

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS OF WORKSHOPS ON DAY 1, MAY 27

### Workshop 1: Wilderness register

Chair: Jana Vavřinová

Rapporteur: Zdenka Kranova

1. We are starting the process and the main task is first to define guidelines. Register is not starting point but something what will come in next phases following by standards – technical methods: criteria, responsibilities, who will fill and how, etc.
2. We agree that we need register, we need to compare different models of wilderness concept of implementation in Europe
3. Categories of register cannot be strictly based only on IUCN categories because:
  - it is not only IUCN 1a and 1b;
  - IUCN is more about current status and less about potentials;
  - our concept is wider but not all IUCN categories will fit within the concept – e.g. IUCN category V;
  - non-intervention management and questions like how to deal with the invasive species have to be solved
  - define how restoration fits to our concept – yes but only within those sites where restoration is a precondition of pre-non-intervention phase/status.
4. There are no large areas of wild nature or wild lands in some countries anymore (in pristine areas meaning) and designation would be a political problem – losing of “wilderness” label of those is unacceptable (example UK). Social aspect and interpretation of register is important.
5. Register should include the regional specialities, there is no single wilderness in Europe, it distinguishes from the real pristine areas up to restoration sites of wild nature in some Western – European Countries.
6. Register is not limited only for the EU countries (there are very important places out of the EU) but we should start with our homeland. There are many various data resources (databases, mapping, research projects) and various other mechanisms and fora (UNESCO, Ramsar, Carpathian and Alpine Conventions), which could be linked with the register too and use it as a tool for biodiversity conservation.

### Workshop2: Wild Area Benefits

Chair: Steve Prior

Rapporteur: Jo Roberts

1. Wilderness needs to the responsibility of government in the first instance. Ideas are that a set percentage of certain funds should be sent by each government to a central fund used for
  - A. protection of wilderness areas in Europe
  - B. Creation of a central mechanism/framework for measuring individualised benefits and intervention requirements in different areas eg measurement tools for carbon, water, climate change mitigation and social benefit projects such as youth, reconciliation etc.
2. Demonstration of different projects to government and local communities to highlight benefits e.g. in the Netherlands the auction of rights in nature for more urban/peri urban communities.
3. Development of communication tools and strategies for highlighting the benefits of wilderness protection to tax payers with focus on those rural communities surrounding protected areas.
4. Development of zoning approach to wilderness/protected areas to maximise land use for tourism and other wider benefits without affecting the protection status of wilderness core areas.

### Workshop 3

Best practice in habitat management for different wild areas

C: Rauno Vaisenen, Head of Natural Heritage Service, Metsähallitus, Finland

R: Vlado Vancura, Conservation Manager, PAN Parks, Slovakia

1. Wilderness related language should be clear and easy and communication and training strategies should be developed
2. Non-intervention management should be more acceptable, development of clear guidance on no-intervention management of Natura 2000 sites is recommended (e.g. IUCN best practice series could be used)
3. Wilderness areas have strong potential to become an important component of European protected area network and climate change adaptation

4. Key element of wilderness is protection of natural processes which require enough space (bigger/better)
5. To achieve wilderness management objectives requires to consider restoration potential, ownership, zoning, ecosystem services, scientific information, etc

#### Workshop 4: Undisturbed Forests

Chair: Erika Stanciu

Undisturbed forests have a very high value for biodiversity compared to managed forests. For the wilderness areas in forests the management approach should be non-intervention management. However, we recognize the importance of the managed forests, where biodiversity and ecosystem service related concerns should be much better integrated, using lessons learned from the few undisturbed forests we still have.

1. All National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans should include reference to wilderness and measures for protection
2. Undisturbed forests should be considered reference areas for research on the natural dynamics of forest ecosystems with the aim:
  - a. to provide information for sustainable use
  - b. to learn about the effects of climate change and possible solutions for managed forests (by studying natural adaptation)
  - c. to learn about adaptation to "catastrophes"
3. EU should:
  - a. include wilderness in the European Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
  - b. include wilderness in the Forestry Action Plan
  - c. develop guidelines on the Habitat Directive to indicate that non intervention management to allow changes of one habitat type to another due to natural processes is one of the acceptable management approaches in Natura 2000 sites.
4. The value of the cultural landscapes should be fully recognized and careful consideration should be given to extending existing wilderness areas without affecting valuable cultural land (for e.g. High Nature Value Farmlands). Stakeholders understanding and involvement are key for the maintenance of the wilderness areas in the European landscape.
5. Identification and mapping should be coordinated throughout Europe to have comparable results as a basis for further support for protection. Special attention should be given to the new EU countries where fast economic changes is threatening to a very large degree some of the last large undisturbed forests of Europe.

#### Workshop 5: Law and Policy

Chair: Kees Bastmeijer

Rapporteur: Alberto Arroyo

- it is a challenge to define precisely wilderness for lawyers, also because of cultural and language differences. Therefore, adoption of definitions at the national or (bio)regional level might be helpful or needed;
- Natura 2000 may have limitations in respect of wilderness protection. Wilderness appears more process oriented, while the Natura 2000 definition is more object oriented. This raises the question what we would like to protect. If one would implement Natura 2000 very much focused on specific species and habitat types, wilderness qualities are likely to fall outside the scope of protection;
- The key discussion is to what extent wilderness protection could or should be ensured through Natura 2000: should we include wilderness qualities in the conservation targets for those areas where that is relevant? Or should we take a separate approach and develop specific tools for wilderness protection? There was no consensus regarding this question. It was stressed that Natura 2000 is very successful regime: it might be best to use the opportunities within this framework, while some questioned the political feasibility of this approach;
- There might be also other options for providing wilderness qualities with legal protection. Examples include instruments in the framework of spatial planning;
- In view of the discussions, it would be very valuable to receive concrete guidance on the issue of protection of wilderness and Natura 2000 from the European Commission and to collect experiences and best practices of European countries regarding legal protection of wilderness.

#### Workshop 6: Sustainable Development

## Wilderness and sustainable development

Chair: Neil Birnie

Rapporteur: Tony Whitbread

- Strong emphasis on facilitating local involvement within all aspects of enterprise planning; dialogue, training and capacity building
- Address challenges relating to high transaction costs and information availability within ecosystem services sector as a whole
- Utilising wilderness as a mechanism for reduction of risk; example of insurance industry and reduction of risk from flood events
- Strong involvement in review of CAP; within this greater definition of the zoning of wilderness areas and wild land as relates to business
- Formation of a Business and Wilderness Forum in order to provide structured input into all of the above in the future