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Current and future Natura 2000 Financing

- **Art. 8 of Habitats Directive acknowledges the funds needed for Natura 2000**
- **Current funds by EU:**
  - ~550-1150 mil. EUR/year
  - ~3% of EU Budget
- **According to the 2010 Commission’s Study:**
  - In 2004 - 6.1 billion € (EU25)/y
  - In 2010 – min. 5.8 billion € (EU27)/y ideally needed
Costs of Natura 2000
Costs of Natura 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Costs</th>
<th>£m per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One off costs (annualised)</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>1,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent costs (annual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management planning</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat management and monitoring</td>
<td>2,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>3,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (25 EU Member States)</td>
<td>5,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapolated to EU-27</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>35% - 2025 mEUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>33% - 1915 m EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other terrestrial</td>
<td>11% - 649 m EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland waters</td>
<td>7% - 430 m EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>6% - 320 m EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>6% - 350 m EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>1% - 78 m EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs required according to MSs
Current Sources

- **2007-2013- financial sources:**
  - ✔ EAFRD (direct N2K payments-898 m EUR)
  - ✔ ESF
  - ✔ ERDF (Cat. 51, 55, 56 4,7 m EUR)
  - ✔ Cohesion Fund (?)
  - ✔ EFF (Axis 3 – 1956 m EUR)
  - ✔ LIFE+ (2.14 b EUR)
  - ✔ FP7 (?)
Current Sources - deficiencies

- Limitations of the existing sources:
  - EU Funding with national co-funding (EU)
  - Lack of clear targeting (EU, MS)
  - Lack of transparency (EU, MS)
  - Competing priorities, little focus on conservation (MS)
  - Different national structures (MS)
  - Lack of uptake and information on funds (MS)
  - Low institutional and administration capacity (MS)
  - Low stakeholder capacity (MS)
  - Funding and co-financing loads (MS)
  - National features of N2K sites (MS)
  - Lack of management plans (MS)
PAFs

- Prescribed by Art. 8 of the HD (SACs)
- To aid lack of coherence and transparency in terms of N2000 funding and national priorities
- A strategic programming to clarify and define funds and the measures they are used for
- MSs are more able to focus funds, identify gaps, reduce administration burden, cooperate and allocate national co-finance for certain measures
- Can help monitor EU funds’ use
- Need for management plans
Our role

- Participate in PAFs processes?
- Lobby at our MEPs and the MSs for a greener budget
  - E.g. N2K and GI under Cohesion Fund
- Pilot projects with ES, IFMs and their applications
- Ecosystem services approach in application for funds
- Greater awareness raising on Natura 2000
- Increased knowledge and social support for Natura 2000
Emphasise the benefits!
Emphasise the benefits!
• Why lobby? – Set the overall aim
• Who to lobby? – Identify stakeholders
• How to lobby? – Set the overall tools
- Sumava National Park, Czech Republic
- Tatra National Park, Slovakia
- Wlodzica river, Poland
- Pirin National Park, Bulgaria
- Sutjeska National Park, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Difficulties and challenges

• Lack of lobby power
• Lack of cooperation between sectors
• Lack of cooperation between NGOs
• Lack of good contacts
• Lack of lobby tools to get the attention
• Policies existence but lack of implementation (due to capacity, funding, administration, etc.)
• Lack of general awareness on importance
• Lack of general support
• Speed of intervention and adequate information
• Source of money
Opportunities

• Good connection with stakeholders
• Good cooperation
• Quick and coordinated reaction
• “Attack” at many levels
• Effective use of media and innovative tools
• Good arguments (scientific data, experts, foreign experience, money term expression, etc.)
• Use EU pressure
• Use policies
• Use public support at many levels
Thank you!
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