



Strasbourg, 19 November 2019

T-PVS(2019)14

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Joint meeting of the Groups of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks and on Biodiversity and Climate Change

3-4 October 2019
Trondheim (Norway)
(Norwegian Environment Agency)

- MEETING REPORT -

*Document prepared by
the Directorate of Democratic Participation*

The Standing Committee is invited to:

- Take note of the report and outcomes of the joint meeting and warmly thank the Norwegian Environment Agency for kindly hosting the meeting;
- Take note of the proposals for further work by the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change;
- Welcome the meeting's conclusion on the need to act quickly (within 10 years according to the IPCC) and boldly and to trigger fast transformative change to avoid passing tipping points in the climate system of the Planet and that nature conservation objectives may be required to move to robustly reflect more dynamic species, habitats and ecosystems as they respond to climate change;
- Examine and if appropriate, adopt the Draft Recommendation No. ... (2019) on nature-based solutions and management of protected areas in the face of Climate Change.

1. WELCOME ADDRESS AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Mr Øystein Størkersen, Chair of the Joint meeting of the Groups of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks and on Climate Change and Biodiversity, opened the meeting and informed of its objectives and proposed working methods during the two meeting days.

Ms Aina Holst, Head of Section, Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA) welcomed the participants to the Norwegian Environment Agency in Trondheim. She congratulated the Bern Convention for its 40th anniversary and continuing good work and informed the participants of the strong mandate of the NEA for addressing Climate Change both at national and international levels.

Mr Gianluca Silvestrini, Head of the Major Hazards and Environment Division at the Council of Europe also welcomed all participants and thanked the NEA for hosting the important meeting and for its continuous support to the Convention. He recalled that Climate Change is an existential challenge rising in intensity and occurrence and the importance of finding nature-based solutions to deal with these challenges. The meeting would be an opportunity to identify the future role of the Bern Convention and its added value.

Ms Iva Obretenova, Secretary of the Bern Convention welcomed the participants and recalled that the Bern Convention had been working on biodiversity and Climate Change since 2006 with the initiation of the Bern Convention's work on preserving biodiversity in the face of Climate Change and the creation of a dedicated Group of Experts. Since 2006, the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention adopted 12 specific recommendations and 16 specialised reports. Protected areas and their management in the face of climate change were at the agenda of the Group of Experts and resulted in a number of expert reports and recommendations to Parties in this respect, which remain valid today.

2. ADOPTION of THE AGENDA

The meeting agenda was adopted (appendix 1). The participants' list is available in appendix 2.

Mr Marc Hory, Project Manager at the Bern Convention reminded participants that the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change would take place under agenda item 13 towards the end of the meeting, and that applications were being welcomed.

3. ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION: OVERVIEW OF THE CONCEPTS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION TO PROTECTED AREAS MANAGEMENT

Mr Olly Watts, Senior Policy Officer on Climate Change, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds stressed that much had been accomplished since 2006 in terms of guidance, but the moment had come to ensure all the recommendations were implemented. Numerous reports show how Climate Change affects nature. It is particularly obvious for migratory birds.

The Paris Agreement attempted to identify solutions, but not much action has been taken since, and only 2 countries are on a good trajectory. A 2°C temperature rise could happen as soon as 2040 and there is a need to focus more on prevention and living with nature, to build resilience against Climate Change, to accommodate to change and to foster renovation of nature.

Protected areas provide key role for nature by increasing species populations which in their turn move beyond protected areas. Therefore, it is necessary to expand the number and size of protected areas, to better connect them and to strengthen their management.

4. GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FACING CLIMATE CHANGE AND IN RELATION TO PROTECTED AREAS: THE NORWEGIAN EXPERIENCE

Ms Linda Dalen, Senior adviser - expert in Climate Change and biodiversity (NEA), presented the Norwegian policy framework for addressing Climate Change. In particular she pointed to the recent White Paper on Biodiversity which foresees the improvement of the management regime for existing protected areas by making it more efficient and more clearly targeted in order to maintain the conservation value of protected areas and ensure that they become more resilient to Climate Change. It also highlights adjustments to the

boundaries of protected areas and if appropriate the expansion of protected areas to improve ecological networks and resilience to Climate Change as well as the development of guidance material for municipalities on how they can make use of ecosystem services in their Climate Change adaptation work.

Mr Tore Opdahl, Senior Adviser, Protected Areas Section (NEA), presented the Norwegian Climate Adaptation Strategy which aims to develop protection plans to supplement existing protected areas, utilize management measures to prevent negative effects of Climate Change, restore wetlands and to develop and secure ecological networks. It was followed by a short introduction to the National plan for wetland restoration and the upcoming work with a supplementary protection plan.

