

**Resolution CM/ResDip(2008)1  
on the revised regulations for the European Diploma for Protected Areas**

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 20 February 2008  
at the 1018th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)<sup>1</sup>*

**Appendix 5: Model plan for annual reports**

**Annual report for the year 2019**

Annual reports should describe the changes that have taken place since the previous year in dynamic terms of management and function and not be limited to basic data. Any new text or map introducing a change in the situation of the area should be attached to the annual report.

State: Romania

Name of the area: Retezat National Park Biosphere Reserve

Year and number of years since the award or renewal of the European Diploma for Protected Areas:  
EDPA renewed in 2013

**Central authority concerned:**

Name: Ministry of Environment  
Address: Bulev. Libertatii, nr. 12, sect 5, Bucuresti  
Tel: (+4)0214089642  
Fax: (+4)0214089615  
e-mail: srp@mmediu.ro  
www: www.mmediu.ro

**Authority responsible for its management:**

Name: Retezat National Park Administration  
Address: 337423 Nucsoara, nr. 284, com. Salasu de Sus, Jud. Hunedoara  
Tel: (+4)0254779969; (+4)0733888586  
Fax: (+4)0354815399  
e-mail: office@retezat.ro  
www: www.retezat.ro

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by Resolution CM/ResDip(2014)2 on 2 July 2014 at the 1204th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies.  
Internet : <http://www.coe.int/cm>

1. **Conditions:** List here all conditions which were attached to the award or the renewal of the European Diploma. Explain either how the conditions have been totally complied with or detail the progress in complying with the conditions. Please also indicate any unresolved difficulties that you have encountered.

There haven't been conditions attached to the renewal of the Diploma.

**2. Recommendations:** List here all recommendations which were attached to the award or the renewal of the European Diploma. Explain either how the recommendations have been totally complied with or detail the progress in complying with the recommendations. Please also indicate any unresolved difficulties that you have encountered.

1. The Romanian authorities should secure a sufficient budget for the national park and allocate the funds early enough in the year to ensure favorable working conditions for the staff, the completion and maintenance of the park's infrastructure, more information for visitors and the improvement of tourist facilities;

**Even if the central public authority for environment didn't finance at all the park's activity, National Forest Administration ROMSILVA (in whose structure we are included) has ensured, at the beginning of the year, a reasonable financial support in order that we have been able to perform most of our activities without financial constraints. Nevertheless, in September we have received an official notice saying we have to reduce spendings to 90% of what was approved at the beginning of the year.**

2. The competent Romanian authorities should work together to harmonize the different national and international designations in order to achieve efficient joint management and to implement joint scientific research and monitoring programmes;

**Last year has arisen a problem related to the international designation of Retezat National Park as Biosphere Reserve: we have received a recommendation letter from the MAB Secretary General to finalize the implementation process of the conditions listed in Madrid Action Plan, or to propose a plan in order achieve those conditions. Practically it's very difficult to harmonize the purpose(s) and the objectives of a real National Park (protected area category II by IUCN classification) with those of a Biosphere Reserve (categ. VI). However, in collaboration with the Romanian National MAB Committee and the Ministry of Environment we have elaborated that planning document, and it has been submitted to the International MAB Committee for analysis; at the moment we are waiting for an answer. After submitting a new compliance plan this year, the situation is still uncertain... because we haven't received any answer.**

3. The management plan should be approved as soon as possible, and at least an executive summary should be translated into either English or French;

**At the beginning of the year 2018 we have started the implementation of a project whose main outcome is the elaboration of the second edition of park's management plan; the project has a budget of 4,234,584 Euros and it will last until 31 of Dec. 2020. The project foresees the following main activities: inventorying and mapping important flora and fauna species and habitats, elaboration of monitoring protocols for important flora and fauna species and habitats, studies on the abiotic factors, studies on the carrying of the alpine pastures and ecosystem services of the habitats, creation of a data base for both specialists and tourists, publicity and information activities, awareness and education activities in schools and local communities, acquisition of different equipment and training courses for RNPA staff. The project completed very well this year, so we are waiting for its completion to have the management plan elaborated.**

4. The park, in close collaboration with the mountain rescue services Salvamont, should maintain or renew, when necessary, the tourist infrastructure (Trail marking, information signs, etc.); a particular effort should be made to solve the problems of the toilets in the camping areas and near the huts;

**There are about 90 information and guiding panels placed on the park's territory, as well at the entrance points. RNPA rangers have renovated the dry toilets built in 2017 near the remote parking place at Gura Bucurei (the end of the forest road along the Lapusnicul Mare Valley) and have built a shelter at the same location. The RNPA's staff took care this year as well to maintain in good condition the orientation-information infrastructure in the park.**

5. The park should maintain pressure on local communities to prevent constructions of inappropriate buildings either in the park or in its immediate vicinity;

**As we have explained earlier, the current legislation is very strict regarding the possibility of building new construction in the park, so we don't have such problems. According to the law, the competence of RNPA is strictly limited to the park territory, so it's enough difficult to influence the building process in the surrounding areas. In 2019 there weren't problems with illegal constructions.**

6. The park rangers should monitor the pastures in order to identify early possible changes due to over grazing and/or under grazing; before the next evaluation, the park should carry out a new study on the pastures; the changes in terms of species composition, erosion, etc., should be analyzed in relation to the type and amount of grazing.

