



Strasbourg, 19 December 2005
[diplome/docs/2006/de08e_06]

PE-S-DE (2006) 8
English only

**Committee for the activities of the Council of Europe
in the field of biological and landscape diversity
(CO-DBP)**

Group of Specialists – European Diploma of Protected Areas

23-24 January 2006
Room 16, Palais de l'Europe, Strasbourg

**EKENÄS ARCHIPELAGO NATIONAL PARK
(Tammisaaren Saariston Kansallipuisto)
(FINLAND)**

RENEWAL of the European Diploma

**Report by
Professor Michael B Usher
(United Kingdom)**

*Document established by
the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

1. Introduction

1. The first on-the-spot appraisal of Ekenäs National Park was carried out between 29 and 31 May 1995. On 19 June 1996 the Committee of Ministers at the 569th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies agreed to award the European Diploma to the National Park, making a series of six recommendations (which will be reviewed in the following section, paragraphs 5 to 11). The Diploma was awarded for a five-year period, until 19 June 2001.

2. The second on-the-spot appraisal of Ekenäs National Park took place on 10 and 11 July 2000. The Committee of Ministers, at the 769th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies on 17 October 2001, confirmed the renewal of the European Diploma, attaching a series of four recommendations. These will also be reviewed in the following section, paragraphs 12 to 15. The Diploma was renewed for a five-year period, until 19 June 2006.

3. With the expiry of the European Diploma in 2006, the Council of Europe considered that a further on-the-spot appraisal was required. The Head of the Natural Heritage and Biological Diversity Division of Directorate General IV: Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, Dr Eladio Fernandez Galiano, asked me to undertake this appraisal. The visit took place on 27 and 28 September 2005 (details of the programme of the visit are given in Appendix 1). I was not accompanied by a member of staff of the Council of Europe during the visit to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

4. The aims of the appraisal were threefold. First, the Council of Europe asks that, on the basis of the visit and the annual reports, an assessment is made of the extent to which previous recommendations have been acted upon (section 2 of this report). Second, it asks that the European interest of the protected area be confirmed (section 3) and that the merits of the protection system be examined (section 4) (the terms of reference for carrying out the on-the-spot appraisal are listed in Appendix 2). Third, proposals are formulated as to whether or not the European Diploma should be extended for a further 5 years; these proposals can contain either conditions or recommendations (sections 5 and 6).

2. A Review of the Previous Ten Recommendations

2.1. The 1996 Recommendations

5. The recommendations agreed by the Committee of Ministers on 19 June 1996 in Resolution (96) 30 were as follows.

- 1. to stop the spring shooting of the eider as soon as possible;*
- 2. to extend the south-west limits of the national park; to inform the Secretariat of the Council of Europe of any modification to the present boundaries of the park through maps showing the greatest possible detail;*
- 3. to intensify the scientific research and the publication of their results with supplementary financial resources;*
- 4. to manage the natural habitats whilst respecting the needs of the indigenous species;*
- 5. to develop the supervision, information and education of visitors, chiefly in summer;*
- 6. to study the 'sponsorship' opportunities for undertaking certain short-term activities, as the financial resources granted to this park are relatively modest."*

6. Enquiries during the visit were slightly ambiguous about the spring shooting of eider. Within the boundaries of the national park, this has either been stopped or is considered to be at an acceptably low level. There would be considerable difficulties in policing a complete ban, especially at sea when the boundary cannot be clearly defined. Recommendation 1 has therefore been implemented within the national park, but has not been implemented outside the boundaries of the park.

7. There has been no extension to the boundary of the national park, although plans to extend the boundary have been with the Government of Finland, Ministry of the Environment, for about 10 years. Recommendation 2, as well as recommendation 1 of the 2001 set, has therefore not been implemented.

8. Recommendation 3 is more nebulous, because it essentially begs the question ‘what research is needed in order to manage the national park more effectively?’. Whilst it seems unlikely that research has been intensified by the national park authorities, there has been a number of research initiatives within Finland that have relevance to Ekenäs Archipelago National Park. These are reviewed in section 5 below, which also incorporates information about recommendation 2 in the 2001 set.

9. Recommendation 4 relates to the day-to-day management of the national park. All of the indications are that it has been implemented in relation to the terrestrial environment. In the marine environment much less is known and there appear to be few problems; hence this recommendation has implicitly been fulfilled even although there might be little evidence for this.

