



COMMISSIONED REPORT

Annex to Commissioned Report No. 271

A review of relevant experience of coastal and marine national parks

Case study (7)

Archipelago National Park, Finland



Prepared by
Alison Munro
for Hambrey Consulting

This report should be cited as:

Munro, A. (2008). *Case study 7 - Archipelago National Park, Finland.* Scottish Natural Heritage Research, Annex to Commissioned Report No. 271 - Available online at <http://www.snh.org.uk/strategy/CMNP/sr-adnp01.asp>

This report is one of a number of studies undertaken to inform the following publication:

Hambrey Consulting (2008). A review of relevant experience of coastal and marine national parks. *Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 271 (ROAME No. R07NC).*

This report, or any part of it, should not be reproduced without the permission of Scottish Natural Heritage. This permission will not be withheld unreasonably. The views expressed by the author(s) of this report should not be taken as the views and policies of Scottish Natural Heritage.

Contents

Sketch profile	1
Contents.....	3
Key observations and lessons learned	5
Timeline	6
Original basis for site selection/designation	7
Administration	9
Management structure	9
The Archipelago Sea Biosphere Reserve.....	10
The role of management plans	12
Management mechanisms.....	14
Overall strengths and weaknesses associated with the designation	24
Bibliography, weblinks and contacts	26

Acknowledgements

Our thanks go to everyone in Finland who provided such great and detailed information for this case study and in particular, to Jouko Högmänder who gave so much of his time to help with our research.

Key observations and lessons learned

1. **Communication - more time should be given to 'speaking with people'**. All contacts stressed the importance of prioritising good quality, extensive communication and participatory consultation with local communities and stakeholders, particularly before the designation of the national park and also during the set-up phases. The barriers to effective communication are often cited as money, resources and time, all of which can be considered at the outset.
2. **Stakeholder groups and management benefit mutually from ongoing contact and a meaningful exchange of information.** The perception that all the decisions are taken 'at a high level' and too far away from the local area should be avoided. Efforts should be made to ensure that all stakeholder groups are included in any consultation process e.g. year-round and seasonal inhabitants. Local residents should almost be viewed as 'protected area customers' whose opinions and wellbeing are important.
3. In the ANP, changes to administrative and management structures resulted in greatly reduced face-face contact, and limited resources on the ground have led to 'poorer and poorer' communication. A recent report prepared as part of an Interreg project indicated that this problem is shared with other national parks and includes clear recommendations to improve communication which the management of ANP are likely to take on board.
4. The successful cooperation between the biosphere reserve and ANP personnel in Finland demonstrates that it is not always necessary for national park personnel to have direct contact with local communities to achieve good local cooperation, understanding and mutual benefit. Working in close partnership with others who operate at local level can be equally effective. However, local communities should be able to see a clear link between 'grass roots' level actions and the management of the national park.

'The worst mistakes were made when the national park was established; there was poor communication with the locals'.

'Our current management plan has worked well, but it has not become familiar for the local people'. Jouko Högmänder

5. **Evaluation.** Regular formal monitoring of local and regional attitudes towards the national park (all levels) could provide ongoing information which may help with the development of management plans and in conflict avoidance.
6. **Local entrepreneurs** - can often provide services which the protected areas cannot offer. Time, money and effort should be invested in cooperating with them.
7. **Fragmented area.** The control and management of a very fragmented area, like the ANP is difficult and can prove a barrier to cooperation with and between communities. The knowledge and cooperation of local communities can be a valuable contribution to efforts at a higher level while simultaneously strengthening the cultural and natural heritage.
8. **Tourism clearly presents a good opportunity for any region near a national park.** Tourism is one of the few economic activities which has a promising outlook in the archipelago. Statistical analyses indicate that the economic benefits to the surrounding municipalities derived from tourism in and near the ANP, are positive. From a conservation point of view it could be argued that a national park does not *need* more

visitors, however, local communities do need an income. Any new initiatives must however be sustainable and not reliant on the common pitfall of 3-year funding. Integrated tourism strategies covering all areas bordering a national park, with a programme of international marketing, should prove beneficial, as could a well developed system of visitor monitoring.

9. **The value of meaningful information** - Katja Bonnevier (coordinator for the biosphere reserve):

'Give information to local stakeholders and people when you plan to start something new. I think many of the problems in Finland that have occurred concerning national parks or Natura 2000 are due to a lack of information. It is very time consuming and laborious, but it's certainly worth doing and will make it easier in the beginning and later on. Local stakeholders and representatives of local associations should be listened to. Starting projects that support local economies or tourism may be good. It is important that locals recognise the positive things associated with the national park and that it provides added value for the area.'

The Archipelago National Park is one of the most challenging national parks in Finland because there are permanent and holiday houses on private areas within the park and there are a lot of different stakeholders with differing interests (local inhabitants, holiday homes, military, coastguard, professional fishing, recreational fishing, hunting, tourism and boating, nature conservation, cultural land and archaeological issues etc.). It is possible to negotiate, but understanding often takes considerable time and effort.'

