**Expert Workshop**

“EU policy options for the protection of European Forests against harmful Impacts”, Brussels, 7 – 8 May, 2009

**Schedule**

7 May 2009 – Day I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:00 pm| Welcome addresses and introduction  
  • Welcome address (J. Van De Velde, DG Environment)  
  • “Implementation of the EU Forestry Strategy: How to protect EU Forests against harmful Impacts”: Study & Workshop objectives, tasks and structure (Georg Winkel, IFP Freiburg) |
| 1:30   | Presentations on workshop background (IFP Freiburg, Ecologic Institute)  
  • European forests: Challenges, impacts, and threats (Lydia Rosenkranz, IFP Freiburg)  
  • Policy framework in the context of EU forests (Timo Kaphengst, Ecologic Institute Berlin) |
| 2:00   | Key note presentations: From Coordination towards regulation. EU environmental and forest policy governance modes  
  • EU Forest Policy (Metodi Sotirov, IFP Freiburg)  
  • EU Water Framework Directive (Thomas Dvorak, Ecologic Institute Vienna)  
  • EU Common Agricultural Policy (Peter Wehrheim, DG Agriculture)  
  • EU Nature Conservation Policy (Mariam Sanchez Guisandez, DG Environment) |
| 3:00   | Coffee break |
| 3:30   | Working groups on abiotic, biotic, and directly human induced forest threats part I  
  • Definition of threats  
  • Need for action at Community level |
| 4:40   | Plenary: Presentation and discussion of results |
| 5:40   | Working groups on abiotic, biotic, and directly human induced forest threats part II  
  • Developing options for a response at Community level |
<p>| 7:00   | End of day I |
| 7:30   | Dinner (optional) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td><strong>Introduction day II</strong> <em>(IFP Freiburg, Ecologic Institute, DG Environment)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>Plenary: Presentations and discussion of results on threat related options for a Community response <em>(Working groups day I)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td><strong>Wrap up: Different options for EU forest policy</strong> <em>(IFP Freiburg, Ecologic Institute)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td><strong>Working groups on EU forest policy options part I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outlining different options for a response for forest protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Steps for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break and snacks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Plenary: Presentation and discussion of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td><strong>Final discussion: EU policy options for the protection of European Forests against harmful impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Main workshop results/ key messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open questions/contradictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Take home messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outlook on the project/compilation and evaluation process of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td><strong>End of the workshop</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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European forests: Challenges, impacts and threats
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• Challenges for European forests
  • Ecological Trends
  • Socioeconomic Trends

• Impacts and threats
  • Biotic, abiotic and directly human induced impacts
  • Resulting threats
  • Different perspectives
What are challenges?

- **Challenging trends:**
  Changes in the ecological and socioeconomic environment of European Forests and European Forest Management

- Most of them are closely interdependent

- All of them can be traced back to human activities

- Result in different impacts on forests

- Regional differences (in regard to challenges, impacts & threats)

---

### Challenges: Ecological Trends

**Climate Change**
- Appr. 2°C rise in global temperatures until 2050
- Change in precipitation patterns & extreme weather events
  - Forests: sinks or sources of Greenhouse Gases (depending on management)
  - But also directly affected by climate change impacts

**Emissions and depositions**
- Sulphur/heavy metals: Decrease since 1980s / accumulations still in soil
- Nitrogenous emissions from road traffic, livestock husbandry and atmospheric depositions main source for acidification and eutrophication
Challenges: Socioeconomic Trends

Changing societal demands and expectations

Commodity
(timber, resin, charcoal, foodstuff, …)

Amenity
(recreation, nature experience, …)

Nature protection
(comparatively natural ecosystems/
pillar of Europe’s biodiversity)

‘New’ conflict: Increase in demand for wood for energetic use!