5. STATE OF PLAY OF THE LIFE PROJECT NATURADAPT IMPLEMENTED BY EUROPARC FEDERATION

Mr Olivier de Sadeleer, Project Manager at EUROPARC Federation, presented the 5-year NaturAdapt project implemented by his organisation and which aims at integrating Climate Change into protected area management practices involving many different cross-sector partners. It primarily involves vulnerability assessments, adaptation measures, a collaborative platform and online courses.

Within the framework of NaturAdapt an online survey was conducted among protected area practitioners.

The main recommendations which evolved from the survey were to adopt a creative, dynamic and inclusive approach and action plans, to improve collaboration with local stakeholders and to position nature at the heart of local adaptation and mitigation strategies.

6. ROUND TABLE - SHOWCASE OF SUCCESSFUL CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION / MITIGATION MEASURES IN PROTECTED AREAS

Ms Carol Ritchie, Executive Director of the EUROPARC Federation played the role of moderator of the Round table. She congratulated the Bern Convention on its anniversary and longstanding work. EUROPARC has had a relationship with the Convention since the beginning. She reiterated the sentiments of previous speakers in that better cooperation was needed between protected areas and Climate Change. EUROPARC aims to innovate new methods of communication between different stakeholders.

The roundtable brought together the managers of 3 protected areas which were invited to share their experience and mitigation/adaptation actions in the face of Climate Change.

Mr Miguel Chamón Fernández, Project Coordinator, LIFE Forest CO2, Murcia (Spain) noted that the effects of Climate Change are already visible in Spain with:

- high death rates caused by drought, plagues and diseases;
- fauna and flora habitat loss;
- vegetal communities' migration;
- reduction of sequestered carbon in forests;
- increase of ecosystems vulnerability.

The Life Forest CO2 project aims to assess forest-carbon sinks and promote compensation systems as tools for Climate Change mitigation.

Ms Anna Sanitjas Olea, Curator of the Natural Park and Reserve of the Montseny Biosphere (Spain) described the adaptation plan of the Park to promote sustainable tourism and sustainable management. The plan centres around improving citizens awareness, promoting adaptive forest management, promoting responsible and sustainable tourism, improving and reducing water use and developing multifunctional farms.

Mr Adam Rowlands, RSPB Suffolk Area Manager, Minsmere Nature Reserve (UK) informed that Minsmere is also holding the Council of Europe European Diploma for Protected Areas. The monitoring of the area shows that habitat is changing a lot with wetland and coastal problems and changing habits and endangerment of species. The focus of the management is on strengthening sea wall and sluices against flooding, while simultaneously ensuring that shingle-dwelling species are unimpeded in moving landward.

The three panellists were asked questions related to their area management and initiatives:

- What mitigation measures were implemented in their sites and if any results had been seen?

Mr Chamón Fernández replied that in Murcia they work with private forest owners and other stakeholders to show them how to manage their forests sustainably, explaining how to sell CO₂ credits and other carbon offsetting measures.

Ms Sanitjas Olea said that they work on 2 levels - on one hand, promoting public transport, on the other hand, promoting renewable energy - such as by offering subsidies to citizens to install solar panels and biomass boilers, etc. Results have been good, but one step more is needed - global actions.

Mr Rowlands informed that they have been developing sea defences, recreating lost habitats inland, making water storage more resilient by creating new reservoirs and stronger sluices. Better access infrastructure was also being designed to anticipate future flooding. Fire management in the heathlands was also a priority. Finally, solar panels had been introduced and 90% of energy used was now created on site.

- what are the obstacles to mitigation/adaptation measures in the management of protected areas and how did they manage to overcome them?

Ms Sanitjas Olea said that economic obstacles are an issue. Another obstacle to adaptation is uncertainty - one doesn't know exactly what will happen to species, and what should be done, especially in the Mediterranean region where there is little experience or reference to reproduce, therefore measures are experimental.

Mr Rowlands said one must bring communities on the journey and convince them to think long-term. The financial costs involved cause problems, thus the wider ecosystem benefits must be demonstrated. Finally, regulation must become more flexible to enable change in protected areas, while not undermining integrity.

Mr Chamón Fernández agreed that financing will always be a problem. It was also a challenge to improve the attitude of major stakeholders such as the forest owners and convince them to adopt sustainable forestry in less productive areas.

In the following discussion, it was emphasised that getting the general public involved and convinced was a challenge, which required tangible proof and actions, rather than simply words. A problem was that biodiversity scientists and protected area coordinators were not always the best communicators, and thus money should be invested in strong communication plans which aim to convince the public of the importance of protected areas and biodiversity and socio-economic benefits, in order to positively affect their daily decisions.

Ms Ritchie asked the three panellists about the support received from and collaboration with various cross-sector partners.

