



ELCN
European Private Land
Conservation Network



LIFE16 PRE DE 005 – Development of a European Land Conservation Network (ELCN)
Action B.3 – Workshop Legal tools for private land conservation

International Workshop: Legal Tools for Private Land Conservation
Rovaniemi, Finland, 14-15 June 2018

Organised by



Centre for Economic Development,
Transport and the Environment



Workshop participants during the field trip at Kätkävaara Nature Trail

1. Introduction

This first workshop of the LIFE project “Development of a European Private Land Conservation Network – ELCN” investigated how private land conservation works under existing EU and national legislation and how new instruments could be legally codified to foster the concept of private land conservation. The workshop focused on two legal tools: "conservation easements" and "privately protected areas".

Conservation easements are widely used in North America and other parts of the world, but are hardly known in the EU. They represent a property law tool that landowners can use to protect their land by defining permissible land uses in perpetuity. Their wider-scale application will require a sound legal basis and proper financial instruments to incentivise landowners to use the tool for the protection of their land. Likewise, the protection category 'privately protected area' is increasingly used around the world¹, but up to this point it has only been codified in a handful of EU member states (e.g. Portugal and Belgium). Moreover, public funding for the establishment, governance and management of privately protected areas has been largely lacking in the EU.

By bringing together leading experts and identifying reform needs for conservation, property, tax and charitable law, the workshop investigated the potential and the risks of these and other legal tools for private land conservation in Europe.

The workshop was hosted by the Finnish LIFE ELCN project partner "[Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for Lapland \(LAPELY\)](#)". The workshop was attended by 29 participants from 15 countries.

¹ Sue Stolton, Kent Redford and Nigel Dudley 2014. The Futures of Privately Protected Areas. IUCN Protected Area Technical Report Series No.1. Gland, Switzerland. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/PATRS-001.pdf>

2. Workshop Programme

Thursday, 14 June 2018 Conservation Easements

09:00 Welcome by hosts

09:30 Conservation easements – legal concept and possible applications, Dr. Tilmann Disselhoff, NABU/ELCN

10:00 The use of easements for conservation in the EU – results of the first international baseline study, Inga Racinska and Siim Vahtrus, SIA Biota, Latvia

11:00 Coffee break

11:30 Incentives and motives for using conservation easements lessons from the USA, Laura Johnson, International Land Conservation Network

13:30 Easements and Stewardship Agreements in Catalonia, Jofre Rodrigo and Hernan Collado, Xarxa de Custòdia del Territori (XCT), Catalonia, Spain

12:00 Lunch

14:15 Obligations réelles environnementales in France, Julie Babin - Federation conservatoires d'espaces naturels, France

15:00 Using easements for forest conservation in Scandinavia and the Baltic States, Jari Pasanen, Lapin ELY-keskus, Finland

16:00 Plenary discussion: Conservation easements in the EU

20:00 Boat tour on Kemijoki River, dinner and “Euro Cocktail” on Kotisaari Island

Friday, 15 June 2018 Privately Protected Areas

09:00 Privately protected areas in the EU – an overview, Sue Stolton, IUCN PPA Specialist Group

10:00 Privately protected areas in Portugal Pedro Prata, Associação Transumância e Natureza, Portugal

10:30 Privately protected areas as a management category in Belgium, Niels Vanheuverbeke, Natuurpunt, Belgium

11:00 Coffee break

11:00 Private land conservation in Croatia Irina Zupan, Croatian Agency for Environment and Nature, Croatia

12:00 Plenary discussion: Privately protected areas in the EU

12:45 Concluding remarks – policy options for improving the legal basis of private land conservation in the EU

13:00 Lunch

14:00 Excursion to Kätkävaara Nature Trail

19:00 Return to Rovaniemi

3. Workshop contents

Conservation easements – legal concept and possible applications, Dr. Tilmann Disselhoff, NABU/ELCN

After presenting video greetings from MEP Sirpa Pietikäinen – Member of the ELCN Advisory Council, Marta Subirá –Secretary for the Environment of Catalonia and Angelo Salsi - Head of the LIFE Programme at the Executive Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises, Disselhoff introduced the attendants to the context of the first ELCN workshop by proposing key criteria for the concept of „private land conservation“. He argued that private land conservation should generally be considered perpetual, voluntary, additional (to regulatory obligations) and complementary to public conservation efforts. Based on this characterisation, he outlined the state of play for the two legal tools that formed the focus of the workshop, conservation easements and privately protected areas. Both tools are well established in the Anglo-American world, with working definitions formally adopted by relevant institutions (LTA and IUCN respectively) and best-practice guidelines published (LTA’s Standards and Practices for conservation easements) or under development (IUCN PPA Guidelines). Disselhoff then briefly outlined the legal history of easements (and related tools such as servitudes and covenants) as a time-proven part of real property law that helps to separate ownership and use rights for a property by creating a contractual relationship between a servient and a dominant estate or party. He then explained how the tool has been adopted for conservation purposes in the US.

