



Minutes of the CERI Board Meeting
Devin, Bratislava, Slovakia
May 25, 2006

Objective

Revision of the Work Plan and Budget 2006
Status of Fundraising
BBI Matra Project Up-date
CERI Strategic Priorities and Organizational Issues
Working Groups – ToR, Budget, Activities

Participants: 8 people, JS=Chair, MC=Executive Secretary; HM=Minutes

Please note that AG=Anna Guttova; BI=Barbara Immerova; HM=Hildegard Meyer; JS=Jan Seffer; MC=Monika Chrenkova; NR=Nenad Robajac; TR=Tomas Ruzicka; YD=Yaroslav Dovhanych.

Mike Baltzer (MB) and Rafal Serafin (RS) were excused from the meeting due to a time collision with another meeting. Andras Krolopp (AK) could not attend because of troubles within CEEWEB. Ioan Abrudan (IA) could not come because of the bird flue.

For contact information on the participants see **Annex XV**.

For list of abbreviations see **Annex XVI**.

Outcome

Revised Work Plan and Budget 2006 including NFP and WG Budgets
Agreement on CERI Strategic Priorities and Organizational Issues
Approval of ToR and Budget of WGs
Action List for Next Steps

9:35 Welcome & Review of Old Business

JS welcomes the small group of Board Members and announced that AK, IA and RS won't come and that Zbigniew Witkowski can't represent Poland as the NFP, because his organization is not member of the CERI yet. He states that there are only 4 NFP at the meeting and that CERI has to motivate the NFPs to come. He wants to allocate money to the NFPs for more capacity to guarantee that the work can be done for CERI. This has to be mentioned in the Tor for the NFPs.

JS introduces AG, who was employed by CERI in March 2006 and will take care about the implementation of the BBI Matra project in the role of the local project manager.

JS goes through the Action List prepared at the last BM on February 3, 2006 (Annex I). He misses the ROP for the CERI logo in the agenda and misses the ROP for the funds for the NFPs at all.

MC says that this document was drafted before, but still needs to be discussed.

The ToR for the CERI Working Groups have been drawn up and an additional WG namely the Management Planning Working Group was established. ToR for the Management Planning WG was also prepared. JS says that he searched for the prices for preparing the newsletter already a long time ago. The layout for the newsletter was prepared by Tamara Malkova. The Action List was fulfilled.

9:45 Introduction of the CERI Team

MC introduced the new team to the Board Members.

Executive Secretary: Monika Chrenkova (full-time, March 06)

Communication Assistant: Hildegard Meyer (part-time, till June 06)

Technical Assistant: Barbara Immerova (part-time, March 06)

Financial Manager: Jana Dirbakova (part-time, March 06)

IT Expert: Jan Ripka (part-time, March 06)

TR suggests to put this list including email contacts to the CERI website.

9:50 CERI Workplan & Budget 2006

MC introduces the Board Members to the Workplan. She picked up the old plan and wants to adapt it to the new situation together with the Board Members.

Ecoregion Action Plan

Everywhere the EAP is mentioned. It is unclear to her what the real content of this EAP should be. It would be impossible to elaborate this EAP this year, but she thinks that the BBI Matra project and other activities would lead towards it.

Carpathian Convention Biodiversity Protocol

CERI should contribute to the Biodiversity Protocol. MC had a discussion with Harald Egerer (Interim Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention). He said that Ukraine is preparing the protocol, but he didn't know anything about the status of the process. CERI should get engaged in this process.

Contribute to **CBD** implementation in Carpathians

HM will tell more about this later on.

CERI Secretariat

3 Board Meetings

1 General Assembly

MC asks for clarification of the following items and for a decision, where the focus of the CERI work should be put on.

Specific geographic (e.g. priority landscapes)

This concerns the Carpathian region. This was also decided in the BBI Matra project. The scope of the work is the Carpathians. TR mentions that SCG were added and that the definition of the Carpathians is still a problem in RO. He requests CERI to decide on this.

JS says that CERI is working in the ecoregion including the Transylvanian plateau. The scope of the Carpathian Convention is another story, because RO declares only the mountain region *sensu strictu* as the Carpathians.

