



## Minutes of the CERI Board Meeting Poprad, Slovakia 22 November 2006

### Objective

- Implementation of the EU Core Grant
- BBI-Matra project up-date
- CERI development and communications strategy
- Rules of Procedure for National Focal Points and Working Groups
- Fundraising
- CERI side event at the COP 1 in Kyiv
- CERI work plan 2007

**Participants:** 13 people, JS=Chair, MC=Executive Secretary; HM=Minutes

Please note that AG=Anna Guttova; AK=Andras Krolopp; HM=Hildegard Meyer; IA=Ioan Abrudan; JS=Jan Seffer; KV=Kristina Vilimaite, MB=Mike Baltzer; MC=Monika Chrenkova; MO=Monika Ochwat, NR=Nenad Robajac; RS=Rafal Serafin; TR=Tomas Ruzicka; YD=Yaroslav Dovhanych.

For contact information on the participants see [Annex XV](#).

For list of abbreviations see [Annex XVI](#).

### Outcome

- Draft CERI communications strategy to be discussed at the GA
- Draft CERI development strategy to be discussed at the GA
- Agreement of the Rules of Procedure for the National Focal Points and the Working Groups
- Proposal for location and date for the next General Assembly in 2007
- Agreement on how to organize the CERI side event at the COP 1 in Kyiv
- CERI work plan 2007

### **8:40 Review of Old Business, Approval of Agenda**

MC introduces the audience to the agenda (Annex 1). JS asked for changes. AK suggests to have a short discussion about the role of CEEWEB in CERI as National Focal Point.

MC introduces the secretariat team to the board members.

- Executive secretary: Monika Chrenkova (full-time, since March 2006)
- Local project manager: Anna Guttova (part-time, since April 2006)
- Technical assistant: Viera Chrenkova (part-time, since March 2006)
- Financial manager: Jana Dirbakova (part-time, since March 2006)
- IT expert: Jan Ripka (part-time, since March 2006)

- o Communications assistant: Hildegard Meyer (part-time, based at WWF DCP)

MC goes through the **CERI Action List of 2006**.

1. **Ecoregion Action Plan (EAP)**: The approach and the methodologies have been identified. The EAP will be promoted at the 1<sup>st</sup> Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Carpathian Convention in Kyiv, 11-13 December 2006.
2. **Carpathian Convention Biodiversity Protocol**: A draft of this document has been circulated and comments were welcome. JS will give a presentation on that at the General Assembly. He thinks that a profound discussion on this topic would be needed. JS will summarize the comments and present it at the GA for approval. A joint NGO version on the comments will be discussed.
3. Contribute to the **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)** implementation in the Carpathians: CERI helped to prepare the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD PoW PAs) project '2012 Protected Areas Programme – The Carpathian Mountain Ecoregion'. The project has been recently approved and will be supported by the MAVA Foundation. The activities of the Biodiversity and Management Planning Working Groups within CERI would support the implementation.
4. **CERI Secretariat**: It is clarified that the secretariat would have some help by Daphne through pre-financing of the last payment of CORE Grant for CERI activities for the first half of the year 2007. Also WWF DCP, NFP Romania, NFP Hungary and NFP Czech Republic are helping.
5. **3 Board Meetings** were organized and held during the year 2006.
6. The **General Assembly** was organized.

### CERI roles

7. **Conservation broker**: CERI gained the observer status at the Carpathian Convention, got involved in the Carpathian Network of Protected Areas (CNPA), and will organize a side event at the COP 1 in Kyiv, 11-13 December 2006.
8. **Carpathian Clearinghouse**: Steps towards the Carpathian Clearinghouse have been done through the creation of the Carpathian Biological Information System Working Group (CBIS WG) that is identifying the methodology of data gathering and is developing a database structure for the species and habitats. Moreover, data providers have been identified.
9. **Communicator**: A draft communication strategy has been developed by Tamara Malkova and has been circulated. On behalf of CERI JS took part in the KEO (Carpathian Environment Outlook) meeting in October 2006, where the KEO publication was discussed. JS mistrusts the results. The publication will be produced in the near future. CERI published its first issues of newsletters in English and national languages. The CERI website has a new domain [www.carpates.org](http://www.carpates.org). Changes and updates on the website were carried out.
10. To support reform and strengthening of **environmental legislation associated with biodiversity conservation** (N-2000): CERI contributes to this with comments on the Biodiversity Protocol prepared by the Ukrainians.  
To **assist the ISCC** to obtain endorsement of the CC by the EU: This task is not realistic to carry out. It was a mistake of the board, but lessons were learnt. It is not favourable to put tasks in the Work Plan that are difficult to achieve.
11. **CERI Working Groups**: Biodiversity WG, Biodiversity Information System WG, Communications WG, Environmental Policy and Rural Development WG, Environmental and Sustainable Development Education WG, Management Planning WG, Tourism WG. The question was how to get the members active in the groups.

