

## System-level evaluation of protected area management effectiveness for Parks & Wildlife Finland (PAME)



1<sup>st</sup> March 2023

## Contents

Key terms	4
TOR	4
Network-level questionnaire	9
1. Context	10
1.1 Is there a clearly articulated vision, plan and strategy, for the on-going development and management of the Finnish protected area system within Parks and Wildlife Finland?	10
1.2 Does the legislative framework adequately support the effective functioning of the protected area system?	11
1.3 Is there a cohesive and nationally coordinated approach to protected area management?	12
1.4 Is trans-boundary and regional co-operation established and maintained in a manner which supports effective management of Finnish protected areas?	13
1.5 Are the values of the protected area system well documented, assessed and monitored?	14
1.6 Are the threats to protected area system values well documented and assessed?	15
1.7 Are the objectives of Natura 2000 (N2000) sites and the protected area system fully harmonised in terms of their conservation objectives and planned measures?	16
1.8 Do Finnish protected area management objectives harmonise with wider cultural objectives including those relating to the Sámi?	17
NEW QUESTION 1.9 Has the Global Biodiversity Framework and the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 been considered at the network level and linked to the vision of the Finnish protected area system?	18
NEW QUESTION 1.10 Is the protected areas network well placed to implement the EU Nature Restoration Law proposal?	19
NEW QUESTION: 1.11 Do protect area objectives harmonise with wider environmental policy and vice-versa?	20
2. Planning	21
2.1 Are protected areas identified and categorised in an organised system?	21
2.2 Are individual protected areas designed and established through a systematic and scientifically based process, aligned with the strategic vision for protected areas?	22
2.3 Are established protected areas covered by comprehensive management plans and are these aligned to the strategic vision?	23
2.4 Are management plans routinely and systematically updated?	24
2.5 Are protected areas located in places with the highest/most threatened biodiversity and/or other important values?	25
2.6 Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate in management planning and designation?	26
2.7 Are individual protected areas integrated into a wider ecological network following the principles of the ecosystem approach?	27
3. Resources	28
3.1 Are personnel and resources well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?	28
3.2 How have resourcing levels varied with increases in protected areas in recent years?	29
3.3 At the protected area level are resources linked to priority actions?	30
3.4 What level of resources is provided by partners and/or volunteers?	31
3.5 Do protected area managers consider resources to be sufficient?	32
NEW QUESTION: 3.6 Do protected area managers consider the expertise/capacity available to them aligned with the values to be protected or intended outcomes to be provided?	33

4. Process	34
4.1 Is management performance against relevant planning objectives and management standards routinely monitored, assessed and systematically audited as part of an on-going 'continuous improvement' process?	34
4.2 Is staff performance management linked to achievement of management objectives?	35
4.3 Is there external and independent involvement in internal audit?	36
4.4 Is there effective public participation in protected area management in Finland?	37
4.5 Is there a responsive system for handling complaints and comments about protected area management and policy?	38
NEW QUESTION. 4.6 Are management systems flexible enough to respond to change, e.g., findings of management effectiveness assessments, monitoring and research results, changes in legislation, new knowledge and understanding.	39
NEW QUESTION. 4.7 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to adapt to climate change?	40
NEW QUESTION. 4.8 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to prevent carbon loss and to encourage further carbon capture?	41
NEW QUESTION. 4.9 Is planning in place to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in protected area management and related activities?	42
NEW QUESTION. 4.10 Are systems in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas?	43
5. Output	44
5.1 Is adequate information on protected area policy, vision and management publicly available?	44
5.2 Are visitor services appropriate for the relevant protected area category?	45
5.3 Are management related trends systematically evaluated and routinely reported?	46
5.4 Is there a systematic maintenance schedule in place for built infrastructure/assets?	47
5.5 Does Finland fulfil its monitoring and reporting obligations under European Directives and international conventions?	48
NEW QUESTION: 5.6 Are visitor use trends systematically monitored and reported in protected areas which have tourism as a management objective?	49
6. Outcomes	50
6.1 Are threatened species populations stable or increasing?	50
6.2 Are selected indicator species within acceptable ranges?	51
6.3 Are biological communities at a mix of ages and spacings that will support native biodiversity?	52
6.4 Are the expectations of visitors generally met or exceeded?	53
6.5 Are neighbours and adjacent communities supportive of protected area management?	54
6.6 Are cultural heritage assets protected?	55
NEW QUESTION 6.7 Is ecosystem functionality and health being maintained?	56
	57

## Key terms

For this assessment important terms include:

**Effective protected area management (PAME) assessment:** is defined by IUCN WCPA as the assessment of how well the protected area is being managed – primarily the extent to which it is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives. The term management effectiveness reflects three main themes:

- design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems;
- adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and
- delivery of protected area objectives including conservation of values.<sup>1</sup>

**Protected area:** The CBD defines a protected area as: “a geographically defined area which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives”.<sup>2</sup> IUCN has another definition: “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”.<sup>3</sup> There is tacit agreement that the two are equivalent.<sup>4</sup> An approved Finnish translation of this definition exists and forms the basis of the national protected area system.<sup>5</sup>

**Protected area network** indicates the range of protected areas that can fall into different the IUCN categories and governance types as defined by IUCN.<sup>6</sup> For this assessment the network of protected areas being assessed covers ONLY those operated by Parks & Wildlife Finland.

**Protected area system** relates to the whole system of protected areas in Finland. Many people now talk about protected and conserved systems to include effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) within this terminology.

## TOR

A comprehensive, nation-wide, agency-level evaluation of the state-owned protected area system operated by Parks & Wildlife Finland.

The basic aim of the PAME is to assess how:

- The protected area system is managed and governed by Parks & Wildlife Finland.
- The system is meeting obligations to the European Union Natura 2000 network and other international obligations.
- Effective the conservation objectives are.
- Effective the system is in protecting Finnish biological and cultural values.
- Well social objectives are met by providing:
  - recreational services (visitor services in support of tourism and recreation opportunities).
  - infrastructure for regional sustainable development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hockings, M., Stolton, S., Leverington, F., Dudley, N., Courrau, J. and Valentine, P. 2006. *Evaluating Effectiveness: A framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas*. 2nd edition. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xiv + 105 pp.

<sup>2</sup> In Article 2 of the Convention, <https://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/?a=cbd-02>

<sup>3</sup> Dudley, N. (ed.) 2008. *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. WITH Stolton, S., Shadie, P. and Dudley, N. 2013. [IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types](#). Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21, Gland, Switzerland – a reprint of the 2008 guidelines with additional guidance on assignment of categories.

<sup>4</sup> Lopoukhine, N. and Ferreira de Souza, B. 2012. What does Target 11 really mean?. *PARKS* 18 (1): 5-8.

<sup>5</sup> Heinonen Mervi (Ed.) 2013: *Applying IUCN Protected Area Management Categories in Finland*. Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services

<sup>6</sup> Dudley, N. (ed.) 2008. *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. WITH Stolton, S., Shadie, P. and Dudley, N. 2013. [IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types](#). Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21, Gland, Switzerland – a reprint of the 2008 guidelines with additional guidance on assignment of categories.



The evaluation should consider the:

1. Adequacy and appropriateness of management
2. Delivery of the protected area objectives by protected area type
3. Design of the protected area system
4. Progress in implementing recommendations of the 2003/4 PAME

Beyond the TOR, other issues to consider are how much are we assessing past management and how much should we consider the future resilience of the system to pressures and readiness for new challenges such as the CBDs Global Biodiversity Framework and other European directives on nature conservation, specifically the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 and the EU Nature Restoration Law (as probably approved in 2023).

Table 1 below provides an overview of the TOR, links the objectives with the questions/issues asked last time (**which are then provided in detail below**), and identifies potential gaps.

