



International workshop on defining transboundary conservation principles
16-18 October 2013, Thayatal National Park, Austria

MINUTES OF THE WORKSHOP



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



Organisers

IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation Specialist Group (TBC SG)

Thayatal National Park

With support by Podyjí National Park in organising a field trip

Participants (24)

Robert Brunner, Florian Carius, Olivier Chassot, Sunita Chaudhary, Andrew Dunn, Boris Erg, David Grossmann, Elaine Hsiao, Elizabeth Koch Ya'ari, Kari Lahti, Matthew McKinney, Stefan Michel, Irma Popović Dujmović, Lenka Reiterova, Cristian Remus-Papp, Tatjana Rosen Michel, Patrizia Rossi, Tomáš Rothröckl, Michael Schoon, Andrej Sovinc, Robert Stejskal, Martin Valášek, Maja Vasilijević, Kevan Zunckel

Documents

List of participants, agenda and presentations are all available for downloading [here](#).

Minutes: Elaine Hsiao and Stefan Michel

Report development: Maja Vasilijević

Background

The *International workshop on defining transboundary conservation principles* was organised in October 2013 in Thayatal National Park, Austria, the location which was chosen because of the park's excellent cooperation with adjacent Podyjí National Park in Czech Republic. It is one of the best practice examples in transboundary conservation (TBC) and an active Transboundary Protected Area (TBPA). The participants of the workshop had an opportunity to get a first-hand experience of this TBPA by visiting both Austrian and Czech parts of the protected areas.

The workshop gathered 24 transboundary specialists from around the world representing practitioners (staff of TBPAs), international and national NGOs, academic institutions, governments, and the workshop/project donor. It was organised within the framework of a project 'Revision of the IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guideline on Transboundary Conservation', funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) through the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), MAVA Foundation, and IUCN WCPA. The objective of the workshop was to define current transboundary conservation principles having in mind a rapid development of TBC practice at global level and a variety of objectives underpinning the processes. The decisions agreed during the workshop will directly feed into the WCPA Best Practice Guideline on transboundary conservation, to be launched at IUCN World Parks Congress in Sydney, Australia, in November 2014.

SESSION 1, Chair: Boris Erg (Director, IUCN SEE)

Welcome by the Chair of IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation Specialist Group (Maja Vasiljević), Director of Thayatal National Park (Robert Brunner) and German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) (Florian Carius)

Maja Vasiljević opened the workshop indicating the importance of the event. She acknowledged the support of Thayatal National Park (NP) in organising the event and thanked the donors of the workshop and BPG project, namely the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) through the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN), MAVA Foundation. WCPA is noted as one of the co-funding partners as well.

Robert Brunner welcomed the participants to a transboundary NP Thayatal-Podyjí shared by Austria and Czech Republic. The NPs have been working together for some 15 years.

Florian Carius explained BMU and BfN's interest in international cooperation in the environmental sector. He noted transboundary conservation's potential for peace and security, economic growth, and animal migration. He further illustrated the need for new guidance from IUCN WCPA by some challenges of TBC initiatives that are supported by BMU and BfN at home and abroad. Florian re-emphasized that German Federal Government announced availability of 500 million Euro annually as of this year for the conservation of ecosystems worldwide.

Introduction of participants

All participants introduced themselves. Boris Erg emphasised this group's responsibility in starting to set the transboundary vision, after which the ideas will go through consultation.

Presentations

History of IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation Specialist Group: Road from Durban WPC (Robert Brunner)

The presentation focused on the history of TBC SG and TBC progress, highlighting the Parks for Life programme, 1997 Peace Parks conference in South Africa, 1999 EUROPARC conference on TB cooperation in Europe, 2003 World Parks Congress, and 2004 La Madallena meeting. Robert provided a review of TBC SG's Terms of Reference 2009-2012 with focus on achieved/on-going activities.

Transboundary conservation and WCPA Best Practice Guidelines Series (Maja Vasiljević)

The presentations provided an overview of IUCN WCPA and TBC SG's current activities (e.g. in networking and communications, recent development of diagnostic tool for TB conservation planners). It noted current WCPA typology of TBC practice and the necessity for updated TB database. Maja introduced the project on revision and updating of the Best Practice Guideline on TBC, highlighting the importance of this series in setting global standards. Key goals of the workshop were also indicated.