10. There is a visitor centre on the quay at Tammissaari/Ekenäs and also a small reception area for visitors on the island of Älgö. The visitor centre in the town is visited by about 26,000 people per year, a large proportion of who are children. Although there has been some work on recommendation 5, a greater discussion of provision of facilities for visitors to enjoy the National Park will be included in section 5.

11. Only limited progress has been made on obtaining ‘sponsorship’ as outlined in recommendation 6. However, with the opening up of the island Jussarö, there are opportunities for franchising facilities such as a café or restaurant and ‘bed and breakfast’ type accommodation

2.2. The 2001 Recommendations

12. The recommendations agreed by the Committee of Ministers on 17 October 2001 in Resolution ResDip (2001) 3 were as follows.

“1. in order to make the different European nature conservation policies more consistent, the boundaries of the diploma area should include the whole of the extended area of the National Park, including the Natura 2000 sites. Within these new park boundaries the rules governing the traditional and restricted spring eider hunting must be revised;

2. to extend knowledge of the ecosystem, scientific research must be strongly encouraged, particularly through closer co-operation with the Tvärminne Zoological Station and the Environmental Research Station; this recommendation also applies to nature management and published results must be aimed at a wider public. Funds are needed for restoring the permanent monitoring sites such as the one in Älgö;

3. the National Park 1990 Master Plan should be revised and updated to take account of the new National Park boundaries, as defined in the LIFE funding applications: revision of zoning, tourism facilities, management and restoration areas;

4. additional resources, to reflect the changes in demand and the objectives of the master plan, should be allocated to the functioning of the visitors centre.”

13. Recommendation 1 was dealt with in paragraph 7 above. Similarly, recommendation 2 was addressed in paragraph 8 above.

14. The Master Plan for the national park has not yet been revised, but there has been a discussion of when a revision would be appropriate. The plan is now 15 years old, and many changes have occurred, such as the award of the European Diploma, the designation of the extensive Natura 2000 site (which includes *inter alia* the national park), and many legislative changes such as Finland’s ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Recommendation 3 has therefore not been implemented.

15. Activities in the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park are the responsibility of Metsähallitus (a Government Agency with many business units – Forestry, ‘Laatumaa’ [marketing land], ‘Morenia’ [soil and aggregates], Wild North [tourism, hunting and fishing] and consultancy – as well as the Natural Heritage Service, which *inter alia* manages the Finnish National Parks). Perhaps during the last few years more attention has been paid to the Archipelago National Park, situated to the west of Ekenäs and

about five times as large as Ekenäs. Also a priority for Metsähallitus has been the management and restoration of forests, largely due both to ear-marked funding from the Ministry of the Environment and to external funding from the EU's LIFE programme (this was evident at Seitsemien National Park, the only other designated area in Finland that holds the European Diploma). Hence, whereas resources have been available for the day-to-day management of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park, additional resources for particular projects have been scarce and recommendation 4 has hardly been implemented.

3. European Interest in the National Park

16. The total area of the national park is about 5,300 ha, of which about 700 ha are terrestrial and the remainder marine. The marine areas range from the Inner Archipelago almost to the margin of the open Baltic Sea in the Gulf of Finland. There is thus a considerable gradient from the most exposed shores to the least exposed. In the least exposed areas, a fringe of reeds (*Phragmites australis*) provides a habitat for fish to spawn, for birds to nest, and for many invertebrate animals. In contrast, the most exposed shores are rocky, and support marine algae and communities of molluscs.

17. The national park includes a large number of islands, islets and rocks (skerries). The smallest and most exposed are unvegetated; the larger islands have mature forest which in places is unmanaged and natural (such as on the western side of Jussäro. Such forest provides a habitat for mammals, breeding birds such as the white-tailed or sea eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) and many species of invertebrate animals and fungi associated with dead wood.

18. The features of the national park, that are of European interest, are documented in the two previous reports (prepared in 1995 and 2000) by Mr Eckhart Kuijken [Council of Europe papers PE-S-ZP (96) 51 and PE-S-DE (2001) 5]. Further brief information is given in the national park leaflet (available in a number of languages) and in *Finland's National Parks: Seas of Blue, Seas of Green* by Markku Lappalainen and published by Metsähallitus (2001). I can confirm that the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park continues to have features of considerable European interest.

4. Merits and Protection System

19. The terms of reference for these on-the-spot appraisals (see Appendix 2) request that certain issues be addressed. These are each discussed in the following eleven paragraphs.