12. **CERI National Focal Points** (NFPs): Funds were given to the NFPs to mobilize the national networks, to improve communication with the members, to get active in CERI issues/projects and to participate in board responsibilities.

### **9:45 Implementation of CORE Grant 2006**

#### **CERI Funding 2006 – CERI CORE Pre-financing Plan: Annex 2**

The subcontracts were signed only in summer and will last until the end of November. Until then the money has to be spent. IA summarizes that he would have 10 days to spend all the money given to him by CERI for national activities. MC says that the contracts could be prolonged for two weeks.

There are several problems with the WGs. As there was low interest of the CERI members to participate in any of the WGs, several WGs were not able to organize the meetings on time. The WG leaders do not know how to spend the money.

The budget dedicated to BBI-Matra, Board Meetings, the GA, the website, the CERI newsletter and CERI leaflet (the text will be completed soon), travel costs, and office running costs is no problem.

Subcontracts for NFP and WG are the problem, because some of them were not active enough.

AK states that office-running costs were twice on the budget. Once in the first line for Daphne and second time for CERI payments. The money was spent for the beamer and computer. RS warned that auditors control that.

AK asks, how much money was left for the CERI. MC says that everything was contracted, but some money has not been spent. The question is, whether CERI has any carry over for the next year. MC says that there would be a carry over only from the BBI-Matra project. She explains that the EU Core Grant has to be spent. There will be no money for the next year for the WGs. MB asks, if it would be possible to get a reserve from the EU grant. JS says that not and that the sum will be covered by Daphne.

MC says that CERI counted on the BBI-Matra pre-financing, but that it would not be possible. All subcontracts were listed there. The question is, who could pay for the CERI WGs in advance. You can find the list in Annex 2. The requested sum is € 43,000.

### **9:20 CERI BBI-Matra Project**

AG introduces the Board Members to the status of the BBI-Matra project.

**WP I** aims at *increasing the understanding of CERI members on the principles and techniques of ecological network development and implementation (N 2000) through trainings*. Karina Kitnaes would carry out a training needs assessment at the GA by handing out a questionnaire. In 2007 trainings will be carried out according to the members' needs. The trainings will be designed; trainers from non-target countries will be recruited.

**WP II** aims at *establishing a joint CBIS (Carpathian Biodiversity Information System) as a base for the development of an ecological network*. In 2006, a methodology has been developed. For 2007 a complete assessment of existing data is planned. The 1<sup>st</sup> kick off expert meeting will be held in January. Botanists, GIS experts, zoologists will be invited. This meeting will be an interim meeting to revise the work that has been done so far. The WG will have to deliver complete data sets.

To improve *capacities and capabilities of CERI members on database a first training on database and GIS* (MS Access, EsRI arc View, ARcMap) will be organized to prepare the members for the data collection.

**WP III** aims at the *development of a design for the Carpathian Ecological Network*. In 2006 a preparatory meeting took place, where all requirements (methods, dataset) for the identification of an ecological network were discussed. In February 2007, the first planning meeting on conservation issues will be held.

**WP IV** aims at *strengthening the organizational structure and capacities of the CERI*. In 2006 national fact sheets were prepared through questionnaires. The identification of

threats and obstacles for sustainable development of the Carpathians is still in process and will be finished during the GA as well as the communication strategy. The fact sheets are not limited to the project focal countries.

TM is preparing the Communication strategy; NR will prepare the organisational and operational structure of CERI. The support within WP IV is dedicated for the whole organization, not only for the focal countries. In 2007 a proposal for the CERI strategy and action plan will be drawn up to address the identified threats and obstacles.