NR announced that in Serbia there is the same problem, but that there will be a change soon. A project proposal to define the whole Carpathian region in Serbia was drafted during a REC project and was approved also by the National Geographical Institute. Before that it was like a strict order to put in the smallest part of the Carpathians to avoid payments for the Carpathian Convention. There will be 11 new orographical regions.

Specific scale (e.g. habitat versus landscape-level, within the ecoregion context)

TR suggests to keep the scale as broad as possible. JS suggests to take orographical units.

HM says that this terms were included in several proposals for on the ground projects.

Ecologically thematic areas (e.g. in the buffer zones of protected areas, in wetlands or in forests)

JS says that this is a field of topics rather than physical areas. AG explains that projects are concentrated in special areas. TR thinks that this is not important. JS reminds that CERI has to report on these issues and that a clarification is needed. TR thinks that this is a WG task and in the end of the year the WG has to report on this. AG says that in the BBI Matra project the work is concentrated in PA, core and buffer areas. JS says that this was written before and that the BD WG has to define the ecologically thematic areas according to this point. TR reminds that there is a big difference between large carnivore PA and an ecological network.

JS says that they will leave it. Two topics are not clear here. In terms of the EAP we can define that all steps CERI is doing leads towards the EAP.

10:10 Roles of CERI

MC summarizes the roles of CERI and leads the discussion through this topic.

Conservation Broker – observer status at the Carpathian Convention

Carpathian Clearinghouse - BIS

Ecoregion Action Plan initiator - ?

Communicator – draft Communication Strategy and Business Plan (?), contribute to KEO Publication, Newsletter, web – „Members only“ portal

To support reform and strengthening of environmental legislation associated with biodiversity conservation (N-2000?)

To assist the ISCC to obtain endorsement of the Carpathian Convention by the EU

Discussion

Q: What can CERI do for the Carpathian Convention? Is it enough to obtain endorsement letters from the EU for the Carpathian Convention? TR thinks that this has to be discussed with Harald Egerer. He should know when it is the right time to set any action. Concerning N-2000 the BD WG should deal with it, because N-2000 is mentioned in the EU Core grant. JS says that there are activities linked to N-2000 in the BBI Matra project. AG adds that these activities are sustainable forestry as part of the BBI Matra project. JS says that CERI will report on N-2000 in the BBI Matra project.

TR explains that the Business Plan should hold something like a strategic plan, e.g. CERI will have 100 members at a certain time. This Business Plan would clearly say what CERI would like to achieve and therefore, would help the Board

and the members to orientate. Ideally the Board would discuss the plan and then it would be approved by the GA.

NR says that the Business Plan should include strategic goals and steps and how CERI will get there. TR knows the term from the UK as strategic plan similar to the Action Plan. AG adds that there is a similar point in the BBI Matra project, namely strengthen the CERI.

TR says that the Board has to decide who will work on this. AG suggests the WGs to work on it. JS asks for the timeframe. AG replies that they changed the timing and that it is important to start this crucial item this year. MC suggests that BBI should be related to the Business Plan.

JS is confused by the current situation. The EAP was initiated by the WWF 1999-2001 and therefore is a WWF tool. They created a kind of conservation planning method to define an EAP. The so-called TNC methodology describes how to define targets. This method was introduced at the WWF meeting in Varenna, Italy. But now it is up to CERI to decide which method they would use. There is a method by PEEN or another Dutch method, which CERI could adopt for their Business Plan.

TR says that CERI should develop a Business Plan. The creation of new PA or the definition of hot spots of biodiversity in the Carpathians would be a clear goal. CERI could take the major tasks of the EAP and could push the governments. TR sees the BP as document saying what CERI would like to have in the future.

JS thinks that the BP is similar to a strategic plan. He would like to have a clear method. According to CBD, which was introduced in Petronell earlier this year, there are different tools for the implementation. This would be a part of the BP.

AG can also find parts of an EAP in the BBI Matra proposal, e.g. the definition of threats.

MC reminds that CERI has to design a method that makes clear what CERI understands under this or that method and is linked to the strategy of CERI.

