Gozdarski inštitut Slovenije
Slovenian Forestry Institute
Večna pot 2, Ljubljana

MCPFE CLASSIFICATION OF PROTECTED AND PROTECTIVE FOREST AREAS IN EUROPE

submitted to
TO THE MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE ON THE
PROTECTION OF FORESTS IN EUROPE,

Dragan Matijašič, Marko Kovač

Ljubljana, November 2002

GDK 91:907:6:(4)
K.b.: gozdnata krajina, varovalni gozd, zavarovana površina, gospodarjenje z gozdom, klasifikacija, Evropa, raba prostora
T.D.: 2.13

I SPLOŠNO

Naslov projekta: Klasifikacija zavarovanih in varovalnih gozdnih površin v Evropi

Zahtevek za anketo: MCPFE (Ministrska konferenca o varstvu gozdov v Evropi)

Izvajalca: Dragan Matijašič, ZGS in Marko Kovač, GIS

Kontaktna oseba MCPFE: Stein Tomter in Isabelle Hay

Datum oddaje ankete: 22. 11. 2002

II OZADJE in CILJ ANKETE

- Klasifikacija in inventarizacija zavarovanih gozdnih površin v Evropi
- Izgradnja omrežja zavarovanih gozdnih površin
- Izgradnja sistema NATURA 2000

III PRILOGA A
Oddana anketa

IV PRILOGA B - mednarodna obravnava ankete
Zapisnik sestanka 28 - 30 November 2001, Køge, Denmark

PRILOGA A
LEGALLY BASED PROTECTED (AND PROTECTIVE) AREAS WITH LONG TERM COMMITMENT

Country:	Slovenia

Class 1.1: "No Active Intervention"

Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A*	B**
Gozdni Rezervat	Forest Reserve			10520	x	

* **Type A** designations comprise designations defining forests and other wooded land within specific geographical boundaries delineating a limited area

** **Type B** designations comprise designations defining forests and other wooded land not within specific geographical boundaries, but as specific forest types or vertical and horizontal zones in the landscape

OWL = Other wooded land

FOWL = Forest and other wooded land

Class 1.2: "Minimum Intervention"

Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B
Narodni Park (centralno obr	National Park (centr				x	
Naravni Rezervat	Nature Reserves				x	

Class 1.3: "Conservation Through Active Management"

Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B
Narodni Park (periferno obr	Narodni Park (perife				x	

Class 2: "Protection of Landscapes and Specific Natural Elements

Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B
Regijski Park	Regional Park			6615	x	

Krajinski Park	Landscape Park			23705	x	
Naravni Spomenik	Natural Monument				x	

Class 3.1: "Management clearly directed to protect soil and its properties or water quality and quan						
Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B

Class 3.2: "Management clearly directed to protect infrastructure and managed natural resources a						
Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B

Regimes unclassified						
Regime (national language)	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha	Type	
					A	B

VOLUNTARILY BASED PROTECTED (AND PROTECTIVE) AREAS, OR AREAS WITH A COMMITMENT PERIOD LESS THAN 20 YEARS

Country:	Slovenia

Class 1.1: "No Active Intervention"

Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A*	B**
GOZDOVI S POSEBNIM NAMENOM - UKREPI NISO DOVOLJENI	FOREST WITH A SPECIAL PURPOSE - NO INTERVENTION	10,301		10,301		
" GOZDNI REZERVATI "	" FOREST RESERVE"					

Class 1.2: "Minimum Intervention"

Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B
VAROVALNI GOZDOVI	PROTECTIVE FORESTS	74,054				

* **Type A** designations comprise designations defining forests and other wooded land within specific geographical boundaries delineating a limited area

** Type B designations comprise designations defining forests and other wooded land not within specific geographical boundaries, but as specific forest types or vertical and horizontal zones in the landscape

OWL = Other wooded land
FOWL = Forest and other wooded land

Class 1.3: "Conservation Through Active Management"						
Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B
GOZDOVI S POSEBNIM NAMENOM - UKREPI DOVOLJENI	FORESTS WITH A SPECIAL PURPOSE - INTERVENTION ALLOWED	50,96				