Discussion

The initial discussion focused on the status of the new guideline in relation to the existing BPG "Transboundary Protected Areas and Parks for Peace and Cooperation", published by IUCN in 2001. Andrew and Stefan raised concern that having two IUCN guidelines in parallel on the same topics would create confusion. Maja emphasised that all titles remain in WCPA BPG Series and while some content of the

current BPG will be revised and updated, the new publication, which will have a new title, will add new content based on improved knowledge. Boris noted that new TB definitions would replace those from the current BPG, while some parts of the new BPG might not be as detailed as in the current one, which is one reason for keeping both titles valid. Michael, Tatjana, Matthew, and Boris emphasised that the new guideline will be broader, focusing on TBC rather than only Transboundary Protected Areas, which will be a good basis for supplementary relation between the two guidelines. Maja noted that majority of the contents of the current guideline is still relevant in today's context; however, there is a need to identify changes and explain properly the relation between the two publications.

One of the key modifications and revisions that will be presented in the new guideline in relation to the current one is the TBC definition/typology. Stefan suggested making an amendment of the definitions and other outdated points in the current guideline. Boris and Maja noted new guideline will have new number and are not replacing the old one, which will not be reprinted, but will be available online. Matthew emphasised there will be no contradiction between the two documents which will complement each other. Patrizia and Elizabeth suggested to refer to the current BPG in the introductory art of the new guideline and also to add a disclaimer next to the current BPG on the website that the new guideline is available (when ready) and that there are new TB definitions available. The participants agreed to this as an optimal solution.

Elizabeth raised the issue of consultation with users of the guideline. Maja noted that draft TB definitions will be sent to other TBC SG members for feedback. Boris noted that draft BPG will be shared with WCPA members. Florian emphasized the need to offer clarity on position of the two documents. Given the many on-going initiatives, he asked for Transboundary Biosphere Reserves (TBRs) to be included in the guideline as one aspect of TB practice, as in the current one. Maja noted that TB international designations such as BRs and World Heritage Sites (WHSs) will be accommodated in the guideline as supplementary types of TBC.

ACTION POINTS:

1. Explain and clarify the relation between current and new guideline in the introductory part of the new guideline.
2. Add a disclaimer to the current guideline on the website when the new BPG is available that there are newly offered TB definitions in place.
3. Consultative process on the new BPG with wider network (TBC SG and WCPA).

SESSION 2, Chair: Maja Vasiljević (Chair, IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation SG)

Presentations

Convention on Biological Diversity's requirements on transboundary conservation (Boris Erg)

Boris explained TBC provisions in the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA). Sunita asked about linkages between CBD and local level work and any existing definitions of TBC offered by CBD. Boris responded that the real issue is how we contribute to the CBD as a lot of work of TBC SG members on the ground is going in the direction of fulfilling CBD PoWPA objectives. Despite many references to TBC, CBD does not provide TBC definition.

Transboundary conservation and international designations (Cristian Remus-Papp)

The presentation offered explanation of current TBC typology, as per IUCN WCPA, and introduction to TB BRs, TB WHSs, and TB Ramsar sites. It also emphasised the importance of transboundary work between NATURA 2000 sites which cover approximately 20% of the European Union land area. Elaine noted that

international designations are normally state-driven, while a lot of TBC processes involve non-state actors and we need to be careful not to exclude them by relying too much on international designations.

Transboundary conservation and connectivity (Olivier Chassot)

Olivier presented linkages between connectivity and transboundary conservation emphasising that TBC provides framework for connectivity and can drive the agenda for connectivity conservation at regional level. The presentation emphasised similarity between governance issues and challenges encountered in connectivity conservation and TBC. Boris noted the overlap between TBC and connectivity conservation and asked how best to address it in the BPG. Olivier noted that the focus should be on overarching issues with application of equal principles. He noted the need for a good case study showing the relation between the two. Kevan emphasised connectivity is one of the arguments that helps to make the case for TBC.

Involvement of communities in transboundary conservation initiatives (Andrew Dunn)

Andrew discussed the involvement and benefits to local people in transboundary situations, especially in cases where communities have been divided by political/colonial borders, suffer from poverty, and similar situations. The discussion focused on terminology related to similarities/distinction between local people, indigenous peoples and other traditional people and how to address this in the guideline. Stefan pointed out that all these three connotations could be understood under the term “local people”. Matthew noted special understanding of Native Americans in North America who see themselves as distinct nation. Maja suggested to discuss the issue of terminology with Governance SG (CEESP).

