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ABSTRACT

The study aims to provide a systematized comparison underlining the strengths and weaknesses of the existing organizational structures for the management of protected areas along the Danube and to formulate some recommendations for their improved functioning. The results are based on information and data provided by the representatives of most of the management bodies within the DANUBEPARKS network by the means of questionnaires, interviews and workshops.

The first part of the report outlines an overall picture of the existing management organizations, by comparing their situation concerning the staff, financing sources and systems, types of structural arrangements, governance systems, fields of responsibilities and management tasks, as well as their integration within local and national or international networks. The comparison allows for both – evidencing the diversity of contexts and arrangements within the network and identifying the major issues that are challenging the management of these organizations. Some of the most frequent challenges are related to: the insufficient number of staff and budgets, doubled by the insufficient means to motivate the staff, the rigidity of the financing and budget allocation systems, low authority and decision-making power in fields relevant for the management of the protected areas, the insufficient capacity and expertise in some management fields (e.g. community outreach and integrated development, communication and networking, project development and management, conservation and restoration of some habitats, river morphology), as well as the difficulties of coordinating the multitude of actors that have management responsibilities for the territories and resources inside the protected areas. Some of the most particular models are detailed in textboxes.

The analysis frames the existing management bodies in a “triangle”, ranging between the 3 fundamental types of organizations: state administration, state company and NGO and describes the main strengths and weaknesses of each type. Most of the existing structures are a pure or hybrid model of state administration, which is not, in most of the cases, an authority, while NGOs have, at the moment, the role of an active partner for the management bodies, without being assigned the full management responsibility and authority.

The lessons learned and best practice recommendations coming from the practical experience within each type of organizational structure, which were collected during the interviews with the protected area managers, are integrated into the last chapter dedicated to recommendations and conclusions. Most of these refer to the most successful approaches of the relation with the stakeholders - based on transparency, openness, communication and participation, as well as to approaches to attracting and valuing the internal resources effectively.

Based on the results of the analysis as well as on the best practices coming from the network members, a series of recommendations were provided for the different levels: the protected area / organization level, the national level (coordinating) authorities and the DANUBEPARKS level.
1 INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

1.1 The context and structure of the study

The DANUBEPARKS Network, bringing together 15 protected areas from 8 Danube countries (Status beginning 2013), is not only a network of natural areas, but also and above all a network of protected area (PA) administrations. The organizational and legal structures of these administrations differ as much as the natural values are diverse along the whole Danube River. Depending on regional and national circumstances and legal provisions as well as on protection category, there are different models of structures and arrangements.

Most of these organizations are relatively recent and have been established in the sometimes dynamic enabling conditions that characterize Eastern European countries.

The study includes:

- a short presentation of its objectives, working structures and methodology
- a presentation of the results – structured to follow the issues that are considered the “pillars” of an organization: the staff, the financing system, the structures, the governance system and responsibilities, the integration within wider networks as well as the context.
- an analysis of advantages and disadvantages of different systems
- general conclusions and recommendations

1.2 Objectives

The study aims to:

- provide an insight into and a systematized comparison between some of the existing organizational structures for the management of protected areas along the Danube.
- inform about some advantages and disadvantages of different organizational systems, as resulting from the experience of its managers and members. This is not realized for the individual site level. This requires a more in-depth structured analysis, which is not the aim of this study.
- derive recommendations for improving the protected area management organizations along the Danube

The in-depth interviews, presented as case-studies aimed to:

1) depict the current situation and the main challenges of some PA management organizations along the Danube and to make a comparison of PA structures, systematized around several pre-selected themes.

2) explore more into depth the issues of governance, tasks, responsibilities and financing

3) present some “portraits” of different organizations with their specifics, their lessons learned, advantages and limitations from their context

1.3 Methods and working steps

1.3.1 Working steps

1. Coordination meeting with Donau-Auen National Park to jointly define the methodologies, communication process, workflow and results and the ongoing communication with the protected areas.

2. The definition of themes and indicators and the design of the questionnaire

3. The collection of information by questionnaire about basic facts
and figures
4. The Directors’ workshop (Hainburg an der Donau, Austria), where the preliminary results were discussed
5. In-depth interviews with selected protected areas for a more into depth analysis of some case studies
6. Draft report – submitted and revised by the network members
7. Presentation of results at the Steering Committee Meeting in Tulcea, Romania in August 2013.
8. Final report, including the comments and observations provided by the network members and Steering Committee Meeting (SCM).

1.3.2 Methods

The analysis carried out based mainly on information collected from the network members, by using the following tools:

- A semi-standardized questionnaire – including open and multiple-choice questions, that was delivered to all the network members in order to gather information concerning the staff (number, composition, characteristics), the organization (type, structure, functions), the role and tasks of these organizations and the integration in and interaction with local and national/regional level networks – (Annex 1).

- Semi-driven interviews – that have been conducted by Skype with six members (5 protected areas and an NGO – see list of the interview partners in Annex 3), meant to explore more into detail some different types of protected area organizations and to document different funding and decision-making systems as well as the different share of responsibilities regarding land use1. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with two PAs while two others responded to the same questions in writing via e-mail.

- Working groups and open discussions that were organized at the Directors’ Workshop in Hainburg an der Donau, Austria on the 14-16th of May2.

In the first stage, 12 of the 14 protected area management organizations filled in the preliminary questionnaire.

The information collected by the means of this questionnaire was analysed by using Microsoft Excel and was qualitatively interpreted. The results are presented in a graphic-supported way.

Three coordination meetings organized at the beginning, mid and end of the project provided a framework for interactive discussions and provision of feedback that play an important role in checking the results and developing realistic conclusions in a participatory way.

NOTE: In the case of Dunajske Luhy Protected Landscape Area (Slovakia), which is officially managed by the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic, the questionnaire was filled in and submitted by BROZ, an NGO which, although is not officially managing the site, has part of the land inside the PA in concession and conducts many activities in this area which are supporting its management. Therefore, the figures are referring to BROZ and not the management organization of Dunajske Luhy Protected Landscape Area. Given their particular statute, BROZ was introduced in the figures as a reference point, but was not taken into account when calculating the averages. Hence, the average values for each indicator refer only to the protected area management bodies, whose responsibility is assigned by law.

State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic, which is the manager of the 2 Protected Landscape Areas (Dunajske Luhy and Zahorie), has the statute of observer within the network, therefore these protected areas were not included in the analysis.

1 The guidelines for interviews are available in Annex 2.

2 The minute of the workshop is available in Annex 4.
2 PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS ALONG THE DANUBE – FACTS AND FIGURES

2.1 The context of the network

2.1.1 Protected areas within the network

The network includes 15 protected areas (Table 1) from 8 countries, featuring a large diversity of different (inter)national categories for conservation and management systems (e.g. national parks, nature parks, Natura 2000 sites, RAMSAR sites, etc.) (Fig. 1, Tab.1). The 15 protected areas are being managed by 14 organizations3.

Figure 1: The DANUBEPAKRS region – categories of protected areas and number of protected areas (as of July 2013)

Table 1: Protected areas included in the DANUBEPAKRS Network (int. PA-category based on www.protectedplanet.net; www.ramsar.org; natura2000.eea.europa.eu; as of October 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of protected area</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>IUCN Cat.</th>
<th>Other intern. Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>UNESCO MBBR, UNESCO World Heritage, RAMSAR, Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djerdap National Park</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunai-Ipoly National Park</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>RAMSAR, Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunai-Drava National Park</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>RAMSAR, Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonjsko Polje Nature Park</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopacki Rit Nature Park</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>RAMSAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtice Landscape Protected Area</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunajski Iuzy Landscape Protected Area</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>RAMSAR, Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donau-Auen National Park</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>RAMSAR, Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persina Nature Park</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimok-Brushlen Protected Site</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusenski Lom Nature Park</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Nature 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube Riparian Forest LPA</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Nature 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Categorization is often inconsistent and does not necessarily correspond with the current tasks and objectives of the respective management (e.g. Serbia – see Sekulic 2011)

The area of the sites included in the network varies considerably, ranging between a maximum of 600,000 ha (Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve) and 3.000 ha – Danube Riparian Forest (Table 1).

2.1.2 Land property and management

Land ownership is a very important context factor for organizations managing protected areas determining and shaping the relations between stakeholders and the protected areas on one side and their relation with the protected area management on the other. In the same

3 Kalimok-Brushlen Protected Site is managed by Rusenski Lom Nature Park.
time, land ownership and management arrangements can influence the structure, the role and tasks as well as the financing system of the protected area management organizations.

As envisaged in Fig. 2, there is a strong predominance of state owned land in the protected areas within the network. In almost half of the sites public property represents more than 90% of the total area.

The weight of the private lands is smaller – in most of the sites it represents less than 20% to 36% of the total area (Fig. 2). Considerable shares of private property are to be found in Dunajské Luhy Protected Landscape Area (36%), Rusenski Lom Nature Park (31%), Persina Nature Park (30%) and Fertő-Hansag National Park (20%). Danube Riparian Forest (representing 70% of its total area) and in Duna-Drava National Park (60%) show the largest shares of private property within their boundaries.

However, even when state lands are predominant, the responsibility for the management of the state-owned territory (both land and water bodies) is most often shared by a multitude of stakeholders – i.e. state institutions, governmental agencies, municipalities - that have to be coordinated and supervised by the protected area administrations.

A particular situation within the network is the fact that park management bodies that are managing part of the state land themselves also have the right to transfer this responsibility to others based on a lease or concession. This is the case for:

- Hungarian Nature Protection Directorates – which are managing part of the state lands in the protected areas under their jurisdiction – e.g. Duna Drava Nature Directorate manages 20% of the land in the park. They can also purchase lands from the private owners, when money is available from the state budget (which is also the case of Persina Nature Park) and lease the state lands to municipalities or privates.
- Donau-Auen National Park – which manages 400 ha of a non-intervention area owned by WWF Austria.
- Djerdap National Park – which manages most of the natural resources in the park (e.g. forest, fishery, game).

In the case of Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve, its administration has the responsibility to manage some state owned natural resources (e.g. fish, reed). In cases when protected area management organizations can manage state land by income-generating activities that supplement their budget, the predominance of state lands inside protected areas is an opportunity for them to improve their management capacity.

The predominance of state lands may reduce the risk of conflicts generated by land use rights in the context of restrictions for conservation purposes and enables the adequate application of conservation measures. The risk of conflicts is amplified by the recent or ongoing land restitution process - that happened in most of the Eastern European countries – and by the lack of financial compensation for land owners affected by restrictions associated to
nature conservation.

High fragmentation of land ownership and the prevalence of private lands may represent a challenge for the management organizations of areas with a more restrictive conservation regime, especially when compensatory measures are not sufficiently working (e.g. Bulgaria, Romania). In this context, it is often difficult for management bodies to convince land owners to get actively involved into management planning or into carrying out management measures. Private owners often associate protected areas with restrictive use or non-use, with restrictions on some funding, or with additional bureaucracy and time-consuming administration (e.g. more permits, more papers to fill for agri-environmental payments).

Despite its participatory approach towards the management planning process, it was not possible for the administration of Persina Nature Park to “find a way to work out with the farmers” and to set any measures for the management of private agricultural lands.

Thus, organizations managing protected areas need a system to control compliance with the law on the site and sufficient staff dedicated to the fields of communication, education and awareness, as well as to community outreach and regional / local development.

However, even if private or public-private ownership prevails, the management of protected areas can prevent or overcome conflicts and tensions by providing financial compensation to land owners (e.g. Danube Riparian Forest LPA).

2_1_3 The historical, political and socio-economic context of the network

The historical-political background of the countries within the network has strong influence on the functioning of their current social, administrative and political systems in general and in particular on their culture of governance, on the way that the management of the common goods is organized. The greatest part of the network includes countries from Central and Eastern Europe, with a long history under the communist regime and a period of transition of a quarter of century (i.e. Slovakia, Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania), while the western part of Danube's basin has a longer tradition of capitalism and decentralized administration.

Relevant background conditions of these countries that are determining the governance system, the design and the functioning of the organizations for the management of protected areas are as follows:

- the legacy of centralized governance systems with a strong involvement of the state and lack of tradition for public participation regarding decision-making, especially in the field of nature conservation;
- a certain level of political and economic instability, with frequent changes of regulations and institutional systems of staff or/and leaders.

These aspects explain many of the limitations and challenges of the PA management and their structures.

---

4 Stela Bozhinova, National Park Director – interview 16.07.2013
2.2 Staff

2.2.1 Total number of staff

Specifications regarding the data

In some cases the data concerning the total number of staff didn’t allow for a comparison of the PA management bodies within the network. Thus, the Hungarian national parks are managed by the Regional Nature Protection Directorates, which are responsible for the management of all the protected areas within their wider region.

Therefore, their total number of staff (represented in Fig. 3) is not responsible only for the national parks. Gornje Podunavlje SNR (Serbia) is managed by the regional office of Vojvodina Forest Authority without having a special management unit with dedicated staff. PA management activities are done by the staff which is in-charge mainly with forestry activities, under the coordination of a person in-charge with nature protection. The numbers depicted in Fig. 3 represent the staff of the whole Regional Office Sombor – in whose jurisdiction Gornje Podunavlje SNR is situated.

In addition to their permanent staff members (whose numbers are reflected by Fig. 3), some organizations are supplementing their human capacity by employing seasonal or part-time staff (as in the case of Gornje Podunavlje SNR – who engages people in, for example, replanting, thinning, harvesting activities, but which are not in direct connection with the protected area) or by involving volunteers (as in the case of BROZ and some park administrations). A special system is in place in Hungary, where the Park Directorates engage the social assisted persons in different activities (e.g. clearing invasive species, cutting the reed, taking care of the animals, etc). These persons are supposed to provide some work for the benefit of the community in order to receive their welfare from the state.

Figure 3: Protected area staff – total number and evolution

(As of May 2013; sorted by total number of staff). It should be taken into account that the number of staff working in the area can differ if more than one organization is working on protected area management tasks in an area (e.g. BROZ – thus coloured differently).
Small and medium sized organizations, with less than 31 permanent members, represent half of the total number included in the network, (Fig. 3a). While the smallest one – i.e. Danube Riparian Forest (6 people) – manages the smallest PA in the network (see Table 1), Rusenski Lom Nature Park (including Kalimok–Brushlen Protected Site), Persina Nature Park and Lonjsko Polje Nature Park, which are the following smallest organizations are managing much wider protected areas. This results in a low density of staff per 10 km² (Fig. 3a) – i.e. 0.3 – 0.7.

