

How to move towards the Carpathian management approach?

Poland

Team

Bożena Haczek – Ministry of Environment

Dr. **Sabina Pierużek-Nowak** – Association for Nature „Wolf”/Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe SSC/IUCN

Prof. **Nuria Selva** – Institute of Nature Conservation Polish Academy of Sciences

Dr. **Jan Reklewski** – Świętokrzyski National Park

Dr. **Robert Mysłajek** – Institute of Genetics and Biotechnology, Faculty of Biology University of Warsaw

Team discussion:

3 main problems in species protection on national level

- [1] Habitat loss and fragmentation due to lack of adequate spatial planning at national, regional and local scales
- [2] Lack of national management plans
- [3] Lack of emergency teams

Main gaps in knowledge

- [1] Lack of data on trends in population dynamics, especially for the lynx
- [2] Lack of description and economic valuation of ecosystem functions and services delivered by LC
- [3] Lack of knowledge about impact of various types of recreation on LC
- [4] Lack of assessment of importance of natural and human-related mortality (e.g. poaching, traffic accidents etc.)
- [5] Lack of proper assessment of the prey base for LC

Mistakes, experience from preparation and/or implementation of MP

- [1] Lack of implementation of existing scientific standards into national-wide monitoring of LC
- [2] Lack of funds
- [3] Insufficient capacity of conservation agencies
- [4] Lack of continuity in transboundary co-operation with Slovakia and Czechia, and weak co-operation with Ukraine
- [5] Lack of procedures and structures regarding emergency situations for the wolf and lynx in proposed MPs
- [6] Lack of neutral professional moderator on meetings with stakeholders

Coming together

- [1] Carpathian MP or another solution?
 - Yes for the Carpathians MP, but focused on common goals and activities
- [2] Main aim and topics of such a MP or solution
 - Assuring of transboundary connectivity
 - Avoiding of the source-sink effect
 - Habitat suitability model for the whole Carpathians
 - Occurrence of LC in all suitable habitats across Carpathians
 - Strengthening co-operation
 - Exchange of knowledge and experiences
 - Common monitoring standards
 - Joint trainings
- [3] Added value of Carpathian MP to national MPs
 - Increase of the rank of national MP
- [4] Who will be responsible for preparation or implementation of Carpathian MP or any other document?
 - Responsible body: have to be accepted by all participants of the Carpathian Convention, the best is neutral body
 - Implementation of MP: corresponding national authorities in every country

Other comments from national perspective