Additional project management activities were the CERI newsletter, a leaflet, the website update, and the 1<sup>st</sup> progress report by the end of August. Regular meetings with the Project Management Team were held on 3 April, 10-11 August, and 22 November. The first Annual Project Steering Committee meeting will be organized at the COP 1 on 11 December 2006.

There is the aim to tuning the project with parallel projects like the Ramsar Carpathian Wetland Initiative, the CNPA and CADSES. These projects will be presented at the GA.

MB suggests to get some names from everybody to set them on the ecological network group. They should have an understanding in management planning and biodiversity. The focus has to be designed (bears, plants...). WGs are welcome to work within this group. JS suggests to combine the MP WG and the BD WG.

RS states that questionnaires and data collecting seem to be frustrating. He wants to know what has happened to the information collected before. AG says that some aspects are changing. RS says that the solution is solution feedback. JS says that one of the problems was that data were gathered at two places (PL and SK). The data set on socio-ecological issues was not complete. All information gathered is on the CD including parts of the reports and the GIS system. JS says that CERI could use the framework, which was used before, as the basement for strategy and action plan. RS asks what the threats are today in order to update what we have made some years ago. AG says that the last stage is that this info will be published in brochures. RS asks how CERI could persuade somebody to give the right information without money? Each group has a different questionnaire. JS we will show the questionnaires tomorrow. JS says the CERI tried to avoid the mistakes that have been done so far. RS states that people on the ground who have all this information have to be motivated. He thinks that people are less willing to participate a questionnaire exercise. He wants to know the exact aim of the questionnaire. Questionnaires are the personal approach of the coordinator. RS says that the question is what CERI can do for the small organizations. CERI has a chance to be different. CERI needs a clear picture what is all about and the Carpathian context gives the added value.

### **9:50 CERI Development Strategy**

To set up the CERI Development Strategy was task of the EPRD WG, but this group has never been established so far. NR thinks that he has not enough capacities to develop this. He asks the board to give some input to this.

There are open questions like how the CERI statutes fits to the CERI strategy, what are the goals of the CERI future role, what are the members' expectations.

CERI as an international organization should connect members, should support multi or bilateral cooperation, lobby, fundraise, and develop projects.

NR sees CERI more or less involved in the processes of national and international legislation lobbying. But the first topic for CERI is biodiversity including conservation, the establishment of a Carpathian-wide database, and management planning. NR says that CERI has to be focused on rural development like tourism, agriculture and forestry as well. The CERI role as a watchdog has to be developed in cooperation with the Communications WG, the CERI secretariat and other WGs. CERI should develop recommendations for policy. Should CERI focus on the EU, the Carpathian Convention, national policies or on the Carpathians.

## Discussion

KV stated that NR will need wide participation of all members and that a closed WG for this topic is not good. She thinks that the development of a strategy is not possible to do today. This would be the process and has to be approved at the GA for the next year. KV suggested that it might be possible to figure out the priorities at the GA and start the process with full involvement of the members.

TR says that KV touched the key points. The WGs were established to organize the people around a topic. TR thinks that none of the WGs is working properly. CERI is facing problems with this set up. It is a shame that there is only little interest in this WG. CERI has to focus this problem. TR is worried that CERI could collapse. RS thinks that CERI is not concrete enough. Therefore people are not interested.

MC stated that 3 WGs are working properly, but that there are also inactive groups. A big problem was the BD WG. This might not have been due to low interest of the members, but rather due to too many interests. The group needs to clarify its focus. The Policy Group should propose the strategy on Friday afternoon, but the WG only has to be started.

MB thinks that the CERI vision and the way it works are very clear. CERI needs some sort of focus and challenge that can motivate. Now CERI has a focus on the EAP and the ecological network. MB asks what single or three issues would drive CERI.

JS says that the fundamental thing is to look to the statutes and if they are workable. There are 2 models in the CERI statutes – CEEWEB and DEF. AK says that within CEEWEB it took three years to get the WG started.