Mr Rowlands said that they have very important working relationships with statutory partners such as the environmental agencies, Natural England, RSPB, Historic England, National Trust etc. It was equally important to work with local NGOs: in particular a grassroots campaign group had taken an interest in the counter-flooding measures, and good collaboration had ensued. Finally, from an economic point of view, it was important to engage with local businesses, while demonstrating the jobs that are created linked to the protected areas.

Ms Sanitjas Olea and Mr Chamón Fernández both explained that they don't receive direct regional or national funding as most money comes from the EU funding schemes. It is thus very important to think now of alternative funding measures, such as through environmental services.

Ms Ritchie asked the three panellists how they envisage the work in their protected areas in the future, and to give examples and recommendations on best practices.

Mr Chamón Fernández emphasised the importance of good communication and collaboration with all stakeholders involved. While planning should go from global to local level, implementation should be the opposite, from local to global level.

Mr Rowlands mentioned the reinforcement and expansion of the cooperation with neighbouring landowners. There was also a proposal to build 2 nuclear reactors at the site boundaries, to which the Council of Europe had made a recommendation. A potential unintended benefit for the protected area is that the developers have to research how the area will evolve over the 160-year lifespan of the nuclear plants, a study which the protected area could not afford.

7. DATA ON VULNERABILITY OF ECOSYSTEMS / SPECIES / HABITATS TO CLIMATE CHANGE, HOW DO THEY RELATE TO SITE- AND COUNTRY SPECIFIC CONTEXTS AND HOW TO LINK THEM TO CONSERVATION MEASURES SET FOR PROTECTED AREAS?

Mr Simon Duffield, Natural England (UK) informed that his organisation acts on 2 levels. On the local level, site managers, are in general very busy and dislike paperwork; thus, trying to convince them to take into Climate Change into their policies is a challenge. Furthermore, the site managers need to take on the work themselves. A 4-step plan was conceived: projected Climate Change, impacts, vulnerability assessment, responses. Site managers are sent simple tasks to undertake. Half of the sites have completed the assessments and results are generally consistent.

At national level, a Climate Change vulnerability assessment was able to rank the vulnerability of protected areas on aspects such as sensitivity, condition, topographic heterogeneity and fragmentation. Natura 2000 Special Protection Areas have various degrees of habitat and species vulnerability, and this can help decide which type of priority action is required. Over 40% of interventions across all categories of habitats addressed non-climatic adverse pressures as a way to field resilience. However, this does not go far enough. The coastal habitats appear to be the most aware of and active toward Climate Change.

Mr. Risto Heikkinen, research Scientist at the Finnish Environment Institute presented the highlights of the Protected Area Network in a Changing Climate in Finland (SUMI) project which focuses on 3 areas:

1. Exposure of protected areas to Climate Change and climate change velocity across Finnish protected areas. This entails studies of differences in velocity values and locations of greatest velocities. The results tend to prove that protected areas and local species populations facing higher velocities are more vulnerable to climate change.
2. Exposure of protected area and vulnerability of species. Threats affecting each species populations are assessed. The characters evaluated are climate change velocity, size of population, supportive / harmful land cover and land use in immediate surroundings and wider landscape
3. Climate change and ecological connectivity of protected areas. This component of the SUMI project has shown that biodiversity-friendly forest management helps some species but not all and that the rising use of forest for bio-economy causes significant loss of ecological connectivity for old-growth forest species.

He concluded by recalling the document “Climatic change and the conservation of European biodiversity: Towards the development of adaptation strategies” ([T-PVS/Inf \(2007\) 3](#)) stressing that it’s pointers are still valid in particular the need to increase the extent of protected areas and their environmental variation, the management for permeable landscapes to increase species movements, the improvement of ecological connectivity with habitat stepping stone and the management to maximize populations of rare or threatened species.

8. CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT – HOW DOES IT WORK IN THEORY?

Dr. Stefan Schneiderbauer, Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU); Climate and Disaster Risk Unit (Institute for Earth Observation, Eurac), recalled the differences between mitigation and adaptation. In terms of disaster risk reduction (DRR), he demonstrated manners of addressing the problem through a participatory approach. In linking DRR and Climate Change, traditionally the 2 concepts diverge as DRR deals mostly with sudden hazards, while Climate Change deals with slow onset events. The terminology also differs with DRR referring more to risk cycle, and Climate Change to vulnerability assessment. DRR actors tend to come from the civil protection sector, while Climate Change personnel come from an environmental background.

A key issue is the lack of collaboration between different actors. There are many relevant frameworks and policies which already exist such as the UNFCCC, CBD and UNCDD to name but a few. Integrating protected areas and ecosystem-based approaches (EbAs) and an ecosystem service (ES) approach into disaster risk management (DRM) and Climate Change adaptation and mitigation is vital. There seems to however be a lack of policies linking Climate Change mitigation and DRM.