The number of staff per area of protected area reflects the capacity of the organization for law enforcement and monitoring. The value of this indicator ranges from 0.2 to 2.3 persons / 10 km² – excluding the case of Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve – where the total number of the staff working in the regional forest administration is counted and the case of the Hungarian Nature Protection Directorates, whose staff have a wider area under their jurisdiction besides that of the Danubian parks (Figure 3).

The management organizations are facing different trends concerning the evolution of their staffing size, probably depending on economic and political changes in each country and on local factors. However, the results of the data collected and of the interviews indicate that most of them seem to enlarge their staffing (Fig. 3b).

### 2.2.2 Age and gender

Concerning the age of the staff of the DANUBE PARKS Network member organizations, there is a slight imbalance concerning the age structure in most of the cases, given by the predominance of staff over 30 years old.
predominant (Danube Riparian Forest – 67% and Rusenski Lom Nature Park – 57%). With an average value of 8%, ranging from 2% to maximum 30% (Fig. 4), the staff under 30 years old represents a minority. As shown in Fig. 4, the organizations with the largest number of young people (<30 years old) within the network are Fertő-Hansag National Park (33%) and Persina Nature Park (30%).

The percentage of women working in the organizations along the Danube varies between 16% and 80%, with an average of 42% (Fig. 5).

Five organizations have more than 50% female staff: Fertő-Hansag National Park, Donau-Auen National Park, Rusenski Lom Nature Park and Persina Nature Park (Fig. 5). BROZ also shows a large share of female staff.

### 2.2.3 Level of education and training

In general, more than half of the staff working in the DANUBEPARKS organizations has an academic education (58% of the total staff in average). Although six organizations out of the twelve are situated below this average, only four of them have less than 50% of their staff with an academic background (Fig. 6).

![Figure 5: Protected area staff by gender](image)

(As of May 2013; sorted by percentage of female staff)

![Figure 6: Protected area staff by level of education](image)

(As of May 2013; sorted by absolute numbers of young staff)
The highest relative weights of staff with an academic degree are recorded in the two PAs in Bulgaria: Rusenski Lom Nature Park (100%) and Persina Nature Park (80%) and in two Hungarian Regional Directorates: Duna-Drava (82%) and Duna-Ipoly (78%), followed by BROZ (75%).

The lowest (relative) numbers of staff with an academic background are observed in both Serbian PAs (16% Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve and 29% in Djerdap National Park).

### 2.2.4 Educational background

Irrespective of its type and territorial context, each protected area has to balance its relations with both the natural and the socio-economic systems, to integrate in its wider territories and to contribute, to a different extent, to the development of its neighbouring communities and regions. This complex mission requires a combination of competences from different fields of expertise.

In the case of the DANUBEPARKS network, more than half of the PA staff (57% on average) has its educational background in natural sciences, while staff specialized in fields of human sciences (e.g. economics, law, administration, politics, social sciences) represent less than a quarter (15% in total - Fig. 7b). This is mostly the staff engaged in administrative work and only few of them are engaged as experts in their fields.

Besides BROZ, six other organizations out of 12 have more than half of their staff educated in the field of natural sciences. The biggest percentage of this category from the total staff is recorded in Duna-Ipoly National Park (87%), Rusenski Lom Nature Park (86%), and Duna-Drava National Park (80%), together with BROZ (75%) (Fig 7a).
Danube Delta BR administration shows the lowest percentage of staff with a background in natural sciences (21%).

At a glance, these figures indicate that the PA management organizations are mostly dealing with the natural dimension of the management and a lower number of specialists covers the human dimension, referring to e.g. communication, territorial development, tourism, marketing or community outreach. However, the existence of such positions in most of the protected areas of the study (as shown by the organizational charts) reflects the transition to a modern, more integrative approach towards the management.

### 2.2.5 Work experience

The competences, attitudes, systems of values, connections and practical experiences developed by the protected area staff during their previous jobs might represent an advantage and asset for the organization. A mixture of different skills, values, approaches, etc, coming from different organizational cultures and environments in which the staff “grew up” can enrich the protected area management organizations.

Most of the staff has previously worked in the private sector – both profit (36%) and non-profit (9%).

Data show that:

- Almost a third of the staff (29%) worked in the public administration (Fig. 8b). All the organizations have a certain number of employees with experience in public administration.
- The largest (relative) percentage of staff coming from this field is recorded in the Hungarian national parks (whose employees are mostly public servants) and in Danube Riparian Forest—which is managed within the public administration system (Fig. 8a).
- More than a quarter of the staff has been working in the protected area management administrations since they graduated. Duna-Drava National Park has the largest percentage of staff working in the organization from the very beginning of their professional life – i.e. 70% (Fig. 8a).
- In average, only a minority (9%) had worked in the non-governmental field before. This is the case in half of the PAs namely Danube Riparian Forest, Donau-Auen National Park, Rusenski Lom Nature Park and Duna-Ipoly National Park.

Although most of the current staff (36%) seems to have worked in the private sector (company), responses probably refer to state companies. This could be due to the fact that the current PA management sector often was developed from the respective forest management system, which is assigned to the state forest companies or enterprises.

The largest percentages of staff, which had worked previously in companies, were reported in Lonjsko Polje Nature Park, Kopački Rit Nature Park and Donau-Auen National Park.
2.2.6 Staff levels and roles

To gain a more detailed image of the share of responsibilities within the organizations and of the human resources available to fulfill their mission the staff positions listed in the questionnaires were classified into 4 levels:

1. **Directorial staff** (directors, heads of the departments),
2. **Expert, technical and middle management staff**, specialized in different fields of activity (research, nature conservation, tourism, education or public relation officers),
3. **Field staff** (rangers and guardians)
4. **Auxiliary staff** (administrative staff, economists, secretariat, workers, etc).

At the network level half of the staff is represented by rangers and other field staff (e.g. forest guards), while around a quarter is engaged in expert positions (Fig. 9a). The proportions are balanced but with a high number of auxiliary staff. This could be linked to the fact that some of the organizations are independent, self-standing units (either private companies or state administrations) that have to cover all functions of an institution, including the administrative part.

The data confirms what was already indicated by the educational background of the staff and by the structure. Most of the expert staff is engaged in nature conservation activities (e.g. nature conservation expert, natural resource manager, researcher) and a much smaller proportion is working in the fields of communication and public relations, education or tourism (Fig. 9b).

---

6 The numbers can be different; it was not clear from the classification if certain positions are experts or rangers. The “technical staff” for example was classified as field staff.
NOTE: In Fig. 9b, even though the number of staff engaged in tourism seems to be larger than the number of conservation experts, the least category includes also the researchers and most probably the greatest majority of what was classified as “undefined experts”.

However, the activities in these fields (communication, education, tourism) are most probably additionally handled by rangers and other staff members.

No positions were identified in community outreach, local/regional development, awareness raising, marketing and P.R. Very few people are working in communication, which is crucial for the long term sustainability of a PA management, acceptance amongst stakeholders, participatory management, local and regional development.

Most of the staff being classified as experts is working in positions dealing with the natural dimension of protected area management, while fewer are engaged in the management of the human dimension (e.g. ecotourism, environmental educators, communication and visitor management, lawyers, etc).

The relatively high number of staff employed in tourism shows the increasing importance for the protected area management. Particularly, visitor infrastructures such as visitor centres require a large number of staff to maintain the infrastructure and perform visitor services.

To gain a better understanding on how management tasks are shared between the staff and the correlation between their competences and responsibilities, a more in-depth analysis is recommended.

---

Figure 9: Staff levels and areas of expertise for the expert staff positions (as of May 2013)
2.3 Financing

The main funding sources for the management of the DANUBEPAKRS (Fig. 10) are:

- public/state budget – 45% (out of which 39% is regular public funding).
- own incomes – 32% (out of which 24% from land use activities and 8% from services organized and managed by the protected area managements).
- projects – 23% mostly from EU funds. Project-based funding is the most variable source of income, which is also limited in time. The situation in year 2012 might not be representative.

Although in all the cases the protected areas have a mixed structure of funding, most of them are funded from the state budget and are relying on public funds. A peculiar situation is that Hungarian Nature Protection Directorates, which have a rich mixture of funding sources.

However, different funding systems and mechanisms are in place within the network, some allowing to the park administrations to generate their own income intended for PA management activities.

Based on the data available for year 2012, three categories of funding systems can be outlined:

- funding systems based mostly on the state/public budget – in which most of input resources that are constantly allocated to support the activity of the management organization are coming from the local or central state budget.
- funding systems supported partly by financial resources generated by the PA management body, in which the PA management organizations, can generate their own income by organizing and providing services from land or resource use activities, while a certain amount of money is provided yearly from the state budget. This can be also be supplemented by projects.
- funding systems based mostly on the state/public budget – in which most of input resources that are constantly allocated to support the activity of the management organization are coming from the local or central state budget.

---

7 To be noted that the analysis is based on the information provided by the protected areas concerning their structure of budget in 2012, expressed in percentages against 4 predefined categories (Annex 1). As it was confirmed during the interviews, in most of the cases the weight of each source can vary considerably.

8 The average of the weights for all the PAs providing data.
The “route” of this money is different: in some cases it goes directly into the budget of the organization (e.g. Hungarian Directorates, Donau-Auen National Park), while in others the money goes to the state budget or to the budget of the central authority in charge of nature conservation (e.g. the Ministries of Environment – in most of the countries, the Ministry of Culture – in Croatia, the Executive Forest Agency – in Bulgaria, which is budgeting the activity of the PA management body).

- systems entirely based on non-state resources - in which the whole/most of the budget for the PA management is generated by its own management body, with very little or without any contribution from the state budget – i.e. Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve (managed by the regional state forest service).

In the case of Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve the management authority is Vojvodinašume – the Forest Management Authority of the Vojvodina Region. The management of the reserve is financed by the budget of the company which is generated by forest management activities. The reserve doesn’t have its own management unit within the regional office of the Forest Authority.

BROZ - a non-governmental organization has a special system of funding by having its budget based almost exclusively on projects. In addition to projects, the organization is running tourism activities, raising cattle and managing land.

**Mechanisms in place for income-generation**

A financing system based on a mixture of funding sources tends to be more stable and decreases the risk of blockages. Some of the management systems within the network allow management units to develop and run their own income generating activities. Different mechanisms and arrangements are in place for this purpose, such as:

- the transfer of land or resource management rights to the PA management body (e.g. parks in Hungary, Djerdap National Park, Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority, BROZ).
the right of the PA management body to lease and rent out the land, its infrastructure or patrimony (e.g. Croatian and Hungarian parks).

For example, Kopački Rit Nature Park – which owns some land outside the park, where the visitor center is located – is renting part of the space to a private person as an additional source of money supplementing the budget. Similarly, Donau-Auen National Park rents out a space in its visitors’ center in Orth a.d. Donau for a buffet.

The Hungarian Nature Protection Directorates have two alternative ways for generating money out of state lands and resources under their direct responsibility: (1) the renting out of land to private persons or municipalities (based on a contract, for a limited term and under conditions set by the Directorate) and (2) the sale of primary or final products generated by their own activities (e.g. wood, animals, etc). However, the main aim of these activities is the proper management of the habitats (as grasslands, forests).

mechanisms for the development of income generating activities and for the provision of services.

The Regional Nature Protection Directorates in Hungary are running own economic activities such as agriculture, ecotourism, forestry and provision of services (e.g. guidance). For this purpose, the administration has the right to manage parts of the state land, has its own animals, infrastructure and technical resources as well as socially assisted workers available (Textbox 1).

Djerdap National Park Public Company is an independent public company which manages the forest in the park, the fisheries, game and tourism.

Donations and sponsoring represent a small share in the budget of the DANUBEPARKS organizations. However, their existence proves not only that these organizations are becoming increasingly visible, trustworthy and important for their mission in the eyes of the public but also that additional money can be attracted.

One of the best examples is that of Persina Nature Park, which ensured co-financing for some of its projects from donations and corporate volunteering activities (Textbox 2).

Donau-Auen National Park (Austria) and Danube Riparian Forest (Germany) reported collaboration with international partners (e.g. Audi, Bayerisches Umweltministerium, REWE, “Ja natürlich” bio-line) resulting in sponsoring and funding.

The structure of the organizations and their functioning are considerably influenced by their financing system.

In the case of Duna-Drava Regional Directorate, for example, a special Department on Property Treating exists, whose responsibilities are related not only to the purchase of land and administrative procedures but also with cadastre, forestry and agriculture activities.

Djerdap National Park Public Enterprise has departments specialized in forest management (with staff specialized in forestry, the protection and improvement of game and private ownership), a department of marketing, as well as staff specialized in cadastre, information systems, physical planning and landscape planning.
Duna Drava National Park (Hungary)

In 2012 Duna Drava National Park Directorate (DDNPD) received 20% of its budget from land use activities, while the rest of was supplemented from services, projects and state budget (Figure 10).

The state lands in the national park (and in other protected areas under its jurisdiction) can be managed (1) by the National Park Directorate (NPD) or (2) can be leased by the Directorate to the municipalities or to the privates, who pay the NPD for this. Thus, the Directorate can earn money from both leases and the selling of wood or animals. The Directorate rents the land for a limited term (4 years), based on a contract in which the conditions for the land management are set according to the management needs of the habitat (period for mowing, number of machines to be used, etc.) and it monitors and controls the implementation of this contract and the compliance with the law.

The NPD manages 20% of the land in the park – including grasslands and meadows which are state-owned. To ensure proper management of these meadows, the NPD grows 213 grey cattle and 787 sheep, which are grazing these areas. The NPD can also buy land, if money is available from the state budget.

In the same time, the NPD earns money by valuing the forest in the national park not by selling or cutting the wood directly, but by selling the right to extract a certain amount of wood from the forest to private companies. These companies submit a request /letter of interest for cutting wood in a specific area and there is an auction. They are then responsible for the whole work – they cut the wood, they do the forestry tasks – taking the wood out, replanting and they pay the money for it to the NPD. The Directorate manages 167 ha of fishery ponds, where it also has the right for fishing.

In addition, the Directorate organizes ecotourism activities in 25 protected areas under its jurisdiction (including the national park), as well as cultural and educational events and activities. Its tourism offer includes hiking tours, photo tours, cycling tours and canoeing on the Danube and Drava. For this purpose, the Directorate runs 6 visitor centres.

To be able to organize all these activities, the NPD owns and manages all infrastructures necessary for its administrative and agricultural activities (4 offices, 24 farm buildings).

