How to move towards the Carpathian management approach?

Working Group CC SLOVAKIA

Participants

Gregg Losinski, University Matej Bel Jakub Kubala, Technical University in Zvolen Ján Kadlečík, State Nature Conservancy Jerguš Tesák, University Matej Bel Marek Sekerčák, HBH project, s.r.o. Mária Naďová, Carpathian Euroregion Slovakia Michal Králik, HBH project, s.r.o. Nuno Guimaraes, University Matej Bel Robin Rigg, Slovak Wildlife Society

Team discussion

Three main problems in species protection on national level

- 1. Commitment of stakeholders to find common solutions
- 2. Lack of robust management, which should comprise:
 - Evidence-based actions/measures
 - Coordination of efforts
 - Standardised monitoring
 - Sharing of data
 - Law enforcement
 - Conflict prevention
 - Habitat protection
 - Education
 - Sufficient capacity of agencies and organisations responsible for implementation
- 3. Loss and fragmentation of habitat, change of land-use, access, increasing infrastructure disturbance.

Main gaps in knowledge

- Population status and dynamics
- Genetic data (comparable between labs/countries)
- Impact of climate change and human responses to it (e.g. forestry)
- Public/stakeholder views

Mistakes, experience from preparation and/or implementation of MP

- Lack of sufficient mediation/independent facilitator
- Mistakes in process
- Lack of transparency

Coming together

Carpathian MP or other solution?

- Alternatives might include:
 - Begin with a Carpathian Strategy, within which a MP could be discussed.
 - Begin with an Action Plan
 - \circ $\;$ Alternative names could also be e.g. Framework, Guidelines etc.
- BUT... such alternatives might not carry the same weight or power as a Management Plan so risk not being implemented.

Added value

- Coordinated approaches
- Overall picture

Who will be responsible?

- Preparation: all key interest groups
- Implementation: mostly government authorities, but also stakeholders