Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Transboundary Prespa Park Region

CONCEPT PAPER IN PREPARATION OF A FULL GEF PROJECT

Submitted to the GEF Secretariat
by UNDP
on behalf of the tri-national
Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee

Abbreviations

BSPSM	Bird Study and Protection Society of Macedonia
PPCC	Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee
EEC	European Economic Community
EU	European Union
FoE	Pro Natura Switzerland
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Association
KfW	Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau
MAP	Macedonian Alliance for Prespa
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NP	National Park
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PA	Protected Area
PDF	Project Development Facility (of GEF)
PPNEA	Preservation and Protection of Natural Environment Albania
SAP	Strategic Action Plan / Strategic Action Programme
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SPA	Special Protection Area (under EC law)
SPP	Society for the Protection of Prespa (Greece)
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education and Science Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

1. Project Title:
Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Transboundary Prespa Park Region

2. GEF Implementing Agency:
United Nations Development Programme

3. Countries in which the project is being implemented:
Albania, the FYR of Macedonia and Greece[1]

4. GEF Focal Area(s):
Multiple Focal Area: International Waters & Biodiversity (also expected to produce Climate Change benefits)

5. Operational Program/Enabling Activities/ Short-Term Measures:
The proposed project fits within OP#12 Integrated Ecosystem & Natural Resources Management.

The project is also relevant to the criteria of OP#8 Waterbody based Operational Programme, OP#4 Mountain Ecosystems and OP#2 Coastal, Marine & Freshwater Ecosystems.

6. Country Drivenness:
In recognition of the ecological and historical/cultural significance of the transboundary Prespa Lakes region, the Prime Ministers of the three neighbouring countries (Albania, the FYR of Macedonia, and Greece) issued a Declaration on 2nd February 2000 announcing the creation of the "Prespa Park" as the first transboundary protected area in South Eastern Europe[2]. The Prime Ministerial Declaration proposes enhanced collaboration among the competent authorities of the three countries and outlines the following joint actions to be undertaken:[3]

a) maintain and protect the unique ecological values of the "Prespa Park";
b) prevent and/or reverse the causes of its habitat degradation ;
c) explore appropriate management methods for the sustainable use of the Prespa Lakes waters;
d) spare no efforts so that the "Prespa Park" becomes and remains a model of its kind as well as an additional reference to the peaceful collaboration among our countries.

As a follow-up to the Declaration of Prespa Park, the three states have established an interim "Co-ordination Committee for the Prespa Park" (PPCC) which includes

[1] The participation of Greece and activities to be undertaken in the Greek part of the Prespa region will be fully supported by funding from the Greek government and other sources of co-funding.
[2] See Map in Annex 1
[3] See Annex 2 for a full text of the Declaration of Prespa Park

representatives from the environmental authorities, local government, and NGO community in each country as well as the Ramsar Convention Bureau/MedWet as observer[4]. The main responsibility of the Co-ordination Committee is to ensure co-ordination among the three countries and concerned stakeholders to facilitate the establishment of the trilateral Prespa Park, the protection of its ecosystems and the sustainable development of the region. The Committee is expected to become the formal body responsible for the implementation of the proposed transboundary, tri-lateral environmental and sustainable development program, benefiting the lake region.

The proposed project is therefore completely in line with the priorities of the three countries and is driven by the representatives of the three countries through the Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee.

In addition, the following supporting measures have been taken by the three countries:

In Albania:

- Prespa National Park was established in 1999 for the rehabilitation and sustainable protection of critical terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems of the Macro- and Micro Prespa Lake area.
- The Council of Ministers ratified the Ramsar Convention in March 1996.
- The Ministry of Environment has been recently established to replace the former National Environmental Agency (NEA).

In Greece:

- Prespa National Forest was designated in 1974 for the protection of the lakes Micro and Macro Prespa and their catchment area, and, in 1975, the same area was declared a "landscape of exceptional beauty".
- The Greek side of the wetland system is a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the EEC Birds Directive.
- The entire Prespa catchment area and the lakes have been included in the Greek National List of the NATURA 2000 protected sites network, according to the EEC Directive on Protection of Fauna, Flora and their Habitats, and the EEC Birds Directive.
- The Ramsar Convention was ratified in 1974 by Greece as one of the founding countries. The amendment was ratified through Law 1950 in 1991. Micro Prespa was declared a Ramsar site in 1974. Moreover, Greece has recently applied for the recognition of the Macro Prespa Lake also as a designated Ramsar site.

In the FYR of Macedonia:

- Pelister National Park was established in 1948 for the protection of a globally unique mountainous ecosystem to the east of Macro Prespa Lake.
- Galicica National Park was established in 1958 for the rehabilitation and protection of unique terrestrial ecosystems straddling the Galicica Mountain located between the Macro Prespa and Ohrid Lakes.

[4] See Annex 3 for the full description of the composition and responsibilities of the Co-ordination Committee

- Bird Sanctuary Ezerani was established in 1996 (declared Ramsar site), bordering the northern section of Macro Prespa Lake for the protection of migratory waterfowl and other waterbird species.
- Macro Prespa Lake was declared a "Natural Monument" in 1977 (Official Gazettement 45/77).

Furthermore, a "Partnership Agreement" between the Albanian Prespa National Park and the Macedonian Galicica National Park was signed on February 4, 2001, within the framework of the Europark Expertise Exchange Program.

7. Context:

7.1 Description and Physical features:

The Prespa region (~41° N latitude, ~23°E longitude) is located in the Balkan Peninsula, in south-eastern Europe (see Map in Annex 1). It is a high-altitude basin which includes two inter-linked lakes, Macro Prespa and Micro Prespa and the surrounding mountains. The Macro Prespa lake has a surface area of 253.6 km^2, Micro Prespa is 47.4 km^2 and the total area of the combined drainage basins and lakes is 2,519 km^2 .[5]

The two Prespa Lakes are situated at an altitude of 850 m above sea level. The highest peaks of the surrounding mountains reach about 2,600 m above sea level. The Baba Mountain Range borders the lake basin to the east, with Pelister Mountain as its highest peak (2,600 m asl). To the north, the Plakenska (1,998m asl) and Bigla (1,656 m asl) are the highest peaks. Micro Prespa Lake on the Greek side is bordered to the south by the Triklarion Mountains rising to 1,750 m asl. The two Prespa Lakes are separated to the west from Ohrid Lake by an elongated calciferous mountain block comprised of Galicica and Mali i Thate mountains (rising to 2,287 m asl). The mountains to the east and south of the watershed are comprised of silicate rock, producing soils and growing conditions that differ significantly from the soils resulting from the calciferous mountains to the north and west of the watershed. The calciferous rock facilitates underground water flow from the Prespa Lakes to the lower Ohrid Lake, where water surfaces in mighty springs at Drilon (in Albania) and Sveti Naum (in the FYR of Macedonia). The exact extent of sub-surface linkages between the Prespa Lakes and Lake Ohrid has not been investigated, however a study using radio isotopes is underway to more accurately determine the sub-surface flows. Because of the linkages in the catchment area, the proposed project will establish effective co-ordination and exchange of information with the management committees set up within the ongoing GEF/World Bank project in Lake Ohrid (as described in section 15).

Until the end of the 1960s the Maliqi Lake in Albania formed an integral part of the region's lake system. The Maliqi Lake was bordered by extensive marshlands of

[5] Hollis, G.E. and A.C. Stevenson, 1997. The physical basis of the Lake Mikri Prespa systems: geology, climate, hydrology and water quality. Hydrobiologia 351: 1-19.

several 100 has, fed by the Devolli River that originates in south-eastern Albania. The Devolli river was channelled at the end of the 60s resulting in subsequent draining of the Maliqi Lake and the desiccation of the swamp. Subsequently, the Prespa watershed was artificially and considerably enlarged by the Devolli River in the south, which was channelled and partly diverted into Micro Prespa Lake.

The climate of the Prespa region is subject to Mediterranean and continental influences and may be characterised as continental-central European. It is characterised by winters with long periods of high rainfall, snow and low temperatures and warm but moderate summers. Mean monthly temperatures in the Prespa region average 9-10° C. The average annual rainfall is approximately 647 mm.

7.2 Global Biodiversity Significance:

Detailed vegetation studies providing fairly comprehensive reviews have been undertaken in all countries sharing the Prespa region. [6] The studies indicate that the entire Prespa region hosts unique biotopes that are important from a European conservation perspective. Extensive deciduous evergreen forests of *Ostryo-Caprinion orientalis*, evergreen Box-Juniper shrublands, and beech and beech-fir forests are found on the eastern and southern slopes of the catchment basin. The evergreen conifer forests along the Albanian and Greek part of Prespa are significant for conservation and consist of tall 12m high and straight trees of *Juniperus foetidissima* and *J. excelsa*. The extensive beech and beech–fir forests of the FYR of Macedonia are also considered important for conservation. As far as the wetland ecosystems are concerned, the littoral zone of Micro Prespa is covered with extensive reedbeds (Ass. *Phragmitetum* predominates) with several open water areas covered by aquatic vegetation. The morphology and structure of wetland ecosystems favour breeding and feeding of rare water bird species.

The flora is composed of more than 1500 plant species with 19 endemic plant species recorded for the three countries. Two plant species are listed in IUCN's Red Data Book as "vulnerable" and 12 as rare (IUCN, 1982).

The aquatic ecosystems of the region are rich in endemic species such as the Prespa barbel (*Barbus prespensis*), the Prespa nose (*Chondrostoma nasus prespensis*) and others. Of the 12 indigenous fish taxa identified, 4 species (*Barbus prespensis, Chondrostoma prespensis, Chalcaburnus belvica, Gobitis meridionalis*) and 8 sub-species are endemic to the Prespa Lakes or to the Balkans. (Further information on species of the project area is provided in Annex 4).