Source: Interview with Eszter Buchert – NP Vice-Director (24.07.2013)

Persina Nature Park (Bulgaria)

In the last three years the park benefited from several donations which were used by the park for co-financing some projects:

- GLOBUL mobile phone company has donated 4.000-5.000 EUR per year during the last three years to all the parks in Bulgaria;
- In 2011 BTV (Bulgarian Television Company) donated 1.000 EUR to the park for organizing local people to remove waste in a part of the park;
- In 2012 and 2013 some companies from Bansk came with their staff to build some infrastructure (some bridges or banks) in the park as part of a national level program. They paid 3.000-4.000 EUR to the park administration.

Source: Interview with Stela Bozhinova – NP Director (16.07.2013)
Joint funding system

In the case of Danube –Riparian Forest LPA, the budget is approved and provided by the two partner administrations. The main advantage in this case is the lower risk of blockages.

Funding through own income generating activities

The advantages of a business-like approach to PA management underlined in the case of Donau Auen are: (i) the opportunity it provides for a more effective use of resources, (ii) the greater flexibility – the organization can act and re-act quicker, can decide how to re-invest its money, has the possibility to co-finance its projects on its own resources, and (iii) its less bureaucratic procedures.

However, except for Gornje Podunavlje SNR, which is managed by the forest management company, all the other organizations within the network receive part of their budget from the state. Thus, they are not fully depending on own income generating activities. A financing system based on mixed funding is considered more stable, flexible and resilient.

The NGO system

This type of organization is often independent, which results in a greater flexibility concerning the budget allocation (except for the case of projects, when their budgets and rules have to be respected). However, NGOs are lacking stability, as their budgets have to be ensured most often on a project basis. A major challenge in this case is ensuring the co-financing for projects. Partnerships with state institutions are sometimes developed for this purpose, as in the case of BROZ, which is implementing LIFE projects in partnership with the Ministry of the Environment in Slovakia. Since the possibility to ensure financial resources on a long-term is not guaranteed, maintaining a constant number of employees cannot be guaranteed and might as well as affect their overall stability of the organization.

2.4 Organizational structures – functions, relations and integration

2.4.1 Structures and functions

The organizational structures widely vary, from “flat” or “unstructured” ones, to more complex systems depending on the responsibilities and on the functions to be fulfilled. Depending on their complexity and sets of functions the following organizational types can be distinguished within the network:

- Primary, “unstructured” structures – as in the case of Danube Riparian Forest.
  
  Since 2011 the protected area is managed by the municipality of Ingolstadt together with the regional administration of the Land Neuburg-Schrobenhausen, without having an administrative body established for this particular aim, based on a formal agreement between the two institutions. Each of the two administrations allocates part of its budget for the management of this area and has altogether six employees which are in charge with this task and which are coordinated by the two DANUBEPARKS project managers. The two parts are working very closely together and have jointly developed a management plan and jointly implement management activities and projects making this a collaborative type of management and governance.

- Simple, (relatively) “flat” structures – meant for the management of a particular protected area only. This is the case of the nature park administrations in Bulgaria (Persina and Rusenski Lom) and Croatia (Lonjsko Polje Nature Park and Kopački Rit Nature Park) as well as of Donau-Auen National Park.

  Such organizations are small or medium sized and, by their responsibilities, these have the role of local (site) level coordinators for other actors responsible for the actual management of lands, resources and territories from their operational area. Their staff is organized in small compartments/services which are subordinated to a Director. Their staff covers most of the management fields
(tourism, nature conservation, public relations, administrative and technical works). These structures usually also include a ranger service/compartment. These organizational structures are not very hierarchical and allow for a close interaction between all staff members. Amongst these, Donau-Auen National Park has the most complex organization in terms of responsibilities, where four departments cover the full range of tasks.

Some protected areas of this organizational type use their capacity to provide services such as Donau-Auen National Park and the two parks in Croatia (Lonjsko Polje and Kopački Rit).

- Complex, hierarchical structures – meant for the management of a wider area and for a wider complexity of functions - including land management and economic activities – sometimes having also as well as the role of an authority. This is the case of the Regional Directorates for Nature Protection in Hungary, of Djerdap National Park and of Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve.

Vojvodinaštume – the management authority of Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve is a special case. The wide complexity of this organization is not in connection with the management of the protected area, but derives from its specialized role as a forest management authority at regional level. In its structure, the coordination of protected area management, which more categories of staff are partially involved into, belongs to only a single person, who is working in the Planning and Management Service and is also in charge of the management of other PAs within the region.

Some of these complex organizations have regional level responsibilities, fulfilling the role of:

- Regional protected area management agency, which is responsible for the management of all the protected areas within their region. This is the case in Hungary (the country is covered by ten Regional Nature Conservation Directorates) and in Slovakia (the State Nature Conservancy’s branches).

- Regional environmental protection authority – Danube Delta BR (Romania) additionally fulfils the function of an environmental protection authority in the area included in the biosphere reserve (6,000 km²). This makes it a PA management authority, which, in addition to its management responsibilities, is also in-charge of issuing permits for activities that are running inside the biosphere reserve. Except for Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve, none of the organizations has the role of an authority (partly Hungarian Directorates). Most of them are coordinating bodies sharing responsibilities of control with other institutions.

In Hungary (Duna-Drava National Park), the Environmental Nature Protection and Water Authority, always asks for the opinion of the National Park Directorates when a proposal for an intervention (e.g. construction, land use activity, etc.) in a protected area is received and it always takes into account the position of the Directorates.

2.4.2 Fields of responsibility and management tasks

The palette of fields of activity which are assigned to the PA management organizations reflects not only the complexity of the PAs and of their territorial context which has to be tackled through their management, but also the way that their mission is regarded at national level, the vision on what a protected area should be and what its management should do.

Depending on the means by which the transfer of responsibility is done, management bodies can be invested with a certain degree of authority and legitimacy in a particular field. The strongest means available for this transfer are laws.

The first round of questionnaires tried to identify fields in which the

---

9 This is a particular case; none of the other PA management bodies in Romania have such responsibilities.
management organizations are active and to clarify by which means these responsibilities are assigned. The results are presented in Figure 11. The analysis shows that:

- **nature conservation and law enforcement** are, with no exception, the fields of activity assigned to the management organizations by the law and sometimes also by the PA management plans (Fig. 12b);

- Except some minor exceptions, **tourism and recreation** fall under the responsibility of these organizations, mostly defined by law and/or by the management plans. This is not defined as a field of responsibility in Danube Riparian Forest, which doesn’t have a dedicated organization for its management. In this case, tourism is managed by other specialized actors.

These are considered to be the basic tasks of these organizations.

Regional development, public relations and marketing, as well as awareness raising are not always defined as responsibilities of the PA management bodies or are solely assigned as such by the management plans (Fig. 12). These are regarded as a secondary responsibility of the PA management and are, most probably shared with other actors. In some cases this is reflected by organizational structures which don’t include special services/departments or specialized staff to address these field of activity (e.g. Djerdap National Park doesn’t have any position in communication, education, awareness or tourism).

In Hungary all the responsibilities are defined by the law.

---

**Figure 11: The responsibilities of the PA management bodies and the means by which these are assigned**

(as of May 2013: sorted by number of responses indicating tasks defined by law and management plan)
2.4.3 Governance

2.4.3.1 The role of organizations in decision-making and management

None of the PA management bodies within the network has the absolute power of decision-making, implementation and influence over its management activity. Their power to influence and intervene varies for each management task.

Figure 13 provides a guidance picture of: (a) the role and the power that the PA administrations have in different management tasks, (b) how strong each of the administrations is in the overall management and how this strength varies between the different organizations.

Globally, the PA administrations have the power to intervene to a variable extent in almost two thirds of the cases. These can take and influence decisions related to their management activities in almost half of the cases (45%), while to a considerable extent (36% of the cases) these have no or limited influence over their management activity (Fig. 13).

The fields in which the PA administrations have the greatest power to intervene (to decide, influence and implement) are:

- the development of protection programmes for species and the management of invasive species
- research and monitoring,
- nature education and tourism (developing their own guided tours and activities), the development of visitor and information infrastructure (Fig. 12a).

These fields correspond with the core tasks of protected area management.

Figure 12: The role of PA administrations in decision-making10 (as of May 2013)

PA administrations stated to have very little or no influence in the fields of:

- land use planning and spatial planning
- as well as in the land management (e.g. management of water bodies, grasslands and open land, water bodies, forest management, game management) or
- environmental protection in general (Fig 12a).

10 The chart represents the total number of the fields in which the PA administrations have different roles (number of times each role was mentioned by the 13 respondents to the questionnaire - Annex 1 – Section 3).
Figure 13: The role of protected area management organizations in different fields of activity
(as of May 2013; sorted by number of responses related to the role “Decision-making, implementing, influencing” (maximum responsibility for a specific task)
2.4.3.2 The roles of other stakeholders

As resulting from the questionnaires, the main fields of the PA management in which other actors have legally defined responsibilities or stakes are:

- law enforcement, control and the regulation of different resource-use activities (as fishing, hunting, shipping);
- land and resource planning and management (water management in particular);
- local development;
- education;
- risk prevention and management (interventions in emergency situations).

The stakeholders at regional / county level (e.g. water administrations, border police, forest enterprises or authorities, inspectorates of police or environment, regional governments) have the most important roles and responsibilities; rarely the local level authorities are mentioned.

2.4.3.3 Decision-making systems

The analysis of the decision-making systems was not the focus of this study. Given its high relevance for the overall effectiveness of the PA management, a more in-depth analysis would be advisable. However, based on the information that was available the following types of decision-making systems, as defined by the IUCN (DUDLEY 2008), were identified within DANUBEPARKS network:

A. State governance:

- by a regional agency (as in the case of Hungary, where the Regional Directorates are public administrations dedicated to nature conservation) or authority (e.g. Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority).
- by a local administration - as for the nature parks in Bulgaria and Croatia. In Bulgaria, the nature parks are managed by their own administrations, which are public entities without legal personality, functioning under the subordination of the Executive Forestry Agency within the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and under the coordination of the Ministry of Environment and Waters. In Croatia parks are managed by independent public authorities established under the coordination of the Ministry of Environment.

- delegated to a public enterprise – which is established by the law and is dedicated to managing a particular protected area. It is reporting directly to the central authority for the environment, it can have a high degree of administrative and financial autonomy and can be partly or mostly financed by the state budget. This is the case of Djerdap National Park Public Company.

B. Shared governance:

- joint management between two public administrations – in the case of Danube Riparian Forest.
- A special case of joint management is that of Donau-Auen National Park, where, based on a partnership between the Republic of Austria, the Federal Provinces of Vienna and Lower Austria, a self-standing company – Donau-Auen GmbH (Ltd) was established. The company is steered by the owners. It is up to the director as head of the company to find the best way to implement these decisions. The non-profit company is a legal body on its own, it is financed by each of the three owners (the three governments) to which it reports to.

- weak or moderate forms of collaborative management (where the PA administrations are working together with multi-stakeholder bodies. Multi-stakeholder bodies are in place and have a consultative, advisory, supervisory or decision-making role for the PA administrations (some examples are presented in Box 3).

C. Private governance

- as in the case of BROZ (Slovakia) – which, although it doesn't have the full management authority for a particular PA, it manages 500 ha of land leased in several protected areas, including Dunajske Luhy Protected Landscape Area.
2.4.4 Integration

2.4.4.1 Areas of interaction and collaboration with the stakeholders

The results of the questionnaires (see Annex) indicate that at the local level, the management bodies of the Danube Parks are closely working with non-governmental and public actors in the fields of:

- tourism and in particular ecotourism (regional tourism administrations as boards or councils, together with non-profit organizations – e.g. Duna Drava National Park, Kopacki Rit Nature Park, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park, Donau-Auen National Park, Danube Riparian Forest), moreover, the development and promotion of common services and tourism offers;
- sustainable nature resources and land management, with a contribution to nature conservation (fishing and game, agriculture, water and forest management, fisheries, meadows) – involving land owners and users (e.g. Lonjsko Polje Nature Park, Kopački Rit Nature Park, Duna Ipoly National Park, Donau-Auen National Park, Danube Riparian Forest);
- research and monitoring (Kopački Rit, Gornje Podunavlje, Duna-Drava, Donau-Auen);
- education and the development of local infrastructure (e.g. Djerđap National Park, Duna Ipoly National Park);
- awareness raising (Kopački Rit and Donau-Auen National Park);
- development of local communities (Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park);
- law enforcement (Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve);
- coordination of activities (Danube Riparian Forest), and projects.

Textbox 3: Multi-stakeholder bodies involved in the PA management

Councils / committees with a consultative role
Persina Nature Park - Consultative Council of 23 members, including representatives of local and regional level public administrations, institutions and NGOs from the three counties overlapping the park. It has a consultative role and it meets periodically.

Donau-Auen National Park – has more stakeholder boards with a consultative role, which include representatives of fishermen, hunters, land owners, local communities, conservation NGOs from the two provinces. The main board in Lower Austria has to approve the annual work plan of the park. Furthermore, a scientific advisory board exists to provide expert advice while a Management Board is in place to take strategic and tactic decisions.

Councils / committees with a supervisory role
Kopački Rit (and most of the PA administrations in Croatia) – a Steering Council of 5 members appointed by the Minister is involved mostly in approving the strategic documents and actions of the park (e.g. annual budget and work plan, management plan, plans for projects) and in supervising the activity of the park to be in line with the law (also checks reports, controls). By law, this system applies to all public institutions such as the park administrations.

Councils with a decision-making role
Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve is managed by the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority together with a Consultative and a Scientific Council. The latter is formed of experts and has a role not only in approving strategic documents and actions of the BR Administration but also in decision-making concerning its current management activity. The council provides an expert opinion and vote for interventions in the PA that require the approval from the Biosphere Reserve Authority.

Source: Interviews with C. Manzano, S. Bozhinova, D. Opačić, G. Baboiu
Although collaborations are mostly long-term oriented, the partnership with NGOs and research institutions is more often temporarily/punctually.

The fields of activity in which the organizations along the Danube are collaborating with national and international level stakeholders are: (1) tourism, (2) nature conservation, (3) research and expert advice, (4) education and awareness raising in which the involvement of NGOs is beneficial. WWF was often mentioned amongst the partners (in Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia). Such collaborations are also including legislative processes and law enforcement, networking and collaboration as well as management implementation and different projects.

2.4.4.2 Networks

The results of the questionnaires show that the same types of actors are involved in partnerships with the management bodies of protected areas along the Danube at both local/national and international level.