Legal aspects of transboundary conservation (Tatjana Rosen Michel)

The presentation focused on variety of levels at which TBC can be initiated, with a variety of legal instruments across all levels of formality, from treaties to informal agreements. While informal arrangements are easier to achieve where the situation is not favourable to more formal arrangements, formal agreements make stronger legal basis for long-term TBC, especially if detailed rights and obligations are laid down. Irma noted the importance of finances in driving the TB process, and not only political will. Matthew emphasised the issue of leadership, while Sunita noted the importance of having a good and credible facilitator who can negotiate with countries effectively (e.g. case of ICIMOD or Convention on Migratory Species). Michael noted the importance of local level and state support at the same time.

Political implications of transboundary conservation (Elizabeth Koch Ya'ari)

The presentation addressed dual approach to initiating and establishing TBC processes. It noted the risks and expected results of both top-down and bottom-up approaches, and reflected on TBC as potential entry point for peace making. Elizabeth made reference to the situation in the Lower Jordan River Valley where large scale water withdrawal is occurring, and which generated brief discussion on the comparative analysis of peace parks worldwide that could help advance the situation in the Middle East.

Discussion

Facilitator: Andrej Sovinc (Regional Vice Chair, WCPA Europe)

Andrej emphasised the need to focus on protection of nature as primary goal of the BPG. He also noted that marine protected areas (PAs) have not been largely discussed and raised the issue of inclusion of marine specificities in the guideline. Maja noted that two invited people who are marine specialists could not join the workshop, while Tanja mentioned her background in marine issues. Andrej further emphasised the guideline might want to address enhancement of TB cooperation in the EU NATURA 2000 sites. He also mentioned previous Parks for Life action plan for European protected areas and based on that, a possibility to highlight TBC in promoting Life and nature-based solutions. Coming from World Parks Congress Stream Leaders meeting in the USA where it was discussed the Congress would involve not only PAs but also broader areas and issues, Kari supported Andrej in the need to get the public feel PAs are relevant for their life. Olivier noted Healthy Parks, Healthy People as a good message.

ACTION POINTS:

4. Ensure there is a chapter in the new guideline on TBC provisions in CBD PoWPA as the guideline is directly feeding into the PoWPA requirements.
5. Ensure TB international designations are noted in the guideline.
6. Consult with Grazia Borrini (Governance SG – CEESP) on the appropriate usage of terms local/traditional/indigenous people.
7. Ensure marine context of TBC is addressed in the BPG, while highlighting the need to elaborate detailed guidelines in future publication.
8. Include TB cooperation of NATURA 2000 sites in regional context in the BPG.
9. Possibly brand TBC as TBCAs “for Life”.

SESSION 3, Chair: Michael Schoon (Assistant Professor, Arizona State University)

Discussion

Draft content of the Best Practice Guideline (Kevan Zunckel)

Kevan presented draft Table of content of the BPG, followed by discussion of the outline of chapters by the participants. Kevan noted that “key messages” would form part of the beginning of each chapter, as a brief summary of the text to follow. The participants discussed extensively the focus of the guideline – protected areas exclusively or wider TBC. General perception was that although primary focus of WCPA is protected areas, the processes that involve TBC include broader scope and thus must not be neglected. The suggested model was to focus on protected areas, but include also broader aspects and balance well between them to ensure the guideline is useful for practitioners working on TBC and not necessarily TBPA models. The BPG has a limited length and not all types of TBC will be elaborate in equal extent and detail, e.g. TB migratory corridors might have to be better explained in some future guideline.

The participants discussed the term “management” in the context of specific set of chapters and whether it is the right term if areas where no intervention are included. It was agreed to provide explanation of management spectrum, and additionally discuss management planning. The discussion on governance of TBCAs revolved around currently proposed governance of PA’s types offered by IUCN in a recent publication and whether the BPG should offer new typology of TB governance. The discussion on governance was continued on the next day.

It was suggested to approach the issue of management of Parks for Peace as integrative part of another chapter. Parks for Peace, although important and also politically attractive as a brand, have been elaborated in current guideline and the new BPG should make reference to it. In relation to case studies, it was suggested to emphasise those cases that prove benefits of TBC, not just listing the benefits.