In terms of the current challenges:

- DRM and Climate Change Adaptation have come together in academia, concepts and policies, but merging them is still hampered by sectorial structures;
- EbAs and nature-based solutions: policies are in place, guidelines and good examples exist, but mainstreaming and awareness amongst decision makers and practitioners is still weak. The Eco-DRR link is more visible than the eco-Climate Change Adaptation link;
- The role of protected areas within EbAs / nature-based solutions for DRR / Climate Change Adaptation approaches has not yet been fully recognised;
- The role of Climate Change Mitigation could be stressed more;
- The contribution of the approach towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) is not yet fully recognised.

During the discussion, it was highlighted that the European Environment Agency (EEA) would publish a new report in 2020 on EbAs, and that much momentum was being made in this area, especially following the Climate Summit in New York. Finally, monitoring was a very important step to also take.

9. ROUND TABLE: SHOWCASE OF NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS AND THE ROLE OF PROTECTED AREAS FOR DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

Mr Simon Duffield, Natural England (UK) and moderator of the round table, introduced the panellists.

Dr. Ioannis Mitsopoulos, Ministry of Environment and Energy, Directorate of Biodiversity and Natural Environment Management (Greece), recalled that a nature-based approach (NBA) had been integrated in the SDGs. There is an increasing risk of fire in Europe as a result of Climate Change, however there can be some positive side-effects of controlled fires such as the removal of dead and live accumulated biomass, recycling of nutrients, stand thinning and regeneration of forest stands.

Prof. Anton Micallef, Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Insular Coastal Dynamics, Institute of Earth Systems, University of Malta recalled that the recent unprecedented economic growth in Malta was leading to environmental degradation, nevertheless, a study found that Maltese citizens were the most likely in EU to favour promotion and use of nature-based solutions. Awareness raising activities such as training courses and summer schools have been initiated.

Dr. Sofia Karma, National Technical University of Athens / European Center for Forest Fires, presented the specialised centres of the EUR-OPA network. The past summer had been very severe and seen many forest fires. The main problem is the generated smoke, specifically the CO₂, and the fact that it can drift a great distance. Particle emissions in human lungs cause grave health consequences: the mortality rates. As well as air pollution, smoke and tar particles pollute the soil and groundwater and shift the chemical properties of habitats. Wildlife is also affected negatively in terms of burning or smoke inhalation. The development of Early Warning Systems (EWSs) are a shield of protection from the risks posed by natural disasters in facilitating the early detection of fires, providing real-time data for the occurrence of any fire, and help in the prevention of landslides following fires.

Mr Rui Manuel Lopes de Cunha Almedia, Institute for the conservation of nature and forests (Portugal) informed that Portugal has a huge problem of forest fires with a high and increasing frequency, which have the worst effect on Portuguese ecosystems. Outliers can change the entire dynamic of the statistics. They need to pursue the blind strategy based on surveillance and awareness to a point of equilibrium, and locally set the balance in terms of area burned, creating discontinuities in vegetation. Prescribed fires can reduce the risk of wildfires. The changing of seasonal weather patterns brings new challenges.

Panellists were asked the extent to which national strategies do consider protected areas as solutions?

In Malta there is an intensive effort to implement green infrastructure, but it is often more closely linked to improve social aspects like quality of life. There are also efforts to improve flood risk management. In Greece, there is an action plan to implement a national strategy, but protected areas are not the focus. Finally, in Portugal, it is very difficult to make a plan at national level, however authorities are trying to gather and disseminate better data across the country.

According to the panellists, the obstacles to the implementation of Nature based solutions included lack of capacity and knowledge, conflicting land-use, limited quality data at local level, a failure to connect NBAs with other sector goals, perceived high costs, lack of collaboration and of a leading entity and uncertainty of the results in the eyes of the public and businesses.

As for the recommendations to ensure that protected areas play a greater role in the implementation of nature-based approaches, the panellists mentioned the creation of a culture and sensitising all people, prevention policies, the development of guidelines for local stakeholders to implement NBAs including better data, more focused research, evaluation and monitoring and finally to involve public in looking after protected areas.

10. WORKING GROUPS SESSION

Participants were divided into three working groups, to discuss in parallel the challenges which hinder Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures and nature-based approaches in protected areas, and possible solutions to overcome them. Discussion were based around the following six questions:

1. In the light of the presentations heard during the day and your personal experience, what are the challenges to the systematic inclusion of Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures in the management of protected areas?
2. How to overcome them?
3. What are the challenges to the implementation of nature-based approaches in protected areas? How to overcome them?
4. What is the role of governments in tackling the issues identified above?
5. How can the Bern Convention support national authorities, as its main counterpart, and how can it help practitioners?
6. What is the role of the Emerald/Natura 2000 networks in this?