Hence, NGOs play the most prominent role, followed by public administrations and various associations of stakeholders or umbrella associations/networks, followed by actors from research, education, tourism and law enforcement. Only in few cases the partners are private companies (Fig. 14).

The results emphasize some gaps of management bodies, in which the organizations have insufficient capacity and which are not covered by partnerships with other stakeholders (e.g. law enforcement, tourism, education, research).
3 ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES

3.1 Pillars of the organizational structures

This section is based on the experiences of the authors and the results and discussions of the Director’s workshop in Hainburg (Austria) and outlines the fundamental issues determining an organizational structure or type of organization. The following issues underpin the organizational development and should be considered when designing or analyzing any organization:\textsuperscript{11}:

1. **Resources** – e.g. financial, technical means, people (staff number and staffing policy)
2. **Setting** – type of structure (e.g. flat, hierarchical, complex)
3. **Internal environment** (relations, links, processes, procedures), culture and identity
4. **Integration in wider systems** (links, relations with other organizations and stakeholders)
5. **Role / “place” in the overall governance system** (authority, power, mission and role)
6. **Context** (socio-economic, political, cultural and local – i.e. protected area level context)
7. **Position / role** – is it adequate for its complex mission?

\textsuperscript{11} The term of „organization“ is used in this paper as a generic term for all the types of protected area management bodies, irrespective of their statutes.

3.2 Types of organizations

As in most of the other fields of activity, the management of nature protected areas is shared by organizations established by three fundamental types of actors: state, private businesses and civil society.

The organizations within DANUBEPARKS range between the following 3 types: (1) the state/public/governmental administration, (2) the state company (managing state resources but having a statute that is similar to private companies) and (3) the non-governmental organization.

These three are fundamentally different types of organizations, the three “corners of a triangle”, but in reality the organizations within the network have mixed characteristics from two or more of them.

By their affiliation on these three sectors, the organizations within the network can be classified as follows:

(1) **State/public/governmental administration** – this is the case of most of the existing administrations, which are part of the state institutional system and functioning under the subordination or coordination of the central authority (i.e. ministry, national agency) in charge of nature conservation. Additionally, their type is shaped by the share of public funds in their budget structure and their subordination (or a certain degree of autonomy) to the governmental authorities. Particular cases are those organizations, which also play the role of a local or regional authority – as the Hungarian Regional Environmental Directorates (partly) and Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Administration.

Six out of the 11 management bodies of the protected areas within the DANUBEPARKS network are state entities (public administrations), financed from the state budget, while the other five are state institutions established by a special law.

(2) **State company/enterprises** – established with the scope of managing a protected area but having a statute similar to private companies) – i.e. Donau-Auen GmbH (Ltd.) and Djerdap National Park Public Enterprise.
An interesting situation is that of Gornje Podunavlje SNR, which is managed by the Vojvodinašume – a public enterprise meant for the management of forests in the region of Vojvodina. The company ensures its management as part of its current activity, without having a self-standing management body / organization dedicated to this protected area or to protected areas in general.

(3) Non-governmental organization – i.e. BROZ. (which is not a management body for a particular protected area – see Chapter 2.3.2). BROZ is the only organization of this type in the DANUBEPAKRS network and is discussed in various sections.

Each of these different “models”/types has its own advantages, strengths, weaknesses and challenges from which the other members can learn and adapt to their own context.

3.2.1 Organizational profiles

(1) The state administration and authority

The Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority

Overall context

The DDBR (Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve) Authority was established in 1990 by law, as a public institution with its own legal personality, subordinated to the Ministry of Environment and Climatic Changes, steered by a Governor - who is appointed by the prime minister – and an Executive Board formed by the chiefs of departments within the administration. A Scientific Council is established in order to provide expert opinions for decision-making, coordinating and supervising the activities of the administration, while a Consultative Council formed of key stakeholders is being consulted, if main decisions are taken. It is also used as a framework for the communication with them.

Functions

The DDBR Authority is the authority for the management of the biosphere reserve as well as the environmental authority for the reserve. It is in charge of impact assessments and of issuing permits and authorizations for investments and visitors of the reserve. In the same time, the DDBR Authority has the obligation to manage several state-owned natural resources (fish, reed, etc.) for economic purposes. For this purpose, a specialized department of about 20 staff was established within the administration.

Organization

DDBR administration has 112 employees headed by two Directorates, namely the directorate of Biodiversity and Integrated Monitoring (with executive departments on Natural Heritage Management, Monitoring and Data Base, Guarding, Public Relations and Awareness and Projects) and the Directorate of Logistics (being in charge of the administrative part).

The executive directors and chiefs of departments are appointed by the Governor, based on a competition. The organizational structure and the number of staff are approved by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Changes based on the existing laws concerning DDBR Authority. The internal structure of the organization, the staffing policy and employment procedures can be changed by Ministerial Order only.

Funding sources and financing system

The main expenditures of the institution (salaries of the staff, costs of management activities - monitoring, patrolling, authorization/licenses/permits issuing, protection/conservation activities, etc.) are covered by the national budget on a yearly demand basis. In addition, fees for the services provided (permits, visiting fees, land management, etc) serve as an additional source of income. Funds obtained from taxes and fees (partially) are sent directly to the national budget, and a small amount of fees can be included in the budget of DDBR Authority. There are also possibilities to attract additional funds from different external financial sources on a project basis.

The budget of the DDBR Authority is approved every year based on the
anticipated demand (several months in advance). It depends on available financial funds in the governmental/national budget. The funds are strictly allocated to different expenditure categories. Changes on the budget can only be done with the approval of the Ministry.

(2) The public enterprise

Donau-Auen GmbH

Overall context

In Donau-Auen National Park, the administrative context – the federal structure of Austria – and its overlapping with two Federal States (Lower Austria and Vienna), as well as the predominance of public lands in the park are the main determinants for the legal status of its management organization.

Austria is made of 9 Länder (Federal States), each having a federal government. All state duties are divided among the Federal and State Authorities. Nature conservation and the management of national parks are not a matter of the Federal Government but belong to Federal States, which are also in charge of legislation regarding conservation and national parks. Thus, each of the Federal States has its own nature conservation law and regulations.

Land ownership

The 3 main land owners are: (1) the Federal Province Lower Austria (more than 50% of the total area - managed by the Austrian Federal Forest Service), (2) the Municipality of Office and Urban Agriculture) and (3) the Republic of Austria (ca. 20% – out of which the river banks and the river are managed by Federal Waterway Authority). A small area of 400 ha is owned by WWF Austria and managed by the NP Administration.

Status

The national park is managed by a Ltd. Company – “Donau-Auen GmbH”, a non-profit, independent organization established in 1996 and owned by three entities: (1) the Republic of Austria – represented by the Ministry of Environment, (2) the Federal state of Lower Austria – represented by the Governor, (3) the Federal state of Vienna and the city of Vienna – represented by the mayor of Vienna. The basis for this partnership is a contractual agreement (a state “treaty” between public bodies) between the partners, which addresses the main issues regarding the organization (e.g. governance and financing, number of staff).

This state contract has the status of a law.

Funding sources and financing system

Only about 60% of the total expenses of the park are covered by the owners. The rest of the money comes from projects (17%), land-use activities (5%) and tourism services (16%). The park provides own guided tours. The back-bone for these services is the national park organization: it has rangers (they are free-lancers) and their services have to be paid for by the visitors. The income from providing services mainly comes from visitors (e.g. visitor centre entrance fee, a shop, selling NP products). The park also has some donors and sponsors.

Organization

Donau Auen Ltd. has 21 full time employees, and is structured in four departments (nature sciences, project management, visitors and communication and organization and financing). It also runs the visitor centre in Orth a.d. Donau. The company can, (theoretically) chose to increase its staff if it is able to provide additional resources for that. The sum provided by the three partners in the contract covers only the salaries of 6 persons. The Director has the full autonomy in selecting the staff and in deciding the staffing policy.

The company is headed by a director, who can work independently within the framework conditions and decisions provided by the Executive Committee, which consists of its three owners. In addition, the park administration has two other stakeholder boards, which regularly meet and provide a good platform for information and communication. The organization works in close partnership with a wide variety of stakeholders (i.e. local municipalities, NGOs, hunting and fishermen associa-

http://www.donauauen.at/
tions, universities) to fulfil its objectives.

The greatest success stories of the organization are related to the development of visiting, educational and interpreting infrastructures, the development of nature education services, the stopping of economic use in the park (forestry, hunting, fishing) and the stopping of river engineering investments in the park.

(3) The non-governmental type of organization

**Regional Association for Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development (BROZ)**

**Mission**

The association was established in 1997 to provide support for practical nature conservation and sustainable development in the Western Slovakia. Its current activities focus on the revitalization of Danube river, the restoration of water regime of river branches and adjacent wetlands, the safeguarding of the Danube floodplain meadows by practical activities such as trimming the coppice willows for fire wood, mowing, reed cutting and grazing with its own cattle and removing invasive species. The organization is also active in awareness raising in the region by working with the general public and schools, organizing excursions, presentations, lectures and seminars as well as in preparing publications, exhibitions and documentary films.

**Functions**

The organization has the multiple function of (i) a non-profit entity, (ii) a land manager (it has the management right by concession for 500 ha of grasslands, marshland and forests within several protected areas and Natura 2000 sites) and (iii) a business function (by providing its own tourism offer and services).

The organization covers the full range of fields of activity that a PA administration does, although it is not officially required by any normative, and despite of its lack of decision-making power in any of these fields.

**Decision-making system (internal)**

The organization is steered by a General Assembly and by a Board. The executive role belongs to an executive director and partly to project managers. Since the organization is implementing many projects, most of its staff is working as project managers or assistants, but also includes some expert technical staff.

**Organization**

The organization has continued to grow since it was established. It had its first employee in 2003 and now reached 25. In addition to its permanent staff, the organization works with volunteers and sub-contractors.

A main competence of BROZ is their experience in project implementation, particularly regarding LIFE projects. The organization successfully implemented 4 LIFE-Nature projects and is implementing 6 others.

**Budget**

99% of its budget comes from projects.

**Integration**

The organization has long-term partnerships with key institutions and organizations in their area: the Administration of Dunajske Luhy LPA, the Forest Administration of Slovak Republic, Comenius University of Bratislava, Slovak Water Research Institute and with the Regional Environmental Offices.

Additionally to DANUBEPARKS, BROZ has long term partnerships with other national and international organizations, such as Birdlife Slovakia and Trout Circle Association in Hungary.

3.2.2 Strengths and weaknesses of each type

The interviews with the representatives of the protected area administrations provided insights regarding strengths and weaknesses of each type. Although these are the result of a self-evaluation and to a certain extent subjective, their value resides from their origin into practice.

---

14 http://www.broz.sk/en
### Strengths and advantages

#### The non-governmental organizations\(^\text{15}\) - the case of BROZ - Slovakia

- human capacity: enthusiastic people
- experience in writing project proposals and implementing projects
- the focus on nature – a wider, more systemic and integrative concept, while other NGOs in Slovakia have a narrow focus (e.g. Daphne – botanists, others are ornithologists, etc), BUT
- focusing on selected issues and not getting involved in everything
- The status of an independent body allowing for deciding freely on its mission, objectives, agenda and strategies. Internal rules can be adapted easily.
- a collaborative approach – try to work with stakeholders in solving problems together and use all the means to develop / build a close, collaborative relationship (e.g. formal partnerships, go to pubs together, the sexy calendar in 2012, go hunting together – this developed a closer relationship and discarded the preconceptions each had about the other).

### Weaknesses, challenges and limitations

- the total dependency on one source of funding – *i.e.* projects
- if money is not accessed through their own income generating activities, it is not possible to ensure the stability of the staff and this might challenge the organization.
- the system is structurally weak. It can only perform as long as the right persons are in place.
- high personal motivation may not be enough on a long term perspective

---

### Strengths and advantages

#### The state authority – the case of Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Administration - Romania

- the organization benefits of a legal framework customized for the DDBR, which ensures clarity, power and stability
- there is a dedicated institution for the management of the reserve, which has the status of an authority and has relatively good capacity to cover the main areas of management activity
- the financing is constantly provided by the national budget – which ensures a certain degree of stability

### Weaknesses, challenges and limitations

- not enough autonomy based on the increased responsibilities of staff/institution
- limited flexibility in using the allocated funds, due to the very fix procedures provided by the law

---

\(^\text{15}\) Since there is only one organization as such in the DANUBE PARKS network, the conclusions refer to the particular situation of BROZ. The information was provided during the 2 interviews with Tomas Kusik and Pavol Surovec.
## Analysis of Organizational Structures for the Management of Protected Areas Along the Danube

### Strengths and advantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The public enterprise – the case of Donau-Auen Ltd – Austria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The flexibility to generate income from services and projects (to attract funds and additional resources), more flexible financial policies, which leads to a more effective use of resources – a more „business-like“ approach than the „administration“ type of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The possibility to manage tourism inside the park on their own, which assures a high quality level of nature interpretation / visitor services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More flexibility to interact with a broad range of stakeholders, given by the fact that it is not a legal authority (it doesn’t issue permits and doesn’t own the land in the park)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages of this management system (Ltd status)**

| - The separation of legal authority (assigned to different institutions) and management „authority“ (belonging to the park administration) allows for a „checks and balances“ - each one can have its own opinion that is weighted and this leads to a better implementation of decisions. |
| - The form of Ltd gives more flexibility in the day to day management – e.g.: the park can develop its own scheme for staff payment and can generate income that goes directly to the account of the Ltd |

### Weaknesses, challenges and limitations

| - In the case of conflicts, the National Park Administration doesn’t have much real power. |
| - To fulfil its tasks, the organization should have all the functions of an institution, which needs to be covered by job positions. |
| - Due to its limited capacity, the company always needs many partners and needs to convince others that partnership and dialogue lead to better solutions |
| - The company is perceived more powerful than it really is by the public leading to unrealistic expectations |
| - No security that state funds remain stable: the contract has no valorisation, no index alignment and is not adapted to the changing needs of the park |
3.3 Main issues for the organizations within the network

3.3.1 Issues concerning the staff

- **Limited number of staff** (and low density of field staff / km²) – in most of the cases staff is insufficient to cover the multiple and complex responsibilities of the management bodies. Due to this, each of the staff members has too many responsibilities decreasing their effectiveness and capacity to deliver properly. The highest diversity of tasks is assigned to the park rangers.