Table 1: **TOR linkages with previous assessment and extended 2023 assessment. New questions/issues/wording are highlighted in red.**

TOR (slightly edited text from the TOR)	Links to assessment questions/issues (2005 & 2023)	Comments
<b>What is the current status of protected area system (to place the management decision in context)?</b>		
1. Adequate protected area legislation and policy	1.2 Does the legislative <b>and administrative</b> framework adequately support the effective functioning of the protected area system? 2.1 Are protected areas identified and categorised in an organised system? <b>1.11 Do protect area objectives harmonise with wider environmental policy and vice-versa?</b>	1.2 has been split into two, 1.2. deals with legislative frameworks and a new question 1.11 covers administrative frameworks.
2. Are administrative structures and procedures effective and what are the major constraints to effective management	2.4 Are management plans routinely and systematically updated?	
3. Is protected area design in relation to the intended outcomes for the whole protected area system	2.2 Are individual protected areas designed and established through a systematic and scientifically based <del>criteria and process, clearly articulated</del> <b>aligned with the strategic vision for protected areas?</b> 2.5 Are protected areas located in places with the highest/most threatened biodiversity <b>and/ or other important</b> values? 2.7 Are <b>individual</b> protected areas integrated into a wider ecological network following the principles of the ecosystem approach?	We have suggested a change to question 2.5. Rather than just focus on biodiversity value, we suggested rewording to focus on wider values in line with the new Global Biodiversity Framework. (Old question read: Are protected areas located in places with the highest/most threatened biodiversity values?)?  A small edit (adding the word individual before protected areas) was added to 2.7 (which was question 2.8). Question 2.7 could be removed from future assessments as issues covered 1.9.
4. Is protected area management planning effective in relation to the intended outcomes for the	2.3 Are established protected areas covered by comprehensive management plans <b>aligned to the strategic vision?</b> 4.3 Is there external and independent involvement in internal audit?	

TOR (slightly edited text from the TOR)	Links to assessment questions/issues (2005 & 2023)	Comments
whole protected area system		
<b>Are the management systems and processes appropriate?</b>		
5. Assess available resources in relation to the management needs (staff, funds, equipment, facilities, budget security)	3.3 At the protected area level are resources linked to priority actions? 3.4 What level of resources is provided by partners and/or volunteers? 3.5 Do protected area managers consider resources to be sufficient? 4.2 Is staff performance management linked to achievement of management objectives? 5.4 Is there a systematic maintenance schedule in place for built infrastructure/assets? <b>3.6 Do protected area managers consider their expertise/capacity aligned with the values to be protected or intended outcomes to be provided?</b>	We feel there is a gap here in terms on staff experience and expertise. And therefore a new question has been added: 3.6 Do protected area managers consider their expertise/capacity aligned with the values to be protected or intended outcomes to be provided?
6. Have the human, material and financial resources been made available and are they appropriate in terms of quantity and quality?	3.1 Are personnel and resources well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?	
7. Have resources been allocated in a planned, balanced, justified and equitable manner?	3.2 How have resourcing levels varied with increases in protected areas in recent years?	
<b>Are protected area objectives being delivered (outputs and outcomes)?</b>		
8. Have targets, work programmes or plans been implemented and what progress is being made in implementing long-term plans?	1.1 Is there a clearly articulated vision, <b>plan and strategy</b> , for the on-going development and management of the Finnish protected area system? 1.5 Are the values of the protected area system well documented, assessed and monitored? 4.1 Is management performance against relevant planning objectives and management standards routinely <b>monitored</b> , assessed and systematically audited as part of an on-going 'continuous improvement' process? <b>5.3 Are management related trends systematically evaluated and routinely reported?</b>	Question 1.1. has been edited for clarity. Note re 5.3 that a specific tourism question has been added, see 5.6. We added monitoring to question 1.1 to better link management process with outputs and outcomes.
9. Do approaches to outcome evaluation involve long-term	1.8 Do Finnish protected area management objectives harmonise with	1.9 now focused on restoration planning. A new question on ecosystem functionality and health was added (noting the focus of

TOR (slightly edited text from the TOR)	Links to assessment questions/issues (2005 & 2023)	Comments
monitoring of the condition of biological and cultural resources of the protected area system, socio-economic aspects of use, and the impacts of management on local communities?	<p>wider cultural objectives including those relating to the Sámi?</p> <p>6.6 Are cultural heritage assets protected sufficiently?</p> <p>6.1 Are threatened species populations stable or increasing?</p> <p>6.2 Are selected indicator species within acceptable ranges?</p> <p>6.7 Is ecosystem functionality and health being maintained?</p>	<p>this issue in Target 3 of the new Global Biodiversity Framework).</p> <p>Question 2.7 (<del>2.7 Are restoration and reintroduction programmes systematically planned and monitored?</del>) was deleted as it is now covered in more detail in 1.10.</p>
10. Do outcome evaluations consider whether the values of the protected area system have been maintained and whether threats to these values are being effectively addressed?	<p>1.3 Is there a cohesive and nationally co-ordinated approach to protected area management?</p> <p>1.6 Are the threats to protected area system values well documented and assessed?</p> <p>6.3 Are biological communities at a mix of ages and spacings that will support native biodiversity?</p> <p>4.10 Are systems in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas?</p>	<p>We added a new question, 4.10, to ensure processes are in place to better understand protected area values from stakeholder perspectives; this understand should feed back into planning (e.g. question 1.1)</p>
<b>Supplementary issues to be assessed</b>		
11. What are the impacts of climate change?	<p>4.7 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to adapt to climate change?</p> <p>4.8 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to prevent carbon loss and to encourage further carbon capture?</p> <p>4.9 Is planning in place to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in protected area management and related activities?</p>	<p>The general built-in capacity of Parks &amp; Wildlife Finland to forecast change and ability to take timely action should be given attention. Is there appropriate awareness of future needs and resilience potential to meet challenges? We have taken the current questions/issues and guidance have been inspired by questions/issues in the new METT-4.</p>
12. Is there trans-boundary and regional co-operation?	<p>1.4 Is trans-boundary and regional co-operation established and maintained in a manner which supports effective management of Finnish protected areas?</p>	<p>This is not in the TOR but was highlighted in discussions and in the previous assessment.</p>
13. EU Directives	<p>1.7 Are the objectives of Natura 2000 (N2000) sites and the protected area system fully harmonised in terms of their conservation objectives and planned measures?</p> <p>5.5 Does Finland fulfil its monitoring and reporting obligations under European Directives and international conventions?</p> <p>1.9 Has the Global Biodiversity Framework and the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 been considered at the network level and linked to the vision of the Finnish protected area system?</p>	<p>This is not in the TOR but was highlighted in discussions and in the previous assessment. We have revised the question and criteria in question 1.7, in the criteria of 5.5 and added two new question 1.9 and 1.10.</p>

TOR (slightly edited text from the TOR)	Links to assessment questions/issues (2005 & 2023)	Comments
	1.10 Is the protected areas network well placed to implement the EU Nature Restoration Law proposal?	
14. Does protected area management follow the principles of good/equitable governance (e.g. inclusive decision-making, recognition of and respect for diverse cultures, knowledge and institutions)	2.6 Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate in management planning and designation? 4.4 Is there effective public participation in protected area management in Finland? 4.5 Is there a responsive system for handling complaints and comments about protected area management and policy? 5.1 Is adequate information on protected area policy, vision and management publicly available? 6.5 Are neighbours and adjacent communities supportive of protected area management?	Also, not explicitly in the TOR but clearly a vital element of management and linked to many of the 2003/4 system level assessments.  Note question 6.5 should be expanded to include residents (full/part time in protected areas)
15. Visitor management	5.2 Are visitor services appropriate for the relevant protected area category? 6.4 Are the expectations of visitors generally met or exceeded? 5.6 Are visitor use trends systematically monitored and reported in protected areas which have tourism as a management objective?	Given the importance of tourism for the organisations and that we have a tourism expert on the team, we have pulled out the visitor/tourism issues separately here and added some additional questions/issues
16. Adaptive management	4.6. Are management systems flexible enough to respond to change, e.g., findings of management effectiveness assessments, monitoring and research results, changes in legislation, new knowledge and understanding.	We suggest adding a new question, 4.6.



## Network-level questionnaire

The network-level questions/issues below builds on the assessment undertaken in 2004 (and reported in 2005). Minor editing of existing questions/issues and all new questions/issues are marked in red. In addition, specific issues have been highlighted for each question to guide the gathering and presentation of information on management. For the existing questions/issues, these additional questions/issues (see column 5 “2023 key questions/issues to consider”) draw on the 2004/5 assessment results and recommendations.