20. The body responsible for the national park is Metsähallitus, the Finnish Forest and Park Service. At the end of 2004 the President of Finland confirmed a new Act of Parliament on Metsähallitus, and this came into force on 1 January 2005. Metsähallitus's Board of Directors also adopted a new strategy in February 2005 (details are given in the 2004 Metsähallitus Annual Report). At the time of the on-the-spot appraisal new structures were being introduced throughout the Natural Heritage Services, the Directorate in Metsähallitus responsible for the management of the majority of Finland's designated protected areas. Responsibility for Metsähallitus is jointly between the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (largely related to the operations as a state-owned enterprise) and the Ministry of the Environment (largely related to the public service obligations).

21. The legislation concerning national parks in Finland, and legislation in relation to Natura 2000 sites (the EU's Birds and Habitats Directives), would appear to be sufficient to provide effective protection.

22. There is a formal zoning within the national park (see Appendix 3), described in the master plan and approved by the Ministry of the Environment. The components of this zoning system are that

- a) access to a few islands is totally prohibited,
- b) movement in the sea surrounding most of the mid- and outer-archipelago islands (a zone of 500m) is prohibited between 1 April and 31 August,
- c) landing on certain inner-archipelago islands is prohibited between 1 April and 15 July, and
- d) movement on island lakes is prohibited when they are ice free.

23. The national park is in the ownership of the state, and is managed on behalf of the state by Metsähallitus. Within the outer boundary of the national park there are some small, privately-owned properties, and these are not formally part of the national park.

24. Because of the location of the national park, 18km by sea from the town of Ekenäs (Tammisaari), and at least 9km by sea from the nearest mainland areas, it is unaffected by mainland land use plans. There appear to be no particular marine use plans that affect the national park, other than the main coastal shipping route from Helsinki to Hanko which passes through parts of the park, and hence speed limits are imposed on marine traffic. The report by Gilligan *et al.* (2005) does, however, identify two threats that are faced by the national park – problems caused by waste disposal, especially oil, and threats to the native wildlife from invasive alien species.

25. There was no indication of development works affecting the national park, other than those listed in paragraph 30 below.

26. The management plan was written in 1990. This ‘Master Plan’ was the subject of a recommendation in the report written after the appraisal in 2000 (see paragraphs 12 and 14 above), and forms the subject of a further recommendation (see paragraphs 53 to 55 below).

27. There is a visitor centre in Ekenäs, small seasonal reception facilities at Rödjan on Älgö and on Jussarö, and minimal facilities on the islands of Fladalandet and Modernmagan. Visitor facilities will be addressed in paragraphs 42 to 46 below.

28. Finland has an important reputation in undertaking high quality environmental research. This is addressed in paragraphs 47 to 52 below.

29. Individual national parks are not members of international networks. However, the regional unit (Southern Finland) is a member of the EUROPARC Federation. There are also close working relationships between Finland’s three national parks in the Finnish Gulf (one of which borders Russia), and with the Perämeri National Park further north in Ostrobothnia (the central regional unit in Finland).

30. During the visit I met the local mayor, who clearly had been briefed about the national park and knew the local Metsähallitus staff. He has a vision for encouraging tourism to the area, which includes both the natural heritage in the national park and the industrial heritage of the wider area around Ekenäs. The mayor is relatively new in his office, and clearly the strategy and then the plans for achieving this vision need to be developed in partnership with the national park authorities.

5. Discussion Leading to Proposed Recommendations

5.1. The National Park’s Boundaries

31. Of the two previous sets of recommendations, the one that appears to be most controversial is the one to enlarge the boundaries of the national park. There are many aspects to the park’s possible enlargement.

32. First, there is a large sea area, with relatively few small islands and islets, in the outer archipelago, contiguous with the existing national park boundary and in the ownership of Metsähallitus. Given both the ownership and the geographical location, this area of sea and land could be included in the park.

33. Second, there is the extensive Natura 2000 site (Tammisaari, Hanko, Inkoo ja Pohja; 52,630 ha), being nearly an order of magnitude larger than the park and incorporating the whole of the park within its boundaries. It would be unrealistic to consider that the whole Natura 2000 site could be included in the park, but it should be possible to plan for the inclusion of those portions of sea and land that are currently in public ownership.