Class 2: "Protection of Landscapes and Specific Natural Elements						
Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B
ESTETSKA FUNKCIJA 1. STOPNJA	FOREST WITH AESTHETIC FUNCTION 1. DEGREE	27,176		27,176		

Class 3.1: "Management clearly directed to protect soil and its properties or water quality and quantity or other fore						
Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B
VAROVALNA FUNKCIJA IN HIDROLOŠKA FUNKCIJA 1. STOPNJA	PROTECTION OF FOREST PLOTS AND STANDS, HYDROLOGICAL FUNCTION 1. DEGREE	193,83		27,176		

Class 3.2: "Management clearly directed to protect infrastructure and managed natural resources against natural ha						
Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B
ZAŠČITNA FUNKCIJA	PROTECTIVE FOREST PROTECTION OF FACILITIES	13,49		13,49		
FUNKCIJA VAROVANJA NARAVNE DEDIŠČINE	FUNCTION OF PROTECTING THE NATURAL HERITAGE	39,679		39,679		
SKUPAJ 1. STOPNJA	1. DEGREE	53,169		53,169		

Regimes unclassified						
Regime (national langua	Regime (English)	Forest area (ha)	OWL area (ha)	FOWL area (ha)	Type	
					A	B

PRILOGA B:

Minutes of the MCPFE Workshop on Protected Forest Areas (November 2001)

Minutes of the Meeting
1. Opening of the meeting and introduction
2. Session I: MCPFE Classification of Protected and Protective Forest Areas in Europe
3. Session II: Further work of the MCPFE on protected forest areas and forest biodiversity - issues to be dicussed
4. Closure of the meeting

Minutes of the Meeting

The MCPFE Workshop on Protected Forest Areas took place in Køge, Denmark on 28-30 November 2001. The workshop was attended by 36 participants representing 29 signatory states, the European Commission, two international organisations and the Liaison Unit Vienna. It was chaired by Mr. Peter Mayer, head of the Liaison Unit Vienna.

1. Opening of the meeting and introduction

Ms. Agnete Thomson (Danish Forest and Nature Agency) welcomed the workshop participants to Denmark and expressed her best wishes for a successful meeting. In her introductory comments, Ms. Thomson informed on recent policy developments on biodiversity in Denmark and pointed to the importance of MCPFE work on forest biodiversity and protected forest areas.

Mr. Peter Mayer (Liaison Unit Vienna) also welcomed the participants and expressed his thanks and appreciation to the Government of Denmark, and in particular to the Danish Forest and Nature Agency, for kindly hosting the workshop and for organising the excursion. Mr. Mayer briefly recalled MCPFE work on biodiversity and forest conservation so far and highlighted the significance of the workshop with a view to the 4th Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (28-30 April 2003, Vienna, Austria). As a result of the discussion, recommendations should be elaborated for the next MCPFE Expert Level Meeting (10-11 June 2002 in Vienna, Austria).

2. Session I: MCPFE Classification of Protected and Protective Forest Areas in Europe1

Mr. Christoph Wildburger presented the work of the MCPFE on the draft classification of protected forest areas in Europe so far and outlined the objective of the discussion in Session I, namely to discuss to results of the preliminary assignment of national data to this draft classification, to clarify up-coming issues related to the assignment, and to address the overall status of the classification with a view to the 4th Ministerial Conference in 2003.

In addition, Mr. Stein Tomter (Norwegian Institute of Land Inventory) gave an overview of the results of the preliminary assignment of national data to the draft MCPFE classification. He also pointed to several assignment problems and concluded that additional close communication with TBFRA correspondents will be required. The TBFRA correspondents should review the results of the assignment and supplement information reported previously or provide information in case countries did not respond to the initial questionnaire.

In a subsequent initial discussion, the close co-operation between the MCPFE, UNECE/FAO and the European Environment Agency (EEA) in the collection of data was re-emphasised. Also the involvement

of The World Conservation Union (IUCN) was pointed out. It was recalled that the MCPFE Preparatory Group on Classification of Protected Forest Areas2 succeeded in defining the linkages between the MCPFE classification and the IUCN Categories for Protected Areas as well as the "Common Database on Designated Areas" (CDDA) maintained by EEA. The intention to pursue these co-operative efforts also in the future was emphasised.