The use of easements for conservation in the EU – results of the first international baseline study, Inga Racinska and Siim Vahtrus, SIA Biota

Inga Racinska and Siim Vahtrus presented the preliminary results of their ongoing study on the use of easements for conservation purposes in the EU. In their study, they investigated for 25 of the 28 EU member states (only Cyprus, Malta and Luxemburg were not covered) where legal mechanisms under national legislation are currently in place that already or potentially allow the application of conservation easement concept, and where easements are already used for conservation purposes. Although they explicitly limited themselves to exploring the legal bases for introducing and/or spreading the conservation easement concept in the EU and did not compare easements to other private land conservation tools or attempted to draw conclusions about the benefits of conservation easements in the various national contexts, it became clear from their presentation that easements are a promising tool for implementing private land conservation initiatives, but that further research is needed to better define the demand for the tool and potential field of applications. They showed that while in most EU member states, easements can already be used for private land conservation, the tool has not been widely used for this purpose yet. It remains to be seen whether this is due to existing limitations of the tool (with regard to its duration, the types of land uses that can be regulated or eligible parties) or the lack of related financial incentives for private landowners. By using examples from France, Ireland, Estonia and Italy, Racinska and Vahtrus argued that the main challenge is actually not the national legal systems, but rather a lack of implementation practice and incentives for testing and wider application of the tool. They thus advocated for the creation of positive precedents for raising the awareness of conservation authorities and landowners about the tool, the provision of fiscal incentives for landowners to put conservation easements on their land, and the use of environmental funding programmes such as LIFE to support the proliferation of the mechanism in the EU. In conclusion, they cautioned against placing too high hopes on the tool without prior assessment of the actual demand for conservation easements in the EU. One reason why easements have not yet been widely implemented might lie the fact that other, more suitable tools are routinely used that fulfil function similar to those of conservation easements (e.g. subsidies for certain agricultural practices, long-term lease agreements).

Incentives and motives for using conservation easements lessons from the USA, Laura Johnson, International Land Conservation Network

Laura Johnson introduced the workshop participants to the history and the scope of the International Land Conservation Network (ILCN), the sister/mother network of the ELCN on a global level. She showed that private land conservation today is a global, widely diverse movement supported by at least 2,000 organisations in 120 countries and territories. As many of private land conservation organisations are genuinely interested in networking and mutual exchange of experience, the ILCN takes on the role of convening the global community of practice virtually and in person, disseminating ideas, cases, and tools, providing training opportunities, promoting partnerships and Collaborations, and raising awareness of the critical role of private and civic land conservation in safeguarding natural resources. Johnson made the case for private land conservation as an important complementary force to public conservation efforts that often suffer from the lack of political will, scarce public funds for conservation and opposition by landowners. She then showed that conservation easements have become the most important private land conservation tool in the US, with over 50 M acres protected since 1980. The reasons for the unparalleled rise of conservation easements as dominant conservation tool lie in the discourse of private property rights vs. government regulatory powers, with land being under pressure from commercial, residential and industrial development, intensive agricultural uses etc. in many parts of the US and a general reluctance towards land use regulations. Moreover, the availability of a federal income tax deduction provided significant financial incentives for the donation of easements. In response, the land trust sector increased its capacity to meet the need for charitable organisations to hold easements. Last not least, the national umbrella organisation of the land trust movement, the Land Trust Alliance supported the creation of a strong community by providing networking, educational and lobbying services to its constituency.

Easements and Stewardship Agreements in Catalonia, Jofre Rodrigo and Hernan Collado – Xarxa de Custòdia del Territori (XCT)

Jofre Rodrigo and Hernan Collado introduced the XCT's achievements since 2003 and they also explained a new legal tool for conservation in Catalonia: Land Stewardship Contracts. Since 2017, the Catalan Civil Code regulates land stewardship contracts. Although the law provides a very open definition for them, it states some basic requirements. For example, the landowner, or other entity that has some rights over the land (such as a tenant), must sign the agreement with a not-for-profit organization that has land stewardship among its primary goals. Furthermore, the law gives freedom to the parties to set the contract terms, including obligations and the breach, the duration or guarantees, and the general contents.