Challenges: Socioeconomic Trends II

Economic globalisation and changing demands of timber industry

• Technological innovations and liberalised markets

• First: long-term deterioration of forest management in huge parts of Europe

• Recent years: rising timber prices

• Concentration processes

• Prognosis: uncertain
  – Economic crisis
  – Energy prices
  – Demand
Challenges: Socioeconomic Trends III

Changing structures within forestry

- Structural transformation of state forest services / Privatisation
- “Urban” forest owners / Fragmentation

Two trends
- Multifunctionalisation: multipurpose forestry
- Economisation: optimising profitability

Main impacts on European Forests

- Biotic impacts
  - Alien plant species / trees
  - Insects and pathogens
  - Game and livestock

- Abiotic impacts
  - Effects of climate change
  - Storms
  - Fires
  - Acidification, eluviation and eutrophication of forest soils

- Directly human induced impacts
  - Land-use changes (deforestation), fragmentation
  - Forest management
What is a threat?

- Difficulty in identifying threats
- Always several perspectives

- A **forest threat** is an impact on a forest ecosystem that is likely to lead to the deterioration of a part of or of the entire ecosystem services of a forest for the society and, therefore, is experienced as being harmful by society as a whole or by certain societal groups.

- ‘Amenity’ and ‘Commodity’ perspective

---

### Different perspectives on EU forests and related perceptions of threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Commodity’-perspective</th>
<th>Aspects to be considered</th>
<th>‘Amenity’-perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource basis and place of wood production</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naturally dynamic ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest owners and enterprises, forest based industry</td>
<td>View of forests</td>
<td>All living species including plants and animals, pluralistic society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest health/stability, vitality (growth)</td>
<td>Groups of greatest concern</td>
<td>Forest biodiversity, dynamic and disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on/within forest ecosystems that harm the profitability of forest production</td>
<td>Important attributes of forest ecosystems</td>
<td>Impacts on forest ecosystems that harm forest diversity and natural dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural, indirectly and directly human-induced origins</td>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Indirectly and directly human induced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causes/origin of threats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Alien plant species
For instance, trees planted outside their natural past or present habitat (spruce, pine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Amenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Backbone of forest industry in Europe</td>
<td>• Might increase diversity if not extensively planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often productive and efficient to manage</td>
<td>• Strongly decreasing natural forest biodiversity if planted in pure stands/ on large areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparatively high associated risks (e.g. storms, fires, soil acidification)</td>
<td>• Need for action: Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for action: Low</td>
<td>• Need for action: High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your attention!
Policy framework in the context of EU forests

Timo Kaphengst
Ecologic Institute

Overview

EU Forest Policy – general

Overview on forest and forest related policies on different levels

Policy coherence

Governance Modes
**EU Forest policy - General**

- Forest policies is first and foremost subject to **competences of the Member States** → no Common EU approach on forest policy so far
- Main role of EC: Supporting forest policy through **coordination** of activities between Member States and **communicating** objectives and research
- Policy initiatives on forest protection on **different governance levels**: international, pan-European, EU, (Member State level)
- Forest policy is spread across **several EU policies** which address forests directly or effect forestry in the EU:
  - Forest policies
  - Forest-related policies

---

**Forest and forest related policies**

- **International**: UNFF, CBD, UNFCCC,...
- **Pan European**: MCPFE
  - Since 1990
  - Main objectives: establishment of SFM and advancement of NFPs

- **European forest policies**:
  - **EU Forestry Strategy (1998)**
    - Coordinating national initiatives for sustainable forest management
  - **EU Forest Action Plan (2006)**
    - refer predominantly to activities in the areas of coordination (including the exchange of information and experience), communication and research
Forest related EU policies

- **Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)**
  - Forest programmes funded under pillar 2 (Axis 2)

- **Water Framework Directive (WFD)**
  - River basin based Programme of Measures can also include forest measures

- **Nature protection (Natura 2000)**
  - Forests being part of Protection Sites (can affect forest management)

- **Policy on Renewable Energies**
  - Targets for renewable energies boost biomass extraction from forests

- **Climate Policy**
  - Commission will assess ways to include emissions and removals related to land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) in the Community