ACTION POINTS:

10. Encompass discussed and agreed suggestions in the Table of content and circulate to workshop participants for final refinement.
11. Decide on the word limit for each chapter and include it in a column in the Table of content

DAY 2, 17 October 2012

Discussion

Continuation of Session 3: Draft content of the Best Practice Guideline (Kevan Zunckel)

Refinement of chapters outline continued.

SESSION 4, Chair: Olivier Chassot (Executive Director, Tropical Science Centre)

Discussion

Transboundary Protected Area (TBPA) definition (Michael Schoon, Matthew McKinney)

Michael and Matthew led a session on revising IUCN WCPA TBPA definition and other types of TBC practice, as well as on governance models of TBC. It was acknowledged that current WCPA definition of TBPA does not comply with IUCN's definition of PA, and that it is too vague. The participants discussed key elements of the new TBPA definition. The issue of inclusion sub-national boundaries alongside international boundaries in TBPA definition raised differing opinions. E.g. Kari and Andrew argued if sub-national boundaries are excluded from the definition, this would eliminate many TBPAs crossing inter-state jurisdictional boundaries such as in Australia and North America. Stefan and Maja noted inclusion of sub-national units leads to inflation of TBPAs and that there is no clarity and precision on the extent of boundaries. Stefan added we might risk not getting appropriate and necessary distinction between any PA and TBPA if sub-national boundaries are included. Irma noted Croatian parks in different counties are managed separately and could be regarded as TB. Boris highlighted practical and political reasons for limiting the TBPA definition and scope to international boundaries only. Patrizia noted that sub-national boundaries represent connectivity conservation rather than TBC, as TBC is characterised by international boundaries as a special "barrier" to overcome. Olivier supported the suggestion to focus on boundaries of states only. Elaine noted cultural dimension of sub-national boundaries as being part of TBPAs (unjust to e.g. indigenous peoples). Matthew and Michael suggested focusing the TBA definition on international boundaries, but acknowledging the work on sub-national level as challenges can be similar.

The participants discussed CBD definition of conservation in order to make parallel explanation of TB conservation concept. Tatjana noted the CBD definition does not cover communication, coordination and collaboration specific to TBC. Kevan noted CBD definition is too limited and falls short of bio-cultural diversity and resource management. Boris and Stefan noted the focus of TBC is conservation and culture comes as a secondary element. Matthew emphasised culture and community standing alongside conservation in TBC. It was agreed that BPG offers substantive explanation of TBC concept and process as introduction to TBC typology.

TBPAs potentially refer to protected areas that are adjacent/adjoining/contiguous in relation to the state boundary. Several examples of protected areas not directly adjoining the state boundary, but where cooperation is taking place, were mentioned (e.g. Florian noted German-Slovakian-Ukrainian Beech forest WHS, Sunita noted the Himalayan TBPAs). Stefan and Michael noted the fundamental criterion in TBPA is cooperation, which makes location less relevant. Boris said from practical point of view (e.g. database generation) the issue of distance will certainly arise. Michael raised the issue of connectivity from ecological standpoint. It was generally accepted that ecological connection has to be included in the TBPA definition. Differentiation between TBPAs and broader TBCAs should be presented.

The participants agreed that Parks for Peace are no longer a self-standing type of TBC, but a sub-type of all TBC models.

The discussion on definitions continued during session 6, while the second part of session 4 was focused on discussing governance models of TBC. Boris noted that IUCN guidelines on governance of PAs are solid framework from which TB models of governance should be further developed. The distinction between governance and management was discussed. Matthew briefly presented the Crown of the Continent case study (Waterton Glacier International Peace Park, USA/Canada), a formal TBPA with informal partnerships. He highlighted a TBC informal to formal continuum of governance models including networks-partnerships-institutions. The discussion touched upon the term “area” in TBPA and TBCA and whether TBC is different from TBCA. Patrizia noted TBC should be dealt with as a process, and Kevan noted the challenge of excluding the term “area” from TBCA in relation to locating it on a geographic map. Stefan noted that while TBC needs to take place in a defined geographic scope, it does not necessarily refer to a delimited “area”. Tatjana said there are examples of TB anti-poaching networks at local scales not necessarily related to ecological processes.