11. FEEDBACK FROM THE WORKING GROUPS

The rapporteurs of the 3 working groups fed back in plenary on the outcomes of the discussions in their respective groups.

As regards question 1:

The obstacle identified across the 3 working groups is definitively the need to coordinate people from different sectors with different approaches more effectively for addressing the challenges of Climate Change and biodiversity loss.

Setting up of monitoring programmes delivering better quality data and strengthening the capacity of managers and decision makers on how to use the data will support the case for action, raise commitment of and hold governments responsible to achieve agreed targets. National trends and habitat maps should be better connected to show the reality of change. While numerous reports on the impact of Climate Change on biodiversity already exist, solution driven approaches including a protected areas perspective should be better shared.

Addressing Climate Change should be considered and marketed as an investment whose benefit goes far beyond its monetary value.

As regards question 2:

All 3 working groups agreed that having a long-term vision and engage in processes rather than in ad hoc measures, involving all layers of stakeholders, in particular landowners and provide politicians with concrete solutions would constitute steps forward for including Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures in the management of protected areas in a more systematic way. Therefore, it seems crucial that science, policy and practice work hand in hand.

As regards question 3:

The obstacles to the implementation of nature-based solutions in protected areas identified by the working groups are mainly related to awareness and communications as nature-based solutions have already widely demonstrated their efficiency for removing CO₂ from the atmosphere. There are already many good existing nature-based solutions. They need to be scaled up and to the link between climate change and ecological emergencies need to be better communicated. Finances were also seen as an obstacle as nature-based solutions can provide a third of the overall mitigation effort needed to achieve the objectives of the Paris Agreement, but only 2.5% of climate finance is dedicated to them.

The working groups also stressed that nature-based solutions may not provide benefits to biodiversity and have side effects. Nature-based solutions need therefore to be well understood first by practitioners and decision makers, before being advocated to the public.

As regards question 4:

The working groups stressed that climate change should be addressed at all levels and that governments and NGOs are needed to tackle the problems. In countries where strong and good grassroot organisations exists, bottom up solutions should be encouraged so as to foster climate and environmental action from citizens. All three working groups acknowledged that education and awareness raising of population is important.

As regards question 5:

The rapporteurs of the working groups reported that the Bern Convention is the warrant for bridging nature protection and human rights and as an intergovernmental platform of cooperation it should seek becoming a centre of excellence, collate best practices of approach and share them coherently amongst contracting parties and help Parties improve communication between scientific fora and practitioners.

Parties on their side should increase investment in nature-based solutions and join the Nature-based Solutions Coalition, as well as support and encourage land managers to implement nature-based solutions.

As regards question 6:

The discussions within the working groups concluded that the Emerald Network should be expanded to improve connectivity and enable a comprehensive range of services and that a pan-European ecological network should be fully progressed. Furthermore, the habitat's condition should be improved in- and outside protected areas to increase their resilience.

12. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Mr Olly Watts, Senior Policy Officer on Climate Change, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (UK) and General Rapporteur, reflected on the working group and plenary discussions came up with the following conclusions:

- There is a biodiversity and Climate Change crisis - in the UK, a quarter of mammals and a half of birds are at risk of extinction;
- An improved communication backed by scientific evidence should be inspired by Greta Thunberg's direct style of speaking;
- Hard choices are ahead: how can nature conservation solutions be delivered, choosing between species to save;
- The Emerald and Natura 2000 networks are essential, but there is a need to think outside of those boundaries;
- The material produced by the Bern Convention and its Group of Experts on Climate Change and Biodiversity since 2006 needs to be used more;
- Bottom-up, top-down and mid-level action is needed
- Climate Change is not a separate concept or extra work and integrated approaches need to be developed;
- The wider value of protected areas, the wider societal benefits including to disaster risk reduction, as well as human health benefits need to be considered;

- Action is needed now, next year isn't soon enough;
- The environment is a biological and human right - this is a wider value of protected areas which should be brought into the mainstream of political and grassroots action;
- The status quo is generally to reduce funding towards nature agencies with the assumption that the private sector will take responsibility - but both actors need to be involved;
- Climate Change affects everybody - business, public, global leaders - this is an opportunity to increase the momentum;
- Nature must be considered a solution and not a constraint;
- Communications about nature-based solutions must be improved.