Mr. Josef Hackl (Federal Environment Agency, Austria) presented the national experience in assessing protected forest areas in Austria according to the draft MCPFE classification. This assessment was carried out in the frame of an on-going project the results of which are expected to be presented in spring 2002. In his presentation Mr. Hackl gave various examples of existing protection regimes in Austria and their assignment to the MCPFE categories. He concluded that the experience gained in the project so far would confirm the usefulness of the MCPFE classification in practice, but would also indicate a need for considerable national "homework". In addition, Mr. Hackl stressed the importance of clarifying the relation of the Natura 2000 network to the MCPFE classification.

Following Mr. Hackl's presentation, various issues raised in the presentation were discussed in more detail. Particular emphasis was given to the assignment of protected forest areas based on voluntary contributions without legal basis. Furthermore, the need to describe the relation of sites designated under the Natura 2000 network to the MCPFE classification in the future was confirmed in the discussion. It was recommended to assign the Natura 2000 sites to the MCPFE categories according to the national designation of these sites.

In a brief presentation, Mr. Mark Roekaerts (European Environment Agency) provided information on the "Common Database on Designated Areas" (CDDA) which has been developed by the European Environment Agency (EEA) in a joint effort with the World Conservation Monitoring Center (WCMC) and the Council of Europe. Mr. Roekaerts pointed to EEA's objective to also include forest information into the CDDA and invited to continue the fruitful co-operative efforts in the future.

Refinement of draft classification

Following these presentations, the participants of the workshop were invited to discuss in more detail the results of the preliminary assignment and to refine the draft classification by building on the consensus achieved by the ad hoc working group on "Biodiversity, Protected Areas and Related Issues" as well as of the MCPFE Preparatory Group on Classification of Protected Forest Areas. It was also recalled in the discussion that the draft classification has been formulated in a way which ensures that protected forest areas assigned to the MCPFE classification are in accordance with the IUCN definition of protected areas.

The following refinements were agreed as a result the discussion (the full text of the revised classification can be found in the Annex):

Title of the classification

The participants of the workshop were in agreement that – in accordance with the terms and definitions used in the UNECE/FAO Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment (TBFRA) – the title of the classification should be modified to "MCPFE Classification of Protected and Protective Forests and Other Wooded Lands in Europe".

Introduction

It was agreed to state in the introduction that in order to ensure comparability of the data assigned to the classification at the international level, terms and definitions used are in compliance with the terminology

of the TBFRA. Furthermore, an explicit notion has been included that protected forests and protected other wooded land (OWL) with management objective biodiversity assigned to the classification are in accordance with the IUCN definition of protected areas.

General Principles

Related to the general principle of the existence of a legal basis, several participants of the workshop remarked that more emphasis should be given to the assignment of protected forest areas based on voluntary contributions without legal basis. In order to give more weight to the subject, it was agreed to present the text of footnote1 of the classification as regular text under heading "general principles".
The discussion at the workshop also indicated the need to specify the general principle of long-term commitment. Consensus was achieved among the participants that long-term commitment would comprise a minimum period of 20 years3.
An "explicit designation for the protection of biodiversity, landscapes and specific natural elements or protective functions of forests and other wooded land" was decided as a modified third general principle for classification according to the MCPFE system.

Finally, the discussion also pointed to the fact that some protected or protective forests and OWL, such as specific forest types or vertical and horizontal zones in the landscape, are designated through regulations in principle, but not within specific geographical boundaries delineating a limited area. There was consensus that also these forests and OWL fulfil the general principles of the classification and should therefore be assigned to it. However, it was agreed that data on these forests should be distinguishable in the reporting. Preliminary wording was added in chapter "general principles", whereas the Liaison Unit was asked to look for possibilities to improve this wording.

Classification:

Following a proposal made by EEA a reference was added to the table in chapter "classification" concerning the linkages between the MCPFE categories and the designation types used in the framework of the Common Database on Designated Areas, managed by the EEA on behalf of two other organisations (Council of Europe and UNEP-WCMC).