- No information was available on the competences of the existing ranger staff; a more in-depth training needs analysis may be advisable. However, the field staff needs to be well trained in communication, stakeholder involvement and developing partnerships.

- **Insufficient expertise** in some fields and inadequate training of staff – is rather an exception within the network but there are some areas of expertise in which specialists are insufficiently represented (e.g. geomorphology, communication). In some cases (e.g. Persina Nature Park) it is difficult to find and employ local experts or even to convince the ones from larger cities to move there due to the fact that park administrations are sometimes located in small towns or villages and in remote or peripheral areas,

- **Gender and age imbalance** – most of the parks have preponderant aged and male staff.

- **Background in natural sciences predominating** – the educational background of park staff is mainly in natural sciences, while there are only few with a background in economic or social sciences. The “human dimension” of protected area management (e.g. social-economic issues, public awareness, stakeholders involvement) is not well covered by job positions, which reflects the fact that the existing management organizations are in a stage of transition from the classical approach to nature conservation, towards a modern one, involving a more complex mission.

- **Work experience** – is rather diverse, but most of the staff gained experience both in the private sector and only few experienced the NGO sector. The significant number of staff who is working in these organizations from the very beginning is an important resource, as these people are “growing up” by assimilating the values of their organizational structures.

- **The staffing policy** – although an increase of the number of staff is limited or not possible, the selection of new staff members is treated very carefully by the organizations, which are developing more and more complex and refined criteria of selection.

3.3.2 Financing

- Insufficient funding is doubled by the lack of possibilities to supplement their budgets and the sometimes low flexibility (in case of state administrations) in allocating the money according to the needs.

- Insufficient stability and flexibility of the financing systems – could be due to the predominance of state money (a maybe inappropriate mixture of funding sources).

3.3.3 Issues concerning the organizations

- **Limited decision-making power in key fields of activity / management**

- The tasks of the organization and of the staff reflect the management approach. This might not yet be sufficiently open to communicating to and with stakeholders (to few people engaged in communication, marketing, awareness raising, education), participatory and integrative. The approach is closer to the classical one, to a centralized way of governance in which the management organization has the main role in making the decisions and implementing the rules and measures.
3.3.4 Issues concerning the interactions and networks

- NGOs play an important role as partners for the management bodies of parks along the Danube, both at local and national/international level. Public administrations are also a common partner mostly regarding law enforcement and legislative issues, coordination, local development, etc.
- NGOs are increasingly important in the field of tourism. Their involvement is often to the benefit of the protected area management, especially due to their input of resources (staff, logistics, expertise, etc).
- No companies are included in these networks.
- Tourism and the management of natural resources and land inside the protected areas, research, education and projects to implement the management plans are most common fields in which collaborations are being established.
- The largest gaps where collaboration doesn’t address the insufficient capacity of protected area management bodies along the Danube occur in the fields of management and planning of lands, law enforcement, control, public awareness, education and of research.
- DANUBEPARKS – the international network is hardly mentioned.

3.4 Trends

In the complex and dynamic context of the management organizations, some evolutions concerning their development became visible during the analysis:

- new organizations are born by unifying structures working in partnership (Danube Riparian Forest)
- the existing ones are extending by increasing the number of staff, developing and adjusting the structure and its internal rules constantly, while developing. Amongst all, BROZ shows most flexibility due to a less formalized structure.
- Some are growing in number in the already given, more rigid framework (Persina Nature Park) – in these cases the organizations are limited to adjust their structure to their needs by the insufficient resources and by the bureaucratic procedure.
- some organizations are increasing their local, regional and national influence (Persina Nature Park, Duna-Drava National Park)
- some organizations are becoming increasingly vulnerable to political or economic pressure because of becoming more influential and powerful in their regions (Bulgaria).

3.5 Needs for further developments

The priorities for the future developments of these organizations, as resulting from the interviews and from the Director’s workshop are:

- the enlargement – more staff is necessary to fulfil the management activities efficiently, and to be able to employ more people, an increased flexibility in staffing policy is necessary;
- an improved resource allocation – i.e. the increase of the salaries of the staff and finding of means to motivate the employees;
- the development / improvement of the capacity in general (strengthening professionalism); the development of capacity to attract and manage the money available (e.g. by training people with expertise in networking and project management); the development in particular fields of activity (e.g. tourism, nature awareness activities for adults).
- an increased flexibility – in general (concerning the administrative procedures provided by the law) and in particular a greater flexibility in using the available funds. This also means to receive the money from the national budget for the management according to the priorities and the needs of the PA – e.g. the remuneration should be based on a motivating system of staffing (DDBR);
- an improved communication and cooperation between the staff;
- a more stable system of funding.
4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4_1 Conclusions

Despite their diversity of structures, systems and contexts the PA along have to face similar problems: the insufficient allocation from the state budget, the multitude of management tasks, the increasing complexity of their management context and its rapid changes, the lack of authority and insufficient means for the implementation of their activities. Each structure and system in place to tackle all these issues has its strengths and limitation. The common question for all of them remains how can the available resources be used wisely?

The main conclusion, first of all, is that there is no universal recipe – management structures and systems has to be designed by taking into account, first of all their cultural context, from which the systems of values, attitudes and behaviours derive (see also HUBER ET AL. 2013).

Secondly, the organizations should be analyzed against their performance and should be designed to be effective. Examples of successful activities in different fields were provided by each of the structures in place in the DANUBEPARKS network indicating that all of these can succeed to a certain extent, in one or certain fields of management. However, the question of performance remains as an open question for further analysis and debate. The analysis of their management effectiveness would provide more concrete and objective information concerning the advantages and disadvantages, the strengths and the weaknesses of each type of management structure.

The importance of the organizational structure and system and its relevance for the management effectiveness of protected areas is widely acknowledged within the network (GETZNER & JUNGMIEIER, 2013; GETZNER ET AL. 2010; GRUJIĆ 2009). There is a real interest and need within the DANUBEPARKS network to learn from the other’s experience (from success stories and failures), to find new models of organizational structures and systems that could be replicated, to understand, accept and value the existing ones. The diversity of models within the network and the existing frame of DANUBEPARKS could be considered an asset representing great opportunities for exchanging experiences, sharing and debate.

4_2 Lessons learned from the network

4_2_1 The profile of a successful organization

Irrespective of its number of members, of its responsibilities, governance system, available resources or any other contextual issue, it is first of all people and the interactions between them that make the organization – people as members, experts, leaders, etc.

The discussions with the interview partners (Annex 3), revealed some of the key ingredients that are, as emerging from their experience, key to a successful organization.

- people16 – “the right people to make the best out of the organization”17, “dedicated people, people with a vision”18
- motivation18 20 and the feeling that what you do makes sense18
- precisions – to do the right things and to do the things well, pre-

16 Stela Bozhinova (SB)
17 Carl Manzano (CM)
18 Tomas Kusic (TK)
cisely\(^{20}\) and the professionalism of staff\(^{19}\)

- good team work\(^{20}\) and cohesion among the team members\(^{19}\)
- the leader – “how he can stimulate his own people and deal with the political surrounding is one of the most important things”\(^{21}\)
- a good framework structure\(^{17}\)
- continuity – to be consequent to one direction / issue and to keep on working to solve and develop things; to build on your previous work.\(^{18}\)
- sustainable funding\(^{18}\)
- realism and pragmatism - “to have the feet on the ground” \(^{18}\)
- the political surrounding and the public in which the organization develops – “There are times when it is more difficult to create new things, new projects, because the political surrounding is more difficult, money is very few in the whole system and in the public. When you have the perfect politicians or the very high ranking area everything goes easy so in such a period you have to wrap everything you get to make them sensible, to start new things”\(^{21}\)
- rules – although it may seem different, an organization can’t make it without clear internal rules.\(^{17}\)

4.2.2 Lessons learned and recommendations from the network

Despite the limitations they have faced and, in some cases, their short history, the PA management organizations can look back on a range of achievements, which include not only habitat restoration or management programs but also participatory processes, successful partnerships, communication campaigns, high quality educational and tourism services. As an organization, being successful equals having a good relation with the external (social) environment.

- It is very important to communicate\(^{16}\)\(^{20}\)\(^{21}\) but how you communicate is essential. Using the press and media as an ally is a good solution for gaining the support of the public and politicians.

Being convincing in the dialogue with the politicians is always a matter of how you present the needs and the benefits or a protected area to the politicians and decision-makers, and this depends on how we understand these outcomes\(^{20}\). “you have to show to the politicians and decision-makers that some real productive result is coming out that is for the sake of the whole district or municipality or for the people living in the surroundings, for their housing, for their spare time or to create money from tourism or whatever.”\(^{21}\)

Make people understand the mission of a PA management organization is one big step towards gaining their support.\(^{16}\)

- The relation with the politicians and the public is very important\(^{21}\)

  - learn to make yourself understood by the politicians, always look at the politicians and the public by showing them the productive results of what you do and by adjusting to their needs and level of understanding\(^{21}\)

- Stakeholder participation is important

  - involving stakeholders\(^{16}\)\(^{17}\) gives them the feeling that the result belongs to them, creates a framework for exchange and for disseminating the information to the wider public.

- The attitude of the organization is very important\(^{20}\)

  - giving a good example to people, communicating your success

\(^{19}\) Grigore Baboianu (BG)

\(^{20}\) Eszter Buchert (EB)

\(^{21}\) Siegfried Geissler (SG)
and letting them come closer slowly, building trust by doing things, by proving that you are capable are the only ways of gaining sound public support.\textsuperscript{18} Transparency and openness are a first step towards developing a long standing relationship.\textsuperscript{21}

- To be constant\textsuperscript{20} and to have continuity\textsuperscript{18}
- As a staff member, to understand the management objectives of PAs as a mission and to make people understand its importance not only for the present but most of all for our children\textsuperscript{19}.
- Work together\textsuperscript{15} \textsuperscript{20} and strengthen the teamwork - Structure is important here – developing less hierarchical structures increases the chances of success.
- Select your future colleagues carefully and not only by criteria referring to their professional background; personal criteria are equally important\textsuperscript{20}.
- Protected areas need dedicated management bodies with dedicated budget – it is harder to have 2 bodies trying to get money and resources for one PA\textsuperscript{21}.

4.3 Recommendations

Even when a structure is imposed by the law, in the given frame, the members of an organization can decide to reduce hierarchies and formalism that sometimes hinders participatory decision-making and the team spirit by adopting a code of conduct defined on the basis of their own values. The relations between its members are the core of an organizational structure whose basic constitutive elements are people (\textsc{Getzner} \& \textsc{Jungmeier}, 2009; 2011; \textsc{Slobodian} 2011).

Therefore, irrespective of the design of its structural frame, an organization can significantly improve its functioning by improving the quality of its members and of the relations between them. This is most easily achievable in small or medium organizations – as most of those included in the DANUBEPAKRS network.

Most of the organizations within the network are public administrations or similar bodies, whose structural changes have to be provided by the law. In this case, optimizing the structures is a cumbersome process. In the same time, the enlargement of the protected area management organizations within the network is limited not only by laws and internal rules, which are specifying the maximum number of its members, but also by the budget.

In this context, the best way to overcome these limitations is to make the best out of the available resources, to enhance synergies.

\textit{Site level}

The following things can help in improving the quality of available human resources:

- assessing your human resources is as important for the organization as preparing the budget, as it shows where the organization stands and keeps track of its progress. Such an assessment has:
  - to be based on a \textit{self assessment},
  - to take into account the \textit{competencies} (including not only \textit{knowledge} but also \textit{skills} and \textit{attitudes}),
  - to be done \textit{periodically} – to allow for monitoring the progress,
  - to be done in an \textit{informal, friendly and open way}, that motivates and encourages.
- assessing your training needs for the whole team – there are structured and systematic methods that can be used in this sense,
- defining capacity building as a distinctive activity in the management plan of the PA and assigning a budgetary line that allows for the staff to be trained \textit{periodically} (see also \textsc{Grujić} 2009)
- developing clear rules and procedures for the functioning of your
organization that are commonly agreed by its members, even though these are not written;
- strengthening the relations between the members and fostering the team work;
- setting quality standards concerning the human resources;
- develop a staffing policy that takes into account not only the needs of your organization in terms of knowledge and professional skills but also the social and personal abilities that are necessary to fit and complement the personality of your team;
- developing the communication skills and the competencies needed for the design and development of participatory processes, working with stakeholders and the development of partnerships;
- developing the knowledge and skills of the staff in writing and implementing projects, business planning and management – to increase the capacity of the organizations to attract additional financial resources and to use them more efficiently

National and network level
- allocating sufficient budget;
- allowing to the existing organizations to attract more resources and to develop alternative financing sources and a greater flexibility in allocating the money, (e.g. POTOZKY 2008, PÎRV 2011);
- when designing a structure, all the functions that a protected area has to fulfil including the socio-economic one should be taken into account.
- the DANUBEPAKRS network could facilitate the exchange of experience in the field of organizational management amongst its members (e.g. through excursions, thematic courses, study visits), as well as its further, more detailed analysis and initiate projects, whose content requires transboundary addressing or is of joint importance (e.g. White Tailed Sea Eagle Action Plan, PROBST & GABORIK 2012).

4.4 General perspective (by Carl Manzano)

For the first time Danube River Protected Areas joined in DANUBEPAKRS network present, compare and analyse their institutional settings in a common stringent frame. They all share a common and coherent ecosystem, they have similar goals and face similar tasks and challenges. Yet this study shows and documents an astonishingly high diversity of their organisational setup and structure.

Since the frame of the study did not allow any valid assessment of the real performance of individual PA administrations, no general recommendation on the value, adequacy, effectiveness or efficiency of specific structures can be given. But documentation and analysis of these structures provide a clearer understanding of the variety of tasks these organisations have to fulfil and of the different options to design, develop and optimise the organisational structures for successfully meeting these challenges.

The study reveals that there are some basic questions behind the setup of a PA administration and different answers given to it in different Danube countries. It is not so much because of different protection categories, e.g. national park, nature park, biosphere reserve, etc., that the answers are so different, but mainly because of the varied traditions of public service and of the general state administration system they are embedded in.