With about 270 bird species, the avifauna of the Prespa lakes region is highly diverse. Among them are globally endangered species, such as the Dalmatian pelican (*Pelecanus crispus*) (700 pairs, i.e. the biggest breeding colony in the world) and the

[6] See, e.g., Pavlidis, G., 1997. The flora of Prespa National Park with emphasis on species of conservation interest. Hydrobiologia 351:35-40; Pavlidis, G., 1997. Aquatic and terrestrial vegetation of the Prespa area. Hydrobiologia 351: 41-60; Rizovski, R., Grupce, Lj., Rizovska-Atanasovska, J., 1997. Vegetation and its importance in the protection of Prespa region. Ont. symp. Towards Integrated Conservation and Sustainable Development of Transboundary Macro and Micro Prespa Lakes, 24-26 October, Korcha, Albania; Buzo, K., Data on the flora and vegetation of the sub-alpine and alpine pastures of Prespa region, 2000. Proceedings of International Symposium: Sustainable development of Prespa region, 23-25/6/2000, Oteshevo, Republic of Macedonia.

Pygmy cormorant (*Phalacrocorax pygmaeus*), both of which breed and winter in the Greek section of Prespa. The Greek Prespa is also the only breeding area of the White pelican (*Pelecanus onocrotalus*) in the European Union, while the globally endangered Ferruginous duck (*Aythya nyroca*) breeds in the Ezerani Lagoon in the FYR of Macedonia and Micro Prespa in Greece. All these and many other bird species use the whole surface of the two lakes in all countries as feeding grounds.

The water surfaces of the lakes are important wintering sites for waterfowl of the Palaearctic realm. The importance of the Prespa lakes and the corresponding wetlands for birds has been widely documented during the last thirty years and has recently been aptly summarised by Hearth and Evans.[7] Based on the richness of waterfowl the Macedonian and Greek sides of the lake system are recognised as wetlands of international importance by the *Convention on Protection of Wetlands of International Importance* (Ramsar, 1971). The Ramsar designation in Greece is based primarily on breeding and wintering populations, whereas in the FYR of Macedonia the designation is based on feeding species. Furthermore, the Greek side of the wetland system is considered a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the *Birds Directive* of the European Union (79/409/EEC) and is part of the Greek contribution to the NATURA 2000 network of protected sites according to the *Directive for the Conservation of Natural Habitats of Wild Flora and Fauna* (92/43 EEC).

It should also be noted that the lake area hosts endangered mammal species, such as bears (*Ursus arctos*), wolves (*Canis lupus*), and lynx (*Lynx lynx*). There are also 25 recorded species of bats in the region. Among these are nine species that are either threatened with extinction or are classified as vulnerable (*Myotis natteri, Nyctalus leisleri, N. noctula, Rrhinolophus ferrum-equinum, R. euryale, R. hipposideros, R. blasii, Tadarida tenoites* and *Vespertilio murinus*).

7.3. Socio-Economic context:

In addition to its natural values, the lake region is considered to be of great cultural/historic importance with high potential for tourism. The region has been inhabited for several centuries. Numerous archaeological sites prove that in ancient times an important trade route of the western Roman empire – the Via Egnatia – passed close to the region. The Byzantine and meta-byzantine monuments of the Prespa basin are numerous and an evidence of the rich cultural and historic heritage of the whole area.

The distribution of villages and people located around the two Prespa lakes shows that approximately 5,202 persons live in 12 villages on the Albanian side, 1,569 from 13 villages on the Greek side and 17,681 persons in one town and 40 villages in the FYR of Macedonia. In the past decades, there has been limited interaction among the people living in this region, due to the fact that it was dissected by military border zones, which formed part of the so-called “Iron Curtain”.

[7] Hearth M.F. & G.Evans IE (Editors) 2000. Important Bird Areas in Europe- Priority Sites for Conservation. 2 Vols., Cambridge, UK Birdlife International (Bird Conservation Series No 8).

The inhabitants of Prespa are mainly occupied in the primary sector of production, with agriculture as the main source of income; stock raising and fishing also contribute to the agricultural produce of the area in varying degrees, depending on the country. The secondary sector is fairly developed only in the Resen area (the FYR of Macedonia), while the tertiary sector is largely confined to tourism, which represents an important economic activity at least in the FYR of Macedonia and Greece.

Large parts of the ecosystems of the Prespa Lakes region have been converted or transformed into agricultural systems of various kinds, or have been replaced by towns, villages and other man-made infrastructures. More specifically, water abstraction from the lakes for irrigation purposes, use of fertiliser and pesticides, disposal of urban wastewater, and of solid household wastes increase eutrophication, enhance vegetation growth at the littoral zone, and increase growth of organic substances in shallow waters, leading to a reduction of the spawning grounds of endemic fish species and feeding grounds of rare water birds.

Along the Albanian side extensive wood and forest cutting, along with the diversion of the Devolli River into Micro Prespa, resulted in the deposition of 40,000m^3 of solid materials into the lake and in the destruction of the wetland. During the last ten years, water level of Macro Prespa has decreased more than 6m. The reasons for this phenomenon have not yet been investigated, however existing hypotheses suggest that this may be due in large part to the severe drought conditions prevailing in the region for some years which have also caused a significant lowering of the water levels of nearby lakes in Greece, or possibly due to an earthquake which may have affected underground water channels connected to Macro Prespa. The reasons for the lowering of the water level are considered to be due to natural causes as there has not been any major change in land-use and water-use patterns in the surrounding areas in recent years. The resulting increased lake water eutrophication has been pinpointed in many scientific studies in the three countries. As a result, habitat diversity has decreased and many types of 'natural ecosystem' are now confined to relatively restricted areas. Recognition of the restricted and threatened nature of the remaining extents of representative natural ecosystems has been an important stimulus for reinforcing conservation action in the region, as indicated by the creation of numerous protected areas in the Lakes region.

However, in areas such as Prespa, as in many other non-wetland mountain areas in Europe, natural conditions have for hundreds of years been disturbed through human interventions; despite these changes, the natural character of the landscape is retained, but is far from being pristine. On the other hand, it should be noted that extensive land use practices have often created conditions favouring a high level of biodiversity. Examples of biodiversity-enhancing practices in Prespa have been: grazing, mowing and collection/use of reedbeds each year, cultivation of small woodland openings, cultivation practices with inter-cropping, crop rotations, small and intermingling fields with a variety of crops, maintaining natural hedges and trees, the non-use of chemicals, and the combination of arable farming and livestock rearing in a system of high spatial and temporal entropy (Catsadorakis & Malakou 1997).[8]

[8] Catsadorakis, G. & M. Malakou, 1997. Conservation and management issues of Prespa National Park, Hydrobiologia 351:175-196, A.J.Crivelli & G.Catsadorakis (eds), Lake Prespa, Northwestern Greece.

8. Project Rationale and Objectives:

8.1 Problem statement:

The tri-national Prespa Park region is considered an ecological entity of global significance, and has, in fact, been characterised as one of Europe's 24 major transboundary "ecological bricks".[9] However, the unique values of this ecosystem are being eroded at a rapid rate and threatened by increasing exploitation of natural resources, inappropriate land-use practices, and uncoordinated sectoral policies and development activities leading to soil and water contamination and degradation.

As borders between states are political and not ecological, the ecosystems of the Lake Region extend across national boundaries. The region is thus subject to different and even conflicting management regimes and policies, which further exacerbate the threats to the ecosystem as a whole and make unilateral and piecemeal response measures ineffective.

The ecological integrity of the Prespa Park region is currently threatened by inappropriate land and natural resource use, which can be broken down into a number of factors including:

- inexistant or inappropriate water management;
- large-scale forest destruction and erosion;
- overgrazing;
- over-exploitation of medicinal plants, fisheries and other natural resources;
- ecologically unsound irrigation practices;
- water and soil contamination from uncontrolled use of pesticides, raw sewage disposal and lake siltation;
- uncontrolled urban and other forms of development;
- pressure from increasing and uncontrolled tourism development

The threats to the Prespa ecosystem identified above have been caused as a result of the following underlying or root causes, which are affecting all or parts of region:

- lack of integrated planning and weak inter-sectoral co-ordination;
- limited management and enforcement capacity;
- lack of financial and technical resources for ecosystem management and conservation;
- regulatory frameworks and policies not harmonized or co-ordinated among sectors and between the three countries;
- lack of co-ordination among the three countries to address transboundary issues and management needs of the region as an integrated ecosystem unit;
- limited income generation opportunities leading to unsustainable use of natural resources and pressure on the ecosystem;
- limited incentives or disincentives to prevent or control environmentally unsustainable practices;

[9] Langer, H., 1990. Ecological Bricks for our Common House in Europe. Munich: Verlag für Politische Oecologie. Global Challenges Network and Verlag für Politische Oecologie.

- lack of awareness among key stakeholders and general public about the ecological values of the region, their potential, and the corresponding need for their preservation.

8.2 Baseline scenario:

In the baseline scenario, conservation programmes may continue to focus on areas that are too small to meet the habitat requirements of all species, and conservation and resource management goals may be too narrow to make either economic or ecological sense. In view of the international importance of the Prespa region's ecosystems, which straddle international boundaries, an integrated ecosystem management approach is needed that can balance economic development in the region with the need for conservation and protection of its unique natural resources. This requires a landscape level planning approach to promote sustainable development alongside efforts to conserve transboundary waters and biodiversity.