34. Third, the military requirement for land and sea for training purposes has diminished, and this makes it possible to consider former military areas for inclusion within the park. An example of such an

extension to the park would be the eastern portion of the large island Jussarö, though this would necessitate careful consideration of the future of former mining and military installations.

35. Finally, there is the possibility of considering some Inner Archipelago islands, which are in the ownership of the local authority, or even portions of the Finnish mainland that could provide a setting for further interpretation of the marine, coastal and terrestrial significance of the national park.

36. It has been stated that the plan to extend the boundaries of the park has been under consideration within the Ministry of the Environment for something like 10 years. One of the main problems has been the potential conflict with the hunters, who have traditionally shot eider (*Somateria mollissima*), particularly in the Outer Archipelago. Over the 10 years since the plan to extend the boundaries of the park was submitted, there have been many changes, particularly the designation of the Natura 2000 site, the decline in military usage of the area, further acquisition of areas by public bodies (local and national), and indeed the initial award of the European Diploma.

37. It seems therefore that this is an opportune moment to consider a way forward that would significantly extend the sea area of the park as well as increasing its terrestrial area from its current c. 700 ha to over 1000 ha. This would necessitate the withdrawal of the extant enlargement plans by Metsähallitus, the drawing up of new enlargement plans in co-operation with all of the interested groups, and the re-submission of the revised plan to the Ministry of the Environment. It now appears to be sufficiently urgent for this topic to form a condition for the renewal of the European Diploma. Thus, a condition for the Diploma's renewal is

C1. Given the changing circumstances of the last 10 years, revised plans for the enlargement of the National Park are to be drawn up by Metsähallitus, in consultation with other stakeholders, within a period of two years (i.e. by mid-2008). These new plans should then be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment with the request that approval be given, and the park enlarged, by mid-2010 at the latest.

38. The time scale given for this condition is relatively relaxed, but accords with the next renewal of the European Diploma, which should occur in 2011 (with consideration by the Council of Europe beginning in mid-2010).

5.2. Reflections on Finland's Protected Areas

39. During 2004 an international group spent two weeks in Finland, at the request of Metsähallitus, to evaluate the effectiveness of the management of the many protected areas in the country. The network of 35 national parks was included within the remit of the review group, but the group did not visit the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park. The group did, however, visit the Archipelago National Park, as well as eight other national parks. The group's report (Gilligan *et al.*, 2005) concludes that "in general, Finland's protected areas are well managed and well resourced, and with some exceptions they appear to be achieving their aims of conserving biodiversity" and further "the Finnish protected areas are in an enviable position compared with many of the world's protected area systems and should form a model that others can follow".

40. The report does, however, focus on some potential improvements, and it collects its recommendations into ten suggested areas for action. These areas are (with some quotations from the report in brackets):

- ecosystem approaches ("... Finland's protected areas need to stretch out consciously into the rest of the land and water mosaic by developing more integrated landscape plans for conservation");
- system planning ("... some key issues do now require coordinated national plans. Two key national strategies that we believe are now required would address invasive species and climate change ...");
- site planning ("Management planning is currently falling behind schedule ... one important element should be a risk assessment ...");

- conservation outcomes (“Most rare or threatened species appear to be stable or increasing within protected areas, although there are exceptions ... some habitats are also declining ... we suggest looking into options for introducing more strictly protected areas where hunting and fishing are prohibited, particularly in national parks ...”);
- community outcomes (“there is ... a mismatch between the general enthusiasm for increasing tourism and continuing antipathy towards protected areas in some places and we recommend that specific efforts are made to build the arguments for protection with concerned rural local communities.”);
- visitor outcomes (“our only real recommendation is that perhaps greater emphasis might be given to looking at ways of reducing visitor impacts ...”);
- finances (“generally the level of support provided by the Finnish government is good ... however, we note that staffing levels are quite lean ... there is also some imbalance between the southern and northern regions ... “);
- global role (“the international work of the Natural Heritage Services is of high quality although not fully comprehended by all staff ...”);
- assessment (“the level of ecological assessment is very good, cultural assessment still needs further development”); and
- state of the parks (... recommend the development of a *State of the Parks* report that would be published periodically ...”).