Under the new rule, a Land Stewardship Contract can be binding between parties or binding to the land. The latter means that an agreement can be attached to the land's deed, therefore following the land title in the event of new ownership, similar to an easement or covenant. The Catalan civil code does not allow for contracts in perpetuity, but stewardship agreements can be as long as 99 years, with the potential to be renewed.

This regulation has great significance for the public recognition of land stewardship as a civic strategy for the conservation of natural, cultural, and landscape. When looking internationally, this is also a novelty, particularly for countries with civil code structure, since only Chile has adopted a law (Law no. 20930 in June 2016) that establishes "environmental conservation in rem right." Last but not least, the Government of Catalonia is currently working to implement a public Register of Stewardship Agreements and a tax incentive framework for land stewardship that will be linked to the register.

Obligations réelles environnementales in France, Julie Babin - Federation conservatoires d'espaces naturels

Julie Babin explained a new legal tool for land conservation in France: Environmental Real Obligation (ERO). The tool was created in August 2016 under the French Environmental Law (Article L.132-3). It is a contract with the owner of land which obliges him to do or not do something on his land, with the goal to protect nature. These obligations can include things like: the maintenance, conservation, management or restoration of elements of biodiversity or ecological functions. There could be one or more purposes defined by the contract. The obligations are attached to the ownership of the property and stay with the property. However, this tool cannot be used to restrict the hunting rights.

The contract is made between the owner of land (public or private, physical or legal person) on one hand, and the contracting party which cannot be a physical person (local authority, public institution or other legal persons). It is not prescribed what the obligations of either side can be, but some examples are: for the owner to: maintain a grazing, not mow before 1 July; not use fertilizers and plant protection products, not build on the plots; for the contracting party to: implement hydraulic and ecological management and restoration operations; carry out inventories and monitoring of the evolution of habitats and species in relation to management arrangements; or pay an agreed amount of money.

This tool can be applied anywhere in France on any kind of property, on the whole or on only a part of a parcel. It can last from 1 day to 99 years, commitments should be reciprocal, revision of the contract can be foreseen, as well as the terms for the cancellation. Julie presented a case of a 30-year contract between CEN Savoy and the owner of land the municipality of Yenne.

Using easements for forest conservation in Scandinavia and the Baltic States, Jari Pasanen, Lapin ELY-keskus

Jari Pasanen started by giving an outline of the nature conservation system of Finland. There are six conservation programmes focusing on the certain ecosystems (i.e. mires, waterfowl habitats, eskers, herb-rich forests, shore areas and old-growth forests). The implementation of the programs takes place under the Finnish Nature Conservation Act. For the implementation of conservation measures on the private land, the state must negotiate with the landowners. Implementation can take place by: selling the land area to the state; by a land swap; by establishing a private nature conservation area (against compensation payments). The law also allows for the implementation of conservation programs without the consent of the landowner, but 99 % of the program areas have been implemented voluntarily. The Finnish State is responsible for the financing of the conservation actions through the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry are responsible for coordinating and implementing the funding – in 2017 funding for the implementation of nature protection programs was EUR 18 630 000. The Government has launched extensive nature conservation programmes, based on the Nature Conservation Act and various action plans, to safeguard biodiversity. One of the most important such action programmes for forest protection is Forest Biodiversity Programme for Southern Finland (METSO).

METSO aims at activating the voluntary-based conservation agreements between forest owners and authorities. u METSO Programme offers three options for forest owner: permanent protection; temporary protection; or nature management in forest habitats. The Finnish government's objective is by 2025 to have sites covering about 96 000 hectares of forest. So far, in Lapland, about 9 000 hectares have been implemented in the METSO program – one third of this was implemented via the NATNET Life + project "Increasing ecological connections and coherence of the Natura 2000 network" that ran between 2012 and 2017 (<https://www.natnet.fi/>). The project was coordinated by

Coordinator the LAPLAND ELY- CENTRE. The project has established conservation agreements on 2860 hectares of land, achieved restoration of 610 hectares of mires on private land, and much more. Active information activities and good cooperation with landowners was a key factor for the success of the project.