In addition, the assessment should consider some overarching issues:

- Reflect past actions, but also be forward-looking to show the networks likely effectiveness in coming years
- Consider the flexibility, resilience and adaptation of the system. Much will have changed over the last nearly 20 years and not all recommendations from 2004/5 will now be relevant.
- The 2020’s have seen a range of ambitious new global and EU-level biodiversity agreements, the assessment needs to take into account these emerging law and policy and preparedness for it.
- Although the assessment will result in a narrative report, there needs to be consideration of how data and new technologies are being used.
- Is management sufficiently linked to Metshallitus' vision?
- Are monitoring and assessment systems reflective of the overall ambition/vision for protected areas?

## 1. Context

### 1.1 Is there a clearly articulated vision, **plan and strategy**, for the on-going development and management of the Finnish protected area system **within Parks and Wildlife Finland**?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No articulated vision, plan and strategy. Identification of values is incomplete and general and of little value for protected area design and management.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Limited vision, plan and strategy articulated. Identification of values is complete but there is insufficient detail for protected area design and management.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Clear national vision, plan and strategy articulated. Identification of values is complete and there is sufficient detail on most values to guide protected area design and management.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> National vision, plan and strategy articulated with strong linkage to European context and international commitments. Identification of values is complete and there is sufficient detail on all values to guide reserve design, strategic and day-to-day management.</p>	Good to very good	<p>There is a clearly articulated vision for the development and management of the Finnish protected areas system. However, it is not necessarily shared by all stakeholders, either inside or (to a greater extent) outside Metsähallitus NHS,<sup>7</sup> and this may be hampering the wider aspects of protected area management, including implementation of N2000.</p> <p>The vision provides an adequate basis for work until 2007, when the current programme for implementation of protected area programmes comes to an end; at this stage it will need to be revised.</p>	<p>Recommendations: Continue with the current vision until 2007. Involve key stakeholders from the Ministries of the Environment, of Agriculture and Forestry and of Finance, in development of a post-2007 vision, which should include greater emphasis on an ecosystem approach, as promoted by the Convention on Biological Diversity. In this case the focus should be on how protected areas relate to the wider landscape, particularly when they adjoin other state forest land.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to monitoring staff attitudes towards and understanding of the vision every few years, perhaps in a sample of staff.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the vision been updated as recommended?</li> <li>2. Does vision cover the 30x30 targets (see also question 1.9 and 1.10)?</li> <li>3. Does the vision sit coherently within the broader national strategy for nature?</li> <li>4. Have stakeholders been identified?</li> <li>5. Is vision explained and understood by stakeholders?</li> <li>6. Has a monitoring system to understand staff attitudes been developed?</li> </ol>		

<sup>7</sup> The name has changed from Natural Heritage Services (NHS) to Parks & Wildlife Finland

## 1.2 Does the legislative framework adequately support the effective functioning of the protected area system?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Legislative framework is an impediment to effective functioning of the protected area system.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Legislative framework permits functioning of protected area system albeit with frequent and widespread problems.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Legislative system provides for effective functioning of the protected area system within constraints.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Legislative and administrative framework supports and encourages effective functioning of the protected area system.</p>	Fair to good	<p>The legislation for management within the statutory protected area network is quite strong, although some historical problems remain relating particularly to hunting and fishing, and enactment of legislation does not always keep pace with conservation action. Current legislation does not fully support the wider ecosystem approaches promoted by the NHS, for example, by providing a legal framework to complete the ecological network through sympathetic management in buffer zones and corridors.</p> <p>Some apparent inconsistencies, relating to hunting and mining, for example, may be having relatively little overall impact on biodiversity, but do have implications for other protected area values such as recreation.</p>	<p>Potential impacts of some of the apparent anomalies in management, particularly the inability of the NHS under current legislation to effectively control some of the key activities in protected areas (such as hunting or mining) need to be explicitly monitored and reported upon with a view to changing legislation if necessary. The Ministry of Environment might consider further clarification of roles regarding the implementation of N2000.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the legislative framework integrate with the broader environmental policy and law (and emerging law/initiative, particularly where conflicts might occur with objectives)?</li> <li>Has relevant legislation been updated and have issues raised in the 2003/4 assessment been resolved?</li> <li>Has monitoring of issues where effective control was not in place been developed?</li> <li>Have roles related to implementation of N2000 (and other international commitments) been clarified (see also 1.3 and 1.7)?</li> </ol>		

### 1.3 Is there a cohesive and nationally coordinated approach to protected area management?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Lack of cohesion and co-ordination obstruct effective management.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Limited cohesion and co-ordination cause frequent and widespread problems.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Cohesion and coordination are sufficient to permit effective management of most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Cohesion and coordination support effective management of all sites.</p>	Good to very good	<p>Current protected area management follows a coherent national approach according to agreed principles. Current changes and new opportunities may mean that these approaches should be refined in the future.</p> <p>Further capacity building might be attempted with respect to understanding the role of Finland's protected areas within a broader ecoregional or global strategy.</p>	<p>Further work will be needed to ensure that the sound strategy currently in place is widened with respect to N2000 and perhaps the need for capacity building of staff with respect to the role of Finland's protected area network in an international as well as a national setting.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How has management changed in the last 18 years, specifically in relation to N2000 (see also 1.7)?</li> <li>How has staff capacity been developed around the role of Finland's protected areas within a broader ecoregional or global strategy?</li> <li>How good is information sharing between organisations of key actors across higher and lower levels?</li> </ol>		

**1.4 Is trans-boundary and regional co-operation established and maintained in a manner which supports effective management of Finnish protected areas?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Lack of cohesion and co-ordination obstruct effective management.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Limited cohesion and co-ordination cause frequent and widespread problems.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Cohesion and coordination are sufficient to permit effective management of most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Cohesion and coordination support effective management of all sites.</p>	Good to very good	The Natural Heritage Services is running an active and impressive international programme including regional capacity building and policy initiatives; development of transboundary protected areas; and wider international cooperation. Lessons learned within Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services are being transferred across the world.	This aspect of NHS work is clearly effective. In line with the aim of promoting protected areas within a global context, it might be worthwhile for key staff to particularly engage with the World Commission on Protected Areas' task force on transboundary protected areas.	1. Provide an update on NHS involvement and support of Europarc and WCPA (and any other relevant regional / international institutions)		



1.5 Are the values of the protected area system well documented, assessed and monitored?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Values not systematically documented, assessed or monitored.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Values generally identified but not systematically assessed and monitored.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most values systematically identified and assessed and monitored for most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All values systematically identified and assessed and monitored for all sites.</p>	Good to very good	Understanding of biodiversity values is generally high although further work is needed to assess cultural values; habitat surveys also need to be completed. Monitoring is currently good although we suggest some strategic thinking about the most cost-effective indicators might be needed.	Assessments of nature conservation values should be completed, and the databases for nature types and threatened species be up-dated with other relevant organisations. Both selected habitat types and species should be monitored at regular intervals, and a process be established for the selection of these (see also Question 6.2). The planned work on monitoring and documenting of cultural values is also highly important. Results of these activities should be reported in the State of the Parks report.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the assessment of cultural values been completed (see also 6.6)?</li> <li>2. Have systems to assess monitoring priorities been developed and implemented (see also 6.2)?</li> <li>3. Provide an update on habitat monitoring/surveys</li> <li>4. Have databases on threatened species been up-dated?</li> <li>5. Has monitoring been assessed in terms of cost-effectiveness?</li> <li>6. Has a <i>State of the Parks</i> report been developed (see also recommendations in section 4 below)?</li> </ol>		

### 1.6 Are the threats to protected area system values well documented and assessed?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Threats not systematically documented or assessed.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Threats generally identified but not systematically assessed.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most threats systematically identified and assessed for most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All threats systematically identified and assessed for all sites.</p>	Fair to good	<p>Overall threat analysis of the protected area system has not been carried out in the past although individual threats seem to be well understood and threat analysis included in wilderness area plans.</p> <p>This situation is apparently changing and there are plans to address threat analysis more comprehensively: we support this development.</p>	<p>We recommend greater attention to threats analysis, regular auditing of the activities of NHS, and development of two specific national strategies (both of which would need input from the NHS and other government agencies and non-governmental partners):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A national strategy for invasive species, in terrestrial, freshwater and marine systems, including a risk assessment and prioritisation for action; and</li> <li>– A national strategy addressing threats to protected areas from climate change including mitigation strategies where possible.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update on NHS approach to threat analysis</li> <li>2. Have the two national strategies (invasives and climate change) been developed?</li> </ol>		