41. It needs to be noted that these are generic recommendations from a review group about all protected areas in Finland, and that they do not relate specifically to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park. However, they do raise a number of issues that could be related to an area awarded the European Diploma for Protected Areas, and hence they form the content of a recommendation, which is

R1. The recommendations of the 2004 review of protected areas in Finland are noted. Metsähallitus is encouraged to implement these recommendations for the well-being of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

5.3. Visitors and their Reception

42. The Visitor Centre in the town of Ekenäs is visited by about 26,000 people per year. In rank order of the 22 visitor centres in Finland managed by Metsähallitus, it is number 10. An estimated 20,000 people per year visit the national park. Again in rank order of the 34 national parks in Finland managed by Metsähallitus, it is number 13=. In both respects the park and its facilities therefore seem to be near the average for Finland (although in many European contexts such visitation rates would appear small).

43. The Visitor Centre in Ekenäs is now about ten years old. Despite the fact that it was innovative when it was designed, it shows distinct signs of the many years of use, and members of staff have said that some visitors expect to see changes, if not from year to year, then at least every few years. The small exhibition on the island of Äglö has recently been upgraded with some very attractive displays explaining the life cycle of eiders. There is therefore plenty of scope for refreshing the Visitor Centre.

44. This becomes more important in relation to a number of other possible developments. The local community are thinking about ways of encouraging more tourism in the vicinity of Ekenäs. The mayor saw the integration of the natural and cultural heritage, incorporating industrial archaeology, as a positive development for the future. If the park is to take its place in the local community, then facilities for visitors become more important. Although the park itself is relatively fragile, with important assemblages of birds especially during the nesting season, facilities can be provided in the visitor centre in imaginative ways. Whilst conservation has priority, developments such as a live video link with nesting birds, such as the white-tailed (sea) eagle, would provide an ever-changing attraction for visitors.

45. There is also discussion about the acquisition of a small area of the mainland, overlooking the national park, for development as an information point, interpretation centre, picnic area, place for barbeques, possible camping ground, etc. Such developments need to be planned in a sensitive manner, but they could be used to provide important information, about both the national park and the Natura 2000 site, to people who have travelled from Helsinki, etc.

46. Thus, a second recommendation can be made about the provision of facilities for recreational and educational users. It is to the effect that

R2. Recreational facilities need to be refreshed periodically, working with the local community, so as to develop the community's socio-economic base, to provide information to visitors, whilst at the same time protecting the environment, habitats and species of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

5.4. Science and Research

47. The two previous on-the-spot appraisals have both referred to the need for increased scientific research and monitoring (see paragraphs 8 and 13 above). There have been, and are, important research initiatives in Finland. Starting in the late 1990s there was a major programme of research on biodiversity, using the acronym FIBRE, managed from the University of Turku. This involved a considerable number of research groups, but it was felt to be 'very academic' in nature. Publications coming from the programme, which ended in 2002, have largely been in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, as would benefit an academically-orientated programme.

48. Subsequently there has been a more applied research programme, with the acronym MOSSE, which has been orientated towards forestry. This has been criticised on the basis that only very small components are either interdisciplinary or relate to the social and economic sciences. Clearly with very little forest on the islands of the national park, this research programme only has marginal relevance to the park's management.

49. The most recently announced programme of research has the acronym VELMU, and it relates to biodiversity in aquatic ecosystems. Given the fact that the majority of the national park's area is aquatic, there is much more potential for the researchers to interact with the park authorities in the VELMU programme. This is especially true because the University of Helsinki's Tvärminne Zoological Station is located close to the park's western boundary.

50. The evaluation of Finland's Biodiversity Action Plan (FEI, etc., 2005) is critical of what has been achieved during an 8-year period. A quotation from the abstract states "The actions have not, however, succeeded in stopping the negative development with respect to biodiversity. The state of many habitats is still not satisfactory from the point of view of safeguarding biodiversity and favourable conservation status has not been achieved for all species and habitats". However, the report goes on to state that "The Action Plan has supported a public discussion on the need to safeguard biodiversity" and "Biodiversity research has expanded significantly and the knowledge of Finland's natural biological diversity has increased considerably". Whilst it is not the purpose of an individual national park, nor of the network of national parks, to achieve the objectives of Finland's Biodiversity Action Plan, they do have a significant role to play in helping to achieve those objectives.

51. All of this argues for a much closer co-operation between the researchers, who are acquiring this knowledge of Finland's biodiversity, the policy makers, who are responsible for drawing up Finland's policies and plans, and the practitioners, who should be using the knowledge gained to achieve the aims of the policies and plans. Similarly, there need to be feedback loops so that the practitioners can inform the researchers where more knowledge or information needs to be gained, or inform policy makers where their ideas are either impractical or could be more challenging. It is probably true that these flows of information are never perfect anywhere in the world, but Metsähallitus needs to explore more active ways of encouraging knowledge transfer (KT).