- **Cross Cutting: Forest Monitoring**

---

Policy coherence

**Vertical:**
- International
- Pan-European
- European

**Horizontal:**
- European (forest and forest related)
- Policy 1 ↔ Policy 2 ↔ Policy 3 ↔ Policy 4a

Coherence → Conflicts or Synergies
Policy coherence

• **Vertical coherence**
  • rather abstract and non-legally binding policy approaches that are mainly based on the idea of national sovereignty (e.g. NFPs)
  • inconsistent application of forest measures and monitoring methods in Member States

  • successful implementation of a protected area network
  • but less successful integration of biodiversity aspects in overall land management \(\rightarrow\) reflect difficulties at the CBD level to concretise the Ecosystem Approach

  • Possible synergies in future climate change policies if LULUCF will be integrated

---

EU policy options for the protection of European Forests against harmful Impacts, Brussels, 7 – 8 May, 2009

---

Policy coherence

• **Horizontal**
  • Potentially contradicting policy objectives with similar importance for forests without set priorities (e.g. competitiveness vs. protection)

  • Inconsistent enforcement due to partly legally binding, partly financially supported, and mostly voluntary measures

  • Inconsistent and fragmentary control on objective achievement

  \(\rightarrow\) Urgent need: Strengthening coordination and communication
  \(\rightarrow\) Key role for Forest Action Plan?
## Governance Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of Governance</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed, detailed legislation, to be further specified by MS through transposing into national law</td>
<td>Select Sites of Community Importance and designate Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas according to certain habitat types and species listed in the annexes of the EU Directives</td>
<td>Habitats Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Framework approach</strong></td>
<td>Broad legally binding objectives and timeframe (often in the form of a Directive), to be specified by MS through transposing into national law</td>
<td>Achieving &quot;good status&quot; for all waters by 2015</td>
<td>WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range of policy options to choose from</td>
<td>Overall binding target for the European Union to achieve a 20% renewable energy share by 2020</td>
<td>Directive on renewable energy sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntarism</strong></td>
<td>Broad legally non-binding objectives</td>
<td>Rural Development measures presented in Council Regulation (EC) No 1898/2005</td>
<td>CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up/inter-sectoral participatory/ coordination processes</td>
<td>Programme of Measures (POM)</td>
<td>WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Forest Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for listening.
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From Coordination towards Regulation. EU environmental and forest policy governance modes:

EU Forest Policy

Metodi Sotirov

May 7th, 2009, Brussels

*Expert Workshop “EU policy options for the protection of European Forests against harmful Impacts”*

---

**Background of the EU Forest Policy**

- **EC/EU primary legal basis: no explicit provision for specific Common forestry policy:**
  - No inclusion of forest products (e.g. timber), apart from cork, in the Annex II list to the EC Treaty of Rome (1957)

- **Responsibility for forestry policy lies with Member States**

However,

- **Long history of forest-related Community supporting actions** (under Community Agricultural and/or Environmental Policies):
  - Monitoring and protection measures on effects of air pollution on forests and forest fires (e.g. Regulations 3528/86; 2158/92; 2152/2003)
  - Afforestations and other forestry measures related to the CAP/Rural development (e.g. Regulation 1257/99)
EU Forest Policy recent developments

- **EU Forestry Strategy (FS) (1998):**
  > Legislative Proposal by the Commission (COM(1998)649),
  > followed by (non-binding) Council Resolution (1999/C 56/01)

- **Council conclusions 2005 (Council Meeting on Agriculture):**
  > EU Forest Action Plan
  > Review of existing Community means and practises for coordination in forestry matters

  > Time span: 2007-2011
  > Mid-term evaluation on implementation and effectiveness in 2009; Final implementation report in 2012

The actual EU Forest Policy Content (based on FS and FAP)

**Principles:**
- Subsidiarity and shared responsibility
- Need to improve policy coordination, communication and cooperation across sectors and government levels
- Need for specific approaches and actions in view of different natural, socio-economic and cultural conditions in EU countries

**Objectives:**
- Sustainable Forest Management and Multifunctional Role of Forests and Forestry for Society
  - Improving long-term competitiveness
  - Improving and protecting the environment
  - Contributing to the quality of life
  - Fostering coordination and communication
Implementation mechanisms (1): Actors and competences