In the absence of GEF funding, the uncontrolled land-use and resource exploitation patterns seen in recent decades could continue to degrade this globally significant ecosystem and lead to uncontrolled and ultimately unsustainable development in the Prespa Lakes region. While important steps have been taken by the countries to establish protected areas, in many cases capacity, funding and resources are limited to ensure their effective management. Thus areas within and surrounding PAs are being rapidly degraded due to lack of effective land-use planning, limited enforcement and management capacity and limited income generation alternatives available to local people. Rapid deforestation is being caused by tree-cutting and over-grazing, due to shortage of alternative fuelwood and poor rangeland management practices. This process in turn is leading to irreversible processes of erosion and land degradation. Within the baseline scenario there is no integrated effort to address such destructive resource use patterns in a comprehensive manner by addressing their root causes. While small-scale projects are being developed in some areas to promote local enterprise, these are neither comprehensive nor sufficiently co-ordinated with environmental protection needs to ensure careful and controlled utilization of natural resources in line with carrying capacity of the areas.

Present water management practices and irrigation practices are also not sufficiently co-ordinated among the riparian countries. Within a baseline scenario there will continue to be limited transboundary co-ordination for the management of the lakes and their fresh water resources, as well as lack of a comprehensive and joint regional assessment and programme to address transboundary threats and identify and implement regional priorities actions and investments. Unilateral actions, such as the diversion of the Devolli river towards Micro Prespa Lake some decades ago, may continue to have severe implications for water quality and quantity as well as aquatic biodiversity of the entire transboundary ecosystem. Similarly potential large-scale irrigation projects, if not designed to be consistent with the conservation objectives of the region, could significantly affect the level and extent of the lakes.

Despite its considerably rich natural and cultural heritage, the population in the Prespa region is characterized by relatively lower living standards in all three countries. This is manifested in low incomes and few income generation alternatives available to local people. Lower living standards are also resulting in gradual erosion of the

population base, especially in the Greek side of Prespa. It is noted in the Strategic Action Plan for Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park, a study being undertaken by the collaborating NGOs in the Prespa Park process, that "none of the three countries alone can raise the living standard of the Prespa inhabitants beyond a certain point, unless it comes to an agreement with the other two states on a harmonised utilisation of natural resources under common terms". [10] It is also noted that in view of the character and special features of the region large-scale development initiatives in the secondary sector (manufacture, industry, mining) would be incompatible with the preservation of the ecosystem and the natural and cultural values of the region. Within the baseline scenario a shared vision for the sustainable development of the Prespa region does not exist, therefore uncontrolled and incompatible development activities may continue in various parts of the ecosystem.

While the three states have taken important initial steps, such as the Declaration of the tri-national Prespa Park and the establishment of the Co-ordination Committee, an integrated and comprehensive approach is needed for sustainable management of the Prespa Park transboundary ecosystem. As indicated by the trilateral declaration by the Prime Ministers of the three countries, the political will to co-operate in the conservation and sustainable use through common management of the shared ecosystems is present. However, this will need to be supported by considerable incremental resources to enhance capacity and establish mechanisms for co-operation between states, among stakeholders, and in co-ordination with concerned development partners.

It is feared that--in the absence of sufficient capacity, appropriate policies and lack of effective co-ordination--the increased attention recently placed on Prespa because of positive transboundary co-operation, may inadvertently increase pressure on natural resources by creating an undesired incentive for various actors to take advantage of the region's rising profile for short-term economic benefit without proper long-term planning. Thus, the GEF recipient countries bordering Prespa have to be rapidly enabled to plan and manage their natural assets and anticipate and promote sustainable economic development in the area.

8.3 Alternative scenario:

The threats to the Prespa Park ecosystem and their underlying causes described above may only be solved through close co-operation between the three countries, involving the relevant sectors and range of stakeholders. The proposed project is being designed to support the three countries in jointly addressing transboundary issues and in designing and implementing an integrated ecosystem management/watershed management approach to land management in order to address the complex and multi-faceted problems facing the region. The proposed approach is expected to result in multiple global benefits in International Waters, Biodiversity, as well as Climate Change.

As already noted, the three countries sharing the Prespa basin have expressed their interest towards adopting a comprehensive approach to conservation that would produce local, regional and global benefits through reduced risk of extinction of rare

[10] Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park, draft Chapter A.

species, maintenance of ecosystem integrity, and establishment of sustainable use paradigms for components of biological diversity. A comprehensive programme and incremental resources are needed to implement this approach.

According to the precautionary principle that guides biodiversity conservation today, the proposed project will attempt to address the underlying root causes of biodiversity loss and the existing or possible future threats through a comprehensive, strategic model of environmental management and sustainable development of the Prespa area. Addressing the root causes would make the proposed activities both cost-efficient as well as sustainable and effective in the long run.

The alternative scenario proposes to focus on landscape level planning in order to deal with regions that are large enough to include the habitats and ecosystem functions and processes needed to make biotic communities and populations ecologically viable over the long-term. This requires co-operation among a range of stakeholder groups, including local communities, government agencies at different levels (local, regional, national), private enterprises, scientific and educational institutions, etc. The PPCC will apply this holistic approach that addresses biodiversity conservation in an ecosystem context, seeking to conserve integral ecological systems within which species can live and evolve within the boundaries of the Prespa catchment basin. The focus is very much on the conservation of ecosystems rather than on single species.

Associated with the notion of multiple conservation units in landscape level management is that of connectivity – the idea of linking up core areas that feature representative samples of a region's characteristic biodiversity, through systems of corridors, restored areas and conservation compatible land use which would permit the migration and movement of biota and adaptation of the overall ecological system. In the Prespa region both the core sites and the corridors are embedded into a matrix of mixed land uses and ownership patterns. A whole spectrum of scientific, social and economic considerations and different perceptions are thus brought to bear in defining management opportunities and in implementing programs of action and investment which will be most likely to be effective and successful within a transboundary ecosystem management approach as proposed within the alternative scenario.

The proposed project would help address transboundary water management issues for the conservation and integrated management of the Prespa Lakes and their catchment areas, by supporting the riparian countries to undertake a transboundary diagnostic analysis and develop a Strategic Action Programme for the management of the Lakes. These preparatory activities are proposed to be undertaken during a PDF B phase and would lead to the identification and prioritisation of demonstration measures to help improve the management of the lakes and to facilitate a co-ordinated investment programme that could be supported by national, regional and international partners.

The proposed project is also expected to result in significant carbon sequestration benefits. While it is not possible to quantify these benefits at this stage, this aspect is intended to be further studied within the PDF B phase. It is estimated that proposed rehabilitation and afforestation activities, as well as improved overall management of rangelands and meadows and reduction of overgrazing and deforestation are expected to lead to significantly enhanced carbon sequestration potential of the ecosystem.

Within the alternative scenario it is also proposed to address the major challenge of over-exploitation and pressure on natural resources by giving consideration to ways in which local communities could make a living from alternative and less exploitative sources of income. For example, the region has a high potential for promotion of eco-tourism, given its rich natural and cultural heritage. However such an approach requires a harmonised and shared programme for the development of region. Likewise, a sustainable development approach requires that communities living in the region are aware of the value and potential of the region, are closely involved plans and activities for the management and conservation of the ecosystem, and are able to share in the benefits.

The alternative approach will also facilitate the development of an "enabling environment" for integrated ecosystem management by identifying appropriate policies and incentives for conservation and sustainable development while strengthening the capacity for enforcement. The project proposes to study and develop sustainable financing mechanisms to help meet recurring costs and promote the long-term sustainability of the project interventions. The project will also strengthen inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms as a means to integrated and coherent planning for the future development of the region.

The international interest in the Prespa region has been evidenced in recent years by an increasing involvement of donors in the region through various projects and activities directed towards social infrastructure development, and reduction of lake contamination from uncontrolled sewage discharge and other sources. There is a need for a co-ordinated approach for conservation and sustainable development of the Prespa region to benefit local people, strengthen regional cooperation and secure global long-term benefits by preserving unique ecosystems. It is expected that the proposed alternative scenario would help to leverage large-scale donor involvement for an integrated and harmonised approach in the region. It would also help to avoid the potential negative consequences of ad-hoc and uncoordinated activities by different donors and partners with overlapping or conflicting approaches.

Finally, as an important by-product of the alternative approach, it is hoped that such co-operation would ease political tensions in the region by building solid links and common interests among stakeholders, and helping to solve existing conflicts as well as prevent potential resource conflicts.

8.4 Justification for GEF involvement:

Significant national and international efforts are needed over and above presently available resources to strengthen regional co-operation, planning and management in order to identify and implement a shared vision for the sustainable development of the region that would secure the protection of its valuable natural characteristics as well as result in the uplift of local living standards. The requested GEF funding is expected to significantly enhance current donor activities, by facilitating co-ordination among stakeholders, enhancing awareness, promoting an enabling policy environment, and building regional capacity for transboundary co-ordination and management in this unique ecosystem.

The proposed GEF project is expected to result in multiple global benefits by protecting globally significant biodiversity and transboundary ecosystems. The expected GEF intervention would assist in the development of a transboundary diagnostic analysis leading to a regionally agreed strategic action programme for the management of the Prespa lakes, their catchment areas and associated ecosystems. GEF support will be instrumental for (a) adjustment and enforcement of relevant laws and regulations affecting conservation and land use in the region; (b) institutionalising procedures for involving the local population in conservation management; (c) establishment of mechanisms to ensure financial sustainability of conservation activities (e.g., trust fund); (d) capacity building at the level of the target groups as well as responsible bodies; (e) promoting land use practices that are compatible with the overall conservation objectives for the area of interest; (e) the rehabilitation of critical watersheds and (f) the rehabilitation of degraded forest ecosystems and severely overgrazed (sub-) alpine grasslands.

8.5 Project Objectives:

The overall objective of the project is to promote integrated ecosystem management of the transboundary Prespa Park region with the participation of all stakeholders and by strengthening co-operation among the three riparian countries.