IT ALL TAKES TIME

Timeline

1973 - 1975	The first working group, comprising mainly politicians, established to consider the principles and the territory of the park. Group produced a report, where the emphasis was the improvement of living conditions for the locals. Nature conservation was almost forgotten. The only thing which survived this work, were the borders of the cooperation area.
1980 - 1982	Second working group established (mainly politicians) undertaking primarily technical work to prepare a proposal for park legislation.
1983	The park was established.
1983 - 1993	Duration of first decree.
1988 - 1989	Preparation for first management plan.
1990	First management plan finalised.
1994	Area approved as a biosphere reserve.
1997 - 1998	Second management plan written.
1999	New instructions were prepared by the Metsähallitus Advisory Board regarding how the participation of locals and stakeholders should be organised. A guide book was published (now available in English, Swedish, Russian and Sami languages), and the current system with public hearings, use of the internet and newspapers, official statements etc. was established.
2000	Second management plan finalised.
2006	Member of Europarc Federation.
2007	PAN Parks application submitted.
2010	Management plan due for update.

Original basis for site selection/designation

The Archipelago National Park is the most representative and most diverse of all the Finnish archipelagos. At the time of designation it had, and still has, some special features which make it nationally and internationally important. These include:

- over 8,300 islands and islets within the current borders of the cooperative area, altogether over 40,000 in the whole SW archipelago;
- shallow sea (max. 100 m), no tides;
- brackish water, the sea freezes in most winters;
- 2 billion year old bedrock is visible and dominates almost every island;
- eskers, sand moraines (mostly under water - part as islands and reefs) and other remnants of the last Ice Age;
- richest biodiversity in the whole country (where southern and northern species and habitats meet);
- to date, almost 400 nationally endangered species and 40 Natura 2000 habitats (of 69 recognised in Finland) have been found here, 14 of which are an EC priority;
- ongoing fishing culture until the 1970s, although this is no longer strong;
- Swedish speaking minority living on the islands at the time of designation (about 500 people).



However, it is understood that the boundaries were originally defined more as a result of a political process, and that input from the nature conservation experts at the time was given less consideration.

There were two main problems with the initial proposal, on which the final National Park Act was based. Firstly, some important areas were left outside the boundary and the high priority areas within the boundaries were not highlighted. This would have been helpful, because right from the beginning, the intention was that there would be both national park and privately-owned areas within the boundary. Secondly, when in 1979 the government started to prepare for the establishment of new parks, the proposed size of the Archipelago National Park was defined at 3,000 ha. It was not based on any detailed knowledge and marine areas were overlooked.

When the Finnish proposal for the Natura 2000 network was submitted to the EU in 2000, most of those representative areas which had initially been left out were then included.

Baseline studies of the southern archipelago were carried out by qualified staff in the 1970s who proposed a boundary for the new park. This proposal was considered by a working group between 1973-75. The working group consisted primarily of representatives of the municipalities and local stakeholders - there was only one person representing nature conservation. At that time, there was no environmental administration in Finland - no ministry, no regional centres and no nature conservation unit in Metsähallitus. The proposal was then included in a national park committee report (set up by senior politicians) which proposed that around 40 new national parks be established in Finland. Almost all of these are now protected areas, the most important are national parks. Another working group

prepared a draft Act and Decree, passed in 1982 and the ANP was established on 1st January, 1983.

The final size of the national park is still under question. The area is increasing every year through the purchase of land and water, the latest acquisition in August 2006. In theory, a further 1,500-2,000 ha should be purchased before the end of 2009 which is the deadline for Natura 2000 purposes. Land acquisition has however been slow in recent years and the reasons for this are unclear. Purchasing authority is in the hands of the Ministry of the Environment and land is expensive so budgetary constraints may be an issue.

Another issue at the time the park was established was poor communication with local communities. The nature conservation restrictions were viewed by some as a threat and insufficient information was supplied in advance of the restrictions being put in place. However, the attitudes and willingness to cooperate with the national park have slowly improved. Metsähallitus has been able to offer the locals grazing and fishing rights, firewood and hay from the managed cultural landscapes and this helped improve the relationship with local people. Cooperation with respect to tourism has also increased and had a positive impact. One of the key remaining areas of conflict, hunting, surfaced after the original designation when the relevant organisations registered the implications of the national park.

Management institutions

ANP is under the management and administration of Metsähallitus (for state owned areas) and the Environment Centre (for private areas in the cooperation area). The biosphere reserve has no legal status and the zonation of the biosphere reserve has no effect on the management of the area.

The National Park Act came into force on 1st January 1983 and was updated in 1993. At the time of the Act, sustainable development issues were considered less important than they are today.