TR says that in this case somebody has to look at the existing methods and define the one which is suitable for CERI. He suggests a WG to do that. JS wants to know whether this is an issue for the Board to decide. He suggests that he would analyse and propose a suitable method.

TR announced that by the end of the year CERI has to know what an EAP means and have a strategic plan and method.

JS stated that the Action Plan comes from the CBD, where strategical goals are defined first and then it is described how to fulfil these goals.

TR says that some countries prepared this kind of document (National Report to the CBD?), but it is not specific for the Carpathians.

CERI would design its own method and take useful parts from these documents which are important for the Carpathians. JS will make a suggestion.

10:30 CERI Budget 2006

MC listed the following changes to the CERI Budget for 2006.

Board: travel – ca. € 2,000 for CERI representation

JS: Is anybody going to the Green Week in Brussels? Rafal Serafin will be there, but would represent the Environmental Partnership. MC suggests that he might put up a CERI poster, because for her it is impossible to go there because she will attend the CADSES Meeting at this time.

TR informs that David Marvy who is based in Prague could take the poster and bring it to the Rafal Serafin, but the deadline is on Tuesday, May 30, 2006. The Board skips the idea.

National Focal Points: € 3,300

The TOR for the NFP will be discussed later.

Member organisations: € 300

The money should be transferred to the NFP. Then they can transfer the money or organize seminars, workshops or meetings.

Newsletter: €100 for translation into national language

MC reports that Tamara Malkova suggested the translation of the newsletter to be done by the NFP. Tamara Malkova or the Secretariat will arrange printing the copies, which Tamara Malkova would like to do in one place. The NFP would get additional € 100 for translating the newsletter.

Working Group (except BIS WG and Com WG): € 4,500

BIS WG and Com WG are included in the BBI Matra Budget.

Q: When does CERI have to report to the EU and BBI Matra? CERI has to prepare a progress report in summer and a final report by March 2007. BBI Matra has a three month reporting period. The next report has to be prepared by September 2006.

10:45 CERI Strategic Priorities

JS says that the situation of CERI has changed a lot compared to last year. There is big progress; the WG are working and there are concrete projects.

TR agrees, but he is nervous whether CERI will get the EU Core money the next year again. The EU Core proposal will have to be prepared in summer.

JS says that there might be a new programme for the next year. CERI has to pre-finance about 40% (approx. € 40,000). The last tranche will be paid only after the final report has been approved. He asks whether there is another organization which could help with the pre-financing. He says that it is not an easy situation for Daphne to help.

TR offers to borrow the money which is dedicated to the CZ NFP.

MC reminds that all money has to go through the CERI bank account, because the audit has to be prepared from the CERI bank account movements.

TR says that it is needed to prove the legislation for that.

HM says that she will ask WWF DCP for a loan.

MC presents the following items and wants to know where CERI should be involved.

Carpathian Biodiversity Information System (CBIS)

Carpathian Ecological Network (CEN)

This will be an initiative at the 1st COP of the Carpathian Convention in October 2006. It is needed to ask the governments for support.

Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA)

This is anchored in the activities of the Carpathian Convention and has to be established by the governments. There are initiatives of CERI to help implement the CNPA, but this would be no NGO issue. Another project is being developed to cover this work.

JS wants to know whether this is related to the CBD. HM replies that a gap analysis for PA in each country will be the first step that has to be fulfilled within the CBD project.

JS says that CERI could support the CNPA, but should not lobby or push for that. The Board agrees on that.

CBD Program of Work for Protected Areas

MC gives short information on the workshop, which was held in April 20-21, 2006 in Petronell, in order to prepare a project proposal according to the CBD Programme of Work for Protected Areas for the Carpathian ecoregion.

Each country supporting the CBD should carry out a gap analysis to increase the number of PAs by 2006, but the countries are not really working on that. This might be due to a lack of capacity or of political willingness. There is also a lack of a common PA management and monitoring system. The aim of the project is to develop a management and monitoring system and to train people for implementing the system. The proposal will be submitted to the MAVA Foundation in July 2006.