SESSION 5, Chair: Maja Vasiljević (Chair, IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation SG)

Presentations

First penta-lateral Biosphere Reserve in the World: The story about Mura-Drava-Danube region (Irma Popović Dujmović)

Irma introduced the developments in relation to the Mura-Drava-Danube BR, recognising that at the moment it is a bilateral BR (Croatia, Hungary), soon to be trilateral (Serbia) and hopefully penta-lateral in the future (Austria, Slovenia). She addressed the challenges that WWF and the countries have encountered during the process, such as funding at national levels, absence of TBR management structure, potential for employment of large destructive projects.

Thayatal-Podyjí National Parks TBPA (Robert Brunner)

Robert presented history of cooperation between Thayatal and Podyjí National Parks emphasising the existence of Czech protected area initiated the process of establishment of a protected area at Austrian side of the national boundary. Although cooperation is at high level, there are unsolved problems such as fishing which is not allowed in Thayatal and allowed in Podyjí and existence of a big hydro-power plant that causes unnatural flow dynamics.

European TransParcNet with special emphasis on Finnish transboundary cooperation (Kari Lahti)

Kari presented TB cooperation between Oulanka and Paanajärvi National Parks (Finland, Russia) noting that the cooperation started at ground-level with joint activities between rangers. The parks nowadays have harmonised management principles, information systems and monitoring methods, and are EU-funds beneficiaries due to TB cooperation in conservation. The presentation further talked about the Green Belt of Fennoscandia, BPAN (Barents Protected Areas Network), and EUROPARC Federation’s programme Transboundary Parks.

EGTC European Park Alpi Marittime/Mercantour (Patrizia Rossi)

The presentation primarily focused on the history of TB conservation between Alpi Marittime and Mercantour (Italy, France) noting the many benefits of cooperation, including joint fundraising and project implementation, common maps and action plan, joint visitor regulation. The TBPA is one of the examples of highest cooperation at global level with EGTC (European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation) being established between the two parks as a single European juridical structure for common management in 2013 (based on EU Regulation 1082/2006).

Transboundary Landscape Conservation and Development Initiatives in the Hindu Kush Himalayas (Sunita Chaudhary)

Sunita presented ICIMOD's work in the Hindu Kush Himalaya region where seven regional TB landscapes have been detected, each one being a separate unit for TB cooperation. The presentation provided examples of Kailash Sacred Landscape (China, India, Nepal) and Kangchejunga Landscape (Bhutan, India, Nepal). Challenges in coordination at local, national and regional levels were emphasised.

Measuring success in TFCA Development: Performance Auditing - The Southern African Approach (Kevan Zunckel)

This presentation was prepared by Paul Bewsher of Peace Parks Foundation, presented by Kevan Zunckel. It was about the Performance Assessment Tool (PAT) that assesses performance of various TBCs. The tool has not yet been tested beyond southern Africa. It consists of eight key performance area, each containing four key indicators. The participants agreed to refer to PAT in the guideline, but avoiding its presentation as a prescriptive model given its very formal structure and framework.

ACTION POINTS:

12. Refer to PAT in the guideline.
13. Explore possibility of developing a monitoring methodology for this specific chapter in the guideline.

SESSION 6, Chair: Kevan Zunckel (Regional Coordinator for East&South Africa, IUCN WCPA Transboundary Conservation Specialist Group)

Discussion

Selection of case studies (Boris Erg)

Boris presented a matrix for selection of case studies for the BPG, explaining the IUCN WCPA editorial policy for BPGs notes that case studies should provide experience and knowledge sharing and cover broad range of realities in order to depict the multitude of approaches and options in TBC. He emphasized case studies will be presented in two ways, either as self-standing sub-chapters (each up to 1,000 words possibly) or in boxes reflecting the principle discussed in the chapter (around 200 words). Boris presented the criteria for selection of case studies which covered a number of aspects: regional coverage, biome, type of TBC, IUCN PA management category, level of cooperation, governance type, scope (site based to regional), lessons learnt. Matthew and Kevan suggested to possibly simplify the criteria. Maja noted that "type of TBC" criteria needs to be adapted to newly agreed typology of TBC, and that levels of cooperation presented in current BPG (developed by Dorothy Zbicz) might have to be modified. Olivier suggested collecting case studies also in Spanish and French and have them translated to English. Maja informed about the IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme's support in translating the BPG to French and Spanish. Elizabeth offered to translate the case studies to Arabic. Andrew suggested to prepare a "wish list" of case studies to avoid getting too many. Maja noted that case studies will be sought from TBC SG entire network and the selection would depend on the criteria and needs. Boris noted that case studies should reflect entire scope of the BPG, not only TBPA's. Elaine suggested to avoid duplicating case studies from current guideline, and Maja noted that some sites may be so good (or have progressed in the last decade) and may be worth highlighting them again in the publication.