Defined categories

* Category 1.1:
The discussion on Category 1.1 (Management Objective Biodiversity "No Active Intervention") focused on limited research as an intervention allowed in forests and OWL assigned to this category. While the importance of science and research was underlined in principle, there was consensus that interventions in this strict category should be limited to "non destructive research not detrimental to the management objective".

* Category 1.2:
The management of wildlife and the control of diseases constituted important aspects in the discussion on possible refinements of Category 1.2 (Management Objective Biodiversity "Minimum Intervention"). As a result, it was agreed to extend "ungulate control" to also include "game control" and to add "control of diseases/insect outbreaks" as another activity allowed in Category 1.2. The latter, however, was restricted to control measures in cases of expected large diseases/insect outbreaks and to the use of biological methods under the provision that no other adequate control possibilities in buffer zones are feasible. Furthermore, research was limited to "non destructive research not detrimental to the management objective" also in Category 1.2. Finally, a proposal was accepted by the workshop participants to extend subsistence resource use to "local communities".

* Category 1.3:
No refinements were made to Category 1.3 (Management Objective Biodiversity "Conservation through Active Management").

* Category 2:
There was a common understanding that "spiritual and historical values" should be added to the main characteristics described for Category 2 (Management Objective "Protection of Landscapes and Specific Natural Elements").

* Category 3:
It was recalled in the discussion that the protection of soil, water and natural hazards should be seen as non-exhaustive examples for protective functions included in Category 3 (Management Objective: Protective Functions ("Soil, Water, Natural Hazards")). Therefore, it was agreed to delete the content of the bracket in the title of the classification and to refer to Category 3 as "Management Objective: Protective Functions".

In addition, Mr. Wildburger presented to the workshop participants detailed proposals for supplement of Category 3, brought forward by the 2nd MCPFE Workshop on the Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (24-25 September 2001, Copenhagen/Denmark). According to these proposals, Category 3 covers forests protecting soil, water, forest ecosystem functions or protecting infrastructure and managed natural resources against natural hazards. These proposals for refinement were considered and accepted by the participants of the workshop.

Role of classification with a view to 4th Ministerial Conference

The participants of the workshop also considered the role of the MCPFE Classification of Protected and Protective Forests and Other Wooded Lands in Europe with a view to the 4th Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (April 2003 in Vienna, Austria). The experts shared the view that the classification should be presented at the next Ministerial Conference. It was stated that a strong political signal should be given by the ministers, underlining their commitment to the conservation of biodiversity as an integral part of sustainable forest management (SFM). The importance of the classification as an essential component of this commitment and as a "communication tool" was underlined. In addition, there was a common understanding that data on protected and protective forests and OWL assigned to the classification should be presented at the Ministerial Conference, if sufficiently available4.

However, it was acknowledged by the workshop participants that the classification could be further developed in the future. The potential contribution of research activities, notably COST Action "PROFOR", was underlined in this context.
In the discussion on the role of the classification also linkages and potential contributions to the global level, notably the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as to the ministerial process "Environment for Europe" and PEBLDS were emphasised.

1 The discussion at the workshop was based on a background paper which had been prepared by the Liaison Unit Vienna and which had been distributed to the MCPFE contact persons and the participants of the workshop in advance.
2 The meeting of the MCPFE Preparatory Group on Classification of Protected Forest Areas took place on 10 April 2001 in Vienna/Austria with participation of IUCN.
3 The expert of the Netherlands expressed his reservation concerning this 20-year period.

For this purpose, the TBFRA contact persons should be contacted and asked to complement and/or revise data on protected and protective forests and OWL which had been reported to the MCPFE for purposes of the preliminary assignment.

3. Session II: Further work of the MCPFE on protected forest areas and forest biodiversity - issues to be discussed

In a brief presentation, Mr. Christoph Wildburger introduced the topics of Session II of the workshop, comprising selection criteria for protected forest areas (PFAs), networks of PFAs as well as possible other aspects considered relevant by the workshop participants with a view to the 4th Ministerial Conference.