**1.7 Are the objectives of Natura 2000 (N2000) sites and the protected area system fully harmonised in terms of their conservation objectives and planned measures?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> There are significant challenges between N2000 and national objectives that are not likely to be solved in the long term.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> N2000 sites objectives are in general harmonised at the level of target species and habitats, but objectives and measures are not aligned appropriately.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> N2000 target species and habitats are aligned with national targets in protected areas as well as planning process, there are only minor challenges in the field planning and implementation.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> N2000 and national protected areas are fully harmonised inc. planning documents and measures implemented in the field.</p>	Fair	Finland is taking a slightly unusual approach to N2000 by focusing on purchase of sites rather than working with existing landowners. We suggest the development of N2000 Master Plans to ensure that the objectives of the European Union are met and also mesh with wider national and regional conservation strategies.	N2000 requires an integrated approach to biodiversity conservation based around the principles of the ecosystem approach. N2000 Master Plans, coordinated by the Ministry of Environment, should be prepared. As part of its contribution to the wider planning of N2000, NHS should ensure that the specific role of protected areas in achieving EU 2010 objectives related to biodiversity is clearly identified and documented.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a N2000 master plan been developed (see also 1.2 and 1.3)?</li> <li>N2000 is based on the EU legislation that sets a clear list of species and habitats for which its sites are designated. National targets are often different. Therefore, there is a need to harmonise targets, objectives and measures in N2000 sites and national protected areas everywhere in overlap.</li> </ol>		

### 1.8 Do Finnish protected area management objectives harmonise with wider cultural objectives including those relating to the Sámi?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Objectives contradictory.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Objectives neither contradict nor support wider cultural objectives.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most objectives generally mutually supportive.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All objectives mutually supportive.</p>	Good to very good	<p>Management objectives are generally supported by the Sámi and in other areas considerable efforts have been made to integrate cultural developments with biodiversity and the former have sometimes provided an entry point for local stakeholders. However currently hunting and overgrazing are causing some tensions with NGOs and other stakeholders and we suggest some steps that might be taken to better integrate conservation and traditional lifestyles including options for adding value to reindeer herding.</p>	<p>Many potential cultural conflicts have been avoided, particularly in the far north, but this may be at the expense of some damage to the protected area system and reindeer herding at the levels practised has clearly had a cost to nature values. We wonder if there would be options for looking at more innovative responses to this issue. Currently reindeer meat is valued relatively low and in addition northern reindeer herders have comparatively little access to the more lucrative markets in the south of the country. Options for some kind of green label for reindeer meat, perhaps through an organic standard or a standard under a forest management certification system such as the Forest Stewardship Council, could be linked to voluntary agreements on slightly reduced stocking levels but would compensate for this by opening up the region to the growing market for certified organic or free-range meat. Such an approach might have interest to any reindeer herders. Standards for wild meat already exist and have been successful in places.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since 2005 several tools for assessing governance and equity have been developed,<sup>8</sup> have any of these applied (see also question 4.5)?</li> <li>2. Do PA management plans make use of any local and traditional knowledge?</li> <li>3. Have ideas re enhancing the value of reindeer meat been explored, or any others relating to better integrating conservation and traditional lifestyles?</li> </ol>		

<sup>8</sup> E.g., [IUCN's green list](#) and the various tools developed by [IIED](#)

**NEW QUESTION 1.9 Has the Global Biodiversity Framework and the EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 been considered at the network level and linked to the vision of the Finnish protected area system?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No amendment of the vision, plan or strategy, has been planned.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Discussions are taking place with the aim of amending the vision, plan and strategy.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Goals are included into the national vision, plan and strategy, but no implementation has taken place.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Goals are included into the vision, plan and strategy, and implementation has begun.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What actions has Finland put in place regarding Target 3 (and other targets) of the Global Biodiversity Framework (bearing in mind that the target is global not national)</li> <li>2. The EU Biodiversity Strategy 2030 sets a task to have 1/3 of protected areas (i.e., 10% of a country) as so called “strictly protected areas”). Has Finland amended the vision of the protected areas network to set this goal by 2030.</li> <li>3. Has the vision been updated to include these goals (see 1.1)</li> </ol>		



**NEW QUESTION 1.10 Is the protected areas network well placed to implement the EU Nature Restoration Law proposal?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No process leading to inclusion of the Nature Restoration Law proposals in the vision, plan or strategy, have been discussed.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Discussions on the process to include the Nature Restoration Law proposals into the vision, plan and strategy, have begun but no concrete actions taken.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> There is agreement of a process to include the Nature Restoration Law proposals into the protected areas system and network vision, plan and strategy,</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> The Nature Restoration Law proposals are already covered by the protected areas system and network vision, plan and strategy .</p>	<p>1. Although the EU Nature Restoration Law (NRL) is only a proposal, it will most probably be approved and thus directly applicable as a regulation in each EU country by the end of 2023 (without significant changes). The NRL sets ambitious goals that are not achievable if the protected areas network is not ready to contribute to its development. As the NRL goes far beyond ambitions in the EU Biodiversity Strategy, its goals should be included into the protected areas development vision asap.</p>		

**NEW QUESTION: 1.11 Do protect area objectives harmonise with wider environmental policy and vice-versa?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Wider environmental policy is an impediment to the effective functioning of the protected area system.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> The wider environmental policy permits the functioning of the protected area system albeit with frequent and widespread problems.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> The wider environmental policy provides for effective functioning of the protected area system within constraints.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> The wider environmental policy supports and encourages effective functioning of the protected area system.</p>				1.		

## 2. Planning

### 2.1 Are protected areas identified and categorised in an organised system?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Protected areas not categorised or systematically organised.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Protected areas generally categorised but not systematically organised.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most protected areas categorised and systematically organised.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All protected areas categorised and systematically organised.</p>	Good	Protected areas are categorised into a national system. For a highly developed protected area system Finland has only a fairly small proportion of its protected areas categorised into the international IUCN classification system (IUCN 1994), although this may be a conscious decision by NHS. Some of the English translations of Finnish names may be misleading.	Consideration should be given to reviewing the terms used to describe protected areas in Finland and to seeing if more of these can be revised to match existing IUCN categories. In addition, and in light of current changes in the Finnish protected area network, it would be worth considering a formal review of the status and management regime for areas with high conservation values not currently managed as formal protected areas, every 5–10 years, to judge, if they should be incorporated within the protected area network or their official status otherwise modified.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the data on the WDPA and the national data been checked?</li> <li>2. Is the system for reviewing the status and management regime for areas with high conservation values not currently managed as formal protected areas been put in place?</li> <li>3. Are the categories well harmonised with international obligations (see questions/issues 1.7 and 1.9)?</li> </ol>		

**2.2 Are individual protected areas designed and established through a systematic and scientifically based process, aligned with the strategic vision for protected areas?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> protected area design and establishment totally ad hoc.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> protected area design and establishment generally systematic but not scientifically based <b>but there is little link with the strategic vision for protected areas</b></p> <p><i>Good:</i> Design and establishment of most protected areas is systematic and scientifically based, <b>and is linked to the strategic vision for protected areas, but linkages could be better</b></p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Design and establishment of all protected areas systematic and scientifically based, <b>and is linked to the strategic vision for protected areas</b></p>	Good to very good	There is clearly a systematic process for selecting protected areas, which has developed over a number of years and is generally scientifically based.	The under-represented elements and shortcomings identified in the SAVA project, METSO Action Programme and the assessment of the efficiency of the National Biodiversity Action Plan (1997–2005) should be carefully considered in the framing of the post 2007 acquisitions strategy (for instance METSO acquisitions are expected to continue at least from 2005–2014).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide updated information on expansion of the protected area system (particularly given GBF Target 3)</li> <li>2. How well are individual protected areas aligned with the strategic vision for protected areas?</li> </ol>		