ACTION POINTS:

14. Adapt case studies' selection criteria based on agreed typology for TBC and levels of cooperation, and other possibly outstanding issues.

15. Send a call for case studies to TBC SG network. Contributions in Spanish and French to be accepted too and translated into English.
16. Select a number of self-standing case studies and those to be included as boxes based on the needs and criteria.
17. Facilitate with FoEME translation of case studies into Arabic.
18. Facilitate translation of the BPG to French and Spanish with IUCN GPAP.

Preparation for the World Parks Congress 2014 (Maja Vasiljević)

Maja introduced the IUCN World Parks Congress (WPC) to be held in Sydney in November 2014. She listed the Streams that will form part of the Congress and emphasized TBC SG's contribution will complement Stream 6 Enhancing the quality and diversity of governance. Kari noted that registration for the Congress will be from 12 November 2013 to 30 June 2014, while call or submission will be from 12 November 2013 to 1 March 2014.

The main aim of the discussion was to agree on the input of TBC SG at WPC. One of the inputs is the launch of the BPG on TBC, a proposed one hour event. Kari advised to organize the launch in the Pavillion and Boris noted this event should primarily be a social event with 2-3 speakers talking about the guideline and followed by cocktail-gathering. Tatjana suggested checking with CMS if they will attend the Congress so that they can join the event. Florian indicated that BfN is willing to contribute to the event although it is not yet clear who will be attending the Congress.

Second potential contribution to the Congress was launching a forum for TBPA managers (Resolution 43, IUCN WCC Jeju 2012). It was noted that this motion was submitted to the WCC without consultation with TBC SG and it is partially already fulfilled by facilitating an e-listserv that includes TBPA managers along with other sectors. Elaine explained the key idea behind this resolution was to develop meetings for TBPA managers. Participants agreed that implementation of this resolution requires too much resources, especially considering the fact the network already exists. Boris emphasized that in order to identify TBPA managers we would first need a good database. Maja noted that what we could prepare is platform for communication and ask WCPA to help in spreading the news about existence of the platform. There was some confusion about the content of the resolution. Maja noted the resolution calls for establishment of "a forum for protected area authorities engaged in TBC" and Elaine noted it calls for "a regularly convening forum". Kari and Michael mentioned a possibility of organizing e-conferences, while Cristian noted this is a very demanding task requiring a lot of manpower. Olivier and Tatjana suggested to set aside time for special meetings during the global conferences such as WPC or WCC where relevant people are participating. Elizabeth suggested to integrate more TBPA managers from different regions in the already existing network. Maja noted that Regional Coordinators in the TBC SG Executive Committee might want to work on that in their regions.

As additional input to the Congress, Maja suggested a motion on the development of a comprehensive TB database. No further ideas were suggested about potential motions to be presented at the WPC.

It was also suggested to organize a workshop led by TBC SG and partners. Elaine expressed interest by Young Professionals SG to have a TBC workshop during the pre-congress week-long gathering on capacity building of young people. Kari noted EUROPARC's interest in presenting TransParcNet at WPC.

ACTION POINTS:

19. Register by 1 March for launch of the BPG at the Pavillion, maximum 1 hour event.
20. Find suitable speakers for the launch of the BPG (coordinate with BfN) and organise catering.
21. Check with CMS if they will attend WPC.
22. Communicate with IUCN about the agreement on the Resolution 43 (Jeju, 2012).

23. Regional Coordinators of TBC SG Executive Committee to try to reach out to TBPA managers in their regions and involve them in the TBC SG network.
24. Consult with TBC SG network on potential submission of motions (TB database et al.)
25. Ask TBC SG network for potential partnerships in organising a workshop at WPC, having in mind potential cooperation with Young Professionals SG and EUROPARC.
26. Develop a programme for the workshop and register by 1 March (Stream 6, a room for 60 people).
27. Ensure a number of paper copies of BPG are distributed to TBC SG Regional Coordinators for their distribution at regional meetings.