52. There is therefore a recommendation that is largely generic and in part related to the local situation.

R3. Metsähallitus should more actively bring together the community of people with interests in biodiversity so as to foster knowledge transfer. More specifically, there should be a proactive attempt at the Ekenäs National Park to bring together those researchers who have worked in or near the park with the managers of the park, and other local environmental interests (such as the

Tvärminne Zoological Station of the University of Helsinki), so as to explore what further research is needed, what opportunities exist for other research, and to discuss both the application of the research that has been undertaken and the encouragement of KT within this community.

5.5. Other Issues

53. Another issue raised in previous on-the-spot appraisals relates to the Master Plan for the national park. As noted in paragraph 14, this plan is now 15 years old, and there have been many developments since it was prepared. To some extent the lack of a revised Master Plan has been due to the fact that the national park's enlargement has not occurred: when enlargement happens a new plan will be required, so why update the old plan before enlargement? Whereas such a situation can be readily understood, the management of the national park at the moment does need a forward looking plan rather than relying on the *status quo*.

54. It is certainly time for a new Master Plan for the national park. In condition 1 (see paragraph 37), a timetable is given for withdrawing the current plans for enlargement, meeting with stakeholders, and submitting new ideas for enlargement. Concurrently with this process there could be both internal and external discussions about the new Master Plan. It may even be helpful to the case for enlargement if a draft Master Plan were to be ready at the same time as proposals for enlargement are made. Given the changing Finnish domestic legislation, and a variety of international factors affecting the management of Finland's protected areas (such as the Habitats Directive, the Birds Directive, the Water Framework Directive and the Convention on Biological Diversity), many new dimensions will be required in the Master Plan. One such dimension, which relates to the increased availability of technological aids, is to mark the national park's boundaries on the electronic navigational charts.

55. Thus, a strong recommendation is that

R4. A new Master Plan for the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park should be prepared. It is further recommended that this be on a timetable similar to that for the re-submission, to the Ministry of the Environment, of plans for an enlarged national park.

6. Recommendation

56. ***I therefore recommend that the award of the European Diploma for Protected Areas is renewed for a further period of five years.*** However, in making this recommendation, I suggest that one condition (C1) and four recommendations (R1 to R4) be attached to the renewal. For convenience, the condition and recommendations, discussed in the paragraphs above, are repeated in this paragraph.

C1. Given the changing circumstances of the last 10 years, revised plans for the enlargement of the National Park are to be drawn up by Metsähallitus, in consultation with other stakeholders, within a period of two years (i.e. by mid-2008). These new plans should then be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment with the request that approval be given, and the park enlarged, by mid-2010 at the latest.

R1. The recommendations of the 2004 review of protected areas in Finland are noted. Metsähallitus is encouraged to implement these recommendations for the well-being of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

R2. Recreational facilities need to be refreshed periodically, working with the local community, so as to develop the community's socio-economic base, to provide information to visitors, whilst at the same time protecting the environment, habitats and species of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

R3. Metsähallitus should more actively bring together the community of people with interests in biodiversity so as to foster knowledge transfer. More specifically, there should be a proactive attempt at the Ekenäs National Park to bring together those researchers who have worked in or

near the park with the managers of the park, and other local environmental interests (such as the Tvärminne Zoological Station of the University of Helsinki), so as to explore what further research is needed, what opportunities exist for other research, and to discuss both the application of the research that has been undertaken and the encouragement of KT within this community.

R4. A new Master Plan for the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park should be prepared. It is further recommended that this be on a timetable similar to that for the re-submission, to the Ministry of the Environment, of plans for an enlarged national park.

7. Acknowledgments

57. I should like to thank the three people who accompanied me on the visit to the national park – Hans-Erik Nyman (the park manager), Hannu Ormio (Metsähallitus, Southern Finland) and Jukka-Pekka Flander (Ministry of the Environment). I should also like to thank Dr Stig Johansson (Regional Director, Southern Finland) who accompanied me on a part of the visit, Eva-Lotta Söderlund (Visitor Centre Manager), Mårten Johansson (the mayor of Ekenäs/Tammisaari) and the press who attended an interesting press briefing on completion of the visit to the archipelago.