Q: Does CERI have capacity to be active to support this project? JS says that it is important to work towards this proposal and later in the project, but only at a low level. HM says that the Management Planning WG is very much related to the content of the project. The CBD is somehow linked to the Carpathian Convention. To find this out the NFP for the Carpathian Convention and the CBD will be contacted and a questionnaire will be sent to them.

Ecoregion Action Plan

The EAP should be something like an umbrella for other initiatives and should be part of the Business and Strategic Plan. This might be mentioned in the Status of the Carpathians 2001. CERI has to update this.

Carpathian Convention

Which roles does CERI want to play in this issue? If the Carpathian Convention is not properly working, CERI should push it.

- Initiator
- Contributor
- Watch-dog

The 3 roles are interlinked. The question is where to put the main focus.

- Expert platform (what fields?)
- Public Participation / stakeholder involvement

JS sees all roles important for CERI. TR reports on the ANPED project. They had activities in all Carpathian Countries. They held stakeholder conferences in each country and plan to have a side event at the 1st COP of the Carpathian Convention to present 'voices from the Carpathians' (results from the stakeholder meetings). In Czech Republic 15 people attended the meeting. The discussion was very vague. There is still little information of the Carpathian in the region itself. ANPED published a leaflet and works closely with the Environmental Ministries. The Czech member of ANPED is the Institute of Environmental Policy in Prague. TR says that CERI has to make a difference to ANPED. The 1st COP of the Carpathian Convention is a good tool for that.

JS informs that Pam McCarthy (ANPED) was in Bratislava the day before and asked for cooperation in a REC project. The project will be a manual for the implementation of the Carpathian Convention.

NR adds that it is also possible for the governments of the Carpathians to implement the Carpathian Convention in their countries involving business, NGOs, expert institutions etc. The Biological Institute in Belgrade signed a contract to analyse the way to implement the Carpathian Convention.

JS says that ANPED was also in Serbia. At the meeting there 20 people mainly representatives of the ministries. Last year more regular meetings with the Carpathian Convention took place in Bolzano, Italy. CERI should mainly implement the Carpathian Convention and transferred this work into the GEF proposal, which is until now not active. Harald Egerer gave these tasks also to ANPED, UNEP and DEFRA. There was a discussion with Pam McCarthy about a Darwin proposal, where CERI has to specify its working field. ANPED might work on preserving cultural heritage in the Carpathians.

MC states that all roles are important for CERI, but CERI cannot cover public participation. The expert platform would be formed by the WG. It is not needed to establish a new WG for this purpose.

Implementation of EU Policies / Directives

CERI uses EU Policies and Directives as tools in nature conservation (N-2000, Water Framework Directive). For the reports these tools have to be specified and linked to the work that has been done under these certain policies / directives.

Pilot projects at national / local level

Q: Will the CERI Secretariat help to develop a project, e.g. on large carnivores at the national level? JS states that the project has to include at least two Carpathian Countries.

10:30 Fundraising

MC presents project proposals submitted recently.

1. GEF – unsure

JS gives an up-date of the information on the GEF proposal. Adriana Dinu (UNDP, Bratislava) changed the proposal from full-sized to medium-sized and discussed the changes with JS right after the last BM. Then the proposal was sent to Ioan Abrudan to lobby for it in the Romanian government. In a meeting Harald Egerer offered his help for lobbying in the NFPs of the Carpathian Convention, but has been no progress so far.

There was a regional meeting for a new project proposal. Governmental representatives and NFPs were invited. Adriana Dinu said that there is still this 'window' to get funded. TR asks JS to inform IA about the meeting with the NFP of Romania. If the NFPs will endorse the project, CERI could start the PDF-A phase. It looks now more optimistic than before. NR thinks that there might be new window, because Serbia is included in the list of the target countries now. There is \$ 1 Mio allocation for the next period. The medium-sized project should be approved.

2. British Ecological Society:

Submitted – April 06

Decision – June 06

Focus: coordination, office costs, WG activities, communications – newsletter, website

Budget: 98 830 pounds (19 966 / year)

Duration: Jan 2007 – Dec 2011

MC says that this project would be a good possibility for co-finance the EU Core grant. JS explains the background of the grant. This fund supports ecological

societies and experts. Therefore the proposal focuses on the research work of CERI.