As regards the Emerald Network, Mr Watts noted that:

- The pan-European network constituted by the by the Emerald and Natura 2000 networks represents a political opportunity to make it happen;
- The Emerald Network sites need to be ready and resilient for a 2-degree milestone 20-25 years away;
- Climate Change awareness seems to be well-integrated amongst Emerald Network actors, but implementation must improve;

The meeting discussed the main messages and conclusions presented by the general rapporteur and agreed that these should serve as a basis for the development of a draft Recommendation on Nature-based solutions and Management of Protected Areas in the face of Climate Change, which should reach the Standing Committee to the Convention. The Secretariat was mandated with further working on the text of the Recommendation and to circulate it for comment to the participants of the meeting, ahead of submitting it for consideration by the Contracting Parties to the Convention for its possible adoption at the 39 Standing Committee meeting in December.

Mr Silvestrini suggested that an Action Plan could afterwards be conceived, and pilot projects implemented with certain partners, as was foreseen for EUR-OPA for next year.

13. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms Linda Dalen, Senior adviser - expert in Climate change and biodiversity, Norwegian Environment agency, was elected Chair of the Group of Experts on Climate Change and Biodiversity.

Mr Libor Ulrych, Botanist at the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic, was elected Vice-Chair of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None were raised

15. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

The Chair of the meeting, Mr Øystein Størkensen, expressed his satisfaction at the outcomes of the meeting and was happy to meet new colleagues to brainstorm and work with. He assured that the outcomes would be followed up during the 39th meeting of the Standing Committee, possibly through the adoption of the proposed recommendation and further on by the Secretariat and Bureau for its implementation. The meeting was closed.

Appendix 1 - Agenda

Thursday, 3 October		Documents and expected results
9.00 – 9.25	<p>1. Welcome address and opening of the meeting</p> <p><i>Ms Aina Holst, Head of Section, Norwegian Environment Agency</i></p> <p><i>Mr Gianluca Silvestrini, Head of Major Hazards and Environment Division, Council of Europe</i></p>	<p>Potential synergies concerning Climate Change between the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and the European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA) T-PVS/Inf(2018)11</p> <p>Report on the survey on Climate Change and protected areas T-PVS/Inf(2018)12</p> <p>The meeting is opened.</p>
9.25 – 9.30	<p>2. Adoption of the agenda</p> <p><i>The Chair of the meeting presents the agenda and calls for its adoption</i></p>	<p>Meeting agenda - T-PVS/Agenda(2019)9</p> <p>Participants are informed of the aims of the meeting and adopt the agenda.</p>
9.30 – 9.50	<p>3. Adaptation and mitigation: overview of the concepts and practical application to protected areas management</p> <p><i>Keynote speaker: Dr John Oliver Watts, Senior Climate Change Officer, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)</i></p> <p><i>Participants are informed of the ins and outs of Climate Change adaptation and mitigation and how successful managing protected areas for change can be facilitated and improved</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of what mitigation and adaptation measures to Climate Change are and how they are expected to be implemented.</p>

10.00 – 10.30	<p>4. Government policies and opportunities facing Climate Change and in relation to protected areas: the Norwegian experience</p> <p><i>Presentation by Mr Tore Opdahl, Senior Adviser, Protected Areas Section and Ms Linda Dalen, Senior adviser- expert in IG Climate change and biodiversity</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the Norwegian experience with adaptive management and mitigation measures with respect to Climate Change and explore how it could feed into their own context.</p>
<p>10.30 – 10.50 Coffee break</p>		
10.50 – 11.15	<p>5. State of play of the LIFE project NaturAdapt implemented by EUROPARC Federation</p> <p><i>Presentation by Mr Olivier de Sadeleer, Project Manager, EUROPARC Federation</i></p> <p><i>Participants are informed of the first outcomes of the NaturAdapt project and of its prospects</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the state of play and expected results of the NaturAdapt LIFE project and discuss the extent to which they could contribute to / benefit from it.</p>
11.15 – 12h30	<p>6. Round table - Showcase of successful Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures in PAs</p> <p><i>Moderator: Ms Carol Ritchie, Executive Director, EUROPARC Federation</i></p> <p><i>Panelists:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mr Adam Rowlands, RSPB Suffolk Area Manager, Minsmere Nature Reserve (UK) b. Ms Anna Sanitjas Olea, Curator of the Natural Park and Reserve of the Montseny Biosphere (Spain) 	<p>Participants take note of the concrete adaptation/mitigation measures implemented at site level and discuss how they could inspire their own management practices.</p>