There might be too many WGs for 30 members only. WGs could be merged as a joint WG. CERI has to go to the fundamental reason, why the WGs are not working properly. There is the possibility to set up the strategy related to a project. For example, the MP WG could include the development of the strategy in its master plan. The plan would include basic chapters like socio-ecological data, operational objectives, and development measures.

KV asks whether CERI has the members to implement this nicely written plan. She suggested to think about what the members can do together to achieve the plan.

Capacities JS

AK stated that CERI has a good structure. The task is to strengthen the network itself; then CERI can go further. He considers WGs as useful and thinks that people like to work on different concrete topics. CERI's members are small organizations, which do not have experience in the development of the strategy plan. In CEEWEB the process took around 3 to 4 years to get started. He thinks the bottom-up approach is better than to design a strategy from top.

TR's impression is that the WGs did not clearly define what they want to focus on. For motivation of the members CERI should think about the design of the WGs. He gives the example that CZ only has four CERI members and therefore cannot send a member to each WG.

KV explains that the Tourism WG decided that the members should not be nominated by the NFP. The strategy should deal with this topic, look to the issues and restructure the whole CERI.

NR summarizes that there are two things to focus in future according to our goals – the organizational structure and the thematic strategy.

RS says that CERI is an organization for citizens groups to participate in conservation in a broad way. CERI is building public support on the local level for the Carpathians. This is an opportunity. Further, he thinks that the vision is clear and that everybody who signs up for the CERI membership has to communicate their expectations and capacities. He thinks that the organizational structure will take some time. He would not make any changes in that. When CERI started as CEI there was no clear focus. Now the Carpathian Convention, the EU and national have their role in the Carpathians. In Poland the expectations of the CERI members and potential CERI members are that with the CERI they would have influence on the implementation of the Carpathian Convention, also on

the local level. Within the EU each country has its regional plans. The success is mixed. A lot of money is being spent on infrastructure; Natura 2000 is absolutely disconnected from that. The CERI members are involved in these processes; therefore CERI should support the members to be more efficient in their work. The contribution of members is of tremendous values. He reminds the board of the small grants programme, which was very important for small organizations. He thinks that the role of the CERI is clear, but it has to be refined.

NR concludes for tomorrow. He will take HM's notes, draft a list of future topics for the CERI and ask the members at the GA. He plans to have a workshop in February, where a strategy will be developed according to the opinions of all countries. At the following board meeting it should be checked, whether the strategy fits in the statutes.

RS does not agree with NR's suggestion. He thinks that NR should start with telling that the Carpathian Convention was ratified in January 2006 and that CERI plays an important role in that. Then NR can say how the members can get involved. CERI has to make arguments for political decisions in the Carpathian countries. It is the role of CERI to have civil societies involved. In many countries of the Carpathians the governments have signed the Convention and then they realized that this convention is connected to lots of money and do not do anything. The Carpathians need civic pressures via local groups. That's the role of the small groups within CERI. CERI had this vision 4 years ago in Bucharest. Now the convention is ratified and there is the challenge to make it work.

MB says that this is a very important and fundamental discussion, but a better way to have this discussion should be found.

RS stated that opening a discussion on this topic at the GA would be risky.

JS agrees with NR strategy for the GA on the following day.

### **10:50 CERI Communication Strategy (Annex 3)**

TM, who is supposed to lead this session, had to change her flight. She received only one feedback on her strategy and plans to work on this at the GA. She needs the approval by the board/members to go further on this. No feedback means that she can work further on it.

KV comments that internal communication, the 'network feeling', is a separate point to external communication, the identity of the CERI. TR supports KV's comments and highlights that internal communication should be a focus for the next year.

NR says that according to the statutes, the Board is responsible for external communications. For KV this is not clear. External communication issues of the CERI are not covered by this strategy. External communication in this context is seen as mainly what CERI can show. Communication towards the public means communication of threats and CERI's solutions for them. MC says that TM would rather like to strengthen internal communication at the moment.

The decision is that TM can go further and push internal communication. KV suggests that external communication should be defined; how it is related to internal communication and which kinds of topics are important. It is definitely not enough to only communicate what CERI is.

The strategic paper will be handed out at the GA on the following day.

### **11:00 RoP for the NFPs**

MC introduced her approach for the Rules of Procedure for the NFPs (Annex 4).