**2.3 Are established protected areas covered by comprehensive management plans and are these aligned to the strategic vision?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No relevant management plans in place.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some management plans exist but are not comprehensive and <b>are not aligned to the strategic vision.</b></p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most protected areas are covered by management plans which are comprehensive and fairly well <b>aligned to the strategic vision.</b></p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All protected areas have management plans which are comprehensive and <b>are aligned to the strategic vision.</b></p>	Fair	Protected areas are in theory covered by comprehensive management plans although so far only about half the intended plans have been completed and some of these need updating. There is a need for some meaningful targets and milestones if current intentions are to be achieved.	A comprehensive strategy, with associated milestones, is needed for catching up with planning if current targets for management plans are to be met. Particular attention is needed to planning for small reserves, within the context of N2000 and in line with our earlier recommendations for a landscape mosaic approach to planning wherever possible.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a strategy for developing and updating plans (with milestones) been developed (see also 2.4)?</li> <li>What is the current status of management plans (e.g., number of sites with up-to-date plans)?</li> <li>Has the recommendations for a landscape mosaic approach to planning been developed?</li> </ol>		



#### 2.4 Are management plans routinely and systematically updated?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No process in place for systematic review and update of plans.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Few management plans routinely and systematically updated.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most management plans routinely and systematically updated.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All management plans routinely and systematically updated.</p>	Fair to good	It is intended that management plans are updated every five-ten years although these targets seem ambitious and we suggest some prioritisation so that new land use and management plans are drawn up for the most needy sites first.	We propose the development of a risk assessment process (perhaps associated with plans for threat assessment referred to above) to guide prioritisation and ensure that those protected areas at highest risk have plans updated every five years.	1. Has the risk assessment process to guide prioritisation (see 2.5) been developed?		

## 2.5 Are protected areas located in places with the highest/most threatened biodiversity and/or other important values?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Protected area locations are unrelated to level of threat to biodiversity and other values.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some protected area locations cover areas with most highly threatened biodiversity and other values.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most protected area locations cover areas with the most highly threatened biodiversity and other values.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All protected area locations cover areas with highly threatened biodiversity and other values.</p>	Fair	<p>On a national scale, the northern ecosystems are very well represented in protected areas whereas those in the south are not, particularly with respect to large forest and mire areas. There is also general under-representation of marine and freshwater systems in part because land tenure issues mean that these habitats are often omitted from the protected area even where they fall within its boundaries. Traditional rural biotopes are also somewhat under-represented in new additions to protected areas.</p>	<p>Better integration is needed of private and public protected areas and of protected areas with surrounding land and water. A process should be established for the boundaries of existing protected areas, particularly in southern Finland, to be reviewed when land use and management planning processes highlight the need. Inventory activities for biodiversity values in freshwater and marine habitats should be enhanced. There is still clearly a need for a strengthening of the protected areas network in the south of the country.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the understanding of the biodiversity values of freshwater and marine habitats been enhanced?</li> <li>2. How are private and public protected areas planning and management being integrated?</li> <li>3. Has there been a review of boundaries to address the imbalance issue identified in the last review?</li> </ol>		

2.6 Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate in **management planning and designation**?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Little if any opportunity for stakeholder participation in <b>management</b> planning and designation.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Stakeholders participate in some <b>management</b> planning and designation.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Stakeholders participate in most <b>management</b> planning and designation.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Stakeholders routinely and systematically participate in all <b>management</b> planning and designation.</p>	Good to very good	There are clear provisions for stakeholder participation in planning and many examples of good practice especially in the north. The level and nature of participation varies considerably between protected areas and regions. There is scope for greater use of advisory committees to enhance and streamline planning for priority reserves.	Consideration should be given to expanding the number and role of advisory committees to expedite and enhance planning in priority reserves in greatest need of management planning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have the number and role of advisory committees been reviewed and expanded?</li> <li>2. Have any governance assessments been undertaken (see 1.8 above)?</li> <li>3. What opportunities are stakeholders given to be involved in designation processes - and are FPIC processes followed?</li> <li>4. Are IP&amp;LC/other local stakeholders represented at higher level decision making (beyond site-level advisory committees)?</li> </ol>		

2.7 Are **individual** protected areas integrated into a wider ecological network following the principles of the ecosystem approach?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Protected areas not integrated into a wider network.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some limited attempts to integrate protected areas into a network.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Protected areas are generally quite well integrated into a network.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Protected areas are fully integrated into a wider network.</p>	Fair	The excellent planning of the protected area system needs to be complemented by some wider landscape-scale approaches, embracing both protected areas and other land, particularly in the south.	That NHS investigate options for widening the effectiveness of the protected areas network in the south by innovative schemes to work with private forest owners and companies on a voluntary basis, perhaps drawing on experience in other parts of the world.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How is the protected area systems being complimented by some wider landscape-scale approaches (see also 2.5), e.g., protected areas and OECMs</li> <li>2. How does the protected area network complement /contribute to the management of the countryside?</li> </ol>		

### 3. Resources

#### 3.1 Are personnel and resources well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Few, if any, resources explicitly allocated for protected area management.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some resources explicitly allocated for protected area management but not systematically linked to management objectives.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most protected areas or groups of protected areas have adequate resources explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All protected areas or groups of protected areas have adequate resources explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.</p>	Good	The NHS organisational structure appears to be quite strong and the workforce well trained and highly motivated. On any international comparison, the NHS is well funded although we note that quite a lot of this money is tied to infrastructure developments and similar fixed costs.	Consideration should be given to development of a systematic funding formula which, with refinement over time, could be linked to state of the parks reporting and directly support a culture of adaptive management.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has development a systematic funding formula been developed?</li> <li>2. Is funding linked to state of the parks reporting?</li> </ol>		



### 3.2 How have resourcing levels varied with increases in protected areas in recent years?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Resourcing levels have remained static or reduced.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some increase in resourcing levels but not systematically allocated.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Resourcing levels proportionally increased for management of most new areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Resourcing levels routinely proportionally increased for management of all new areas.</p>	Good	<p>Although funds have increased significantly, they may not have kept pace with new expectations and new protected areas.</p> <p>However, general levels of support remain good.</p> <p>We suggest slightly more emphasis on exploring options for contributions, probably voluntary, from visitors.</p>	<p>Opportunities for private sponsorship and volunteer contributions to ongoing operations should be explored more thoroughly.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have innovative funding models / alternative financing options been explored?</li> <li>2. Has funding matched changes to service demand (e.g., visitation), or increases in the diversity of outputs/outcome?</li> <li>3. Are sufficient resources allocated for other objectives and governance priorities, e.g., protection of cultural heritage, mitigation of human-wildlife conflict, public participation etc.?</li> </ol>		

### 3.3 At the protected area level are resources linked to priority actions?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Resources allocated ad hoc.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some specific allocation for management of each protected area or group of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Comprehensive formulae systematically applied to decide most resource allocations to most individual protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Comprehensive formulae systematically applied to decide allocation of resources for management of individual protected areas or groups of areas.</p>	Fair to good	<p>Those resources linked to biodiversity conservation are aimed at the most threatened species using a staged assessment based around the national Red List, EU Habitats directive, globally rare species not under threat in Finland and umbrella species.</p> <p>Questions remain about whether the proportion of the budget devoted to biodiversity conservation is significant enough when compared with other costs.</p>	<p>Stronger linkages need to be established between the allocation of resources and the achievement of conservation outcomes. A state of the parks reporting system could be an important mechanism to achieve this. The full cost of providing services for visitors should be clearly communicated so that visitors are aware of management challenges in balancing visitor enjoyment and conservation programmes. We would also recommend a shift towards spending an increased proportion of the budget on active biodiversity conservation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are resources being better linked to conservation outcomes?</li> <li>2. Are the ratios between resource allocation for biodiversity conservation and other objectives being monitored and reported?</li> <li>3. Are full cost of providing services for visitors being clearly communicated?</li> <li>4. Are resources available to support actions at a larger spatial / organizational scale (e.g., to support ecosystem approach, cooperation, etc.)?</li> </ol>		