Selection criteria for PFAs

Concerning selection criteria for PFAs, the participants of the workshop shared the view that the criteria applied for the selection of sites in existing networks of protected areas would be sufficient for the MCPFE for the time being5. It was pointed out that substantial efforts have already been undertaken within existing networks in the definition of selection criteria. However, it was also acknowledged that a systematic compilation of the selection criteria used in different systems would be very useful. COST Action "PROFOR" could give valuable input to this compilation. In this context, reference was also made to on-going efforts within PEBLDS to analyse selection criteria used in different programmes.

Networks of PFAs

Also with regard to a network of PFAs as laid down in Helsinki Resolution H2, the workshop participants expressed the common view that existing networks would meet the requirements of the MCPFE so far. It was remarked that existing systems of PFAs would still be in an early stage of implementation. Thus, a gap analysis evaluating the outcomes of the existing networks should be carried out at a later stage. It was stated that in this context also buffer zones and corridors should be considered.

Related to the discussion on selection criteria and networks of PFAs, the delegates highlighted the importance of achieving a common understanding on forest types in Europe and advocated further efforts of the MCPFE in this regard. Reference was made in this context to efforts made in the project BEAR as well as to EEA's work on habitat classification.

Other aspects related to biodiversity and PFAs with a view to next Ministerial Conference 2003 in Vienna

In general, the participants of the workshop emphasised the importance of the linkages and potential contribution of MCPFE work on the conservation of biodiversity to the global level, in particular the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Reference was made in the discussion to the draft revised programme of work on forest biological diversity of the CBD, as discussed at the recent meeting of CBD SBSSTA 76. Furthermore, the continued co-operation with the ministerial process "Environment for Europe" and PEBLDS was considered to be very important by the experts.

As regards further aspects related to biodiversity and PFAs, it was stated that the MCPFE should also address "restoration" and discuss possible co-operative efforts at the pan-European level. However, it was also acknowledged that restoration still needs to be defined more clearly and that this aspect could possibly be better addressed in the overall discussion on the conservation of biodiversity in forests outside PFAs.

In this context, it was re-emphasised that PFAs and the conservation of biodiversity constitute an integral part of sustainable forest management (SFM). Consequently, the participants of the workshop recommended that when presenting the MCPFE classification at the next Ministerial Conference, the ministers should recognise in their commitment the importance of the conservation of biodiversity in the sustainable management of forests, as reflected in earlier MCPFE commitments.

5 These selection criteria complement the criteria for an overall assessment of PFAs agreed upon by the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, i.e. adequacy, connectivity and effectiveness, which had already been accepted as basic principles for the selection of PFAs by the MCPFE.
6 The seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD SBSSTA 7) took place on 12-16 November 2001 in Montreal, Canada.

4. Closure of the meeting

Mr. Mayer expressed his thanks to the delegates of the workshop for their active participation and comments made in the discussions and closed the meeting.

Tabela: Analiza statističnih kazalnikov v primeru 1, 2, 3, 4 ploskev na trakt

št. plo.	med ploskvami			med trakti			povp	N
	var	std	koefvar	var	std	koefvar		
1				136,64	11,69	0,558	20,93	688
2	87,13	6,76	0,348	111,62	10,56	0,503	21,02	688
3	81,38	7,33	0,378	96,01	9,80	0,467	20,97	688
4	79,32	7,62	0,396	88,66	9,42	0,448	21,00	688

Tabela: Povprečna osutosti (POS) in poškodovanost (IND) stare (M6) in nove (KPP) ploskve

	N	povprečje	Confid. -95,000%	Confid. +95,000%
POS_M6	676	22,05092	21,31943	22,7824
INDM6	676	0,248917	0,233367	0,264466
POS_KPP	617	18,6884	17,9891	19,38771
IND_KPP	617	0,192892	0,177683	0,208101
POS	682	20,55571	19,93442	21,177
IND	682	0,222789	0,209597	0,235981

Tabela : Primerjava vrednosti POS in IND med KPP in M6 (t-test za neodvisne vzorce):

VAR 1	VAR 2	P	
POS - M6	POS – KPP	0,00000	***
IND – M6	IND – KPP	0,00001	***