1. Approved by the GA in Serbia in 2005
2. Proposals for additions
  - a. Communicate with members in the country
  - b. Coordinate national activities
  - c. Represent national network at the CERI
3. RoP on funds for NFPs

- a. If CERI raises funds for national activities, NFPs receive funding for national networks via contracts.
- b. The funds for NFPs cover the active coordination work of NFP, expert work and national network activities as specified in Terms of Reference.
- c. NFPs are obliged to involve national network members into implementation of contracted activities.
- d. NFPs receive funding for members and disseminate the funds among the members as set in ToR and agreed by national network.
- e. Full funding can only be eligible under the condition that all tasks set in ToR are fulfilled at the end of the contracting period.

JS has nothing to add. AK agrees and asks who would check the validity, what has been fulfilled. JS says that in the contract there are measurable outputs and that network activities are difficult to measure. The secretariat will propose an assessment and the Board has to decide. If the board does not agree, it could be an ugly discussion. CERI needs a strategy to handle with that. RS says that if the members are not satisfied with the NFP, they can replace the FP at the GA.

### **11:05 RoP for the WG (Annex 5)**

MC introduced the RoP for the WGs to the board.

#### **Discussion**

AK asks, if the WGs do need a chair or a coordinator each. The board agrees that it has to be like this. AK thinks that members only from 2 countries it are enough. The main thing is that people work on the topic and can attract others. Good ideas have to be proved first and then spread in the other countries. RS states that the purpose is to cover the whole Carpathians. He asks what membership means and if it is enough just to sign and do nothing.

AK asks whether the WGs have to write their ToR themselves. He says that it is not needed to overcomplicate the rules. In CEEWEB the WGs do not have their own ToR. At the GA the ToR have to be signed by the leader of the WG and the secretariat.

MC says that once a WG is approved by the GA and the money is given, the ToR are the technical instructions, which does not have to be approved by the GA.

TR says that this is written in the statutes. 'The GA will approve the WG'.

AK asks what would happen, in case there is a group of members, which would like to establish a WG during the year. Do they have to wait for approval for one year? The board decided that the board could approve an ad hoc WG.

An expert can be a member of the WG. The chair and the coordinator should decide, how much liberty they would like to give. AK says that experts are needed. Once the WGs get the budget, they can decide on that. If a lot of other organizations want to be members, their expenses will not be covered, or they are potential members.

AK asks what a WG can do, if they are in the situation to have a national fund, which is not transferable to other countries. The question was how this money could go back to the CERI secretariat. The EU Core funding requires co-financing. That could be done through projects of the WGs. Criteria for overhead should be included for the secretariat services. JS can imagine this scheme for the NFPs. IA says that he could organize meetings with 20 people, but is not able to transfer money directly to the secretariat.

### **11:20 NFP activities**

MC presents the table of expected outputs and timeframe (Annex 4).

IA would like to change the timeframe for Romania. He doubts that all other NFPs have fulfilled the tasks. MC says that this table is what they discussed at the last board meeting in May and that the board could change it.