### 3.4 What level of resources is provided by partners and/or volunteers?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Partners/volunteers either contribute nothing or are left to do everything in the management of the protected area or group of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Partners/volunteers make some contribution to management of the protected area or group of protected areas but opportunities for collaboration are not systematically explored.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Partner/volunteer contributions are systematically sought and negotiated for the management of most protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Partner/volunteer contributions are systematically sought and negotiated for the management of all protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p>	Fair	There are a range of EU projects and also voluntary activities although the latter could be extended, perhaps to include some private land-owners around or within protected areas, and some capacity building with other potential partners such as tourist information offices.	The NHS should develop a more comprehensive strategy to maximise partner/ volunteer contributions to protected area management and the achievement of conservation objectives.	<p>1. Has a strategy to maximise partner/ volunteer contributions to protected area management and the achievement of conservation objectives been developed? E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there cooperation over resources with private landowners around or within protected areas?</li> <li>• Is capacity building with other potential partners such as tourist information offices taking place?</li> </ul>		

### 3.5 Do protected area managers consider resources to be sufficient?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
----------	--------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------	----------------------

<p><i>Poor:</i> Most managers consider resources insufficient for most tasks.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some managers consider resources sufficient most tasks.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most managers consider resources sufficient for most tasks.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All managers consider resources sufficient for most tasks.</p>	Fair	<p>Responses to the RAPPAM questionnaire show that there are concerns from managers about levels of resources, particularly in light of new responsibilities for cultural resources and for N2000.</p>	<p>Wherever possible links between budget resource allocations and management outcomes should be strengthened and made transparent so that expectations of managers are realistic and focused on adaptive management within available resources.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have the links between budget resource allocations and management outcomes been strengthened and made transparent?</li> <li>2. Is resource allocation focused on adaptive management?</li> <li>3. Have managers considered alternative approaches or efficiencies to deliver greater effectiveness?</li> </ol>		
---	------	--	--	--	--	--

**NEW QUESTION: 3.6 Do protected area managers consider the expertise/capacity available to them aligned with the values to be protected or intended outcomes to be provided?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Most managers do not have access to expertise/capacity necessary to achieve agreed outcomes.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Managers have limited access to all the expertise/capacity necessary to achieve agreed outcomes</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Managers have access to the expertise/capacity necessary to achieve agreed outcomes, but some gaps remain</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Managers have access to all the expertise/capacity necessary to achieve agreed outcomes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider the each sites objectives and assess if there is sufficient staff who have training/expertise/experience in, for example, visitor/tourism services.</li> <li>2. Are staff competencies know and assessed?</li> </ol>		

## 4. Process

### 4.1 Is management performance against relevant planning objectives and management standards routinely **monitored**, assessed and systematically audited as part of an on-going 'continuous improvement' process?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No performance management system exists.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Performance management is only loosely linked to planning objectives and identified management standards.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most aspects of management performance are routinely assessed and systematically audited with reference to planning objectives and identified management standards.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All important aspects of management performance are routinely assessed and systematically audited with reference to planning objectives and relevant management standards.</p>	Fair to good	The NHS is audited regularly by an internal process and also according to ISO 14001 and in some individual protected areas through other assessment systems. We suggest that greater emphasis be given to conservation targets in the audit process and look at options for a more regular State of the Parks report.	The regular audit could include a check of whether the resources of the protected area are focused on the management objectives of the individual protected area and the wider vision of the NHS. Auditing should not focus just on internal management issues, but delivery of strategic objectives. The NHS and the Ministry of the Environment should give particular attention to conservation outcomes in the formulation and annual review of their funding agreement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a monitoring regime in place to track management performance?</li> <li>2. Has greater emphasis been given to conservation targets in the audit process?</li> <li>3. Have conservation outcomes been considered in the formulation and annual review of the funding agreement?</li> <li>4. Are techniques employed to monitor whether data use and management is appropriate / delivering best value?</li> </ol>		

#### 4.2 Is staff performance management linked to achievement of management objectives?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No linkage between staff performance management and management objectives.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some linkage between staff performance management and management objectives, but not consistently or systematically assessed.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Performance management for most staff is directly linked to achievement of relevant management objectives.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Performance management of all staff is directly linked to achievement of relevant management objectives.</p>	Good	There are already systems in place for linking individual staff performance to agreed management objectives, although we suggest that this process could be strengthened if performance agreements were periodically audited as part of the internal audit programme and, in time, linked to state of the parks reporting.	NHS staff performance audits should be covered by periodic audits as part of the internal compliance and audit programme.	1. Have NHS staff performance audits been added to the periodic audits as part of the internal compliance and audit programme?		

#### 4.3 Is there external and independent involvement in internal audit?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No external and independent involvement in internal audit.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Limited external involvement in formulation and implementation of audit and compliance program but independence questioned by stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Significant external involvement in formulation and implementation of audit and compliance program but independence and or capability of some members of audit committee questioned by some stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Comprehensive external involvement in formulation and implementation of audit and compliance program and independence and capability of audit committee acknowledged by all key stakeholders.</p>	Fair	External involvement is limited. We suggest some changes in terms of bringing some outsiders onto the controlling Audit Committee and external review of any State of the Parks report.	Consideration should be given to appointment of more external, independent representatives with experience and expertise in conservation management to Board and audit roles within the NHS, including those with experience in conservation management and non-governmental organisations. In addition, key aspects of any future State of the Parks review should include external review.	1. Have external, independent representatives with experience and expertise in conservation management been added to the Board and audit roles?		

#### 4.4 Is there effective public participation in protected area management in Finland?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
----------	--------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------	----------------------



<p><i>Poor:</i> Little or no public participation in protected area management.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Opportunistic public participation in some aspects of protected area management.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Systematic public participation in most aspects of protected area management.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Comprehensive and systematic public participation in all important aspects of protected area management.</p>	<p>Fair to Good</p>	<p>NHS currently relies on statutory options for participation and on management boards and advisory committees in some areas. It is still unclear quite how well this is working, with some continuing disquiet about protected areas in rural districts and perhaps a failure to recognise their role in encouraging tourism (which has general support). Some further research and explanation of these links might be useful.</p>	<p>The participatory process has been carefully developed but perhaps needs to be periodically reviewed for its effectiveness. More studies like the one carried out at Oulanka would be useful to gauge feelings towards protection within different regions of Finland. More systematic efforts to quantify and publicise the links between protected areas and sustainable development may be required.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the participatory process been reviewed for its effectiveness?</li> <li>2. Have more systematic efforts to quantify and publicise the links between protected areas and sustainable development been implemented?</li> <li>3. Are the governance structures and processes for participation clearly defined?</li> <li>4. Is all necessary information to effectively participate made available to the public?</li> <li>5. Is relevant information for transparency and accountability, such as management plans, budgets, maps etc., made publicly available/made available to all relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>6. What kind of public participation/stakeholder participation meetings actually take place for coordination?</li> <li>7. What codes of conduct exists for staff responsible for enforcing PA related laws when interacting with community members?</li> </ol>		
--	---------------------	---	--	--	--	--

4.5 Is there a responsive system for handling complaints and comments about protected area management and policy?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No systematic approach to handling complaints.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Complaints handling system operational but not responsive to individual issues and limited follow up provided.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Co-ordinated system logs and responds effectively to most complaints.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All complaints systematically logged in co-ordinated system and timely response provided with minimal repeat complaints.</p>	Good	Comments from visitors are generally positive and complaints are tackled on a case-by-case basis. It is harder to gauge whether overall opinions are fed back to NHS.	Any state of the parks system should include monitoring of visitor satisfaction and public opinion of management so that adaptive management approaches can be employed to address issues of concern. There is an argument for carrying out occasional opinion polls amongst both rural and urban populations to gauge attitudes towards the protected area system and its management.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have there been any attempts to carry out opinion polls amongst both rural and urban populations to gauge attitudes towards the protected area system and its management?</li> <li>2. Have equity and governance assessments been carried out (see question 1.8)?</li> <li>3. Are there processes in place to feedback visitor comments to Parks &amp; Wildlife Finland?</li> <li>4. Do any reviewing systems in place (visitor surveys etc.) actively collect feedback beyond generic visitor satisfaction, e.g. related to diversity and inclusivity (race, gender, age, special needs etc.), relations with neighbours/residents, recognition of objectives of IPLCs, protection of cultural heritage etc. (related to principles 2, 6, 8 and 9)</li> <li>5. Are reviewing systems made accessible and effectively promoted?</li> <li>6. Are complaints and comments effectively acted upon?</li> </ol>		