The specific objectives of the project, which will lead towards the realisation of the overall objective are the following:

Objective 1: to protect ecosystem values through effective land-use planning, protected area management and integrated water resources management.

Objective 2: to enhance awareness and understanding of the ecological values of the region among public at the local and national levels and to promote sustainable local development.

Objective 3: to create an enabling environment for sustainable development in the Prespa Park region through appropriate policies, incentives and opportunities, and inter-sectoral co-ordination.

Objective 4: to build up mechanisms for transboundary co-operation through the strengthening of the PPCC and its Secretariat and exploring options for the establishment of a more permanent regional commission.

9. Expected Outputs and Activities of Full Project:

The main outputs, components and activities proposed within the project alternative, to be financed by GEF financing as well as co-financing, may be summarized as follows. The listed activities are indicative at this stage and will be amended and/or further defined based on the results of the consultations and studies to be undertaken during the PDF B phase:

Outcome 1: Ecosystem values protected through effective land-use planning, PA management and integrated water resources management.

Output 1.1: Improved management of the designated conservation units of the lake region.

Activities:

- Elaboration and implementation of management plans for Galicica NP in the FYR Macedonia and Prespa National Park in Albania.
- Implementation of Management Plan Pelister NP in the FYR of Macedonia that currently is being elaborated through Swiss bilateral aid.
- Elaboration and implementation of the management plan for Ezerani Bird Sanctuary in the FYR of Macedonia.
  Formal establishment of Prespa National Park in Greece and implementation of the relevant management plan

Output 1.2: Sustainable range management & rehabilitation of degraded forest lands and other sensitive or important habitats.

Activities:

- Pilot projects (livestock quality improvement and elaboration of range management plans for selected priority villages in the support zone of the Albanian Prespa Park).
- Phasing-out of livestock grazing on dedicated forest land in all three countries (policy development and capacity building).
- Sustainable firewood production with focus on Albania.
- Sustainable utilization of designated forest lands for wood fiber and minor forest products.
- Implementation of management plan for Prespa wetlands (wet meadows etc.).
- Pilot projects introducing alternative energy (solar etc.).
- Elaborate and implement range management plans for Prespa NP (Albania) and its support zone.

Output 1.3: Demonstration projects for regulation of the Micro and Macro Prespa water regime

Activities:

- Elaboration of water management plan for sustainable water extraction and irrigation systems in Greece, Albania and the FYR of Macedonia.
- Restoration of past interventions concerning the Devolli river, including possible rehabilitation of the Maliqi Wetlands.
- Establish monitoring system for Macro and Micro Prespa lakes (water quality, etc.)

Output 1.4: Demonstration projects and awareness raising for prevention of lake contamination

Activities:

- Elaborate system for organic horticulture and agriculture (capacity building)
- Public awareness and extension campaign involving rural and city populations.
- Co-operation with planned sewage treatment projects financed through bilateral aid agencies and KfW in the Prespa region.

Outcome 2: Enhanced awareness and understanding of the ecological values of the region among public at the local and national levels and to promote sustainable local development.

Output 2.1: Promoting better resource use practices and local development activities

Activities:

- Promote organic horticulture techniques (capacity building)
- Cooperate with planned social infrastructure development projects (to be financed by KfW and Swiss bilateral aid).
- Assist in improvement of animal husbandry (capacity building).
- Promote sustainable fish management (capacity building).

Output 2.2: Promoting alternative livelihood sources for local communities

Activities:

- Develop sustainable fishery management plan for Prespa Lakes.
- Elaborate regional tourism development plan.
- Capacity building for tourism sector –all levels.
- Agricultural and forest product certification.
- Develop marketing strategy for products produced from renewable resources in an environmentally compatible fashion.

Output 2.3: Increasing environmental awareness

Activities:

- Design and implement environmental awareness campaigns in the three countries.
- Produce information materials for environmental awareness.
- Develop and implement public involvement strategies to increase understanding seek public support towards the goals and objectives of the project

Outcome 3: An enabling environment developed for sustainable development in the Prespa Park region through appropriate policies, incentives, financing mechanisms and strengthened inter-sectoral co-ordination.

Output 3.1: Establishing Legal and Policy framework for sustainable development and management of the Prespa Park.

- Identify and develop appropriate incentive measures, such as user fees, subsidies etc.;

Output 3.2: Strengthening law enforcement through increased awareness and capacity of the appropriate agencies to ensure ecological integrity of the protected areas and the lakes and compatible land use in the support zones of PAs.

Output 3.3: Established and functioning inter-sectoral co-ordination mechanisms

- Establish inter-sectoral advisory task forces in each country and develop mechanisms for consultation and co-ordination to guide implementation of project activities

Output 3.4: Establishment of mechanisms for sustainable financing for the protected areas for the Prespa Park Region

Activities:

- Establish legal framework for the establishment of a conservation trust fund (or conservation trust funds in Albania and FYR Macedonia).
- Secure capitalization of fund(s) from GEF other co-financing.
- Establish management and operating structure for fund(s)

Outcome 4: Mechanisms for transboundary co-operation strengthened through the capacity building of the PPCC and its Secretariat and exploring options for establishment of a more permanent regional commission.

Output 4.1: Well-established and functioning administrative structure for Prespa Park

Activities:

- Strengthening of the Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee and its Secretariat (capacity development) with a view to the establishment of a more permanent regional commission.
- Formalize co-operation between local, regional and national authorities.
- Explore options for a formal co-operation framework between the three countries, such as a trilateral treaty for approval by the three parliaments.

The above listed outputs are preliminary and indicative at this stage and will be further refined through the project development process to be undertaken during the PDF B phase.

In a co-ordinated effort, the German Government through KfW is expected to support the recipient countries in several interventions that will contribute to the achievement of the above-mentioned outcomes and outputs of the proposed GEF project. The following measures are proposed by KfW and intended to complement the proposed GEF project objectives within a consistent and co-ordinated strategy:

- Improving water quality of Lake Macro Prespa through the rehabilitation of existing sewage disposal and treatment systems in the FYR of Macedonia.
- Management and land use planning (with focus on the core PAs).
- Strengthening the effectiveness of conservation areas and authorities thr ough the provision of infrastructure and equipment.
- Support measures to the population in the surrounding areas (social infrastructure, income generation in rural areas).
- Hydrological assessment in terms of long-term conservation (and rehabilitation where appropriate) of the relevant ecosystems with subsequent civil works interventions as applicable.

The GEF project is proposed for an estimated duration of 5 years. A decision to increase the project duration and/or phase project implementation (phase 1 preparation; phase 2 implementation; phase 3 evaluation and sustainable financing) may be taken by the PPCC during the implementation of the PDF B phase.

10. Sustainability and Replicability of the Full Project:

It is hoped that the proposed sustainable development of the lake region, to be achieved in co-operation with the international donor community, will provide a sound basis for the long-range conservation goals for the project area, which are needed to safeguard the sustainability of the proposed interventions. Involvement of local communities and authorities in conservation management in and around protected areas will be crucial for the sustainability of interventions. Promotion of alternative income generation opportunities and local sustainable development activities will be an important element in arresting the present unsustainable natural resource use and reducing pressure on the ecosystem. The project preparation phase will undertake an assessment of the viability and profitability of alternative income generation opportunities.

It is expected that several project components will be replicable (e.g., organic fruit and vegetable farming; ecological model villages; policies and legislation regulating resource use in trans-border areas; participatory management planning for the national parks; sustainable fuelwood production; rehabilitation of degraded watersheds, etc.).

It is assumed that the three Governments will provide sufficient financing for the PPCC as part of the countries' counterpart contribution to GEF co-financing. In addition, sustainable financing mechanisms such as conservation trust funds will be developed in order to help meet recurring costs of PA management.

11. Country Eligibility:

Albania:

- **The Convention on Biological Diversity was ratified Jan.5, 1994, and came into force April 5, 1994.**
- **The UNFCCC has been ratified on 3 October 1994.**
- Elaboration of National Environmental Action Plan in 1993, and a NEAP update completed in 2001.
- Approval of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan in 2000.
- Albania is a party to the Ramsar Convention.
- Albania is a party to the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD).

The FYR of Macedonia:

- **The Convention on Biological Diversity was ratified by the parliament through Law 54/97 in 1997 and entered into force March 2, 1998.**
- **The UNFCCC has been ratified on 28 January 1998.**
- The Ramsar Convention was legalized by the Act for Succession, Sept. 8, 1991.
- The National Environmental Action Plan was elaborated in 1995 and approved in 1996.
- The Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) was ratified in 2000.
- A National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan is under development since 2000.

Greece:

- **The Convention on Biological Diversity was ratified by the parliament through Law 2204 in 1994.**
- **The UNFCCC has been ratified on 4 August 1994.**

12. Stakeholders Involved in Project:

The key stakeholders involved in the project are:

- The Ministries of Environment of the three countries
- Relevant sector ministries/agencies, including: Agriculture, Forestry, Water management, Regional development, Tourism, etc.
- Local authorities in the region, including the Communes of Liqenas and Progri in Albania, the Municipality of Resen in the FYR of Macedonia, and the Municipality of Prespa in Greece.
- Local communities
- NGOs, including the PPNEA in Albania, the MAP and the BSPSM in the FYR of Macedonia, and the SPP in Greece, as well as foreign NGOs working on specific projects in the Prespa region.
- Private sector
- Academic and scientific institutions
- International organisations and donors active in the region

The project will follow GEF public involvement guidelines by ensuring the participation of a broad range of stakeholders in each country through local level consultations, and through the establishment of inter-sectoral advisory task forces, which would meet periodically.

The Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee (PPCC) will play a critical role in the co-ordination of proposed project activities at the national and regional level. The PPCC includes the following 10 members:

Country	Constituency	Representative
Albania	Government	Ministry of Environment
	NGO	PPNEA
	Local government	Commune of Liqenas
Greece	Government	Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning & Public Works
	NGO	Society for Protection of Prespa (SPP)
	Local Government	Municipality of Prespa
The FYR of Macedonia	Government	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning
	NGO	Macedonian Alliance for Prespa (MAP)

	Local Government	Municipality of Resen
Observer		Ramsar Bureau/ MedWet

13. Information on Project Proponent:

The Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee is the proponent of the project. Details about the Committee are provided in Annex 3.

The Executing Agencies will be the Ministry of Environment in Albania and the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning in the FYR of Macedonia. Both agencies will closely liaise with the Greek Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works as integral partner of the PPCC.

The Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar 1971) and its MedWet Initiative, which were instrumental in the establishment of the Prespa Park, will assist in the development of the programme and will supply technical methods and tools as requested.

The German Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau, in short: 'KfW') will provide major co-financing. Past, current and programmed projects in the project area financed by the KfW are summarized in Annex 6. Furthermore, KfW has over 5 million DM available for wetland conservation in Greece of which a portion may be spent on the Greek side of the Prespa Lake system in the framework of this project.

The Swiss Government through its Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC) is currently financing activities related to the sustainable protection of Pelister National Park. For this project CHF 650,000 have been made available. The project covers the elaboration of a management plan for the NP and support zone, a public awareness campaign and eco-tourism development. It is implemented by Pro Natura (FoE Switzerland), a Swiss based environmental NGO.

14. Financing Plan of Full Project:

GEF funding will be requested for an estimated USD 6-8 million, which will cover the costs of project activities in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia. The estimated financing for activities in Greece is USD 3 million consisting of: German co-financing USD 2 million; Greek government contribution USD 0.5 million; other sources USD 0.5 million (EU and NGOs). The governments of Albania and FYR of Macedonia are also expected to contribute towards the project.

It is expected that co-financing of up to USD 12.8 million will be available for complementary activities through the German KfW [11], as well as co-financing of USD 0.5 million through the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC).

In addition, it should be noted that the establishment and strengthening of the transboundary Prespa Park has been proposed as a top priority by the governments of the three countries within the framework of the Regional Environment and Reconstruction Programme (REReP) of the Stability Pact for South-East Europe. It is expected that additional financing for the Full project will become available from resources committed within the Stability Pact process.

15. IA Coordination and Linkages to GEF and IA Programs and Activities:

The UNDP Country Offices in Skopje and Tirana will support the implementation of this transboundary project and its preparatory phase. UNDP's programme activities in the two countries are focused on promoting sustainable development, protecting environment and sustainable natural resource use to alleviate poverty and provide alternative livelihood options to local people. UNDP has implemented several regional International Waters projects in the Eastern Europe region (such as the Danube River Basin Programme, the Black Sea Environmental Programme and the MedWet/Coast project) and will facilitate exchange of experience and lessons learnt from other established water basin secretariats and commissions as relevant and needed.

Linkages will be promoted for exchange of experience with other GEF-supported projects focusing on lake ecosystems, including the World Bank/GEF Lake Ohrid project involving Albania and the FYR of Macedonia, as well as the UNDP/GEF Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe project involving Estonia and the Russian Federation. Internet resources provided by LakeNet and IW-Learn will also be utilised. Future coordination will be explored with a World Bank/GEF Medium-sized project intending to identify and disseminate good practices on international lakes management.

The project will establish linkages with and build on the lessons learned from the GEF/World Bank Ohrid Lake Conservation Project. The Joint Macedonian-Albanian Ohrid Management Board that was created for this project is central to the management of the Ohrid Lake region. The principal role of the Board is to review and decide on management strategies proposed for the region and to monitor and supervise the implementation of programs aimed at the protection of Lake Ohrid and its watersheds. The Board has established the following multi-stakeholder task forces and committees that assist the Board in the decision-making process: (a) Task Force for Institutional Strengthening; (b) Watershed Management Committee; and (c) the Monitoring Task Force. The task forces and committees are composed of community representatives, the private and public sector, NGOs, subject matter experts and scientific institutions. Representatives of the Prespa Lake region in Albania and in the FYR of Macedonia are also members of the Ohrid lake task forces and the committee.

[11] See Annex 6. KfW co-financing table

They could provide an important future link to the Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee.

Experience shows that the structure and composition of the Ohrid lake Board proves sufficient for the multi-disciplinary management of the complex Ohrid Lake region. The Board enjoys political support on all levels. With a four-year duration, the Ohrid lake GEF project will be finalized in the current calendar year. The experience generated and lessons learnt by the Lake Ohrid project in capacity building, joint monitoring and research, and public participation activities will be extremely relevant for the proposed project. Information exchange and periodic consultation will be ensured between the Lake Ohrid teams and the proposed project teams. It is envisaged that the Ohrid Board would closely co-operate with the PPCC, and specific mechanisms for this purpose will be established during the PDF B phase.

Additionally, there are several donor-supported initiatives being launched in the Prespa region, not only related to environmental protection but also to social and infrastructure development, good governance, gender, livelihoods, tourism etc. Among the organizations, which are becoming active in the region are the Council of Europe, OSCE, Soros Foundation and USAID. The UNDP Country Offices in Albania and the FYR of Macedonia are active in country-level donor co-ordination activities and maintain contacts with many of these partners. The Secretariat of the Prespa Park CC is also engaged in compiling information and establishment of a database on various initiatives in the region aimed at promoting sustainable development. The objective of the PPCC is to ensure that the aims and objectives of these different projects are consistent with each other, that there is maximum co-operation among the different partners and minimum overlap and duplication of efforts. Co-ordination with the various development activities and projects underway in the Prespa region will be ensured during the implementation of the GEF Project.

16. Proposed Project Development Strategy:

A GEF PDF B phase is being requested for approximately $500,000 in GEF financing and is expected to be implemented within a duration of 1 year, in order to undertake preparatory activities for the preparation of the GEF Full Project. The main outputs of the PDF B are expected to be:

- establishment of the institutional structure for the project and strengthening of the PPCC and its Secretariat;
- a fully participatory and consultative process involving local level stakeholders, inter-sectoral consultations, and initial co-ordination with national, regional and international donors and partners;
- a baseline biodiversity assessment and threat analysis;
- a study of the threats to the Prespa lakes ecosystem resulting from climate change and identification of measures to mitigate threats and contribute to reduction of global carbon emissions;

- identification of the transboundary problems affecting the Prespa Park region through a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA)[12];
- identification and examination of priorities for action through broad consultations among stakeholders to be embodied in a Strategic Action Programme focusing on legal, policy, and institutional reforms and investments targeting transboundary issues;
- development of a full-fledged GEF Full Project Brief and UNDP Project Document for submission to the GEF Council in January 2003.

The PDF B will build upon ongoing and completed studies to the fullest extent, including the KfW commissioned feasibility study for the newly established Albanian National Park Prespa [13] which was undertaken in 2000, as well as the ongoing Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of Prespa Park funded by the Ministry of Environment of Greece with a grant of USD 150,000 for a first synthesis of the environmental and socio-economic status of the Prespa Park area, identification of gaps in knowledge, formulation of strategic policy and management axes, and assessment of priorities for specific projects and activities in the region.[14]

KfW is expected to co-finance certain preparatory activities during the PDF B phase for approximately $300,000. This will include support for consultations among the three countries, local and regional stakeholder workshops; collection and analysis of baseline information and research; relevant site of field surveys; as well as co-ordination with project partners to secure co-financing.

[12] During the PDF B contacts will be established with the IAEA which has a strong radio isotopes programme, in order to explore financial and technical support for parallel studies to determine the boundaries of the hyrogeological basin and the nature and extent of sub-surface flows.
[13] Schuerholz and Fremuth, 2000. Prespa Basin Conservation Program, Prespa National Park.
[14] See Annex 5 for more details on the Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park.

ANNEX 1: Map showing the Transboundary region and location of the Prespa Lakes

ANNEX 2:

Text of the Prime Ministerial Declaration of the Prespa Park

Declaration
on the Creation of the Prespa Park and the Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development of the Prespa Lakes and their Surroundings

We, Prime Ministers Costas Simitis, Ljubco Georgievski, and Ilir Meta, met today, February second of the year 2000, on the occasion of World Wetlands Day at Aghios Germanos in Greece, and agreed that the Prespa Lakes and their surrounding catchment are unique for their geomorphology, their ecological wealth, and their biodiversity, which gives the area significant international importance. The Prespa Lakes and their surroundings provide habitat for the conservation of various and rare species of flora and fauna and offer refuge for the migratory bird populations. They constitute as well a much-needed nesting place for many species of birds threatened with extinction.

We recognize that the conservation and protection of an ecosystem of such importance not only renders a service to Nature, but it also creates opportunities for the economic development of the adjacent areas that belong to the three countries. Furthermore, the long history of the human presence in the area proves the compatibility of traditional activities and knowledge, with the conservation of nature.

We are aware that conservation of Nature and sustainable development largely depend on the respect by governments and people of international legal instruments, which aim at the protection of the natural environment. Participation in such agreements and conventions is helpful for the protection of the Prespa Lakes and their surroundings. Individual national activities should be complemented by international collaboration in this field.

Furthermore, we recognize and value the importance of the work done by the Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations, especially when combining their different though complementary experiences and skills. To that effect we are pleased to recall that such a non-governmental organization, namely the Greek Society for the Protection of Prespa, was honoured in 1999 with the Ramsar Convention Award as an outstanding example of a pioneer approach to wetland management. Finally, we would like to underline the benefits of public awareness in order to achieve the goals of the protection of nature and sustainable development.