Is it e.g. better to entrust one all-encompassing institution with all the different tasks of modern PA management or is it wiser to have a set of different bodies or organisations to play differing and specific roles? Is there the role of the “protecting” authority enforcing the law and the (generally restrictive) rules of nature conservation. There is the role of the de facto land manager with actual access and rights of landownership or quasi-landownership. There is another role of a (regional) development agency, promoting a sustainable and integrative development and mediating different stakeholder interests. There is the role of an educational organisation with a distinctive “costumer service” orientation and strong communicative skills. There is the role of a “scientific” institution providing a strong knowledge base and long-term continuity of monitoring and knowledge and data management. And there is the role of a (nature) tourist developer, provider or even operator.
At first glance it seems preferable to have all these functions in one overall and “powerful” organisation to ensure an effective, comprehensive and integrative approach. On the other hand these different tasks need different people and different organisational “cultures”. It is hard to allow these different working cultures to flourish in one organisation, which is generally dominated by one culture, usually derived from the origins and the wider institutional embedding of the organisation. The different roles also require different “faces” to the outside world and it is not so easy to let them all live in one organisation.

The key issues and differences are firstly the combination or split of the function of a legal authority and the actual tasks of a “managing body”. There is a strong tendency in most countries to keep these functions apart from each other or having separated them in the past years. Secondly it is the combination or separation of overall PA management and actual land use management. This concerns the relationship to landowners and the “grasp” of PA administration over them, be them private or public (bodies). This still seems to be a problematic and unsolved issue in many cases. One possible answer is to entrust the state forest agency with the management of their “own” PA.

A third issue is how far PA administrations can or should be involved in actively delivering services to visitors and other costumer in return of payment and create part of their income from “business” activities. A fourth and even more general issue is how to combine the necessary stability and continuity of a public body with flexibility, initiative and extraordinary commitment often to be found in NGOs. It is remarkable, that in a case of restricted capacity of state nature conservation service a NGO is able to fulfil effectively the actual role of a PA administration - at least for a certain period of time.

There is also the basic issue of governance of PA administrations, their positioning and embedding on a national, regional or even local level, the question of stakeholder participation and their involvement or not-involvement in decision making. This issue goes beyond the scope of this study. However, the findings show a certain tension between the need to be close to the centres of political power and decision making (to secure the necessary political and financial support for PA administration) and the wish for “independence” from day-to-day (party) politics (to ensure a continuous “technical” and professional PA manage-

ment). This question is also tensely tied to the issue of financing PA administration and activities.

The underlying, most elementary question though is how societies and respectively states organise public functions, public institutions, public interests and public goods. Almost all DANUBEPARKS PAs are quite young institutions having emerged during the last two decades. Therefore, the institutional settings of the PAs mirror especially the complex, manifold and shattered history of Central and South-East-European countries after 1989. The different solutions are mainly rooted in the range between (post-) socialist, liberal to neo-liberal paradigms. On one side there is a strong trust in the accountability and the structures of the state. On the other hand market-based approaches and private initiatives and institutions are considered more effective and successful in managing public goods.

Not all public functions need to be provided by a public authority, not all types of public services can be delivered by a company or a NGO. There is also the option of state-owned and state-controlled organisations outside the regular state administration system fulfilling public tasks with a “company-like” organisational setting. This discussion is of global dimension, represented e.g. in the emotional discussions of privatising water supply in the European Community or the fundamentalist debates on public health insurance in US. There is no sign that this discussion will come to an end or will lead to joint conclusions; it rather is an aporetic dilemma (ENDOR & MORITZ, 2013; OSSIMITZ, 2012; NIETSEN, 2007), where the truth is not even in the middle.

In this study PAs along the Danube are shown to have particular and differing positions on the “gradient” between trust in stable state and trust in competitive market mechanisms. In a first assessment the strengths and weaknesses of these individual positions became visible.

Particular PA structures derive from the national state administration structure that they are embedded and cannot be changed out of this context. However, these structures themselves are subject to political debate and reform and thus in a certain state of flux. A better understanding of different PA organisational structures given by this study should help to promote and realise further development and improvement of individual PA organisations, whenever a change is required or possible.
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6 ANNEX

6.1 The questionnaire

The questionnaire is divided into four major sections:

Section 1: People

1a) Number of total staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number of staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b) Education and disciplines of staff (Number of staff specialised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Disciplines</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics/administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1c) Previous occupation of staff in percent of total staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1d) Functions/Professional positions. Please name the functions or professional positions (e.g. rangers, technical staff, researchers...), working in your organization and how many persons are involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number of staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Organization

2a) Organisational chart. Please draft an organisational chart of the organisation of your park including all hierarchical levels, decision-making (steering) bodies and advisory bodies (e.g. stakeholder board). Please draw executive bodies in black, decision-making bodies in blue and advisory bodies in red. Additionally, please mark the body, who appoints the director of your park.
2b) Type of organization

- Public administration
- Institution established by special law
- Other

2c) Function fulfilled by your institution

- Land tenure
- Business function
- Profit organization
- Non-profit organization

2d) Land ownership in percent of total area of the park

- Private Property
- Public body
- Other

2e) Please name your main funding sources and the amount provided per annum (example of the year 2002):

- Regular budget
- Subsidies
- Other

Section 3: Tasks

3a) Please assess the following tasks your park fulfills.

- Nature conservation
- Law enforcement
- Regulation and development
- Awareness raising and education
- Public relations and marketing
- Tourism and recreation

3b) Please assess the role your park management is playing in fulfilling the task.

- Decision making
- Implementing
- Opportunity to influence

Section 4: Interaction and Networks

4a) Please name the most important partners you cooperate with at the local level.

- Partner 1
- Partner 2
- Partner 3
- Partner 4
- Partner 5

4b) Please name the major cooperation partners outside the protected area region.

- Partner 1
- Partner 2
- Partner 3
- Partner 4
- Partner 5
6.2 Guide for interview

Part 1:

the respondents are asked to briefly present their organization by presenting the 3 issues: (1) their financing system, (2) their responsibilities with regards to land/resource use and planning and (3) decision-making.

This part aims rather to documenting the existing situation by extracting the information necessary to draw the profiles and “portraits” of different organizations.

The following things should (ideally) be touched / clarified:

- Financing and tasks
  - How is money “attracted” to their budget? By using the capacity of their organization (e.g. writing projects, providing services) or as an allocation from the state?
  - Can they decide on how resources are allocated and if they can allocate resources for the development of their organization (e.g. staff training, equipment, etc)?
    - Do they have legal personality or are they subordinated to other entity?
  - Can they influence (increase) their budget? If not, who does?
  - For ones managing land / providing services:
    - How is the activity organized? How does the system work? (number of staff allocated to these tasks, responsibilities, etc)
    - Do they see any risks in being financially self-sufficient/producing money by your own activities as a PA manage-
ment organization (e.g. in relation with the conservation aims, with the stakeholders, etc)?
  - Which are the advantages /difficulties of this system?

- Governance
  - Do they decide on the number of staff, their organizational structure (e.g. departments, services)? (Or are these established by the law?)
  - Do you have the power to change these issues (e.g. to employ a new person, to assign a new staff position, to change the structure)? If not, who does?

Part 2:

aims to getting the lessons learned, personal opinions, insights and recommendations from the network members.

Open questions:

1. A SWOT question - in which areas (e.g. decision-making system, financing, resources responsibilities) do you perceive strengths, weaknesses of your organizational structure / setting and its limitations?
2. Of what thing(s) (e.g. procedure, process or structure) concerning your organization are you mostly proud of and you would recommend for replication to your colleagues?
3. In which fields or sectors do you want to develop or strengthen your protected area/organization in the near future?
4. What do you expect from DANUBEPAKS? On which of the issues would you like to have closer collaboration/exchange with other parks in the future?
5. What makes, in your opinion, an organization successful?

6.3 List of interview partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siegfried Geißler</td>
<td>Project manager - Landkreis Neuburg-Schrobenhausen – Danube Riparian Forest</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>09.11.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carl Manzano</td>
<td>Director – Donau-Auen National Park</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11.07.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stela Bozhinova</td>
<td>Director – Persina Nature Park</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>16.07.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eszter Buchert</td>
<td>Vice-director and project manager – Duna-Dráva National Park</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>25.07.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grigore Baboianu</td>
<td>Project manager - Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>20.08.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tomas Kusik</td>
<td>President of BROZ - Regional Association for Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>21.08.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goran Gugic</td>
<td>Director – Lonjsko Polje National Park</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Djerdap National Park</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Presentation of results at SCM in Tulcea, 30th of August, 2013
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Dr. Alina Ionita MSC.
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Contents
- Project overview and goals
- Methods and data collection
  - Questionnaire
  - Interviews
  - Director’s workshop
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- Interviews
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Project objectives
- Background
  - Diverse protected areas in different countries showing different contexts (politics, organization, culture, funding, ownership) form a joint umbrella organization
- Objectives
  - Analysis of organizational structures of the members of DANUBEPAKRS
  - Identification of common and different features
  - Increase of understanding of the management context and structure of the different protected areas within the network
  - Creation of a basis for increasing co-operation in the network
Methods and data collection

- Questionnaire
  - Questionnaire to explore structures, contexts, tasks and framework of individual protected areas
  - One questionnaire per protected area

- Director’s workshop
  - Workshop with representatives of all member parks in Orth to discuss the organizational features based on the results of the questionnaire

- Interviews
  - Individual interviews with representatives of selected protected areas, which show interesting organizational features

Results based on the questionnaire

- Private property: 80%
- Publicly owned: 10%
- Other: 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>% of Public Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duna-Drava National Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusenski Lom Nature Park</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendap National Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duna-Ipoly National Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomiski Polje National Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopadi Rt Nature Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornje Podunavlje SNR</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persica Nature Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Not data available for Duna Auen NP and Danube Riparian Forest
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Staff – the core asset of protected areas

**TOTAL NUMBER OF STAFF**

- Danube Riparian Forest: 9
- Donau-Auen National Park: 20
- Kupački Rit Nature Park: 12
- Danube Delta: 18
- Donau-Ipoly National Park: 15
- Donau-Drava National Park: 10
- Lonjsko Polje Nature Park: 10
- Donau-Auen National Park: 8
- Donau-Drava National Park: 6
- Danube Delta: 5
- Donau-Ipoly National Park: 3
- Kupački Rit Nature Park: 2
- Donau-Auen National Park: 1

Age distribution

- Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve: 3 (0-30), 6 (31-60), 3 (>60)
- Donau-Ipoly National Park: 8 (0-30), 26 (31-60), 11 (>60)
- Donau-Auen National Park: 10 (0-30), 12 (31-60), 15 (>60)
- Donau-Ipoly National Park: 5 (0-30), 10 (31-60), 7 (60+)
- Gornje Podunavlje Special Nature Reserve: 2 (0-30), 2 (31-60), 5 (>60)
- Danube Delta: 1 (0-30), 2 (31-60), 1 (60+)

Gender distribution

- Females: 10, Males: 10

Educational background of protected area staff

- a. The situation at the site level:
  - Donau-Auen National Park: 100% with academic education
  - Lonjsko Polje National Park: 60%
  - Donau-Ipoly National Park: 40%
  - Donau Drava National Park: 20%
  - Kupački Rit Nature Park: 10%

- b. The overall situation within the network:
  - Biology: 1%
  - Social sciences: 1%
  - Legal studies: 2%

NOTE: No data available for Danube Delta National Park

* The numbers represent the number of persons
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Academic background

Professional background

Complex vs. flat organizational structures

Funding

a. The situation at site level

b. Overall situation within the network

WORK EXPERIENCE of PROTECTED AREA STAFF [previous jobs]

Complex vs. flat organizational structures

Danube Riparian Forest (Ger)

Djerdap NP (Srb)
The individual networks of DANUBEPARKS members

Main fields of collaboration and networking:
- Law enforcement
- Education
- Research
- Tourism
- Nature administration
- UN agencies
- NGOs
- International organizations

a) Local level
b) National / International level

Different types of organizations, similar goals:
- "There is real interest and need within Danube Parks to learn from the other's experience (success stories and failures)"
- "We saw that we have different sort of administrations but finally we have common ideas, participate in the same Danube Park project"
- "All of the PAs have the same goal: nature conservation, but from the different starting point, and in a different way. What is the best practice?"

Key results from the Directors Workshop:
- Mix of methods (e.g.: Director's panel, triangle exercise)
- Aspects highly relevant for organizational development in general
  - Hard facts
    - "Authority in a legal sense" – The power to decide
    - Land ownership
    - The possibility to provide services
  - Soft facts
    - Politics
    - Staffing

www.e-co.at
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Priorities for future changes – similar needs

- Better funding and staffing
  - more staff and more flexibility in staffing (Duna-Ipoly NP)
  - increase the salaries and motivate the staff (Persina NP)
  - increase the number of staff (Lonjsko Polje NP) – they have 36
  - increase the number of staff (in Donau Auen NP) - by law there are 6, but we 22 are working – want to have 20 ensured by the law
  - more stable sources of funding (BROZ)
- More flexibility and less bureaucracy
  - more flexibility by the law (Gornje Podunavlje NR)
  - more flexibility to use the available funds - to receive the money from the national budget for the management according to the priorities and the needs of the PA - (DDBR)
  - less bureaucracy (Fertő-Hansag NP)

Recommendations from the network for the network – Selected statements

- „It is very important to communicate but how you communicate is essential. Using the press and media as an ally is a good solution for gaining the support of the public and politicians. Stakeholder participation is essential“
- “You have to show to the politicians and decision-makers that some real productive result is coming out that is for the sake of the whole district or municipality or for the people living in the surroundings, for their house care, for their spare time or to create money from tourism or whatever“.
- “As a staff member, to understand the management objectives of PAs as a mission and to make people understand its importance not only for the present but most of all for our children.“
- “Select your future colleagues carefully and not only by criteria referring to their professional background; personal criteria are equally important.”

Interviews – Selected statements

- The interview partners
  - Jedlovački rezervat (JPR, Jedlovački National Park)
  - Carl Marschall (CFM, Donau Auen National Park)
  - Föor, Daniel (DFA, Donau Delta Biosphere Reserve)
  - Fóger, Béla (FNB, Fertő-Hansag National Park)
  - Stieglitz, Joachim (LS, Lower Saxony National Park)

- The profile of a successful organization
  - People
    - “the right people to make the best out of the organization”
    - “dedicated people, people with a vision”
    - “the leader – how he can stimulate his own people and deal with the political surrounding is one of the most important things”
  - Strategy and vision
    - “continuity – to be consequent to one direction / issue and to keep on working to solve and develop things, to build on your previous work”
    - realism and pragmatism - "to have the feet on the ground"
  - Organizational setting
    - “a good framework structure”
    - “sustainable funding”
    - “rules – although it may seem different, an organization can’t make it without clear internal rules”

The role of Danube Parks as an organization

- Was not mentioned as part of the network in the questionnaire
- However, positive perception in the interviews
  - Danube Parks as an opportunity for:
    - Accessing and exchanging information
    - Exchanging experiences and best-practice examples
    - Developing personal informal contacts improving professional partnerships
    - Joint development of projects along the Danube

Additionally it was highlighted that
- The Danube Parks Network has a more powerful voice in the Danube region than each park alone, particularly regarding decision-making processes
3 questions for discussion

- **Plausibility:** Which of the results are plausible / not plausible to you?