8. References

- Finnish Environment Institute, University of Helsinki/Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Finnish Forest Research Institute and MTT Agrifood Research Finland (2005). Evaluation of the Finnish National Action Plan 1997 – 2005 for Biodiversity. Available at <http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=8410&lan=en>.
- Gilligan, B., Dudley, N., Fernandez de Tejada, A. & Toivonen, H. (2005). *Management Effectiveness Evaluation of Finland's Protected Areas*. Series A147, Nature Protection Publications, Metsähallitus, Vantaa.
- Lappalainen, M. (2001). *Finland National Parks: Seas of Blue, Seas of Green*. Metsähallitus, Vantaa.

APPENDIX I

ITINERARY FOR APPRAISAL OF TWO NATIONAL PARKS IN FINLAND

(Those parts of the itinerary relevant of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park are in larger type)

Monday 26 September 2005

- Departure from home (05.20) and travel to Helsinki via Copenhagen
- Meeting and dinner with Dr Rauno Väisänen (Director of Natural Heritage Service, Metsähallitus), Dr Stig Johansson (Regional Director (South Finland) of Natural Heritage Service, Metsähallitus) and Mr Lassi Karivalo (Senior Planning Officer, Metsähallitus, Central Unit)
- Night spent in Helsinki

Tuesday 27 September 2005

- Drive to Ekenäs Visitor Centre with Dr Stig Johansson
- Presentation on the Ekenäs/Tammisaari Archipelago National Park at the Visitor Centre (Visitor Centre Manager: Ms Eva-Lotta Söderlund)
- Lunch with the Mayor of Ekenäs, Mr Mårten Johansson, and Metsähallitus staff
- Visit to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park, stopping *en route* to the island of Jussarö at a possible extension area on the mainland. Accompanied by Mr Hans-Erik Nyman (Park Manager), Mr Hannu Ormio (Senior Planning Officer, Metsähallitus, Southern Finland) and Mr Jukka-Pekka Flander (Senior Adviser, Ministry of the Environment)
- Night spent on Jussarö

Wednesday 28 September 2005

- Visit to other islands – Modermagan and Rödjan on Älgö – in the Ekenäs National Park (rough seas prevented a visit to the outermost islands)
- Return to Ekenäs/Tammisaari and meeting with representatives of the press (2 people)
- Return to Helsinki
- Evening discussions with Professor Jari Niemelä, Dean of Biological Sciences, University of Helsinki
- Night spent in Helsinki

Thursday 29 September 2005

- Travel by train to Parkano with Dr Tapio Lindholm (Senior Scientist, Nature Division, Finnish Environment Institute)
- Presentations at the Seitsemien Visitor Centre by Mr Pekka Vesterinen (Park Manager), Ms Satu Kalpio (Senior Planning Officer, Metsähallitus, former Western Finland), Ms Elina Pilke (Planning Officer responsible for educational programmes) and Ms Tuulikki Halla (Visitor Centre Manager)
- Visit to various areas in the Seitsemien National Park to see old growth forest, some restoration work of mires and even-aged forests, and the cultural heritage associated with an old farm
- Night spent in Parkano

Friday 30 September 2005

- Further visits in the Seitsemien National Park to see restoration work on mires and even-aged forests
- Meeting at the Visitor Centre with 2 representatives of local communities (Mr Timo Saari from the Kuru Municipality and Mr Jorma Kiiveri from Ikaalinen Town) and representatives of the press (3 people)
- Brief visit to Kauhaneva-Pohjankangas National Park (about 60km west of Parkano) to see an extensive system of mires
- Return by train from Parkano to Helsinki, arriving at about 20.15
- Night spent in Helsinki

APPENDIX II**THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EXPERTS
CARRYING OUT ON-THE-SPOT APPRAISALS**

Experts mandated to carry out on-the-spot appraisals of applicant areas shall, in particular, examine the following matters:

I. European interest (to be confirmed)**II. Merits and protection system**

a. The body responsible for administration and management of the area, particularly its attributions, powers, budget and human resources.

b. The effectiveness of existing protective regulations vis-à-vis internal and external threats, particularly those originating in surrounding areas; effects of agriculture, industry, tourism, hunting, fishing, urban development, road building, air traffic, military manoeuvres, etc.; possible need for supplementary protective measures.

c. Zoning.

d. Ownership title (effects of possible expropriation).

e. Land-use plans, in so far as these affect the area in question.

f. Development work launched, under way, or to be launched.

g. The management plan for the area.

h. The manner of public access and reception facilities and infrastructures, if any.

i. Any scientific studies needed and activities of research bodies.

j. Possible membership of international networks.

k. Relationship between the body responsible for the area, local elected representatives, officials in the socio-economic sphere and associations.