In Finland the private nature conservation areas are normally not established as easements. In Finnish real estate and property law the definition of an easement means a right / entitlement to use someone else's land or water area. The right is usually based on decision made by a public authority and the right is restricted to a certain area. The easement, information on its contents and changes are entered into the Real Estate Register. Conservation areas are usually established through regulatory authority decision, and they are not considered as easements. The Authority Decision that establishes a conservation area, is entered into the Real Estate Register and the regulatory decision is shown in the cadastral certificate.

In Latvia easements can be used to dedicate a property, or part of it, to nature conservation purposes, but there are some restrictions to the type of information that can be registered in the Land Register.

In Estonia easements can be used to dedicate property / or part of it to the nature conservation purposes. According to the general norms regulating easements ("servitudes" in Estonian legal language) in the Law of Property Act, these may take form of entitling another person or owner of "dominant" property to either use "servient" property or obliging the owner of the "servient" property to refrain from particular exercises of ownership rights (e.g. not construct any new buildings, cut trees or similar). Also, certain actions may be required from the owner for the benefit of another person as part of a servitude called "real encumbrance". The law does not preclude any purpose for which the easements may be used, i.e. it can also be used for nature conservation purposes.

In Denmark the situation is similar to Estonia. According to Danish law easements in principle can be used to dedicate property to nature protection purposes. The easements ('servitutter') may be described in a text directly entered in the title, or in a document that is attached and thus becomes part of the title.

Privately protected areas in the EU – an overview, Sue Stolton, IUCN PPA Specialist Group
Sue Stolton explained how IUCN defines privately protected areas (PPAs), provided an overview of the PPAs in Europe and informed the audience about the work that is being done by the IUCN-WCPA Specialist Group on Privately Protected Areas and Nature Stewardship.

Good private land stewardship can encompass a range of management policies and practice, from the purely voluntary decision to conserve biodiversity on a piece of land to full protected area management under national conservation legislation. However, for a site to be recognised as a PPA it has to be a protected area, as defined by IUCN, under private governance: *A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through **legal or other effective means**, to achieve the **long-term** conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values.* An area can be a PPA if it is legally designated and managed in accordance with the IUCN definition and associated principles, or if an area is **managed in accordance** with the IUCN definition and associated principles, and, though **not legally mandated**. In terms of long-term intent towards conservation it should be at least 25 years, although the intent should be conservation in perpetuity. Safeguards should be put in place to ensure conservation objectives persist even if ownership changes.

In terms of how many PPAs are there in Europe and where, not a lot is known at the moment. Global information about protected areas is being collated in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). At the moment, only 25 countries have reported on PPAs into the WDPA and among them only 1 country from Europe. So the PPAs are largely under-represented in the WDPA, while we know there are many out there (e.g. 10 000 or more sites in Finland, more than 750 sites in Germany, 2 sites in Slovenia, more than 1 300 sites in Spain or more than 4 000 sites in UK). The reasons for this under-representation are: in the past WDPA was based solely on government reporting and 80% of records on the WDPA are for protected areas under the governance of government agencies; PPAs in the WDPA are not always readily identifiable because their governance type has not been reported or has been misreported.

WDPA data for European countries is updated collectively through submission of the Common Database on Designated Areas (CDDA) supplied by the EEA. However, the CDDA does not collect information on governance type and all sites are automatically assigned 'Federal or national ministry or agency'. UNEP WCMC has recently identified all sites that appeared to be PPAs based on their designation and contacted relevant governments to ask if governance type should be changed – with little response as yet. The IUCN WCPA Specialist Group on Privately Protected Areas and Nature Stewardship worked with the managers of the world database on protected areas (UNEP WCMC) to develop new reporting process so that other sources than governments can report on PPAs. The IUCN Specialist Group runs a newsletter and has an email discussion group. More information can be found at privateconservation.net. The Group is currently finalizing the Best Practice Guidelines which should be launched at the CBD COP in Egypt in November 2018. PPAs contribute substantially to biodiversity and other conservation objectives. They should, therefore, be better recognized, encouraged and resourced.