- **Relevance:** Which of the results are of particular relevance for you and your organisation?

- **Strengths and weaknesses:** In comparison with the other partners/interviewees - What do you consider to be particular strengths and weaknesses of your organisation?

---

**6.5 Minutes of the Directors’ Workshop in Hainburg a.d.**

**Donau and organizational charts of DANUBEPARKS members and organizational charts**

**List of participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabi Morozov</td>
<td>Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigore Baboianu</td>
<td>Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damir Opacic</td>
<td>Kopacki Rit Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlatko Rozac</td>
<td>Kopacki Rit Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goran Gugic</td>
<td>Lonjsko Polje Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Takac</td>
<td>Vojvodinsume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ognjen Ivosev</td>
<td>Vojvodinsume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radmila Sakic</td>
<td>Vojvodinsume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Wagner</td>
<td>Donau-Auen National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg Frank</td>
<td>Donau-Auen National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katalin Sipos</td>
<td>Duna-Ipoly National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal Kezdy</td>
<td>Duna-Ipoly National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyula Kiss</td>
<td>Duna-Ipoly National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonka Hristova</td>
<td>Rusenski Lom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilka Petrova</td>
<td>Rusenski Lom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefa Bozhinova</td>
<td>Persina Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviya Petrova</td>
<td>Persina Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovan Ilic</td>
<td>Djerdap National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragana Milojkovic</td>
<td>Djerdap National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevenka Jevric</td>
<td>Djerdap National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Kusik</td>
<td>BROZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavol Surovec</td>
<td>BROZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila Fersch</td>
<td>Fertő-Hansag National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Manzano</td>
<td>Donau-Auen National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido Plassmann</td>
<td>ALPARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jungmeier</td>
<td>E.C.O. Inst. of Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Ionita</td>
<td>E.C.O. Inst. of Ecology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### First Directors‘ Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time &amp; Place</th>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Participants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14-05-2013, 10:00 – 13:00 Donau Auen National Park – Hainburg an der Donau | - present the first results of the analysis to the participants  
- discuss with the participants the main findings | Directors, projects managers and selected staff members |
| 15-05-2013, 09:00 – 13:00 | | |

**Facilitation**

Dr. Michael Jungmeier

**Annex**

PowerPoint-Presentation

**Prepared by:**

Dr. Alina IONITA for E.C.O. Institut für Ökologie Jungmeier GmbH, Kinoplatz 6, A-9020 Klagenfurt. Tel.: 0463/50 41 44-18; e-mail: office@e-c-o.at; homepage: www.e-c-o.at

**Abbreviations used in the text:**

- **PA** = protected area
- **PAA** = protected area authority / administration
- **D-Parks** = Danube Parks
- **DDBRA** = Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority
- **DANP** = Donau Auen National Park
- **t.b.a.** = to be announced
AGENDA

First day:
- Welcome and opening
- Introduction
  - Agenda
  - Technical issues
- Main findings of the preliminary analysis
  - Presentation
  - Discussions
  - The „triangle“ exercise
- Excursion

Second day:
- Presentation of the agenda
- Reference to day 1 (presentation)
- Working session
  - Working group on expectations
  - „Directors‘ panel“ exercise
- Further steps
RESULTS

SESSION I

1) Discussions on the findings of the preliminary analysis

The main issues, common features and differences of the organizational structures within the network, as resulting from the preliminary analysis of the questionnaires were presented to the participants in the beginning.

The session of open discussions that followed the presentation, revealed some interesting opinions and stimulated some new questions that are presented in the table below, grouped in 4 sections: (1) comments, (2) relevant issues, (3) “contras” and (4) questions.

Table 1 – Discussions on the preliminary findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The questionnaire and the methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the perception on the law may differ among the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it is difficult to simplify the organizational structures so that they fit a questionnaire; sometimes it is not easy to identify the limits of the organizational systems of protected areas (PA), as these interfere with the management system of different nature resources [!!!!]. Simplifying the structures doesn’t help in envisaging the full complexity. [Carl Manzano]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Donau Auen NP has 2 forest company working for the park but it is difficult to calculate how many of their staff is engaged only in the park management, as (1) one company has 15 people employed in total but only few work for the park + (2) Vienna City Forest Administration – they don’t know themselves how many people are working for them in total…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is interesting that the answers are pretty different even amongst representatives of PAs from the same country (e.g. Hungary) [Attila Fersch]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Referring to some questions to the questionnaire – it was not possible to get the exact number of staff – they have 69 but they are responsible for the whole region. [Attila Fersch]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The analysis and its usefulness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the comparative analysis is useful, as well as having a set of models of best practice that can be used – <em>What is better to do? What model works in e.g. Danube Delta?</em> This analysis should be in-deepen by defining a set of indicators to characterize the management [Grigore Baboianu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The results and some high important issues</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The issue of financing (the source of financing) is tricky. It could be fine to have the money coming only from the state, if this money is sufficient
to cover the management costs. Letting private companies to finance may leave room for their interests to be followed to the detriment of protected area management objectives. *Is it better that the park/PA manages the resources?* It would be useful to find answers to this question by presenting some examples from the network. [Grigore Baboianu]

- e.g. DDBR has 2 functions: (1) protected area administration (PAA) and (2) environmental authority in the region. The comparison of this structure with the others within the network could be useful.

- Concerning the *funding sources* - Danube Riparian Forest NP is in a very good condition due the support of the state while colleagues from other countries are striving to get money through projects. [Attila Fersch]

- similarities between the organizational arrangements of different protected areas within the network: e.g. the forest management system in Donau Auen NP is similar to that of Vojvodina (Serbia) and to Hungary. [Carl Manzano]

### RELEVANT issues

Some aspects that are considered to have a very high relevance for the issue of organizational management and development were listed: [Carl Manzano]

- **hard facts:**
  1. *authority* in a legal sense: are PAAs depending on the law or have the power to decide? DANP prepares the management plan but depend on the law, which is different for each of the 2 regions that overlap the park;
  2. *land ownership*: it makes a real difference in the context;
  3. *the possibility to provide services*: are PAAs able to deliver services (e.g. tourism) and make money out of it? DANUA wants to monopolize the lead in tourism services and don’t have any privates involved. This is one of the possible approaches.

- **soft facts:**
  1. *politics*: we all depend on politics; it is people’s park but there is different understanding and autonomy. The question is *how much decision-making power do we have? How independent are we from the politics?*
  2. *staffing* (approach and policy) – *i.e.* what kind of people do we have /should we have? with what e.g. education, gender, age, etc.

### CONTRA (critics/objections)

Some participants made some *corrections* to the results:
- DANP don’t have a section for law enforcement. [Carl Manzano]
- for Fertő-Hansag Directorate, the responsibility it is not defined by the law. [Attila Fersch]

Some others expressed contrary opinions:
- public funding is not necessarily a good thing for the organization. Mixed funding might be preferable because it is safer. [Magdalena Wagner]

QUESTIONS

Maybe private ownership is a limiting factor. In this case the question would be how to purchase the land? The Germans have a good funding system but they have a big portion of private land ownership. [Georg Frank]

2) The “triangle” exercise

Description: representatives of 3 different types of PAs, representing the 3 pillars of the triangle are invited in front of the room to respond to the questions addressed by the moderator.

Participants:
(1) DDBR – Grigore Baboianu – the state institution* [Romania]
(2) BROZ – Tomas Kusic – the NGO (the independent non-governmental and non-profit entity)* [Slovakia]
(3) Vojvodina sume – Radmila Sakic – the state enterprise* [Serbia]

1 DDBRA (Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority) = public authority directly subordinated to the Ministry, financed mainly from the state budget, having authority both in its field of responsibility – i.e. nature conservation and the management of DDBR and in the field of environmental protection.
2 The Chair of BROZ – an NGO involved in the management of Dunajske Luhy LPA.
3 Vojvodina sume – public enterprise in charge with the forest management in the region of Vojvodina, self financed from the forest management and guarding activities, managing the Goranske Podunavlje Nature Reserve.
Table 2 – results from the “triangle exercise”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question / Issue</th>
<th>State (forest company (SR))</th>
<th>State (governmental administration (RO))</th>
<th>NGO (SK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The contact with the working environment</td>
<td>Radmila - GP NR – 1st day was confusing – I was a forester. I was asked if I wanted to work in this (appointed)</td>
<td>Grigore - DDBR – fishery engineer working for the DD research institute which was together with the BR Authority. When I started to work, I was not elected, I was appointed, I wanted it, I found it challenging, it was very new, so I didn’t know which anything about PAs – the DDBR was the first PA established by law. (looked for this job) most of them</td>
<td>Tomas - BROZ chair of NGO – founded in 1997 – I got this position because nobody wanted to take it. had to find different planned (self created job) only 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Remember the day when you started to work for the organization in this position. How was it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: How many of you are in this position?</td>
<td>2-3 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the institution</td>
<td>Vojvodina Sume - Forestry, fishing, hunting (&amp; ...) ...</td>
<td>PA Authority + environmental authority, managing the biodiversity conservation/protection, fisheries and all other resources use, public awareness and community involvement</td>
<td>Coordinating the activities (telling others what to do) in 10 km around Bratislava + doing conservation activities ourselves /manage part of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Which are the tasks of your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between the 3 „pillars“</td>
<td>The source and system of funding – we are state owned but get money from the resources we manage ourselves (state forest company); autonomy.</td>
<td>We (DDBRA) get money only from the state and projects, not from the management of resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Which do you think are the main differences between you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities between the 3 „pillars“</td>
<td>Similar to Djerdap NP.</td>
<td>The great majority of the participants are Similar to DDBR. Special case of Lonjsko Polje – multiple sources of co-financing.</td>
<td>Only DANP - it provides services and earns money from these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Are there similarities between the 3 and other participants concerning financing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of financing</td>
<td>In Kopacit Rit – they have a surplus invested in conservation.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6:</strong> Is an important part of money coming from services?</td>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong> DANP provides services and earns money because they have the money already but out of this money they can’t do other management activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resources</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Q7:</strong> Which is your staff number?</td>
<td>Enough people for the obligations we have&lt;br&gt;RO: Not enough staff (1 warden /15.000 ha), doing different kind of activities. Cooperate with the research institute, Water Management Authority, Forestry Authority, etc.&lt;br&gt;SK: 30 people – the biggest NGO in SK, 15 person executive – grazing animals, field work and other executive work. Advantage – can freely select the people you work with – people are motivated and no one from the outside can impose a person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q8:</strong> Would you be able to find your position in the triangle or you need another pillar?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The decision-making system</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Q9:</strong> (Georg) How many people have to be asked till you can decide?</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;5&lt;br&gt;Nobody (in Tomas’ particular case)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Interesting findings at a first glance

The resume of the first session – interactive exercise: What is the most interesting /surprising thing that you found out during the day?

Diversity, differences and similarities praised
- Picture of the great diversity confirmed
- Differences between national park/protected area administrations
- Many differences between the protected areas but the roles are similar
- (bio)diversity
- Very different types of organizations but working together
- Differences in organizational structures
- Cooperation between partners BUT many differences between PAs
- We are different but we can work together in the same project
- Differences and similarities between the Danube Parks
- we saw that we have different sort of administrations but finally we have common ideas, participate in the same Danube Park project
- diversity in organization -> diversity in ideas and priorities -> shared problems and chances for cooperation within DANUBEPARKS (helpful to understand)

Interesting new information revealed
- Interesting and new information about the Danube Parks (same but different)
- Approach of the evaluation of the questionnaire

Opportunities and bridges acknowledged
- Diversity of opportunities
- Different reading and answers to the questionnaire by two Croatian PAs with the same legal status

New questions arose
- Yet another way to know each-other
- All of the PAs have the same goal: nature conservation, but from the different starting point, and in a different way. What is the best practice?
- Curious on SWOT of funding sources & implications of that
- can state funding be unfavourable?

**SESSION II**

1) **The expectations of participants concerning this study and this project component (working groups)**

**Description:** the participants were split in 4 working groups and were invited to list on a flipchart paper at least 3 of their expectations concerning the analysis of organizational structures within the DANUBARKS network.

**G1**
- Can we really use it? (doubt)
- Best practice for small changes within existing structures
- Better understanding of different priorities and better cooperation

**G2**
- Data on wrong person/area can be used as argument for capacity building
- Data helps to evaluate our own practices and decisions
- Organizational background helps to understand strategies on management of protected areas
- Could be a good starting point for the future institutionalization of Danube Park

**G3**
- Learning from the others’ experience
- Understand diversity is a necessary base for cooperation
- Use the experience of others as an argument to develop our own organization
- Helping to know – accept the others

**G4**
- Knowing each-other better
- Identifying weaknesses and strengths
- Elaborating a common vision

**Conclusions:**
Most of the members are interested in share of experience and exchange of information concerning the existing models within the network, best practices that could be replicated, means to evaluate the existing structures and to evaluate their performance, knowing each-other and
developing a common vision.

2) „Director's panel“ exercise

Description: The directors present in this „Directors’ workshop“ were invited in from of the room to sit at the same table and answer a list of questions concerning their PA context. Given the limited time available for this exercise the following 5 questions were addressed:

- Q1: You have an important project. For private reasons the project manager needs to be replaced within a short time. What do you do?
- Q2: Have you implemented a project that had a positive effect on the River Danube? Can your activities effect the Danube?
- Q3: What means do you have to change land-uses (law, compensations, etc)?
- Q4: If you could change one thing in your organization, what would it be?
- Q5: You want to sign a Memorandum of Understand to intensify the co-operation within DanubeParks, whom do you need to ask / involve?

Participants:
(1) Attila Fersch - Fertő-Hansag National Park (HU)
(2) Katalin Sipos - Duna-Ipoly National Park (HU)
(3) Ognjen Ivosev - Vojvodinasmre - Gornje Podunavlje Nature Reserve (SR)
(4) Stela Bozhinova - Persina Nature Park (BG)
(5) Goran Gugic - Lonjsko Polje Nature Park (HR)
(6) Carl Manzano - Donau-Auen National Park (AT)
(7) Grigore Baboianu - Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve (RO)
(8) Tomas Kusik – BROZ (SK)

Conclusions:

1. Staffing policy and flexibility to changes

- the deputy system in Hungary (Fertő-Hansag NP) is helpful. Same in Croatia (Lonjsko Polje NP) - there is a second person that in this case will

\[4\] Or the participants having the experience of a Director.
take over the task; otherwise a tender can be open.