APPENDIX III

A PLAN OF THE EKENÄS ARCHIPELAGO NATIONAL PARK
SHOWING THE ZONING SYSTEM IN OPERATION



APPENDIX IV**COUNCIL OF EUROPE
COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS****Resolution ResDip(2001)3
On the renewal of the European Diploma
awarded to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park (Tammisaari) (Finland)**

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 17 October 2001,
at the 769th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)*

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.a of the Statute of the Council of Europe;

Having regard to Resolution (65) 6 instituting the European Diploma, as amended by Resolution (98) 29 on the Regulations for the European Diploma of Protected Areas;

Having regard to Resolution (96) 30 on the Award of the European Diploma to the Tammisaari Archipelago National Park;

Taking into consideration the expert's report submitted to the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas at its meeting on 1 and 2 March 2001;

Having regard to the proposals of the Committee for the Activities of the Council of Europe in the field of Biological and Landscape Diversity (CO-DBP);

Renews the European Diploma to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park until 19 June 2006;

Attaches the following recommendations to the renewal:

1. in order to make the different European nature conservation policies more consistent, the boundaries of the diploma area should include the whole of the extended area of the National Park, including the Natura 2000 sites. Within these new park boundaries the rules governing the traditional and restricted spring eider hunting must be revised;
2. to extend knowledge of the ecosystem, scientific research must be strongly encouraged, particularly through closer co-operation with the Tvärminnen Zoological Station and the Environmental Research Station; this recommendation also applies to nature management and published results must be aimed at a wider public. Funds are needed for restoring the permanent monitoring sites such as the one in Algö;
3. the National Park 1990 Master Plan should be revised and updated to take account of the new National Park boundaries, as defined in the LIFE funding applications: revision of zoning, tourism facilities, management and restoration areas;
4. additional resources, to reflect the changes in demand and the objectives of the master plan, should be allocated to the functioning of the visitors centre.

APPENDIX V**DRAFT RESOLUTION****On the renewal of the European Diploma
awarded to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park (Tammisaari) (Finland)**

*(Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 17 October 2001,
at the 769th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies)*

The Committee of Ministers, under the terms of Article 15.a of the Statute of the Council of Europe;

Having regard to Resolution (65) 6 instituting the European Diploma, as amended by Resolution (98) 29 on the Regulations for the European Diploma of Protected Areas;

Having regard to Resolution (96) 30 on the Award of the European Diploma to the Tammisaari Archipelago National Park;

Taking into consideration the expert's report submitted to the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma for Protected Areas at its meeting on 23-24 January 2006;

Having regard to the proposals of the Committee for the Activities of the Council of Europe in the field of Biological and Landscape Diversity (CO-DBP);

Renews the European Diploma to the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park until 19 June 2011;

Attaches to the renewal the following condition:

1. Given the changing circumstances of the last 10 years, revised plans for the enlargement of the National Park are to be drawn up by Metsähallitus, in consultation with other stakeholders, within a period of two years (i.e. by mid-2008). These new plans should then be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment with the request that approval be given, and the park enlarged, by mid-2010 at the latest.

Attaches to the renewal the following recommendations:

1. The recommendations of the 2004 review of protected areas in Finland are noted. Metsähallitus is encouraged to implement these recommendations for the well-being of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

2. Recreational facilities need to be refreshed periodically, working with the local community, so as to develop the community's socio-economic base, to provide information to visitors, whilst at the same time protecting the environment, habitats and species of the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park.

3. Metsähallitus should more actively bring together the community of people with interests in biodiversity so as to foster knowledge transfer. More specifically, there should be a proactive attempt at the Ekenäs National Park to bring together those researchers who have worked in or near the park with the managers of the park, and other local environmental interests (such as the Tvärminne Zoological Station of the University of Helsinki), so as to explore what further research is needed, what opportunities exist for other research, and to discuss both the application of the research that has been undertaken and the encouragement of KT within this community.

4. A new Master Plan for the Ekenäs Archipelago National Park should be prepared. It is further recommended that this be on a timetable similar to that for the re-submission, to the Ministry of the Environment, of plans for an enlarged national park.