3. **DBU Foundation 1:** German partner needed!

Submitted – April 06

Partial Decision – May 06 - YES

Focus: Carpathian Ecological Network (western Carpathian countries)

Budget: 125 000 EUR + 30% co-financing

Duration: Jan 2007 – Dec 2008

WWF submitted a project proposal to CADSES, which was approved. The aim of the project is to set up a Carpathian Ecological Network in the whole Carpathians and not only in the Eastern parts like in the BBI Matra project. The DBU proposal should contribute to the BBI Matra project.

It would be good to summarize the two projects, because CADSES has a budget that covers activities in the Western Carpathian countries and BBI Matra in the Eastern Carpathian countries. CERI is no partner in the CADSES project, because CERI should have had co-financed this project, which was not possible at that time. Green Warsaw is the partner. The aim of the project is similar to the BBI Matra project. Therefore, cooperation with the CADSES project partners would be good. The following week there will be a first meeting and MC is invited in the role of an observer.

MC announces that AK informed her that CEEWEB is the official partner in the CADSES project, because one Polish partner gave up. The structure of the proposal is changing and there might be a replacement needed.

JS thinks that this is an ideal situation. They could subcontract CERI for carrying out some work.

TR suggests the Frankfurt Zoological Society as the German partner for the project. They lead a project in Bulgaria and are focused on animals. He will contact them.

JS says that there is the rule of a 50% co-finance and that they asked for 30%, which was possible. Daphne submitted also a project proposal.

NR suggested Jörg Lohmann (IUCN) as project partner.

4. **DBU Foundation 2:** German partner needed!

Submitted – April 06

Partial Decision – May 06 - YES

Focus: "World of Carpathians" Manual

Budget: 125 000 EUR + 30% co-financing

Duration: Jan 2007 – Dec 2008

The preparation of the "World of Carpathians" Manual was supported by WWF a few years ago, but the budget was cut and allocated to Milvus, Romania.

5. **MAVA Foundation** (CBD Work Programme for Protected Areas):

WWF DCP Initiative

CERI as one of partners

Submission – June 2006

Partial decision – July 2006

Focus: Gap analysis for PA, PA management and monitoring, rural development, trainings

Budget: CHF 1.75 Mio

Duration: Jan 2007 – Dec 2012

6. **Possible cooperation with ANPED:**

Public participation / Stakeholder involvement

Is CERI Interested?

7. Potential projects / topics? ...

12:00 BBI Matra Project (AG)

AG informs about the project and the up-date.

WP I is chaired by Karina Kitnaes, Bio/consult and includes a training tool for CERI members in Ukraine, Romania and Serbia. Trainings are offered by Alterra on three issues: (1) N-2000 implementation; (2) responsible forestry; and (3) ecological network designing. Alterra will contact the NFPs and all CERI members to collect background information which kind of trainings are actually needed. AG asks the Board Members what would be useful for them. YD says that trainings on N-2000 implementation would be good in Ukraine. In Serbia there was this kind of training two months ago, but there is still lack of knowledge and understanding of N-2000. NR suggests to invite not only CERI members but also focal officials like representatives of the Institute for Nature Conservation or the ministry. Trainers from the Western parts of the Carpathians have to be involved.

JS suggests to add focus trainings on agriculture issues. TR says that the Czech ministry agreed on a twining project with Romania, where WWF was quite active.

AG presents the time plan. There will be an assessment phase (Nov-Dec 2006). The trainings will be performed in the beginning of the next year (Jan-March 2007) after assessing expertise available in the non target countries to provide training.

The budget will be allocated to the trainers.

WP II deals with the establishment of a Carpathian Biodiversity Information System (CBIS) and is chaired by JS. JS explains that there is still not the right format of data needed, but he wants to start in autumn. I is needed search for information and capacity in the target countries except in Serbia.