- **Community:**
  - Guidance, overall objectives, support to MS projects
  - Communication and coordination

- **Member States:**
  - National policy- and decision-making
  - Project implementation on site
  - Communication and coordination

- **Institutional framework for coordination:**
  - within the Commission: Inter-Service Group on Forestry
  - between EC and MS: Standing Forestry Committee
  - on international issues: Council Working Group on Forestry
  - with stakeholders: Advisory Group on Forestry and Cork

Implementation mechanisms (2): Instruments

- **Implementation of (international) forest policy related commitments:**
  - Participatory, holistic, inter-sectoral and iterative National Forest Programmes

- **Joint coordination and communication actions:**
  - Meetings, workshops, exchange of experience, research
  - Websites, awareness events

- **Reference to/making use of existing Community funding:**
  - e.g. bottom-up projects at MS level under:
    - Environmental Policy: LIFE+ Regulation (EC No 614/2007)
    - Structural Funds, Research Funds (7th Research Framework Programme)

- **Additional actions by MS, incl. national resources**
Conclusion

The Nature of the present EU Forest Policy Mode of Governance:

- **Abstract/broad and non-legally binding policy approach**
  > e.g. no specific forest policy reporting, monitoring and/or funding

- **National sovereignty + specific Community support**

- **Voluntary actions by Member States**
  > MS are free to choose from objectives and instruments that best serve national/regional needs
  > No direct link to national forest laws, only NFPs or similar plans (e.g. Rural development plans)

- **Complex interactions with other (existing) Community policies & regulations**
  > e.g. agriculture, environment, climate, energy, industry, trade etc.

Thank you for listening!

Expert Workshop “EU policy options for the protection of European Forests against harmful Impacts”
From Coordination towards regulation: EU environmental forest police governance modes - Lessons to be drawn from the EU Water Framework Directive

Thomas Dworak
Ecologic Institute

Forest and Water

Commonalities
• Have multiple service functions (environmental, social, economic)
• Undisturbed ecosystems are rare
• Changes in the systems effect other ecosystems
• Long term to restore
• Increasing pressures due to economic activities (esp. Biomass)

Differences
• Forest doesn’t have upstream-downstream relationship
• Access to water is a human right – Access to forest/wood?
• Water is management by European Laws with a clear focus on environmental protection

What does this mean for management?
Why a Directive on Water?

- Since 1970 several water related Directives existed which created a patchwork
- New Member States (1995) entered the EU with party higher water protection standards
- New understanding of how to manage “environmental problems” → holistic approach

What is the WFD about?

- Managing all water (incl. coastal zones)...
- ...and related land
- Achieving a high status of environmental protection, but also allowing new sustainable human developments
- Periodic Review of the water management activities set out in plans.
- Fostering a cross sectoral dialog
- Fostering public participation to increase the public awareness and transparency.
Why and what is unique?

- The Directive itself as it understands the management of water as a cross sectoral issue
- River Basin approach as opposed to Administrative
- The implementation process

The implementation of the WFD

- A Common Implementation Strategy (CIS) was defined in order to:
  - Address the challenges in a co-operative and coordinated way to limit the risks of bad application and subsequent disputes; and
  - Support the Commission in delivering on its obligations for further policy development (e.g. Working group F on Floods)
- 9th year of implementation → first management plans have to be ready by 22.12.2009
Structure of the CIS

1. Sharing Information
   - Tools for information sharing
   - Raising awareness

2. Develop Guidance
   - Analysis of pressures and impacts
   - Heavily Modified Water Bodies
   - Reference conditions inland SW
   - Typology, classification of transitional, coastal waters
   - Inter-calibration
   - Tools on assessment, classification of groundwater
   - Monitoring

3. Information Management (GIS)

4. Application Testing Validation

---

Structure of the CIS II

Expert Advisory Forums

Water Directors

Strategic Co-ordination group

WG: Ppressures and Impacts
WG: Heavily Modified Water Bodies
WG: Groundwater
WG: GIS
WG: Intercalibration
WG: Reference conditions inland surface waters
WG: Typology, classification of transitional coastal waters
WG: Monitoring
WG: Best practice in RBP
WG: Economic analysis

Stakeholders, NGO's, experts, etc.