**The approved project for reviewing the management plan (see explanation no. 3) includes a series of studies on habitats and species that will be mapped and evaluated from the conservation point of**

view, and conservation measures will be issued for each of them. The existing monitoring plan will be also reviewed in order to include the new conservation measures. The project will be implemented in a period of three years (01.01.2018 – 31.12.2020).

**3. Site Management:** List here any changes to the European Diploma holding site management, in relation to both terrestrial and aquatic environments (as appropriate), and in relation to staff and finances, since the last annual report was submitted to the Council of Europe. Please also indicate any unresolved difficulties that you have encountered.

In November 2014, the central public authority for environment renewed the contract with the National Forest Administration and subsequently with the Retezat National Park Administration, for the next 10 years. In that document it's clearly mentioned that the Gemenale Scientific Reserve's (IUCN categ. I) management is done by the same structures that administrates the Retezat National Park. However, the collaboration with the new people from Romanian Academy in charge for that issue has improved, and now we have a much better collaboration in all aspects related to the territory of that reserve. By law, in 2017, a new administrative structure was established – the National Agency for Protected Areas – which took over the duties of relevant ministry in relation to the protected areas and their administrators.

**4. Boundaries:** Give details of any changes to the boundaries of the European Diploma holding site since the last annual report was submitted to the Council of Europe. If there are any changes, please attach an appropriate map to this report. Please also indicate any unresolved difficulties that you have encountered.

There were no changes to the boundaries of the park since the last annual report, the boundaries being the same since the re-establishment of the park, in 2000.

**5. Other information:** List here any other information about the European Diploma holding site which you consider should be provided to the Council of Europe.

At the moment, we don't have any other special information to communicate to the Council.

\*\*\*

The following sections of the form should only be filled in if your area is in the year before a renewal of its European Diploma for Protected Areas, i.e. year 4 after the award of the European Diploma or year 9 after its renewal.

**6. Natural heritage (general abiotic description: geomorphology, geology and hydrogeology, habitats, flora, fauna, landscape) – State of conservation**

- 6.1. Environment: changes or deterioration in the environment, of natural or anthropic origin, accidental or permanent, actual or anticipated
- 6.2. Flora and vegetation: changes in the plant population and in the vegetational cover; presumed causes
- 6.3. Fauna: changes in the sedentary or migratory populations; congregating, egg-laying and breeding grounds

**7. Cultural heritage and socio-economic context**

- 7.1. Cultural heritage
  - 7.1.1. Changes concerning cultural heritage
- 7.2. Socio-economic context
  - 7.2.1. Changes concerning the socio-economic context

**8. Education and scientific interest**

- 8.1. Visitors – Information policy
  - 8.1.1. Arrangements for receiving and informing the public (building, booklets, maps, cards, etc.)
  - 8.1.2. Frequentation by visitors and behavior (number, distribution in time and space)
  - 8.1.3. Special visits (distinguished persons, groups, etc.)
- 8.2. Scientific research
  - 8.2.1. Current or completed research (observation, experimentation, etc.; identification or inventory of the species listed in the appendices to the Bern Convention, etc.)
  - 8.2.2. Scientific publications

**9. Site description (vulnerability, protection status, ownership, documentation)**

- 9.1. Changes in legislation or regulations
- 9.2. Changes in ownership title (conversion to public property, rentals, etc.)
- 9.3. Extension or transfer, new uses (for example, conversion into total reserve)

**10. Site management (management plans, budget and personnel)**

- 10.1. Improvements made
  - 10.1.1. Ecological action affecting the flora and biotopes; controls of fauna
  - 10.1.2. Protection against the elements (fire, water regime)
  - 10.1.3. Approaches and thoroughfares (paths, roads, car parks, signposting, fencing, etc.)
  - 10.1.4. Field equipment (hides and study facilities)
  - 10.1.5. Waste management
  - 10.1.6. Use of renewable energy systems
- 10.2. Management
  - 10.2.1. Administrative department: changes made
  - 10.2.2. Wardens' department: changes made
  - 10.2.3. Internal policing measures
  - 10.2.4. Infringement of regulations and damage; legal action

**11. Influence of the award of the European Diploma for Protected Areas**

--