Privately protected areas in Portugal, Pedro Prata, Associação Transumância e Natureza
Pedro Prata has told the story about establishing the Faia Brava – the first and only private nature protection reserve in Portugal. This is in a way a strength of the project. The reserve is a part of the Rewilding Europe initiative. Some of the weaknesses are that there is no benefit for the land owner, and complex landownership matrix. High levels of land abandonment in the area represents an opportunity, but also contributes to the threats: isolated area and prone to larger events such as fire. This project is being implemented by a non-profit organisation working on nature conservation with the aim of creating more space for nature. More than 1 600 hectares has been acquired for conservation since 2000. In 2010 the area was legally recognised as the first Privately Protected Area and it has become a pilot site for Rewilding Europe in Western Iberia in 2011. In 2015 a Conservation Strategy was defined based on the Faia Brava model. The vision for the future is that wild nature is the primary objective and private initiative the driver of this process. In concrete terms this means that: natural processes are reinvigorated, and wildlife populations restored in the greater Côa Valley; ongoing habitat improvement in support of the comeback of the Iberian wolf and Iberian lynx; upscaling of natural grazing with rewilded horses and Tauros in the Greater Côa Valley, through a cooperation of landowners, municipalities and other stakeholders. The main threats are poisoning, poaching and wildfires. A group of wildlife ambassadors works with local communities to fight poaching and poisoning and a network of fire guards, using state-of-the-art surveillance – is established. There is ongoing work on the development of a new, nature-based economy, using tourism facilities already in place and new opportunities based on wilder nature and wildlife comeback with a special highlight to the Côa Grand Route LandArt Festival.

Privately protected areas as a management category in Belgium, Niels Vanheuverbeke, Natuurpunt

Niels Vanheuverbeke explained how privately protected areas (PPA's) are used as a management category by Natuurpunt. Natuurpunt is the largest Flemish NGO working on the protection and long term conservation of nature in Flanders and was officially founded in 2001 by the merge of two former Flemish nature organisations. To accomplish his challenging mission (as Flanders has a high pressure on rural grounds due to expanding urban zones and intensive agriculture), Natuurpunt focusses on acquiring (70%) and renting (30%) land which it then manages for nature purposes. Currently, Natuurpunt manages more than 23 000 hectares, divided in more than 300 nature reserves, and this number is still growing at an average rate of 650 ha/year, based on the passed 20 years.

For the acquisition of land, Natuurpunt is subsidised by the government. In by the government officially recognised so called "project-areas", covering for example a river valley or an old forest, subsidies for the purchase of land can be obtained by Natuurpunt. We can say that over the passed few years, about 65% of the total acquisition was subsidised by the government. As the nature legislation recently changed in Flanders, it's still not clear yet how this rate will evolve in the future. Besides the acquisition, Natuurpunt gets also governmental financial support for the recurrent management of his terrains. This is however only possible after a terrain is included in an officially recognised nature management plan, by which the terrain gets the official status of "nature reserve" (this holds an everlasting easement for nature purposes).

Obtaining such a vast property of nature in Flanders was and is only possible because of the model of Natuurpunt, based on a network of volunteers. Those volunteers live all across Flanders and group in almost every municipality in "self-organising teams". These teams are centrally coordinated by the head office in Mechelen, but they keep a very high responsibility and independence: they purchase land in their working area (municipality), they manage their own nature reserves, they distribute their own local magazines among their members and they organise activities in order to obtain money and be able to buy land. The power of this model, as volunteers are deeply rooted in the local situation and know for example the owner situation of a piece of land, is the bond between Natuurpunt's volunteers as land stewards and the land itself. Volunteers are responsible for their own nature reserves and by managing those themselves, they get a very strong emotional bond with them, as one could compare with the bond between a private landowner and his land. Although Natuurpunt's volunteers are not official owner of any parcel of land, they feel and act as one. As has been proven, this model seems to work as a catalyst for local and regional nature conservation.

Private land conservation in Croatia, Irina Zupan, Croatian Agency for Environment and Nature
Irina Zupan gave an overview of the institutional and legal framework of protected areas in Croatia. Croatia has a long tradition of designating the protected areas' network going back more than 70 years. There are 9 national categories of protected areas which together cover some 8,5% of the Croatian territory. Some 89% of the protected areas are IUCN category V. As an EU member state, Croatia has designated a network of Natura 2000 sites according to the EU Nature Directives. While largely overlapping with the national designations (87% of national designations are also Natura 2000), Natura 2000 is much broader and covers some 29% of the territory (IUCN category V or IV). There is a well-established institutional framework of Protected Areas Management Authorities (PAMA) for the management of designated protected areas coordinated centrally by the Ministry of Environment and Energy. In terms of governance type almost all sites are governed by the national or regional governmental agency. Land ownership within the sites varies from in some sites almost completely state owned (National Park Paklenica 93%) to a complete opposite where all the land is privately owned (National Park Kornati 99%). There are legal mechanisms in place to ensure protection on privately owned land. There are some mechanisms for applying proactive

conservation measures (for maintenance, revitalization or restoration of ecosystems) in the form of incentives for biodiversity friendly farming practices within the Agri Environment programme but are scarcely used. The biggest problems in relation to the privately-owned land is unclear ownership due to an inaccurate Cadastre and intensive emigration so owners are no longer in Croatia.