**NEW QUESTION. 4.6 Are management systems flexible enough to respond to change, e.g., findings of management effectiveness assessments, monitoring and research results, changes in legislation, new knowledge and understanding.**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Management does not recognise the need to adapt to changing conditions</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> There is awareness that management systems should adapt to change, but process do not allow this to happen rapidly or effectively.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Management systems are adaptive to change, but this process could be more efficient.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Management systems are set-up to be adaptive to change and have built-in resilience</p>			

**NEW QUESTION. 4.7 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to adapt to climate change?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> There have been no efforts to consider adaptation to climate change in management of the protected area network.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some initial thought has taken place about likely impacts of climate change, but this has yet to be incorporated into planning.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Limited (or ad hoc site by site) planning has taken place about how to adapt management to predicted climate change.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Detailed plans have been drawn up considering the whole network about how to adapt management to predicted climate change, and these are being implemented.</p>	<p>1. Have key issues related to managing for climate change adaptation been considered, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Assembling available knowledge and resources,</li> <li>● Planning for change, and developing a long-term capacity for flexible management.</li> <li>● Assessing vulnerability and risk to determine which species, ecosystems, and other values are most vulnerable to changing conditions.</li> <li>● Identifying key vulnerabilities that pose the greatest risk to achieving conservation goals.</li> <li>● Identifying and selecting short and long-term adaptation goals.</li> <li>● Setting and measuring indicators of success and failure and using that information to evaluate and recalibrate plans.</li> </ul>		

**NEW QUESTION. 4.8 Is the protected area network being consciously managed to prevent carbon loss and to encourage further carbon capture?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Carbon storage and carbon dioxide capture have not been considered?</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Carbon storage and carbon dioxide capture have been considered in general terms but has not yet been significantly reflected in management across the protected area network.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Limited (or ad hoc site by site) measures are in place to reduce carbon loss and increase carbon dioxide capture</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> There are active measures in place both to reduce carbon loss from the protected area network and to increase carbon dioxide capture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have carbon capture and storage (e.g., capturing and storing carbon dioxide before it is released into the atmosphere) been considered, e.g. preventing fire in forests or grasslands where fire is not a necessary part of ecosystem dynamics, maintaining natural water regimes in peatlands, appropriate, ecosystem restoration or other habitat management that increases the storage of carbon in standing vegetation or in the soil.</li> </ul>		

**NEW QUESTION. 4.9 Is planning in place to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in protected area management and related activities?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Carbon dioxide output has not been considered in management of the protected area network.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Carbon dioxide output has been considered in general terms but has not yet been significantly reflected in management across the protected area network.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Limited (or ad hoc site by site) measures are in place to assess and reduce carbon dioxide output.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> There are active measures in place across the whole protected area network (e.g., identification and monitoring of emissions, plans and targets to reduce emissions) to reduce carbon dioxide output.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Have significant sources of emission from the management of protected areas been identified?</li> <li>● Is monitoring of protected area generated emissions in place?</li> <li>● Have plans been put in place to reduce emissions?</li> </ul>		

**NEW QUESTION. 4.10 Are systems in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No systems are in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> The need to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas has been considered but little actual assessment has taken place.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Systems are in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas and the results are reflected in strategic planning, but improvements could be made in assessment or implementation.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Systems are in place to assess how people value / understand the value of protected areas and the results are reflected in strategic planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there any systems in place to assess the understanding of values of sites<sup>9</sup> and the protected area system as a whole?</li> <li>● Is there any consideration of this assessment of values in site / system strategies?</li> <li>● Have there been any recent studies of the positive and negative impacts of the conservation approaches in the protected area system on the wellbeing of neighbouring and resident/IP&amp;LC communities?</li> <li>● Are measures taken to mitigate any negative impacts on neighbouring and resident/IP&amp;LC communities (e.g. human-wildlife conflict for farmers and herders)? How effective are they?</li> <li>● Are measures taken to actively encourage diversity, accessibility and inclusivity along gender, race, age, special needs etc. to benefit from the protected area system, (e.g. in promotion of tourism, physical accessibility, targeted activities etc.)?</li> </ul>		

<sup>9</sup> E.g., the protected areas benefits assessment tool <https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/49081>

## 5. Output

### 5.1 Is adequate information on protected area **policy, vision and management** publicly available?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Little or no information on protected area management publicly available.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Publicly available information is general and has limited relevance to management accountability and the condition of public assets.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Publicly available information provides detailed insight into major management issues for most protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Comprehensive reports are routinely provided on management and condition of public assets in all protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p>	Good to Very good	Publications are of a high standard, including web pages. We suggest a more comprehensive strategy regarding distribution of the more expensive items and perhaps a general strategy about information services as options change with greater web access.	As we believe is already intended within the NHS, a general strategy is needed for the future management of information including analysis of costs of different publishing options.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a publications strategy (looking at issues such as distribution, publishing options, greater web access and functionality) been developed?</li> <li>2. How transparent on the system, do people understand the overall vision (see 1.1) for the protected area network and system.</li> </ol>		



## 5.2 Are visitor services appropriate for the relevant protected area category?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Visitor services and facilities are at odds with relevant protected area category and/or threaten protected area values.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Visitor services and facilities generally accord with relevant protected area category and don't threaten protected area values.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> All visitor services and facilities accord with relevant protected area category and most enhance protected area values.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All visitor services and facilities accord with relevant protected area category and enhance protected area values.</p>	Good	Visitor services are generally of high quality and in fact we question whether in some cases visitor needs are being elevated above those of biodiversity, for instance in the provision of firewood. We suggest gradually phasing out the collection of firewood within protected areas and also phasing in more individual responsibility with respect to waste management by requesting visitors carry this out with them.	A review of firewood provision might be included as a routine part of the audit procedures and collection within protected areas gradually phased out over the next few years. Similarly, recent experiments with requesting visitors to carry waste out could, if they continue to be successful, be more widely applied to protected areas both to save money and also to help build up a culture of caring for protected areas and minimising environmental impacts.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has fuelwood provision been reviewed?</li> <li>2. Have initiatives been considered / implemented to phase in more individual responsibility with respect to waste management?</li> </ol>		

5.3 Are management related trends systematically evaluated and routinely reported? (note: tourism trends are covered in question 5.6)

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Little or no systematic evaluation or routine reporting of management related trends.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some evaluation and reporting undertaken but neither systematic nor routine.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Systematic evaluation and routine reporting of management related trends undertaken for most protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Systematic evaluation and routine reporting of management related trends undertaken for all protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p>	Fair to good	A great deal of very useful information is collected. However there is currently no single place where such data can be analysed and presented to the public and we therefore propose that key information, particularly on management effectiveness and the outcomes of NHS' work, should be reported periodically in a State of the Parks report.	The excellent information currently available is rather scattered and not analysed as a whole to build up a picture of management effectiveness in Finland, particularly as it relates to conservation outcomes. Most of this information is already available. We therefore recommend serious consideration be given to the development of a State of the Parks report that would be published periodically (for example once every five years) to collect and analyse this information and report it in an accessible form.	1. Has a State of the Parks report been developed?		