Note: For international projects the language can be a problem.

In case of BROZ the deputy system is not always the best; it offers an interim solution.

- refer to existing capacity (in case of Duna-Ipoly NP and Vojvodina Sume) – there are opportunities to replace the person and there are others experienced persons willing and able to work. It takes about 2 weeks to replace an employee (in Hungary);
- make a competition for a new positions (Bulgaria) – this takes between 2 weeks and 1 month;
- in case of Donau Auen NP and DDBRA the current administration can’t take over. All the persons are too busy. It’s an important decision to hire a person and it would take the time to do it. A local person would be most suitable (in DDBRA) but as a public institution the law imposes an approval in advance and a tendering procedure that takes at least 1 month, after the approval.

2. The power to influence Danube river and its associated nature systems (the subject to conservation within the D-Parks)

All the participants have the power to influence Danube river (in their area and more or less downstream). They have already done:

- wetland habitat restoration projects (DDBR),
- a river restoration project (DANP), although this is not the national park’s responsibility (the water management authority has it and the money as well, hence the park seeks for their cooperation,

Same in the case of Sava river (Lonjsko Polje Nature Park), where stakeholders are committed for this cause. To succeed there is need for cooperation [Katalin Sipos].

Comments:

“Danube river” has multiple dimensions. Danube is the habitat, the biotope, the social-economic system, etc. The river means also the people. For people a ferry would be useful but not for biodiversity [Attila Fersch]. Fertő-Hansag National Park had projects concerning this issue.

River engineering management is a threat; we don’t have the authority to influence the river management authority so we have to cooperate with the authorities. [Carl Manzano]

3. Available means to influence the structure of land use

- the stakeholder’s committee (Lonjsko Polje NP) which is about integrated planning and conservation in the field, legal means, a step by step strategy, etc;
- in Persina NP most important habitats are public state properties and is easy to cooperate with the state and there is the possibility for the park
authority to buy land;
- in Serbia (Gornje Podunavlje NR) to change the management practice it is necessary to change the law, which is not easy but it is easier than in the case of Bulgaria with the private property;
- subsidies in Hungary (Duna-Ipoly NP);
- the existing laws give a good frame for the land management in PAs in Hungary [Attila Fersch]. Partnerships are working. Game is the big problem, for hunting there are some partnerships but still not working properly (Fertő-Hansag NP);
- communication, the law and whatever subsidies are existing in Slovakia (BROZ). We use the fact that people don’t see the NGOs as the bad guys as for the institutions and we have a good image due to successful projects. Communication helped a lot. People understand what we do.
- In case of Romania (DDBR) the change has to be based on the law and the management plan – therefore political will is necessary. When land is owned by the county council the land use has to be changed on decision of the county councils together with the DDBR.
- compensations for not using the land in case of Donau Auen NP. The instrument is the management plan that has to be adopted by the authorities and is a powerful tool. We don’t have the possibility to affect the people. We have to respect the internal culture of the local communities.

4. Priorities for future changes

- more staff and more flexibility in staffing (Duna-Ipoly NP)
- more flexibility by the law (Gornje Podunavlje NR)
- increase the salaries and motivate the staff (Persina NP)
- increase the number of staff (Lonjsko Polje NP) – they have 36
- increase the number of staff (in Donau Auen NP) - by law there are 6, but we 22 are working – want to have 20 ensured by the law
- more flexibility to use the available funds - to receive the money from the national budget for the management according to the priorities and the needs of the PA - e.g. the salarisation should be based on a motivating system of staffing (DDBR)
- more stable sources of funding (BROZ)
- less bureaucracy (Fertő-Hansag NP)

5. Power and authority to develop/strengthen strategic partnerships (e.g. sign a memorandum)

- the Board has to be asked if financial implication exist (depends on financial implications) – DANP, AU
- it has to be approved by the Ministry (DDBR - RO)
- nobody but if it’s a sensitive issue the Board is consulted (BROZ)
- don’t need to ask anyone (Fertő-Hansag NP - HU)
- depends on the financial implications. Would inform the Ministry although in theory we are independent (Duna-Ipoly NP)
- talk with financial authorities. Consult with different levels (Gornje Podunavije NR)
- Ministries have to be consulted (Persina NP - BG)
- the permission of the Board is necessary. If money is involved the permission of the Ministry, as in case of Duna-Ipoly, is needed (Lonjsko Polje NP - HR). Same procedure as Katalin – inform the Ministry

Final conclusions and comments

The workshop was an opportunity for the D-Parks to meet again and exchange ideas, express their points of view, learn about each other’s context, challenges, strengths, etc, and to gain an overview of their entire network, as regarding from the perspective of a their organizational context. The meeting offered a chance to discuss the main findings, to correct some inadvertencies and to raise new questions and to experience a wonderful part of Donau Auen National Parks and its surroundings.

The importance of the organizational structure and system and its relevance for the management effectiveness of protected areas is widely acknowledged within the network. There is a real interest and need within the D-Parks to learn from the other’s experience (from success stories and failures), to find new models of organizational structures and systems that could be replicated, to understand, accept and value the existing ones. The organizations within the network range between 3 fundamental types: (1) the state/public/governmental administration, (2) the state company (managing state resources but having a statute that is similar to private companies) and (3) the non-governmental organization. Most of the organizational structures along the Danube are currently corresponding (entirely or are closer) to the first type. This is differentiated by the predominance of public funds in their structure of budget, their subordination (or a certain degree of autonomy) to the governmental authorities and limited, insufficient resources (especially in terms of human resources). However, each of these “models”/types has its own advantages, strengths, weaknesses and challenges from which the other members can learn and adapt to their own context.

Note: more specific findings, as resulting from the analysis that was presented in ppt format (and available in Annex 1) will be provided separately, in a draft report.

The main conclusion, as resulting from the opinions expressed by most of the participants, is that both, the differences and similarities, between the D-Parks represent first of all a bridge, a shared reality, an opportunity for cooperation within the network and for learning from each other.

One of the most important common characteristic and a strong link is the capacity to influence Danube (the whole system, including the human dimension) and the already existing successful initiatives that have contributed to the preservation of nature. These prove once more, that each of the
existing structures has its strengths and advantages that can lead to wonderful achievements and contribution to the overall goal.

The main priority for changes, as resulting from a majority of opinions, concerns the staff - its number, staffing policy, possibilities to motivate and reward as well as funding (stability and flexibility of funding resources).

There is a very rich diversity of models, perceptions, approaches (even for PAs from the same country) that is worth exploring and sharing both within the network and with other networks (e.g. CNPA, ALLPARKS).

Reality is often very complex and it is not easy to be simplified in order to fit some methodological requirements (as in the case of the initial questionnaire). To be able to learn from each-other’s models and experience, more detailed presentations of e.g. case studies would be necessary in addition to the synthetic results of a quantitative analysis regarding the whole D-Parks network.

The issue of financing (i.e. the financing system, the sources of funding and their implications for the management outcomes) emerged as one of the topics of main interest for the participants, given its obvious relevance and impact. This topic will be further explored in the next stages. However, a detailed study focused solely on this topic would be useful.

Some other relevant issues (that are highlighted in Table 1) were identified by the participants as relevant for the organizational management. These will be taken into account as possible criteria that can differentiate amongst certain types of organizations and will be further explored (as much as possible in the remaining time, through the skype interviews).

**Further steps and timeline**

1. Receive feed-back on the minute and the intermediary results  
   15<sup>th</sup> of June
2. Interview with the protected areas within the network  
   15<sup>th</sup> of July
3. Prepare the final report and submit it for comments  
   15<sup>th</sup> of August
4. Workshop in Tulcea (present and discuss the final results)  
   beginning of September (t.b.a.)
5. Finalize the report  
   October
ANNEX

Analysis of organizational structures of protected areas along the Danube

Preliminary Results

Step 1: Coordination meeting & questionnaire draft
Step 2: Questionnaire for all parks and analysis
Step 3: Director’s workshop in Orth
Step 4: Interviews with park representatives
Step 5: Analysis and documentation of results
Step 6: Presentation and discussion of draft final report at SCM in Târgu (HOM) 36–31.08

Overview – Responses and contact

Major achievements of the parks
Section 1: Staffing

- Total number of staff
- Age of staff
- Male and female staff
- Academic and non-academic staff
Section 1: People – Large number of functions

- Guardian of the PA
- Ranger
- Ranger Chief
- Ranger Department
- Director
- Managing director
- Head of Department
- Project manager
- Leader
- Senior officer
- Natural resource manager
- Senior officer for nature conservation
- Advisor forester
- Biodiversity, research, conservation
- Research & Nature Conservation Director
- Nature management Managing director
- Nature Conservation Experts Department Head
- Tourism Department Head
- Biodiversity and management of wetlands Head
- Visitor Centre Head
- Rangers Department Management staff communication – visitors
- Rangers Management staff
- Rangers Head staff and property treating
- Rangers Chief Leaders
- Rangers Technicians, Public relations and educational programmes
- Auxiliary staff Environmental educators
- Worker Economics
- Public workers Ecotourism
- Technical Service & Maintenance Dep.
- Lawyers
- Accountant Presentation & Touristic Department
- Secretaries & Administration Researchers Management Office

Management plan implementation, structure, regulations of the park

Previous occupation of staff

Danube Delta

Section 2: Different organizational structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Region</th>
<th>Public administration</th>
<th>Institution established by special law</th>
<th>Size of organization (number of staff)</th>
<th>Staff/10 km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danube Delta</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusenski Lom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70,7</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derdap</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonsjko Polje</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopacki Rit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornje Podunavlje</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duna-Drava</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duna-Ipoly</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertö-Hansag</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunajske Luhy (Association - NGO)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donau-Auen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube Riparian Forest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rusenski Lom

Djerdap

Persina

Lonjsko Polje

Abbreviations:
TOA - Tourism Authority of Austria
MWA - Ministry of Water and Agriculture
March - March 2015
COP - Consultative Council
MACP - Ministry of Agriculture and Food
PRNP - Rusenski Lom National Park
DNPA - Department for Management of the Park Management Agency
RFO - Regional Forest Office
EFA - Education, Training and Research Agency
Section 2: Organization – Land ownership

Section 2: Funding sources
Common features and differences

- All parks have
  - Department/Section/Division for nature conservation or biodiversity (except Gornje Podunavlje)
  - Department/Section/Division for public relation, education and visitors (except Danube Riparian Forest, Djerdap, Gornje Podunavlje, Persina?)
  - Department/Section/Division for law enforcement/ranger service
  - Department/Section/Division for common affairs/administration

- Other common sections
  - Department/Section/Division for land-use/forest management
  - Department/Section/Division for economics

Detailed tasks – Competences of parks

- Bulgaria no ranger patrols
- Hungary, Austria extensive competences
- Croatia & Serbia mainly research, visitor, controlling
- Hardly any land-use planning authority

Section 3 – Tasks: General tasks – Legal background

- Law enforcement, conservation and tourism basic tasks
- Regional development, awareness raising, public relations less common

Various stakeholders in PAs

- Bulgarie no ranger patrols
- Hungary, Austria extensive competences
- Croatia & Serbia mainly research, visitor, controlling
- Hardly any land-use planning authority
Section 4: Networks & Interaction

- DANUBEPARKS and international organizations hardly mentioned
- WWF important role in many parks
- Weak company links
- Mainly:
  - Public administration
  - NGO
  - Research
- Education & Tourism major successes

Aspects for discussion

- Section 1: People
  - Huge amount of different positions and names for positions
  - Huge differences in staffing
- Section 2: Organization
  - Land ownership – Public vs. Private property
  - Public organization vs. Institution established by special law
  - Which departments are equivalent? Which ones may supplement other parks?
- Section 3: Tasks and competences
  - All parks involved in nature conservation, law enforcement and tourism/recreation
  - Few in regional development, awareness raising
  - Some in public relations and marketing
- Section 4: Interaction and networks
  - The role of international cooperations (DANUBEPARKS)
  - NGOs as linking organizations (WWF)
  - Discussion: Coordination between parks: Who can provide experiences in certain sections (e.g. management plans, visitor management)

Local and (inter)national networks

Analysis of organizational structures of protected areas along the Danube

Preliminary Results

directors’ workshop
Mag. Dr. Michael Jungmeier
14.05.2013
A study on "organisations" - What are the benefits that we can have from this exercise?
Director’s pannel
6 questions to the directors
1. The Governor of DDBRA is proposed by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and appointed by the Prime Minister.
2. The executive directors and the heads of departments are appointed by the Governor based on national selection/competition.
3. The Directorate of Biodiversity and Integrated Monitoring includes executive departments on: Warden, Natural Heritage Management, Monitoring and Data Base, Public Awareness and Relations, Projects.
Rusenski Lom Nature Park

- Executive Forest Agency at Ministry of Agriculture and Food
- Director
- Accountant
- Implement the management plan, structure and regulations of the park
- Biodiversity, research and conservation activities
- Infrastructure and regulations of the park
- Public relations and educational programs
- Biodiversity and management the wetlands
Persina Nature Park

Abbreviations:
EFA - Executive Forest Agency
MoEW - Ministry of Environment and Waters
RIEW - Regional Inspectorate of Environment and Waters
RBD - River Basin Directorate
CC - Consultative Council
MAF - Ministry of Agriculture and Food
PNPD - Persina Nature Park Directorate
EMEPA - Enterprise for management of environmental protection activities
RDF - Regional Directorate of Forestry
FD - Forestry Directorate
EEA - Executive Environment Agency
Lonjsko Polje Nature Park

Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection
(appoints the director of the park and the members of the council)

State Institute for Nature Protection

Managing Council (5)

Managing Director (1)

General, common and administrative affairs department (3)

Ranger Service (4)

Expertise for matters of conservation, maintenance, preservation and use of Lonjsko Polje Nature Park department (2)

Promotional activities, hospitality and tourism department (3)
Kopacki Rit Nature Park

- Steering Council
- Directors Office
- Common Affairs
- Technical Service and Maintenance Department
- Nature Conservation Experts Department
- Rangers Department
- Presentation and Touristic Department
Duna-Drava National Park
Duna-Ipoly National Park
Donau-Auen National Park
Danube Riparian Forest