1. **Nominate members** to the CERI WGs in relevant fields (11 Sep. 2006)
2. 1<sup>st</sup> issue of CERI **newsletter** printed in national language (20 Sep. 2006)
3. 2<sup>nd</sup> issue of CERI newsletter – national contribution provided (25 Sep. 2006): MC announced that TM asked for contributions for the newsletter, the language corrections have been done and that the newsletters in national languages are at the illustrator at the moment. IA says that he had a problem with the lay out in Romania. It becomes clear that it was possible to just correct the plain text and send it to Rikki Watzka.
4. **Experts for CERI expert database** identified (29 Sep. 2006)
5. **Summary report from meetings with CC and CBD focal point** provided (13 Sep. 2006): TR asks, what for this report is needed. He could write two sentences about it.
6. Comments to the **Biodiversity Protocol of the CC** provided (17 Oct. 2006)
7. **Progress narrative and financial report** submitted (20 Oct. 2006): These reports could not be drawn up, because the contracts were not signed at this time.
8. Feedback to **fact sheet questionnaire** content provided (29 Sep. 2006): This issue will be fulfilled at the GA. Questionnaires were developed and will be circulated.
9. **National information** provided (20 Oct. 2006):
10. Contribution to assessment of **training needs** provided (27 Oct. 2006): Karina Kitnaes will introduce the members to the questionnaire developed by her at the GA. According to the results she will draft a training plan.
11. Comments on/update of CERI **website** provided (31 Oct. 2006)
12. Report from **national coordination meeting** submitted (15 Nov. 2006)
13. List of **projects in Carpathian ecoregion** completed for the relevant country (15 Nov. 2006)
14. 2<sup>nd</sup> issue of CERI **newsletter** printed in **national language** (17 Nov. 2006): The text was finalized only the week before.
15. Contribution to **CERI Communication Strategy** provided (24 Nov. 2006): This has been done at this board meeting.
16. Participants for training sessions nominated (30 Nov. 2006): Karina Kitnaes did not travel around to meet the people as promised; therefore she will do the TNA at the GA.
17. **Final narrative and financial report** submitted including copies of all the receipts/invoices (10 Dec. 2006): There is no real deadline for the EU Core grant reporting, but the final report has to be done until the end of December. For the financial report, CERI has to close the books to get the money. All funds have to be spent by the end of the year. AK says that the money doesn't necessarily need to leave the account. The subcontracts would be enough. IA needs some details for Romania. RS says that CERI needs to prepare the technical report until the end of January and the financial report by the end of the year!

## 11:45 GA 2007 nominations

The location of the next GA in 2007 depends on the financial situation. The proposed locations are **Ukraine, Romania and Hungary**. AK will prepare the budget for having the GA in Budapest or in the Aggtelek National Park in January. In case money is short, IA proposed to hold the GA in Brasov. It would be possible for him to co-finance the event. JS says that a combination of the GA and the BBI-Matra meeting would save travel costs.

The proposed dates are **late September** or the **first part of October**.

### **11:50 COP 1 CERI side event**

MC introduced the board to the plans for the COP 1 CERI side event at lunchtime on 11 December 2006. The programme would contain the following issues:

- o Presentation of CERI Activities
- o Posters of CERI Working Groups
- o Distribution of CERI materials
- o Signing MoC with ISCC
- o MATRA BBI Steering Committee Meeting
- o Refreshment/lunch?
- o Special „Carpathian input“?

### **Discussion**

The board agrees to serve lunch at the meeting otherwise people will not participate.

AK comments that the signing of the Memorandum of Cooperation with the ISCC should not be part of the side event. The Steering Group Meeting would be only interesting for CERI. VK says that people would come for this side event rather to discuss certain issues. JS states that besides the CERI activities the Carpathian Ecological Network would be the main message. CERI has to know what others do to be different.

MB says that the ecological network is a good idea, because it shows off on thing of the variety to implement the Carpathian Convention. At the meeting there will be the majority of government people. The main aim of the side event is to engage them in the future activities of CERI. JS asks what UNEP will present. UNEP will present the Carpathian Project including CADSES and KEO. JS doubts the quality of the KEO report.

MO, NR, KV, JS, AG, MB, and HM of the CERI will participate in the COP. MO and NR will have support by UNEP, JS can be covered by the BBI-Matra project. An announcement for the members at the GA will be done to attract more people to be present at the COP. Financial possibilities will be checked.

An invitation will be prepared and send out to the participants of the COP.

### **12:10 Fundraising**

1. **DBU Foundation 1:** The full proposal '**World of the Carpathians' manual** was submitted together with Thüringen Ökoherz in November 2006. The budget is € 88,000 with 50% co-financing. The project will run from March 2007 to February 2009. The story behind the project is that the idea to create the manual was stopped some years ago. Now there is the change to finalize this. The co-financing could be possible through a small grant programme within GEF or the Slovakian Environmental Fund. CERI submitted a project in cooperation with Daphne and a Polish partner.
2. **DBU Foundation 2:** The focus of the project is the **Carpathian ecological network for the Western Carpathian countries**. For this project there is still a German partner needed. The full proposal is in development. The budget is

proposed for € 90,000 plus 30% co-financing. The project would run from June 2007 to May 2009. Discussion: CERI should not directly apply for this fund, but could co-finance via BBI-Matra. A German partner was contacted, but it is still not clear whether there will be cooperation.