---
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What can we learn I

The CIS process:

• Created a big forum for experts, stakeholders and policy makers to discuss formally and informally
• Developed several approaches that suit all of Europe
• Allows mutual learning and shares the burden of developing methodologies for critical implementation issues
• Has been used to discuss and to develop further policy actions (new regulations/directives) in the context of the WFD

What can we learn II

However:

• Not sure if all that was developed is applied in MS - Assessment of dRBMPs will provide more information
• Issue of having a lot of information that is not always consistent
• Information is difficult to assess for Non-WFD people – issue of Transparency
• Still potential for unequal implementation
Conclusions for forest policy impl.

• Common EU approaches have the advantage to share the burden of developing suitable solutions (if flexibility in implementation is ensured)
• Stakeholder involvement increases resources and can support the implementation
• Keep the organisation structure for implementation simple
• Involve other sectors from the beginning. The development of a common understanding takes some time
• A clear defined policy –science link is a benefit
• Ensure consistency between the different work flows
• Agree on basic definitions to ensure comparability

7/8 May 2009, EU Forest Strategy Workshop, Brussels

Thank you for listening.
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Support for forests under the EU’s rural development policy

Peter Wehrheim
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Unit G1, Consistency of Rural Development

Forestry Expert Workshop, 7 May 2009

CAP policy areas today

Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)

1. Pillar:
- Common Market organisation
- Direct payments (“decoupled“ from production)
- Cross Compliance standards
- Article 68

2. Pillar: Rural Development Policy

Multifunctional agriculture
Food
Environmental function
Rural function
Modulation
Rural development policy 2007-2013:

**Objectives**

« LEADER Axis » (5%): local development / governance

- **Axis 1:** Competitiveness 10%
- **Axis 2:** Environment and Land Management (25%)
- **Axis 3:** Diversification and quality of life (10%)

EAFRD: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development

**Measures**

« LEADER Axis » (5%): integrated, bottom/up, innovative

- **Axis 1:** Competitiveness 10%:
  - Farm modernisation
  - Processing
  - Infrastructure
  - Natural disaster aid
  - Training

- **Axis 2:** Environment and Land Management (25%):
  - Less favoured areas
  - Natura 2000 and WFD
  - Agri-environment
  - Forestry measures

- **Axis 3:** Diversification and quality of life (10%):
  - Diversification, tourism
  - Micro-enterprises
  - Village renewal
  - Basic services

EAFRD: European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development
1. EU Strategic Guidelines establish the Community Priorities for the period 2007-2013

A strategic approach

2. National Strategies reflect EU-priorities according to the situation in the Member State concerned

3. Establishment of national or regional programmes on the basis of SWOT analysis

4. Programme implementation accompanied by monitoring and evaluation (‘ongoing evaluation’) based on a Community framework

The indicative global Rural development expenditure

- EAFRD: €90.8 billion
- Public expenditure: €57.7 billion
- Private expenditure: €64.8 billion
- National top-ups: €12.4 billion

TOTAL: €225.7 billion
EAFRD-Expenditure per axis

Allocation of RD funds 2007-13 for forestry measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Foreseen expenditure, EUR million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National co-financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)</td>
<td>348.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 1 forestry measure</td>
<td>348.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First afforestation of agricultural land (221)</td>
<td>1 248.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First establishment of agroforestry systems (222)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First afforestation of non-agricultural land (223)</td>
<td>235.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natura 2000 payments (224)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest-environment payments (225)</td>
<td>173.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring forestry potential and introducing prevention actions (226)</td>
<td>920.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-productive investments (227)</td>
<td>570.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 2 forestry measures</td>
<td>3206.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for the eight forestry-specific measures</td>
<td>3 555.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presence of forestry measures and forestry-related actions in the 88 national or regional programmes, by measure