	<p>c. Mr Miguel Chamón Fernández, Project Coordinator, LIFE Forest CO2, Murcia (Spain)</p> <p><i>Participants are informed of successful Climate Change adaptation/mitigation approaches implemented in protected areas and hold a discussion on the issue</i></p>	
<p>12.30 – 13.30</p>	<p>Lunch break</p>	
<p>13.30 – 14.30</p>	<p>7. Data on vulnerability of ecosystems / species / habitats to Climate Change, how do they relate to site- and country specific contexts and how to link them to conservation measures set for protected areas?</p> <p>7.1 England’s national nature reserve’s work on assessing vulnerability, identifying and delivering adaptation for PAs, presentation by Simon Duffield, Natural England (UK)</p> <p>7.2 The Protected Area Network in a Changing Climate project in Finland (SUMI project), presentation by Ms. Kaisu Aapala and Mr. Risto Heikkinen (Finland)</p> <p><i>Participants learn about the Finnish and UK experience in identifying where adaptation and mitigation is needed, how it should specifically be targeted and implemented</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the usefulness of data on vulnerability of ecosystems / species / habitats to Climate Change for setting conservation measures, take note of examples of identification where adaptation and mitigation is needed and how it is implemented and discuss how these examples could be reflected in their own management practices.</p>
<p>14.30 – 15.00</p>	<p>8. Climate change adaptation and disaster risk management – how does it work in theory?</p> <p><i>Keynote speaker: Dr. Stefan Schneiderbauer, Global Mountain Safeguard Research , United Nations University -</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the correlation between Climate Change adaptation and disaster risk management and discuss the reality of this connection in their respective national strategies.</p>

	<p><i>Institute for Environment and Human Security; Eurac Research, Institute for Earth Observation, Unit Climate and Disaster Risk</i></p> <p><i>Participants are informed of the ins and outs of Climate Change adaptation for disaster risk management</i></p>	
<p>15.00 - 16.00</p>	<p>9. Round table: showcase of nature-based solutions and the role of protected areas for disaster risk management in the context of Climate Change.</p> <p><i>Moderator: Simon Duffield, Natural England (UK)</i></p> <p><i>Panellists:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dr. Ioannis Mitsopoulos, Ministry of Environment & Energy, Directorate of Biodiversity and Natural Environment Management (Greece) b. Prof. Anton Micallef, Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Insular Coastal Dynamics, Institute of Earth Systems, University of Malta (Malta) c. Dr. Sofia Karma, National Technical University of Athens, Greece/European Center for Forest Fires (Greece) d. Mr Rui Manuel Lopes de Cunha Almedia, Institute for the conservation of nature and forests (Portugal) <p><i>Participants are informed of successful nature-based approaches to reduce disaster risks related to Climate Change and hold a discussion on the issue</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the nature-based approaches to reduce disaster risks and discuss how they could inspire their own management practices.</p>

16.00 – 16.15	Coffee break	
16.15 – 17.45	10. Working Groups session <i>Participants discuss in parallel working groups the challenges which hinder Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures and nature-based approaches in protected areas, and possible solutions to overcome them are proposed</i>	Challenges which hinder adaptation/mitigation measures and nature-based approaches in protected areas are discussed, and possible solutions identified.

Friday, 4 October		
9.00 – 10.00	<p>11. Feedback from the working groups</p> <p><i>Rapporteurs from the working groups report in the plenary on the outcomes of the discussions</i></p> <p><i>Participants exchange views on the solutions proposed by the different working groups for overcoming obstacles to Climate Change adaptation/mitigation measures and nature-based approaches in protected areas and the role of the Bern Convention.</i></p>	<p>Participants take note of the conclusions of the parallel working groups and discuss the extent to which the Bern Convention could foster and support the implementation of Climate Change adaptation/mitigation and nature based-solutions in the management of protected areas.</p>
10.00 – 10.30	Coffee break	
10.30 – 11.30	<p>12. Conclusions, recommendations and next steps</p> <p><i>The general rapporteur presents the conclusions and the recommendations which emerged from the discussions for possible future actions</i></p> <p><i>Participants exchange views and consider proposing a follow up work, in the form of a Recommendation for both national authorities of Bern Convention Contracting Parties and for the Convention itself. A draft Recommendation could be submitted for consideration to the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention at its 39th meeting in 2019.</i></p>	<p>Participants are committed to consider Climate Change mitigation in the management of protected areas in a systematic way and to engage in a nature-based approach for reducing disaster risks.</p>

11.30 – 11.45	13. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change	
11.45 – 11.50	14. Any other business	
11.50 – 12.00	15. Closure of the meeting	

Appendix 2 - List of Participants

I. CONTRACTING PARTIES

ARMENIA

Ms Hasmik GHALACHYAN Head of Plant Resources Management Division, Bioresources Management Agency, Ministry of the Environment

FINLAND

Mr Risto HEIKKINEN Research Scientist, Finnish Environment Institute

Ms Kaisu AAPALA Senior Researcher, Finnish Environment Institute

GEORGIA

Ms Salome NOZADZE National Biodiversity Monitoring Coordinator of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture

ITALY

Mr Lorenzo CICCARESE Doctor Head of the Area for Terrestrial Biodiversity Conservations and Sustainable Agro-Forest Systems, National Institute for Environmental Protection and Research

MALTA

Ms Marita GALEA Assistant Environment Protection Officer, Environment and Resources Authority

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Ms Veronica JOSU Main Advisory Officer, Department on Biodiversity Policy, Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment

Ms Angela LOZAN Manager Biodiversity Office, ENPI, Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment

NORTH MACEDONIA

Mr Aleksandar NASTOV Head of Biodiversity Unit, Nature Department, Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning

NORWAY

Ms Linda DALEN Senior adviser - expert in Climate change and biodiversity, Norwegian Environment agency

Mr Tore OPDAHL Senior Adviser, Protected Areas Section, Norwegian Environment agency

Mr Øystein STØRKERSEN Principal Advisor, Norwegian Environment agency

Ms Kristin SUNDAL Executive Officer, Nature Management Department, Norwegian Environment agency

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mr Libor ULRYCH ING., PhD. - Botanist, State Nature Conservancy

PVS(2019)14

SWITZERLAND

Mr Gian-Reto WALTHER

Dr – Scientific Officer, Species, Ecosystems, Landscapes
Division, Federal Office for the
Environment

TURKEY

Ms Zerrin KARAARSLAN

Landscape Architect (MSc), General Directorate of Nature
Conservation and National Parks, Ministry of Agriculture and
Forestry

UKRAINE

Ms Anastasiia DRAPALIUK

Head of the Division on Formation and Development of the EcoNet
and Protected Areas of Department of EcoNet and PAs, Ministry of
Energy and Environmental Protection

Ms Yuliia HRYTSAK

Senior Expert of ETS Implementation and Registry Division of the
Department of Climate Change and Ozone Layer Protection,
Ministry of Energy and Environmental Protection

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Bev NICHOLS

EU Transition Strategy and Engagement Team Leader, Joint Nature
Conservation Committee

Ms Clare WHITFIELD

Senior EU Exit Adviser, Joint Nature Conservation Committee

Mr James WILLIAMS

Biodiversity Indicators Manager, Joint Nature Conservation
Committee

Mr Hugh WRIGHT

Marine Protected Areas Evidence Manager, Joint Nature
Conservation Committee

II. MEMBER STATES NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES AND OTHER STATES

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr Nikolay SOBOLEV

Senior Researcher, Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of
Sciences

III. INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Ms Karin ZAUNBERGER

Policy Officer, Biodiversity Unit, DG Environment

IV. OBSERVERS

Mr Kakha ARTSIVADZE

Emerald Network Programme Coordinator, NACRES – Centre for
Biodiversity Conservation and Research (Georgia)

Mr Sam WELCH PhD student, Norwegian Institute for Water Research (Norway)

V. SPEAKERS

Mr Rui ALMEIDA Forest Engineer Responsible for projects related to Forest Defence, (Portugal)

Mr Miguel CHAMON FERNANDEZ Project Coordinator, LIFE Forest C02, Murcia (Spain)

Mr Simon DUFFIELD Senior Specialist Climate Change Adaptation, Natural England (UK)

Ms Sofia KARMA Dr. Research Associate, National Technical University of Athens, School of Chemical Engineering; European Centre for Forest Fires (Greece)

Mr Anthony MICALLEF Director of the Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Insular Coastal Dynamics, Institute of Earth Systems, University of Malta (Malta)

Mr Ioannis MITSOPOULOS Senior Policy Officer at the Ministry of Environment and Energy of Greece (Greece)

Ms Carol RITCHIE Executive Director, EUROPARC Federation (Germany)

Mr Marc ROEKAERTS Scientific and Technical Consultant to the Bern Convention for the setting-up of the Emerald Network (Belgium)

Mr Adam ROWLANDS RSPB Suffolk Area Manager, Minsmere Nature Reserve (UK)

Mr Olivier de SADELEER Project Manager, EUROPARC Federation (Germany)

Ms Anna SANITJAS OLEA Curator of the Natural Park and Reserve of the Montseny Biosphere (Spain)

Mr Stefan SCHNEIDERBAUER Head of Bolzano Office Global Mountain Safeguard Research – GLOMOS, United Nations University - Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS); Eurac Research, Institute for Earth Observation, Unit Climate and Disaster Risk (Italy)

Mr John Oliver WATTS Senior Policy Officer on Climate Change, RSPB (UK)

VI. SECRETARIAT OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

**Directorate of Democratic Participation, Directorate General of Democracy (DGII)
F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France**

Mr Gianluca SILVESTRINI Head of Major Hazards and Environment Division

Ms Iva OBRETENOVA Secretary of the Bern Convention, Biodiversity Unit

Mr Marc HORY Project Manager, Biodiversity Unit