sustainable. But really working filter ...
Natura 2000 sites designation is usually a kind of game between MS NGO’s and government
“Shadow list” – NGO’s list of sites not submitted officially

Quite normal in EU!
Natura 2000 Shadow List in Poland

*Detailed Analysis of Habitat Directive Implementation*

*Synthetic Approach to Bird Directive Implementation*
SPAs (Bird Sites) –

Designed individually
By Member State

NGOs can complain of inappropriate designation
A: Global

A1. Species of global conservation concern
The site regularly holds significant numbers of a globally threatened species, or other species of global conservation concern.

A2. Restricted-range species
The site is known or thought to hold a significant component of the restricted-range species whose breeding distributions define an Endemic Bird Area (EBA) or Secondary Area (SA).

A3. Biome-restricted species
The site is known or thought to hold a significant assemblage of the species whose breeding distributions are largely or wholly confined to one biome.

A4. Congregations
The site is known or thought to hold, on a regular basis, ≥ 1% of a biogeographic population of a congregatory waterbird species.
The site is known or thought to hold, on a regular basis, ≥ 1% of the global population of a congregatory seabird or terrestrial species.
The site is known or thought to hold, on a regular basis, ≥ 20,000 waterbirds or ≥ 10,000 pairs of seabird of one or more species.
The site is known or thought to be a ‘bottleneck’ site where at least 20,000 storks (Ciconiidae), raptors (Accipitriformes and Falconiformes) or cranes (Gruidae) regularly pass during spring or autumn migration.

B: European

B1. Congregations
The site is known or thought to hold ≥ 1% of a flyway or other distinct population of a waterbird species.
The site is known or thought to hold ≥ 1% of a distinct population of a seabird species.
The site is known or thought to hold ≥ 1% of a flyway or other distinct population of other congregatory species.
The site is a ‘bottleneck’ site where over 5,000 storks, or over 3,000 raptors or cranes regularly pass on spring or autumn migration.

B2. Species with an unfavourable conservation status in Europe
The site is one of the 'n' most important in the country for a species with an unfavourable conservation status in Europe (SPEC 2, 3) and for which the site-protection approach is thought to be appropriate.

B3. Species with a favourable conservation status in Europe
The site is one of the 'n' most important in the country for a species with a favourable conservation status in Europe but concentrated in Europe (SPEC 4) and for which the site-protection approach is thought to be appropriate.
C: European Union

C1. Species of global conservation concern
The site regularly holds significant numbers of a globally threatened species, or other species of global conservation concern.

C2. Concentrations of a species threatened at the European Union level
The site is known to regularly hold at least 1% of a flyway population or of the EU population of a species threatened at the EU level (listed on Annex I and referred to in Article 4.1 of the EC Birds Directive).

C3. Congregations of migratory species not threatened at the EU level
The site is known to regularly hold at least 1% of a flyway population of a migratory species not considered threatened at the EU level (as referred to in Article 4.2 of the EC Birds Directive) (not listed on Annex I).

C4. Congregatory – large congregations
The site is known to regularly hold at least 20,000 migratory waterbirds and/or 10,000 pairs of migratory seabirds of one or more species.

C5. Congregatory – bottleneck sites
The site is a ‘bottleneck’ site where at least 5,000 storks (Ciconiidae) and/or at least 3,000 raptors (Accipitriformes and Falconiformes) and/or 3,000 cranes (Gruidae) regularly pass on spring or autumn migration.

C6. Species threatened at the European Union level
The site is one of the five most important in the European region (NUTS region) in question for a species or subspecies considered threatened in the European Union (i.e. listed in Annex I of the EC Birds Directive).

C7. Other ornithological criteria
The site has been designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA) or selected as a candidate SPA based on ornithological criteria (similar to but not equal to C1–C6) in recognized use for identifying SPAs.
IBA must be designed as SPA!
NGO strategy:

Prove that IBA criteria are fulfilled!

If you prove that, SPA must be designed!