Most recent policy developments: Additional support for RD

- „Health Check“ and „Recovery Package“ have made available approximately additional amounts of 3.24 and 1.02 billion € for rural development
- Will be injected in one go into the existing 88 RDPs
- Revision of NSP and RDP until 15 July 2009
The EAFRD resources MS intend to make available for forestry-specific (EUR 6.2 billion) and forestry-related measures (EUR 1-2 billion) add up to approximately EUR 8 billion (2007-13)

These amounts correspond to about 9% of total EAFRD funding (without budget from HC and RP)

Support for second pillar has been strengthened with Health Check and Recovery Package

Thank you for your attention!
EU Policy Options for the protection of European forest against harmful impacts
Forestry House, 7-5-2009

Mariam Sánchez Guisández - DG Environment
Unit Nature and Biodiversity
NATURA 2000

- The largest network of protected areas in the World
  - Terrestrial: 17% of Europe, 72.9 M. ha
  - Marine: 13.0 M. ha.

- Based on science
  - Objectives defined and scientific selection criteria established
  - Lists of European habitats and species of interest
  - Evaluation performed at site level / selection made at European level

- 2 phases of development:
  - Designation of sites (almost finished)
  - Management of sites (starting)

- Enacted by 2 Directives: Birds and Habitats Directives
Natura 2000:

- Habitats (Annex I)
- Species (Annex II)
- Directive « Habitats »
  - Art. 3
- National List of Sites
- List of Site of Community Interest (SCI)
- Special Conservation Areas (SCA)
- Directive «Birds »
  - Art. 4
- Special Protection Areas (SPA)
- NATURA 2000

Natura 2000: EU Commission Role

- Monitoring of the implementation of the directives by the MS
- Drafting of guidance manuals and documents
- Exchanging of good practices on managing Natura 2000:
- Funding
- Protection: developments and Natura 2000
- Infringement and complaints
**Protection:**

**Dealing with plans and projects**
*(Art. 6.3/4 Habitats Directive, simplified)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible negative impact on Natura 2000 site?</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature impact assessment</td>
<td>If negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives?</td>
<td>If no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overriding public interest?</td>
<td>If yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation measures - Commission opinion</td>
<td>(if priority interest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Forest in Natura 2000**

- **Annex I HD:** 220 habitat types
- **81 Forest Habitats in Annex I** in 6 groups of Forest Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Type</th>
<th>No. hab. type / group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forests of Boreal Europe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests of Temperate Europe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Deciduous Forests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Sclerophyllous Forests</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate Mountainous Coniferous Forests</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. &amp; Mac. Mountainous Coniferous Forests</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram showing the distribution of forest habitats in the Natura 2000 sites.
What is being designated?

14.250 M ha (SCI for forest habitats)

- N2000 = 30% forest - 60% with wooded elements

- (sub)natural woodland vegetation of native species forming forests of tall trees, with typical undergrowth, and being:
  - rare or residual, and/or
  - hosting species of Community interest

- criteria for identification and selection of sites:
  - occurrence of native species
  - high degree of wilderness
  - presence of old and dead trees
  - forests with a substantial extension
  - forests having benefited from continuous sustainable management over a significant period
Management of Natura 2000

- NO strict reserves required (economic use can be essential) wrong myths!
- Certain limitations on management (species used/biocides/logging practices/deadwood....)
- Subsidiarity applies (no prescriptions / results count)
- Consultation with interest groups is important
- Examples from MS show the different approaches

Funding Instruments for Nature 2000

- LIFE (pilot projects)
  - from 1992 until 2005, many forest related projects were financed (publication is being prepared)
  - LIFE+ from 2007-2013 (under development)

- Rural Development Plans
  - 4,700 M € for forests from 2000 to 2006
  - complete set of forestry measures, including N2000 payment for 2007-2013 (RD Plans of MS)
To keep in mind ....

- Implementation in the field is up to MS, not EC
- Economic development is not prohibited: meeting point between economic and conservation interests can be found
- Exchange of experiences: a success, many reactions
- Increased efforts for consultation at the local level are needed. Partnerships
- Formalisation of conservation objectives needed. Long term vision

Welcome to the Nature and Biodiversity homepage!

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/index_en.htm

Thanks for your attention!