There are existing legal mechanisms allowing the possibility for private entity (person, association or business) to manage a protected area (both national categories and Natura 2000 sites). This is so-called custody (according to the Nature Protection Law) – partial or total delegation of management. This mechanism is, however, not very well defined and there is a very limited interest for it. Only 1 example exists: Protected Landscape Gajna is managed by a local NGO.

There are no privately protected areas in Croatia so far. One of the main challenges for such initiatives could be the national legislation of different sectors (water management, hunting, mining, golf courses) which has priority above the private ownership and could be in collision with the conservation objectives.

4. Lessons learnt / conclusions

Some of the main lessons learnt are that national legal frameworks might be very different, but experience sharing is very important when trying to develop conservation easements and land stewardship agreements, or to establish privately protected areas (PPA). It was interesting to realise how many countries are actually having easements recognised as a possible tool, even if these are not used to the full extent. Out of the discussions at the workshop it was evident that the next logical step would be to determine if the demand exists in EU Member States for a tool such as the conservation easements.

While some countries have more similarities than others, a lot of work still needs to be done at legal level, to be able to make a European approach to the subject. There will not be a one size fits all solution. Legal tools (in particular similar to conservation easements) to support private land conservation are needed, but the legal tools will most likely differ from one Member State to the other. There could be a clear role for a network such as ELCN to facilitate this.

Privately Protected Areas (PPAs) contribute substantially to biodiversity and other conservation objectives. They should, therefore, be better recognized, encouraged and resourced than they are now. There is a role for the ELCN network to help increase the recognition of the PPAs at the European level, by advocating for this with the relevant European institutions (e.g. European Environmental Agency).

It was good to see that there is interest in the topic from across Europe and that the participants have really appreciated the opportunity to network.

An additional dimension that is necessary to support private land conservation in Europe are incentives (including tax and financial incentives). That is why this will be the topic of the next workshop ELCN is organising in November this year.



5. List of participants

	Last Name	First Name	Organisation	Country
1	Babin	Julie	Fédération des Conservatoires d'espaces naturels	France
2	Balanica Dragomir	Carmelia Mariana	National Agency for Natural Protected Areas	Romania
3	Borass	Lars	NEEMO	Germany
4	Čivić	Kristijan	Eurosite	The Netherlands
5	Collado	Hernan		Spain
6	Disselhoff	Tilman	Naturschutzbund Deutschland Bundesverband	Germany
7	Gherghiceanu	Cristian	ADEPT	Romania
8	Gnittke	Inka	Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und nukleare Sicherheit	Germany
9	Gooden	Jennifer	Oxford University	UK
10	Johnson	Laura	International Land Conservation Network	Global
11	Krolopp	Andras	The Nature Conservancy	Belgium/Germany
12	Langedijk	Amina	Industrial Minerals Association Europe	Belgium
13	Pasanen	Jari	LAPELY Keskus	Finland
14	Prata	Pedro	Associação Transumância e Natureza	Portugal
15	Račinska	Inga	SIA Biota	Latvia
16	Rafa	Miquel	Fundació Catalunya la Pedrera	Spain
17	Rauhala	Jouni	LAPELY Keskus	Finland
18	Ringblom	Helena	Skogsstyrelsen	Sweden
19	Rioufol	Veronique	Terre de Liens	Spain
20	Rodrigo	Jofre	Xarxa de Custòdia del Territori	Spain
21	Sadam	Ave	Keskkonnaamet	Estonia
22	Sobakina	Elena		Chile/Switzerland
23	Stolton	Sue	IUCN Privately Protected Areas Specialist Group	UK
24	Tack	Jurgen	European Landowners Organisation	Belgium
25	Vahtrus	Siim	SIA Biota	Estonia
26	Van der Stegen	Joseph	European Commission, DG Env, Nature Unit	Belgium
27	Vanheuverbeke	Niels	Natuurpunt	Belgium
28	Vieira	Jóni	Montis	Portugal
29	Zupan	Irina	Hrvatska agencija za okoliš i prirodu	Croatia