There was a meeting for discussion on WP III the week before, where a basic outline of methodical issues was set up. Minutes and information of this meeting is being prepared. No CERI relevant activities are foreseen within this WP. The budget for local experts is included, who will contribute to this WP. MB will be subcontracted by CERI. The contract is already drafted, but the budget of the project is at the Dutch Ministry for approval and should be confirmed next week. There will be a separate contract for Daphne (WP II). CERI will contract WWF, Bob Smith, MB, HM, CERI Secretariat and CERI manager. There is a overall budget of € 101,120 plus € 60,000 management fee. That makes € 28,000 for this year. This budget functions as co-financing.

For WP IV the activities and budget were revised and adopted to CERI needs after the meeting with all WP leaders in April 18-19, 2006.

WP IV activities (Annex II)

1. Fact sheet of current situation regarding the protection and management of the Carpathian Mountains in the core countries (July-Dec 2007)
2. Identify threats and obstacles for sustainable development of the ecoregion (July 2006-June 2007) – Elaborate draft study of threats and obstacles, organize workshop to comment and finalize study

Travel expenses for participants of the Western Carpathian countries are available. A workshop plan will be proposed.

3. Elaborate a strategy and EAP for the CERI to address these threats and to support sustainable development (July 2007-June 2008) – Elaborate draft strategy and action plan, organize workshop to comment and finalize strategy and action plan

CERI activities and responsibilities

Fact sheet (NFPs)

Their tasks are to comment on the draft questionnaire, to supply information on current situation according to the questionnaire, and to compile the fact sheet according to the feedback from the questionnaire.

Threats and obstacles for sustainable development of the Carpathian ecoregion (WGs represented by their coordinators)

Biodiversity – Vasyl Pokynchereda

Database – JS

Ecotourism – HM

Enviropolicy – NR

Management planning – Milan Janak

Elaborate a communication strategy for the CERI to ensure effective external communication (ComWG – Tamara Malkova)

12:30 LUNCH

13:40 National budgets 2006

Proposals for the NFPs ToR include national coordination, CERI representation, MATRA and CORE components. The Board has to agree on the ToR and the budget.

Timeline: The MoA could be signed in June 2006. The EU Core money has to be spent by the end of the year. A financial report has to be prepared by the end of the year. JS reminds the NFPs to inform the CERI Secretariat in case they won't spend the money. The money could then be allocated and would not get lost. Payments will be done in July 2006 and December 2006.

For information on the National Budgets for 2006 see [Annex III](#).

ToR activities - additions to approved ToR for NFPs (GA 2005) - [Annex IV](#)

Coordinate the national network

Communicate with CERI Secretariat and members

Represent the CERI at the national level

Contact the Carpathian Convention and CBD focal point and define possibilities for cooperation

Identify experts for the CERI Expert Database - potential nominations for SAC, fields will be described!

Provide feedback to draft questionnaire for Fact sheets of current situation regarding the protection and management of the Carpathian Mountains

Supply information on the current situation regarding the protection and management of the Carpathian Mountains as given in questionnaire

Provide national contribution to CERI Newsletter

Contribute to CERI Communication Strategy

Nominate members for the Working Groups

To support national projects contributing to the sustainable development of the Carpathian Ecoregion

To inform Secretariat about national projects in the Carpathian Ecoregion - develop form to be filled, pictures, project database! - was partly developed already

Submit the progress and final narrative and financial reports in the required format

Translate newsletter - additional 100 EUR

Website - update on national information

Logo

Payments individual approach - how much can NFP pre-finance?

1. payment - 50%, if not possible to pre-finance so much, can get more
2. payment - December

Discussion

The NFP could agree with the CERI members in their country to hold meetings at certain times, e.g. at the GA. The NFPs need to put their planned activities together. This will be one budget item. Budget items can be formulated according to categories or activities. MC thinks that categories are better, because this would leave more space for the NFPs. TR asks if it is possible to buy a monitor for that money. MC says that she will work this out. She would not make a differentiation of the budget lines according to personnel, travel and equipment costs, but for categories, e.g. for communications. For this category it will be possible to buy a monitor as office supply. She will define categories.

The item 'contribution to Carpathian Convention at the national level' in the ToR for the NFPs is deleted.