*Use best scientific knowledge*
SCIs
(Habitat Sites) –

1. Proposed by MS as pSCIs
2. Assessed by EC (Biogeo Seminar procedure)
3. Designed by EC as SCIs
4. Designed by MS as SAC

NGOs can discuss on Biogeo Seminar and complain inappropriately designation
MS have some level of discretion in pSCIs submitting ...
... but must base on scientific arguments only
... and must achieve the Directive’s objectives
pSCIs – till the EC approval - must be protected more strictly than SACs
Biogeographic Seminar
EC – MS gov. – MS NGO’s

Objective: to evaluate the (in)sufficiency of the national proposals for each habitat type and species

Rules of the game:

1. refer to habitats and species by their codes or latin names
2. discussions based on habitats and species (not sites, shadow sites or sites boundaries !)
3. only scientific arguments count
4. evaluation based on best scientific information available at that moment

NGOs Strategy:
Prove the species / habitat is „insufficiently” represented in official proposal (IN MAJ, IN MOD)
- new sites for this species / habitat must be designated!
BioGeo Seminar
NGO’s Common Arguments:

No one site proposed = IN MAJ

Not enough part of national resources included
20-60-80% rule = IN MOD

Not whole geographical range covered
= IN MOD (geographical gap)
Still IN MOD
(geographical gap)

SCIENTIFIC RESERVE
(do more research and come back in future)

SUF
Before and after Biogeo Seminar:

- Most effective: „communication with the EC and ETC in a Seminar style”; 

- Species / habitats” related, not directly sites related (although based on „Shadow List” of sites); 

- Based on the best available scientific knowledge – scientific publications, experts; 

- Use also national art. 17 report! 

- NGO’s assessment of species / habitats representativity as a reaction on each governmental Natura 2000 extension.
Dolina Wierzycy
pSCI – Shadow List 2006
### 3. Progress in achieving habitats & species sufficiency

**HABITATS (INSUFFICIENCIES REMAINING AFTER THE 48 SITES SUBMITTING IN SEPTEMBER 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Habitat type</th>
<th>Conclusion of the Seminar</th>
<th>Progress as result of New sites submission, 31 March 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td><em>Salicornia</em> and other annuals colonizing mud and sand</td>
<td>IN MAJOR</td>
<td>No progress, still IN MAJOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3220</td>
<td>Alpine rivers and the herbaceous vegetation along their banks</td>
<td>IN MAJOR</td>
<td>All localities known at 2006 in Sudety mts. and locality Jasiolka river in Carpathian Foothills have been included, but habitat is much more common in Sudety mountains and in the Carpathian Foothills. Should be concluded as IN MOD (habitat present in Kamienica river, Dunajec river and Lososina river on the Carpathians foothills) and also considered as SCI RES in Sudety mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5130</td>
<td><em>Juniperus communis</em> formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands</td>
<td>IN MAJOR</td>
<td>No progress, still IN MAJOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6110</td>
<td><em>Rupicolous calcareous</em> or basophilic grasslands of the <em>Alysso-Sedion albi</em></td>
<td>IN MAJOR</td>
<td>One site (Dobromierz) submitted, but most important sites (Góry Kaczawskie and Góry Kamienne) still not included (these two sites contain $&gt;70%$ of habitat resources!). Definitely IN MOD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130</td>
<td><em>Calaminarian</em> grasslands of the <em>Violellalia calaminariae</em></td>
<td>IN MAJOR</td>
<td>Locality found in previously submitted site Rudawy Janowickie (although not mentioned in SDF). But the second, and most important, “classic” locality near Olkusz still not submitted. definitely IN MOD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typical scenario of NGO role:
„National NGO coalition for Natura 2000”

- elements of scientific inventory;
- collecting scientific data;
- sites proposals preparing (maps & SDF are the basic Natura 2000 language);
- data analysis;
- Shadow List preparing;
- communication with the government;
- communication with the EC;
- representing EHF on Biogeo Seminar;
- communication again ...
Thank you for your attention

... And wish you good final Natura 2000 designation in your country

It depends also on you!