Having in mind the above, We decide to declare the "Prespa Park" as the first transboundary protected area in South Eastern Europe and present this initiative as a "gift to the earth" in the context of the WWF Living Planet Campaign. This campaign is aimed at securing the conservation of the world's most important biological resources and ecosystems into the next millennium. The "Prespa Park" consists of the respective areas around the Prespa Lakes, and each of the three countries has declared them a Ramsar Protected Site.

This Declaration will be followed by enhanced co-operation among competent authorities in our countries with regard to environmental matters. In this context, joint actions would be considered in order to a) maintain and protect the unique ecological values of the "Prespa Park", b) prevent and/or reverse the causes of its habitat degradation, c) explore appropriate management methods for the sustainable use of the Prespa Lakes water, and d) to spare no efforts so that the "Prespa Park" become and remain a model of its kind as well as an additional reference to the peaceful collaboration among our countries.

ANNEX 3

Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee

Committee's responsibilities

1. The Committee, besides its crucial political, administrative and institutional role, would also have a significant role to play in relation to technical issues, and thus the three states shall ensure that the Committee has access to the competent services in each country.

2. The Committee's main responsibility shall be to guide the course of future measures and activities so as to realise the objectives of the Prespa Park that are to:

"… *a) maintain and protect the unique ecological values of the "Prespa Park", b) prevent and/or reverse the causes of its habitat degradation, c) explore appropriate management methods for the sustainable use of Prespa Lakes waters and d) spare no efforts so that the "Prespa Park" become and remain a model of its kind, as well as an additional reference to the peaceful collaboration among our countries."*

(From the Declaration of the three Prime Ministers of 2 February 2000.)

3. In this framework, it is proposed that the Committee will have the following main responsibilities:

3.1. Prepare an inventory of all activities and projects being carried out in the Prespa region that may have a direct or indirect effect on the natural or socio-economic status of the Prespa Park.

3.2. Monitor and co-ordinate the development and implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park (see Appendix II).

3.3. Monitor and co-ordinate the implementation of specific actions/ projects based on the framework programme for the Strategic Action Plan.

3.4. Identify and propose to the relevant governments and other interested parties next steps and necessary actions according to the Strategic Action Plan. This may include institutional and legislative measures to reinforce the collaboration of the three neighbouring states in the Prespa region.

3.5. Evaluate the results of ongoing actions according to the objectives of the Strategic Action Plan, and disseminate the results widely.

3.6. Inform the governmental authorities concerned on the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan so that proposed actions are reinforced by the appropriate political decisions. In this way the Committee, shall

a) obtain the political consensus and support at the national level for the implementation of the necessary actions, and

b) identify and propose possible funding sources at a national, European and international level for all of the above areas.

4. In addition, the Committee shall ensure that information concerning development plans and other planned actions, policies and programmes with a possible effect on the Prespa Park will be made available promptly to all three sides.

5. In case of unexpected events, such as floods, forest fires and other natural or anthropogenic catastrophes, the Co-ordination Committee shall contribute to the mobilisation of resources of the three states, and the international community, as appropriate, to mitigate the negative impacts.

Operating Arrangements

The three governments involved decided to establish an interim Co-ordination Committee for the transboundary Prespa Park, during the Tirana Working Meeting of 16-17 October 2000 (Tirana Meeting Documents, point 5 of the Conclusions), chaired by the Secretary General of the Convention on Wetlands. The structure, mandate, responsibilities and operational guidelines of this Committee were included in Appendix I of the afore-mentioned Conclusions. In this Appendix provision is also made for a Secretariat to serve the Committee (par. 16 and 17).

The present document, approved by the First Meeting of the Co-ordination Committee, is meant to clarify certain operating arrangements for the Co-ordination Committee and the Secretariat, in order to render their work more effective. Naturally, the Committee may modify these arrangements if and when necessary.

A. The Co-ordination Committee (PPCC)

Structure of the Committee

1. Chairperson: The PPCC is chaired, until the beginning of the next meeting, by the representative of the state that is hosting its current meeting (starting with Albania, which has hosted the Working Meeting of 16-17 October 2000). In case of absence of the state representative, the meeting will be chaired by his alternate or by one of the other members of the country's delegation.

2. Members: Although appointed officially by the responsible government authority, all members of the Committee are considered equal and have the right to express their views and to vote (whenever required) independently. The representative of the Convention on Wetlands – MedWet can participate fully in the work of the Committee, as an *ex officio* observer, but does not have the right to vote.

3. Alternative members: Each member of the PPCC will designate an alternative person, authorised to replace him/her in case of inability to attend with full membership rights.

4. Communication: Communication among members of the Co-ordination Committee and with the Secretariat may be carried out through electronic means (preferably e-mail or, if not available, by telefax).[1]

Meetings

5. Dates of regular meetings: Unless otherwise agreed, the first regular meeting of the year will be held in the Spring and the second in the Autumn of each year. Their exact dates will be agreed at the end of the previous meeting. These dates cannot be changed, except in the case of very grave reasons, and with the agreement of all members of the PPCC.

6. Extraordinary meetings: Such meetings can be held either at the request of the Chairperson or of at least 4 members of the PPCC to deal with urgent and unexpected developments. Members should be consulted by the Secretariat as to their availability at least 2 weeks before the proposed date of such meeting. For issues of urgency, approval can also be achieved through circulation of the documents. The same procedure can be followed in relation to minor issues that, however, need the consent of all members.

[1] The Secretariat should study the possibility of connecting all members through an Intranet system, and submit a proposal on this to the Committee.

7. Place of meetings: The rotation provided for in par. 13 of Appendix I of the Conclusions of the Tirana Working Meeting can be modified by a common agreement of all members. In such a case, the meeting after will be held in the country that had normal priority for the meeting.

8. Organisation of the meetings: For each meeting, the host country will designate an official responsible for its organisation and logistics. This official will be assisted by the Secretariat, and especially by its member from the host country.

9. Agenda: The agenda of each meeting, as well as any working documents required, will be prepared by the Secretariat and agreed upon by the Chairperson. The Secretariat will take care that such documents are circulated to the members of the PPCC at least one month before the meeting, so that they have the possibility to make comments.

10. Quorum: The PPCC has a quorum when at least 7 of the 9 regular members are present. However, when two members from the same country are absent there can be no quorum.

11. Decisions: Efforts will be made to have all decisions of the PPCC taken unanimously. In case this does not prove possible, a majority of 2/3 of the votes is necessary.

12. Minutes: Summary minutes of the PPCC meetings will be kept by the Secretariat in English, with decisions taken identified clearly and reviewed before the closure of the meeting. All such decisions – if relevant - will include an indication of who will be responsible, the time frame and any financial implications. After review by the Chairperson of the particular meeting, the minutes will be circulated no later than 2 weeks after the end of each meeting. The minutes of the previous meeting will be reviewed only if one or more members request amendments to them.

13. Costs: The Committee will strive to secure funding for its meetings through various sources. This will include travel and subsistence of the delegations of the other two countries, rental of the meeting place (if no public facility is available), stationary and photocopying and reasonable hospitality expenses. The host agency will prepare at least three months in advance a budget for the meeting and submit it to the Secretariat.

14. Observers: The Chairperson of the PPCC or the representative of the host country (with the approval of the Chairperson) can invite observers to the meetings, whose functions are related or can contribute to the development of the Prespa Park. Observers will cover their own travel costs.

15. Language: English will be the working language of the PPCC meetings. Members who are not familiar with this language must make their own arrangements for translation, so that they can participate actively in the discussions.

16. Visas: The agency hosting each meeting will make the necessary arrangements with the immigration authorities of its country to ensure that visas (whenever required) are issued to all participants of each meeting, without undue delays. In case this is not feasible, the meeting will rotate to one of the other two countries, until the normal issuance of visas is ensured.

B. The Secretariat

17. Structure: The number and composition of the Secretariat staff (at least one from each country) is decided by the PPCC. At this stage, the Secretariat will consist of three persons, belonging to the non-governmental organisations members of the PPCC. These persons must:
- have an educational and professional background that is appropriate to their tasks,

- be fluent in English and with reasonable computer skills,
- be able to devote at least 50% of their time to the work of the Secretariat.

The seat of the Secretariat will be located at the SPP headquarters in Aghios Germanos, Greece.

18. Work plan: The Secretariat will prepare a yearly PPCC work plan, to be approved at the last regular PPCC meeting of the previous year. The Secretariat is also responsible for preparing issue-related work plans (e.g. a communication plan) that will be presented and approved by the PPCC. The provisions of these plans will then be incorporated accordingly into the annual plans.

19. Tasks. Besides preparation of the above-mentioned work plans, the Secretariat will work on all day-to-day issues that concern the Prespa Park as they arise. Its specific tasks are defined in its Terms of Reference that are adopted by the PPCC.

20. Guidance and supervision: The work of the Secretariat will be guided by the decisions of the PPCC and will be supervised by the Chairperson of this Committee. The Secretariat will submit to the PPCC at each meeting a brief report on its activities since the previous meeting, including a detailed financial statement where necessary.

21. Costs: The Secretariat will strive to secure funding for its operation through various sources. The relevant costs will include a modest remuneration of its members, as well as travel and operation expenses. A detailed budget for such costs shall be prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the PPCC as part of the work plan.

22. Visas: Greece will ensure that the non-Greek members of the Secretariat will receive multi-entry visas for the entire period 2001-2002.