MC says that the Board Members have to approve the budget for the WGs and to review the documents produced by the WGs. JS assumes that the Board Members work around 15 days a year for CERI.

Q: Payments for contracts - how much can CERI offer for the beginning? JS says that this is a question of pre-financing. CERI will get 60% of the EU Core money. Daphne will transfer € 36,000 to the CERI bank account. The second instalment will be transferred after CERI will have received the EU money. Each NFP has to pre-finance their activities until then. NR says that 50% pre-financing is too much. He can only pre-finance 30%. The CERI Secretariat will find out how much the NFPs can pre-finance. JS says if the second payment will be in December, Daphne could cover it. MC says that all money has to go out by June and CERI has to spend it until the end of the year. JS will ask Henk Zingstra (BBI Matra) for the maximum payment as early as possible. Until now Henk Zingstra hasn't made clear when CERI will get money and how much the first payment will be. YD says that he could cover the expenses until the second payment.

The NFPs have to send the money to the CERI bank account. An arrangement has to be drawn up.

14:30 WGs - ToR, Workplans, Budgets 2006

MC presents the budgets for the WGs for 2006 (**Annex V**).

BD WG (Biodiversity WG) - YD

YD goes quickly through the ToR and the activities (**Annex VI**). He says that there has not been time enough to elaborate the activities. He would like to do it after the BM and send the results to JS for discussion and recommendations. TR suggests to do this now, because the WG should start working as soon as possible, because the money has to be spent this year. At least one meeting should be organized before the GA in October. The board has to push the members of the WGs reporting on their work at the GA.

JS asks whether there are any rules for the creation of a WG, e.g. one member per country. Milan Janak, the coordinator of the Management Planning WG, plans to have two people per country.

YD presents the BD WG budget (**Annex VII**). He can't estimate how many a meeting costs.

TR states that meetings are very important as an exchange platform. A two-days meeting would be almost enough as activity for a WG.

MC asks whether the BD WG overlaps with the Database WG (BIS WG). JS says that the BD WG could deal with 'real' conservation issues in the field like inventory, whereas the BIS WG would orientate on GIS issues. There is an overlap of members in both groups, therefore a good information exchange is guaranteed. Both groups should work together; data on inventory are needed to feed the GIS for creating recommendations.

Recommendations for the BD WG

Raise budget from € 4,500 to € 5,500 agreed

Contribution to website: Coordinator has to care that a report will be prepared

Up-date of earlier work on BD which was done until CERI got independent

Draft project proposal for the Red List of the Carpathians – IUCN would be glad to cooperate. Former Red List of the Carpathians was not properly prepared according to IUCN categories.

Comparison of legislation in terms of BD in the Carpathian Countries

Contribution to the newsletter

The chair of the WG should be elected by the members of the WG itself. For the first year the Board appoints the coordinator. The following year the WG will decide on the coordinator.

Com WG

MC says that the ToR for the Com WG was circulated and that it is not needed to discuss it, because its activities are clear.

BIS WG (Biodiversity Information System WG)

JS explains that the members of the WG don't have to be CERI members. He proposed experts to be members as well.

TR asks whether this WG relates to the KEO. JS sees a problem in the preparation or the final publication. He thinks there is not enough information yet. He would better create an ecological network with the possibility to up-date and add data. There are 5,000 principle authors; Zbigniew Witkowski is responsible for the section about biodiversity. It is not possible to put all forces together to work on this publication, because KEO is governmentally organized and their people work on it.

Ecotourism WG (Ecot WG)

HM presents the ToR for the Ecot WG (**Annex VIII**). A detailed budget (€ 4,900 plus € 400) will be prepared as soon as possible after the questionnaires will have been sent, which HM sent out to the potential members of the WG the week before.

Recommendations

The WG should collect information about existing ecotourism operators and put basic information on that to the website with links.

TR offers to give a presentation on regional branding in the Czech Carpathians, information about heritage interpretation (tools) and cycling tourism at a WG meeting.

Environmental and Sustainable Development Education WG (ESDE WG)

MC introduces the Board to the ToR for the ESDE WG (Annex IX).