Timeframe (Maja Vasiljević)

Key dates in the development of the BPG are as follows:

- 1 December 2013: comments on TBC definitions gathered
- 1 February 2014: 1st draft case studies received
- 1 March 2014: 1st drafts of core texts received
- 1 April 2014: Revisions
- 20 April 2014: 2nd drafts ready
- 20 May 2014: Preface and foreword received
- 1 June 2014: Final draft of BPG ready
- 20 June 2014: Peer review
- 15 July 2014: Proofreading
- 15 August 2014: Layout
- 1 September 2014: Final BPG ready

Tatjana and Boris suggested to ship to Sydney only limited number of paper copies and ensure having BPG on memory sticks as e-version.

ACTION POINTS:

28. Inquire with IUCN GPAP about plans for WPC (as much paperless as possible?)
29. Possibly ensure adequate number of memory sticks with pdf version of the BPG for WPC.
30. Ask WCPA whether key products will all be provided by them as e-versions.

Continuation of discussion on TBC definitions (Michael Schoon)

Michael presented newly drafted definitions of TBPA and TB Conservation Landscape/Seascape (in current typology this refers to TB Conservation and Development Areas, however, the workshop participants argued for modified title of this type). The participants discussed the content of these definitions word by word and agreed on the general principles encompassed in the definitions. It was decided to further refine the wording based on the agreed principles after the workshop and present them to other people in the network. Definition of TB Migratory Corridors and Parks for Peace would also be refined after the workshop. The participants also agreed on a definition of TBC in its broadest sense, keeping in mind the TBC has to be further explained and elaborated after the introductory definition.

ACTION POINTS:

31. Refine the agreed definitions of TBPA, Park for Peace, and TBC Landscape/Seascape, redraft the definition of TB Migratory Corridors and allow for consultative process regarding the new definitions.

Conclusions (Tatjana Rosen Michel)

Tatjana thanked the organisers of the workshop for hosting and preparing the meeting. She noted it was inspiring to see all the TB examples from different places.

DAY 3, 18 October 2012

Field excursion to Thayatal-Podyjí TBPA started with a bus drive from Retz to Vranov where Robert Stejskal (Podyjí NP, Czech Republic) and Robert Brunner (Thayatal NP, Austria) introduced the fieldtrip's programme and key facts about the parks, including challenging issues such as the unnatural water flow dynamics caused by a hydro-power plant near Vranov. Another challenge is to establish a fish population adapted to the river type (hydro-peaks), since ecological connectivity of the river is interrupted by two dams. While fishing is banned in Thayatal, it is still allowed in Podyjí, making the fishing regulations non-harmonised. Being located at the former "Iron Curtain" with access allowed only with special permission, the nature remained intact, making it ideal area for conservation purposes.

The hosts organised rafting on Thaya/Dyje River for the participants, which was an opportunity to experience the parks by boating along the very border of the two countries. There was no official border crossing with passport control, making it a positive experience about the unity of the two parks managed under separate jurisdictions in two countries. Apart from the river, the landscape is characterised by forests (beech forests in the western part and oaks and hornbeam forests on the eastern side), meadows (heathlands) and rocks, being a habitat for numerous animal and plant species (e.g. Eagle owl, Black stork, Variegated iris). In certain areas there were still patches of fir trees, non-native for this part of Austria/Czech Republic, and undergoing the removal process, as agreed by both parks. The parks are also cooperating on numerous research activities, resulting with information on species inhabiting the parks that is jointly collected and shared.

Rafting ended in Hardegg and the fieldtrip continued through the forest in the Austrian side of the TBPA along the river by walking. Meadows in this area are rather rare and thus cooperation is ensured between park managers and local farmers to maintain this important habitat. The highlight of this walk was a climb to the famous viewpoint from which two sides of the Thaya River get as close as 120 metres and almost make a full circle, both NPs could be seen and the Novy Hradek ruin. This large meander is formed around the "meander mountain". From there, the fieldtrip led to the Kaja castle where it ended.

This TBPA is an example of good practice, although some challenges in cooperation are evident, primarily due to the fact that parks need to work under different national legislations. At site level, it is clear that Directors of the two parks and their staff work cooperatively, holding regular meetings with agreed long-term management plan for the TBPA.