Annex 4

Species List of the Prespa Park Region

Rare or endagered invertebrates in the Prespa area

Species	Distribution	Habitat	Importance/ Threat
Potamothrix prespensis	µ?	?	END/B
Psammoryctides ochridanus typica	µ?	?	END/B
P. o. variabilis	µ?	?	END/B
Spirosperma tenuis	µ?	?	END/B
Arctodiaptomus steindachneri	µ?	?	END/WB
Coenagrion pulchellum	µ	?	VT, KO
Platychnemis pennipes	µ	?	VT
Anisoptera			
Gomphus vulgatissimus	µ	?	VT, KO, CORINE
Calosoma sycophanta		?	RED (V) CORINE ECE (V)
Lucanus cervus		?	92/43(II) BERN (III)

Note

92/43: Directive 92/43/ EEC on the conservation of natural habitats of wild flora and fauna (NATURA 2000 Directive)

BERN: Berne Convention on the conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

CORINE: CORINE BIOTOPES PROJECT (1998) Technical hanbook1.

RED: IUCN Conservation Monitoring Centre (1988) IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

ECE: Economic Commission for Europe (1991) European Red List of Globally threatened Animal and Plant Species, UN.

END/B: Balkan endemic species

END/WB : Endemic species of the western Balkans

VT: Van Tol, J & Vendrok, M.J. (1998): The protection of drangonflies (Odonata) and their biotopes. Council of Europe, Nature and Environment No. 38, 181 pp

KO: Koomen, P. & van Helsgingen, P.J. 1993: Listing of biotopes in Europe according to their significance for invertebrates. Council of Europe, T-PVS (93) 43, 74 pp

II,III,V: Annexes of Directives, Laws etc.

Rare endemic, threatened and protected fish species

Species	Importance
Salmonidae	
Salmo trutta peristericus	??? END R/V/E ECON END
Cyprinidae	
Alburnoides bipunctatus prespensis	KOK END NAT II BERN III CORINE CRIV END
Barbus prespensis	??? END ? NAT II 92/43 V ECON END CRIV END
Chalcalburnus belvica	??? END ECON END CRIV END
Chondrostoma prespensis	??? END ECON END CRIV END
Paraphoxinus epiroticus prespensis	KOK END NAT II ECON END CRIV END
Rutilus ohridanus prespensis	KOK END NAT II ECON END CRIV END
Cobitidae	
Cobitis meridionalis	KOK END NAT II ECON END CRIV END

Note

??? Species mentioned in the Red Book of the Threatened Vertebrates of Greece (Greek Zoological Society, Athens 1992).

? Threatened
V Vulnerable
R Rare

END	Prespa endemic
NAT II	Species included in Appendix II of the Directive 92/43/?EC but it is referred to with another name in the specific Appendix, as explained in detail in the Standardized Fact Form Natura 2000 for the Micro Prespa lake (Area GR1340002, Babalonas *et al.* 1995).
92/43 V	Species included in Appendix V of the Directive 92/43/?EC for the conservation of the natural habitats of wild fauna and flora.
BERN III	Species included in Appendix III of the Bern Convention for the conservation of the European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Decision 82/72/?EC of the European Committee).
ECON END	Endemic species according to the Checklist of Freshwater Fishes of Greece (Economidis P.S., 1991).
CRIV END	Endemic species according to Crivelli *et al.* (1997).

Important amphibian species

	Species	**Importance**
1	*Salamandra salamandra*	BERN III
2	*Triturus cristatus*	92/43 II/IV BERN II
3	*Triturus vulgaris*	BERN III
4	*Bombina variegata*	92/43 II/IV BERN II
5	*Bufo buf?*	BERN III
6	*Bufo viridis*	92/43 IV BERN II
7	*Hyla arborea*	92/43 IV BERN II
8	*Pelobates syriacus*	92/43 IV BERN II
9	*Rana dalmatina*	92/43 IV BERN II
10	*Rana balcanica*	92/43 V BERN III
11	*Rana graeca*	92/43 IV BERN III

Note

92/43	Directive 92/43/?EC for the conservation of natural habitats of wild fauna and flora.
BERN	Bern Convention for the conservation of the European Wildlife and Natural Habitats.

? ?, IV, V Appendices.

Important reptile species

	Species	**Importance**
1	*Testudo hermanni*	92/43 II/IV BERN II
2	*Emys orbicularis*	92/43 II/IV BERN II
3	*Algyroides nigropunctatus*	92/43 IV BERN II END B
4	*Podarcis erchardii*	92/43 IV BERN II END B
5	*Podarcis taurica*	92/43 IV BERN II
6	*Podarcis muralis*	92/43 IV BERN II
7	*Lacerta viridis*	92/43 IV BERN II
8	*Lacerta trilineata*	92/43 IV BERN II
9	*Lacerta agilis*	92/43 IV BERN II
10	*Anguis fragilis*	BERN III
11	*Ablepharus kitaibelii*	92/43 IV BERN III
12	*Malpolon monspessulanus*	BERN III
13	*Coluber caspius*	92/43 IV BERN III
14	*Coluber gemonensis*	BERN II
15	*Elaphe situla*	92/43 II/IV BERN II

16	*Elaphe quatuorlineata*	92/43 II/IV BERN II
17	*Elaphe longissima*	92/43 IV BERN II
18	*Natrix natrix*	BERN II
19	*Natrix tessellata*	92/43 IV BERN II
20	*Coronella austriaca*	92/43 IV BERN II
21	*Vipera ammodytes*	92/43 IV BERN II
22	*Vipera berus*	BERN III

Note

92/43 Directive 92/43/?EC for the conservation of the natural habitats of wild fauna and flora.
BERN Bern Convention. Decision of the European Committee, 82/72/?EC, for the conservation of the European wild flora and fauna and the natural habitats.
END B Endemic species of the Balkans.
?,??, IV, V Appendices.

Endemic, rare threatened and protected bird species

	Species	Importance
1	*Podiceps nigricollis*	??? I ECE K
2	*Phalacrocorax carbo*	79/409
3	*Phalacrocorax pygmaeus*	??? E2 BON II 79/409 SPEC 2 ECE K
4	*Pelecanus onocrotalus*	??? E1 BON I/II 79/409 SPEC 3

5	*Pelecanus crispus*	??? E1 BON I/II CIT I 79/409 SPEC 1 ECE E
6	*Botaurus stellaris*	??? I BON II 79/409 SPEC 3
7	*Ixobrychus minutus*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 3
8	*Nycticorax nycticorax*	??? K 79/409 SPEC 3
9	*Ardeola ralloides*	79/409 SPEC 3
10	*Egretta garzetta*	
11	*Egretta alba*	??? E2 79/409
12	*Ardea purpurea*	??? V BON II 79/409 SPEC 3
13	*Ciconia ciconia*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 2
14	*Plegadis falcinellus*	??? E1 BON II 79/409 SPEC 3
15	*Anser anser*	??? E2 BON II
16	*Tadorna tadorna*	??? V BON II
17	*Anas penelope*	BON II
18	*Anas strepera*	??? K BON II SPEC 3

19	*Anas crecca*	BON II
20	*Anas platyrhynchos*	BON II
21	*Anas acuta*	BON II SPEC 3
22	*Anas querquedula*	? ? ? K BON II SPEC 3
23	*Anas clypeata*	BON II
24	*Netta rufina*	? ? ? R BON II SPEC 3
25	*Aythya ferina*	? ? ? K BON II SPEC 4
26	*Aythya nyroca*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 1
27	*Aythya fuligula*	BON II
28	*Bucephala clangula*	BON II
29	*Mergus merganser*	? ? ? E2 BON II
30	*Pernis apivorus*	BON II CIT II 79/409 SPEC 4
31	*Circaetus gallicus*	? ? ? I BON II CIT I 79/409 SPEC 3
32	*Circus aeruginosus*	BON II CIT II 79/409
33	*Circus cyaneus*	? ? ? V BON II CIT II 79/409 SPEC 3

34	*Circus pygargus*	??? E1 BON II CIT II 79/409 SPEC 4
35	*Accipiter gentilis*	BON II CIT II
36	*Accipiter nisus*	BON II CIT II
37	*Buteo buteo*	BON II CIT II
38	*Aquila chrysaetos*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 3
39	*Falco tinnunculus*	BON II CIT II SPEC 3
40	*Falco vespertinus*	BON II CIT II SPEC 3
41	*Falco columbarius*	BON II CIT II 79/409
42	*Falco subbuteo*	??? II BON II 79/409
43	*Tetrastes bonasia*	79/409
44	*Alectoris graeca*	SPEC 2
45	*Perdix perdix*	79/409 SPEC 3
46	*Coturnix coturnix*	??? K BON ?? SPEC 3
47	*Porzana parva*	??? R BON II 79/409 SPEC 4
48	*Charadrius dubius*	BON II
49	*Vanellus vanellus*	BON II
50	*Tringa glareola*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 3

51	*Actitis hypoleucos*	BON II
52	*Sterna hirundo*	79/409
53	*Chlidonias hybridus*	??? V 79/409 SPEC 3
54	*Streptopelia turtur*	SPEC 3
55	*Bubo bubo*	CIT II 79/409 SPEC 3
56	*Asio otus*	CIT II
57	*Strix aluco*	CIT II SPEC 4
58	*Athene noctua*	CIT II SPEC 3
59	*Caprimulgus europaeus*	79/409 SPEC 2
60	*Merops apiaster*	BON II SPEC 3
61	*Alcedo atthis*	79/409 SPEC 3
62	*Picus viridis*	SPEC 2
63	*Dryocopus martius*	79/409
64	*Dendrocopos syriacus*	79/409 SPEC 4
65	*Dendrocopos medius*	79/409 SPEC 4
66	*Dendrocopos leucotosi*	??? R 79/409
67	*Calandrella brachydactyla*	79/409 SPEC 3
68	*Galerida cristata*	SPEC 3
69	*Lullula arborea*	79/409 SPEC 2
70	*Alauda arvensis*	SPEC 3
71	*Riparia riparia*	SPEC 3
72	*Hirundo rustica*	SPEC 3
73	*Anthus campestris*	79/409 SPEC 3