The UNESCO announced the decade of education and sustainable development. CERI should ask UNESCO for approval and support of the ESDE WG. The project 'World of Carpathians' manual is CERI's contribution to this decade.

Environmental Policy and Rural Development WG (EPRD WG)

NR goes through the ToR for the EPRD WG (Annex X). The EPRD WG is related to all other CERI WGs. It would act like the Ministry of Foreign affairs within CERI.

Recommendations

The WG should monitor the process of the Carpathian Convention and give recommendations what CERI could do in this concern.

Collect cases, for which CERI should have a common point of view. An announcement should be sent out to the members to inform NR, the coordinator of the WG, about important and hot topics. Then the WG will develop CERI (political) statements to different issues in the Carpathians, e.g. Baia Mare, Tatra Mountains.

Website contribution might be tool to reach people in the region to report on problems in their specific region.

There will be 9 WG members. A meeting will be organized before the GA in October.

Q: Shall 'rural development' focus more on economic issues? The WG could function as a watch-dog.

The budget of the EPRD WG (Annex XI) is approved??

Management Planning WG (MP WG)

JS says that the WG was founded right after the last BM in Bratislava in February this year. There is a need for this kind of WG for N-2000 implementation and PA management. Members of this group are IA (University of Brasov) and Milan Janak (Daphne), who is the leader of the WG. Both institutions have good experience in these fields.

The ToR (Annex XII) and the budget (Annex XIII) of the MP WG are presented.

The BM agreed on the budget???

HM says that this WG could eventually contribute to the CBD PoW PA project, which will be submitted to MAVFA Foundation very soon.

16:35 Communications

Items

Internal e-mail voting – CERI statutes

„If a CERI Board member does not reply in the given time period in the means described above, it is taken as his disapproval“.

MC will add the term 'approval is needed'.

Newsletter: 7 articles collected, English + national versions finalised till September 2006

CZ and SK could produce a version of the newsletter half in Czech and half in Slovak.

Promo material possibilities: 1000 EUR

1. CERI info leaflet – basic information about CERI, mission, objectives, main activities, contacts on Secretariat and NFPs
2. A map, where important objects will be marked as well as hot places, CERI members activities etc.
3. Promo-CD
4. CERI Folders

Discussion

TR and HM refuse a Promo-CD. NR says that there is not enough material yet to print a map. He emphasizes the leaflet idea. The Board agrees on a leaflet including a map.

16:45 Cooperation with ISCC (Interim Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention)

CADSES project

Biodiversity Protocol – CERI contribution?

Input to 1st COP:

CERI presentation, signing MoC, special event? – linked with GA?

Discussion

MC wants CERI to attend the 1st COP of the Carpathian Convention to be more visible. CERI has been promoting the Carpathians from the very beginning. TR agrees and adds that also ANPED will prepare a side event for the COP, because it is a politically strong event. REC will be there. CERI could have posters, leaflets and the newsletter as well as other promo material there.

The questions arise whether the GA should be one day before the COP, which will most probably be held in Brasov, Romania and whether it is possible to change the date and the location of the GA, which was decided at the last GA in Serbia. TR suggests to ask all Board Members and of course the NFP of Ukraine and the organization promised to arrange the GA.

16:00 CERI Organizational Issues

CERI member database in Access – how to use it?

Expert database – SAC: development

Both will be put in the member zone of the website.

Country visits – summer 2006

AG and MC will travel to target countries of the BBI Matra project, sign the contracts and meet with the NFPs. Afterwards there will be decision made whether it is possible to meet the other NFPs in their countries.

Autumn BM – timing and place

The next BM will be held shortly before the GA to discuss the order of the event.

16:15 Miscellaneous

HM asks whether a contract between the CERI Secretariat and Daphne has been signed yet. JS replies that they will wait until the first money transfer.

The Board is satisfied with the ToR for the Secretary, but improvements are welcome. Activities and tasks will be part of the contract between CERI Secretariat and Daphne.

TR wants to agree on the ROP for the use of the logo, because this might be important for the contracts with the WGs and NFPs. HM will send out this document once again.

See **Annex XIV** for the Action List for next steps!