#### 5.4 Is there a systematic maintenance schedule in place for built infrastructure/assets?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> No systematic inventory or maintenance schedule.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Systematic inventory undertaken and maintenance schedule in place for some sites.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Systematic inventory provides the basis for maintenance schedule for most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Systematic inventory provides the basis for maintenance schedule for all sites.</p>	Fair to Good	A detailed, GIS-based database of infrastructure is currently being completed and will give a clear picture of status, needs and repairs. We also support the development and application of a risk-based analysis so that repair and maintenance can be targeted at the places in greatest need of attention.	We underline the importance of having a functioning inventory system. Given the costs involved we would also support the development and application of a risk-based analysis so that repair and maintenance can be targeted at the places in greatest need of attention.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the inventory been completed?</li> <li>2. Is a risk-based analysis used to target repair and maintenance?</li> </ol>		

### 5.5 Does Finland fulfil its monitoring and reporting obligations under European Directives and international conventions?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> There is no monitoring and reporting scheme in place, and few, if any, reporting obligations are fulfilled.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> The national monitoring and reporting scheme is inadequate to fulfil reporting needs.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> There is a monitoring and reporting scheme in place, but it is not fully effective and reporting could be improved.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> There is a fully effective monitoring and reporting scheme in place, allowing all reporting needs to be fulfilled to a high standard and in a timely manner.</p>	Fair to good	<p>Membership of the European Union has brought new obligations, particularly in this case with respect to monitoring the 2010 target to halve biodiversity loss.</p> <p>Existing monitoring programmes may need some modification to meet these new needs and this could be addressed within a N2000 Master Plan for monitoring in Finland.</p>	<p>A monitoring and reporting programme is needed within a N2000 Master Plan for Finland, building on existing systems but also taking account of new monitoring needs under European Union and other international obligations.</p>	<p>1. Is there a national monitoring and reporting scheme in place to report to on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. European Directives</li> <li>b. CBD</li> <li>c. WH</li> <li>d. Ramsar</li> <li>e. Other key conventions?</li> </ul>		

**NEW QUESTION: 5.6 Are visitor use trends systematically monitored and reported in protected areas which have tourism as a management objective?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Little or no systematic evaluation or routine reporting of visitor use trends.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some evaluation and reporting of visitor use is undertaken but neither systematic nor routine.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Systematic evaluation and routine reporting of visitor use is undertaken for most protected areas or groups of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Systematic evaluation and routine reporting of visitor use is undertaken.</p>			

## 6. Outcomes

### 6.1 Are threatened species populations stable or increasing?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Threatened species populations declining.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some threatened species populations declining, most others stable.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most threatened species populations are increasing, most others stable.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All threatened species populations are either increasing or stable.</p>	Good	Surveys show that populations of many threatened species on land administered by the NHS are either stable or increasing, however there are exceptions such as the populations of the Baltic Ringed Seal and the Arctic Fox.	Recent conservation values in small conservation areas and sites of national conservation programmes should be surveyed on both state and private land in terms of rare habitats and threatened species. The possibilities of using NHS expertise in the management (including restoration) in protected areas on private land should be explored. These sites should also be included the monitoring programmes of selected species.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a strategy been developed to use monitoring data more systematically and within an overall adaptive management strategy?</li> <li>2. Provide updates on monitoring of threatened species?</li> </ol>		

## 6.2 Are selected indicator species within acceptable ranges?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Most selected indicator species are outside acceptable ranges.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Many selected indicator species are outside acceptable ranges.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most selected indicator species are within acceptable ranges.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All selected indicator species are within acceptable ranges.</p>	Fair to good	Specific use of indicator species is not widespread in Finland although some of the species currently monitored fulfil this function. We suggest a possible expansion in the use of indicator species in the future.	That a strategy be developed to use current monitoring data more systematically to develop a suite of indicators representing different aspects of biodiversity for reporting within a State of the Parks report.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a strategy been developed to use monitoring data more systematically and within an overall adaptive management strategy?</li> <li>2. Have indicator species been identified?</li> <li>3. Are indicator species reflective of biodiversity value?</li> </ol>		

### 6.3 Are biological communities at a mix of ages and spacings that will support native biodiversity?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Biological communities unlikely to be able to sustain native biodiversity.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some biological communities are likely to be able to sustain native biodiversity.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most biological communities are likely to be able to sustain native biodiversity.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> All biological communities are likely to be able to sustain native biodiversity.</p>	Fair to good	Biological communities probably exist at a viable scale in northern protected areas but probably not in the case of many protected areas in the south. Here major restoration efforts are needed coupled with landscape approaches to increase transition zones and to address size problems. In addition actions outside and bordering smaller protected areas may be undermining their effectiveness in some cases, particularly with respect to drainage of mires.	Management plans for small protected areas need to look beyond the border of the protected area at likely impacts of surrounding management; particularly in the case of protected areas surrounded by state-owned land under different management regimes. Restoration efforts need to be continued and perhaps expanded.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a strategy been developed to use monitoring data more systematically and within an overall adaptive management strategy?</li> <li>Although the focus of the assessment is on the protected area system managed and governed by Parks &amp; Wildlife Finland, for the objective of protection of Finnish biological and cultural values to be achieved the wider protected area network must be considered. What type of collaboration exists with wider protected area networks, specifically those bordering state run protected areas?</li> <li>Provide an update on restoration strategies and implementation</li> </ol>		



**6.4 Are the expectations of visitors generally met or exceeded?**

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Expectations of visitors generally not met.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Expectations of many visitors to many sites are met.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Expectations of most visitors to most sites are met.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Expectations of most visitors to all sites are met.</p>	Good to very good	Most visitors seem satisfied and indeed enthusiastic about the protected areas system.	Visitor satisfaction should be monitored and reported as part of a state of the parks system.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a strategy been developed to use monitoring data more systematically and within an overall adaptive management strategy?</li> <li>2. How is visitor satisfaction reported?</li> </ol>		

### 6.5 Are neighbours and adjacent communities supportive of protected area management?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Neighbours/adjacent communities are hostile.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Key neighbours/communities are supportive.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Most neighbours/communities are supportive of protected area management for most sites.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Most neighbours and communities are supportive of protected area management for all sites.</p>	Good	There do not seem to be major clashes between local people and protected areas although there is still resistance and some resentment in some communities; this may be gradually changing over time and as the tourism and other economic benefits are recognised.	Consideration is given to a periodic survey of local attitudes ideally linked to Advisory Committees where these exist, and to surveys of urban attitudes to protected areas. Efforts at building links with local communities and raising awareness of protected area values, as demonstrated by some of the visitor centres with links to municipalities, should be extended.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have periodic survey of local attitudes, ideally linked to Advisory Committees where these exist, been undertaken – and how do the results impact management?</li> <li>2. How are protected area values to local communities assessed, interpreted and shared (see also 1.5)?</li> <li>3. How do people who work for Parks &amp; Wildlife regard IP&amp;LC communities and their interests in the protected area system?</li> <li>4. What do people who work for Parks &amp; Wildlife think of the local and traditional knowledge and practices of IP&amp;LC communities?</li> </ol>		

## 6.6 Are cultural heritage assets protected?

Criteria	2005 results	2005 summary details	2005 recommendations	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> Little or no management undertaken, or despite management efforts, deterioration of cultural heritage assets continues, or values are unknown.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Some management activity, but deterioration continues.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Planned approach to management underway at most sites and deterioration of assets is being redressed.</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Planned approach to management underway at all sites and deterioration of assets is being significantly redressed.</p>	Good	<p>There is clearly increasing effort being put into conservation of cultural values and some impressive interpretation work.</p> <p>There is also some concern amongst NHS staff that they have insufficient resources to undertake these new responsibilities. As a first step, a systematic survey of cultural heritage within the protected area network needs to be completed.</p>	<p>A systematic inventory of cultural heritage within the Finnish protected area system should be completed as soon as possible. The condition of cultural heritage assets should be monitored and reported as part of a state of the parks system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has a systematic inventory of cultural heritage within the Finnish protected area system been developed (see also 1.5)?</li> <li>2. Is the condition of cultural heritage assets monitored and reported?</li> <li>3. Are relevant property/access/use rights of IPLCs clearly defined and documented in relation to the PA system?</li> <li>4. Are rightsholders generally aware of their rights, and able to exercise them?</li> </ol>		

**NEW QUESTION 6.7 Is ecosystem functionality and health being maintained?**

Criteria	2023 key questions/issues to consider	2023 results	2023 summary details
<p><i>Poor:</i> There is no monitoring of ecosystem functionality and health.</p> <p><i>Fair:</i> Ecosystem functionality and health monitoring is planned or only minimally taking place.</p> <p><i>Good:</i> Monitoring of ecosystem functionality and health is taking place, but is not extensive enough, or not effectively fed back into management, to ensure full maintenance of functionality and health</p> <p><i>Very good:</i> Monitoring of ecosystem functionality and health feeds into adaptive management to ensure functionality and health is maintained.</p>	<p>1. Has a strategy been developed to use monitoring data more systematically and within an overall adaptive management strategy?</p>		