74	*Erithacus rubecula*	BON II SPEC 4
75	*Luscinia megarhynchos*	BON II SPEC 4
76	*Phoenicurus ochruros*	BON II
77	*Saxicola torquata*	BON II SPEC 3
78	*Saxicola rubetra*	BON II SPEC 4
79	*Oenanthe oenanthe*	BON II
80	*Oenanthe pleschanka*	BON II
81	*Oenanthe hispanica*	BON II SPEC 2
82	*Monticola saxatilis*	BON II SPEC 3
83	*Turdus torquatus*	??? R BON II SPEC 4
84	*Turdus merula*	BON II SPEC 4
85	*Turdus pilaris*	BON II SPEC 4
86	*Turdus philomilos*	BON II SPEC 4
87	*Turdus viscivorus*	BON II SPEC 4
88	*Cettia cetti*	BON II
89	*Locustella luscinioides*	K?? K BON II SPEC 4
90	*Acrocephalus melanopogon*	BON II 79/409
91	*Acrocephalus shoenobaenus*	BON II SPEC 4
92	*Acrocephalus palustris*	BON II SPEC 4
93	*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*	BON II SPEC 4
94	*Acrocephalus arundinaceus*	BON II
95	*Hippolais pallida*	BON II SPEC 3

96	*Sylvia cantillans*	BON II SPEC 4
97	*Sylvia hortensis*	BON II SPEC 3
98	*Sylvia nisoria nisoria*	BON II 79/409 SPEC 4
99	*Sylvia curruca*	BON II
100	*Sylvia communis*	BON II SPEC 4
101	*Sylvia atricapilla*	BON II SPEC 4
102	*Phylloscopus bonelli*	BON II SPEC 4
103	*Phylloscopus sibilatrix*	BON II SPEC 4
104	*Phylloscopus collybita*	BON II
105	*Phylloscopus trochilus*	BON II
106	*Regulus regulus*	BON II SPEC 4
	Regulus ignicapillus	BON II SPEC 4
107	*Lanius collurio*	79/409 SPEC 3
108	*Lanius minor*	??? K 79/409 SPEC 2
109	*Lanius excubitor*	SPEC 3
110	*Lanius senator*	SPEC 2
111	*Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax*	??? K 79/409 SPEC 3
112	*Emberiza cia*	SPEC 3
113	*Emberiza hortulana*	79/409 SPEC 2
114	*Emberiza melanocephala*	SPEC 2

Note

??? Red Book of the Threatened Vertebrates of Greece (Greek Zoologial Society, Athens 1992).

- ?1 Directly threatened
- ?2 Threatened but not directly
- V Vulnerable
- R Rare
- ? Not enough known
- I Undefined

BON Bonn Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. 1979

CIT Regulation 3626/82/?EC for the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES).

79/409 Directive 79/409/?EC for the conservation of wild birds.

SPEC Species of Conservation Concern:
1. Species found in Europe and needing world-wide protection
2. Species whose world-wide population is found only in Europe and is not sufficiently protected
3. Species whose world-wide population is also found in areas other than Europe and is not sufficiently protected
4. Species whose world-wide population is found only in Europe and is sufficiently protected

ECE Economic Commission for Europe (1991) European Red List of Globally Threatened Animals and Plants, UN.

?? Appendices of Directives, Conventions etc.

Important mammal species

	Species	Importance
4	*Crocidura leucodon*	BERN III
5	*Crocidura russula*	BERN III
6	*Neomys anomalus*	92/43 II/IV BERN III KOK K
7	*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*	92/43 II/IV BERN II KOK V
8	*Rhinolophus hipposideros*	92/43 IV BERN II
9	*Myotis daubentoni*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK E

10	*Myotis nattereri*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK E ECE I
11	*Nyctalus leisleri*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK E
12	*Pipistrellus kuhli*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK V
13	*Pipistrellus nathusii*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK E
14	*Tadarida teniotis*	 BERN II KOK E ECE R
15	*Lepus europaeus*	92/43 IV BERN III
16	*Dryomys nitedula*	92/43 IV BERN III KOK R
17	*Muscardinus avellanarius*	 BERN III END ECE V
18	*Glis glis*	 BERN III
19	*Spalax leucodon*	KOK V END ECE I
20	*Micromys minutus*	
21	*Microtus epiroticus*	END
22	*Canis lupus*	BERN II KOK V CIT II RED ECE V
23	*Ursus arctos*	92/43 ✓?!? IV BERN II KOK E CIT II ECE Rev

24	*Mustela nivalis*	BERN III
25	*Martes foina*	BERN III
26	*Meles meles*	BERN III
27	*Lutra lutra*	92/43 II/IV BERN II KOK V CIT ? I RED V ECE V
28	*Felis silvestris*	92/43 IV BERN II KOK V CIT ?? II
29	*Sus scrofa*	BERN III
30	*Capreolus capreolus*	BERN III KOK V
31	*Rupicapra rupicapra*	92/43 II/IV/V BERN III KOK R

Note

92/43	Directive 92/43/?EC for the conservation of the natural habitats of wild fauna and flora.
✓	Priority species according to Directive 92/43/?EC
BERN	Bern Convention for the conservation of the European Wildlife and Natural Habitats.
? ? ?	Red Book of the Threatened Vertebrates of Greece (Greek Zoologial Society, Athens 1992).
?	Endangered
V	Vulnerable
R	Rare
CIT	Regulation 3626/82/?EC for the implementation of the Convention International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES).
RED	IUCN Conservation Monitoring Centre (1988) IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals.
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe (1991) European Red List of Globally Threatened Animals and Plants, UN.
END	Possible endemic species of the Balkans.
?, ??, IV,	Appendices of Directives, Conventions etc.

ANNEX 5

Strategic Action Plan for the Sustainable Development of the Prespa Park

The Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that is currently being developed jointly by SPP-Greece / MAP- the FYR of Macedonia / PPNEA-Albania, under the auspices of the Prespa Park Co-ordination Committee, funded by the Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works of Greece, aims at laying the foundations for the sustainable development of the region and the full establishment and functioning of the Prespa Park.

For this purpose, the following issues have been identified as the ones forming the core areas of interest of the SAP:

1. Social characteristics of the populations living within the Prespa Park area. Distribution of population, specific social and economic characteristics and needs of each sub-group. Special attention must be paid to the needs and expectations of each by the establishment of the Prespa Park.

2. Economic activities and compatibility with the Park (agriculture, livestock, fisheries etc). Evaluation of the importance of economic activities that have a significant –positive or negative- direct or indirect effect on the management if the Park area and resources. Special attention should be paid to activities that are important to local populations and could constitute significant management tools as well as sources of income and employment through their improvement in the context of the Park (e.g. controlled origin products, organic goods etc)

3. Tourism development plan for the Park. Evaluation of the potential for the development of tourism activities compatible with the conservation and sustainable development of the area. Development of guidelines and specifications for the development of an integrated approach to tourism (including eco-tourism, agro-tourism etc) working in complementarity with the management and conservation of the area. Evaluation of the potential for the creation of income and employment for local people.

4. Administrative arrangement for the establishment and operation of the Prespa Park. Identification and description of the necessary arrangements including the legal establishment of the Park combining the national and international levels, and preparation of the necessary legal acts.

5. Management and operation, staffing. Identification and description of the appropriate management body for the Prespa Park, proposed composition, staff and responsibilities. Identification of needs in terms of infrastructure and resources.

6. Prespa Park resources, funding of works, maintenance and operation. Identification of the appropriate funding sources for the different actions at a national and international level, including national schemes, European funds, international donor organizations and initiatives (REReP, KfW, GEF etc), donations and private participation.

7. Description of necessary works and interventions and identification of costs. This includes all the works and activities that will be identified by the previous chapters, additional studies and all the programmes for the management and operation of the Prespa Park (e.g. wardening, monitoring etc)

8. Other programmes in support of the Park and funding sources. Description of complementary activities in support the Park operation and development (e.g. agricultural development, human resources training) and proposals for funding under EU or other funding programmes.

Finally the collection and presentation of data will be done only to the extent that is necessary to support the above issues, since the study is not an inventory but a strategic approach to the sustainable development of the Prespa Park.

ANNEX 6

Related Project Interventions supported through KfW in the Prespa Region

Location	Title	Short Description	Budget in US$	Duration
1. Prespa Lake, the FYR of Macedonia	Environmental Protection L. Prespa – Sewerage Project	Reduction of (mainly) organic effluents into L.Prespa by rehabilitation & extension of existing wastewater facilities	7 Mio Grant	In preparation
2. Prespa Region (Albania & FYR Macedonia)	Prespa Trans-Boundary Reserve	Same approach as project outlined in concept paper – baseline (focusing on mgt. plans & subsequent civil works measures / equipment supply)	4 Mio Grant	" "
3. Prespa Region, the FYR of Macedonia (in part)	Social Infrastructure I & II	Rehabilitation / construction of small-scale social/ economic infrastructure (water, sewerage, solid waste, rural roads etc.) on participatory basis for 13 communities in the FYR of Macedonia	~ 1.5 Mio Grant (regional share)	2001- 2003
4. Prespa Region, Albania	Social Investment Fund II – "Prespa Component"	Rehabilitation / construction of small-scale social/ economic infrastructure on participatory basis, specifically for communities adjacent to Albanian Prespa NP, in co-ordination with conservation authorities & NGOs; with Albanian development Fund (ADF) as impl. agency	0.3 Mio Grant	2001 - 2002
Budget Total			**~ 12.8 Mio**	

Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Transboundary Prespa Park Region

Annex 7: CONCEPTUAL MODEL