3. MAVA Foundation: The '**2012 Protected Areas Programme – The Carpathian Mountain Region**' project has been recently approved. The question is how CERI can get involved in that.
4. **GEF**: There are no chances to go further. There was the information at the end of August that the Romanian government would allocate the money for the establishment of the CNPA.
5. **Carpathian CADSES Project**: There is still the possibility for CERI to get involved. There were some discussions with Mr Baranovsky, who said that there were problems with the co-financing.
6. Further funds: **Core fund or LIFE+**. CERI cannot rely on the EU Core grant until June/July 2007. EU policy is changing right now. If you apply you need to provide secured co-financing at the time you submit. The EU will calculate the new budget according to what the organizations have spent the previous year. There is no DG (Directorate General) budget that will be allocated for LIFE+ of Natura 2000 activities. WWF is lobbying, but the outcome is uncertain. As it looks like, the countries should have a budget for these activities, because the EU simply doesn't have the capacity to deal with the new accession countries. The problem should be dissolved by the end of summer in 2007. The question is, whether to risk the money or not.

DOEN Foundation has recently restructured their funding. They shifted their regional focus to thematic issues like climate change and biodiversity. But there is a change to get some money there, because they know and like CERI since the beginning. DOEN already supported some projects.

### **12:30 CERI Work Plan 2007**

1. Ecoregion Action Plan
2. Carpathian Convention Biodiversity Protocol
3. Contribute to CBD implementation in Carpathian MAVA activities
4. CERI secretariat
5. 3 board meeting
6. Annual General Assembly
7. Support national activities, small grants: In case the EU Core Grant will be available, a small grants programme would be feasible.

### **Discussion**

It is needed to continue the publication the newsletter. Fundraising is certainly an important topic for the next year. MC prepared five proposals in this year. The funding situation looks like that the position of MC is covered for the first half year 2007, but basic activities have to be covered by other sources. If there will be no funding from DBU, CERI will face a crisis situation. The first board meeting can be covered by the BBI-Matra project; the GA is a bigger problem.

AK states that CEEWEB is an international network in Central Eastern Europe, and should therefore have a consultatory status within the CERI. CEEWEB should not be a member of the board, should not be in the position of decision-making. CEEWEB cannot speak on behalf of the NGOs in Hungary, because they work in a lot of other countries. CEEWEB will be an observer in the board meetings. Travel costs should be covered by CEEWEB. A

Memorandum of Cooperation should be signed. This would make more sense. AK will propose a new focal point for Hungary in the beginning of the next year and draft a MoC.

**13:00 End of meeting**

**Action List –Board Meeting, Poprad, Nov 22, 2006**

<b><i>ACTION</i></b>	<b><i>Responsible</i></b>	<b><i>DEADLINE</i></b>
Finalize and approve Rules of Procedure for NFPs	MCh	GA 2006
Finalize and approve Rules of Procedure for Working Groups	MCh	GA 2006
Prepare and present proposals for GA 2007	MCh	GA 2006
Finalize Memorandum of Cooperation with ISCC	MCh	End November 06
Sign MoC with ISCC at the COP1	JS	December 06
Prepare Side Event at COP1	MCh	December 06
Discuss possibility to involve CERI in Carpathian CADSES for data collection	JS	December 06
Collect comments on Biodiversity Protocol and present them at COP1	JS	December 06
Finalize sub-contracts with NFPs and Working Groups, prepare forms, disseminate them, collect reports and outputs	MCh	End of January 07
Find German partner for DBU proposal on CEN	AG	January 07
Arrange EU Audits for CORE Grant	MCh	February 07
Prepare and submit reports for CORE Grant 2006	MCh	February 07
Incorporate GA comments and proceed with the elaboration of CERI Development Strategy	NR	February 07
Incorporate GA 06 comments and prepare new draft of CERI Communication Strategy	TM	February 07
Prepare and print CERI Leaflet	MCh	March 07
Develop and send for comments new design of CERI Website	MCh	January 07
Prepare texts for CERI Website	MCh	March 07
Elaborate and submit Proposal for CORE Grant 2007	MCh	Depends on deadline
Propose new NFP Hungary	AK	Beginning 07
Draft MoC between CERI and CEEWEB	AK	Beginning 07