In 1991 the objectives of the ANP were defined and the cooperation area around the park specified. Exchange of state-owned minor plots became possible in order to facilitate land acquisition for enlarging the park.

According to the Act, the Archipelago National Park has been established to:

- protect the nature and the culture of the Archipelago Sea;
- safeguard the traditional ways of utilising nature;
- preserve a living community in the archipelago;
- promote environmental research and general interest in nature.

Several amendments were introduced in the Decree in 1994. These include:

- the structure of the decree was modernised and harmonised with other national park decrees;
- the activities allowed for anybody, Defence Forces, Border Guard etc. with or without the permission of Metsähallitus were formulated more precisely.

Subsequently, restrictions on hunting have been defined. Hunting in the ANP is possible with the permission of Metsähallitus' only for people permanently living within the cooperation area.

Administration

Initially, (1988-1993) the Archipelago National Park had an independent administrative unit within Metsähallitus (the Finnish Forest and Park Service) with 10-14 staff, increasing to 30 in the summer. There have since been several changes to the administration.

In 1994, the advisory committee of the ANP was abolished and replaced by one in the biosphere reserve, which was subsequently replaced by the advisory committee of the Outer Archipelago in 2002.

Since the beginning of 2006 there has been no dedicated administrative unit with its own staff or budget. The current administrative unit covers a third of the whole country and around 25 national parks. The regional, park-based model, has been replaced by the Natural Heritage Services department in Metsähallitus which has four functional processes: nature conservation, recreational services, area management and fishing and hunting. The whole country is then divided into only three regional units.

The perceived advantages of the current system are focus and personal skill development for personnel. Administration and standardisation of management can be guided from Metsähallitus HQ. The tangible disadvantages however include a lack of local representation and lack of contact between park management and local communities, leading to reduced communication and consideration of local views. The lack of a dedicated budget also means that less attention can be paid to local needs in the management of both biodiversity and visitors.

A recent study entitled '*Co-operation between coastal protected areas and local societies: from experiences to recommendations*' was conducted as part of the Interreg funded '*Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge*' (CSC) project (discussed in more detail later in the report). The cumulative results give many indicators on the views of local entrepreneurs, authorities, institutions and organisations, and personnel of coastal protected areas. Results included the type, quality and extent of cooperation in protected areas; the reasons for cooperation and how it has developed. Four countries participated in the survey (Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) and the ANP stands out in particular for the improvement in positive attitude towards the national park and the increase in both extent and value of cooperation between partners over the last 10 years. However, the coordinator of the CSC project commented that the research had a number of shortcomings, and that with specific reference to ANP, the results while valid, should be treated with caution due to the following:

- The research sample for Finland was small;
- A response rate of only 44% was achieved;
- The level of questionnaires used for different target groups was too complex.

Management structure

The current park management structure includes:

- One superintendent with 7 staff across 1.5 provinces: responsible for recreational services and facilities;
- One officer with a staff of 5 responsible for nature conservation issues within the same area;
- One area manager with no staff covering the management of protected areas in an area of 5 provinces in Southern Finland;

- Seasonal workers;
- NHS-Southern Finland experts who have responsibility for e.g. certain threatened species or habitat types.

There are four municipalities belonging to the national park. These are small, with numbers of inhabitants ranging from 600-4,000; 7,000 in total. By early 2009, these will be amalgamated into 1-2 municipalities. The original advisory board of the national park provided a direct link between the communities and the park and the relationship with local municipalities was close. Current relationships are mainly with mayors and other local administrators. It is worth noting that for many projects e.g. tourism, the national park works in close cooperation with the biosphere reserve, which in turn extends its borders to incorporate further municipalities.

Jouko Högmander - Park Superintendent 1988-2005, currently Senior Adviser, Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services comments on park management:

'In general, I would say that there would be two or three options: the N.P. has its own staff who focus on the management of only one park (plus perhaps some smaller nature reserves close to it), or there is a regional administration with an increased number of staff who operate across a larger area encompassing many parks. The first approach gives staff better opportunities to get to know their territory, its inhabitants and needs.

The third option would be a kind of combination, where persons working in the park have, in addition to their responsibilities in the park, some tasks at regional or national (or international) level, and that way have opportunities to develop their skills and see management issues in a wider context. Such an approach should be supplemented with an effective 'results-driven' management system helping to ensure that annual national goals are effectively delivered across the organisation.

We have experience of all three kinds of administration, and to my mind, the disadvantages of the second approach are self-evident. I would like to add that in isolated areas, as in an archipelago park, the administrative problems may be magnified compared to parks close to big cities. There are many risks: the staff can be living too close to local communities and can forget the priorities of the park; or, on the other hand, if the connections at grass-roots level are too weak, the needs and views of local people (and even those of one remote park) can easily be forgotten.'

The Archipelago Sea Biosphere Reserve

Management

The Archipelago Sea Biosphere Reserve is coordinated by the Southwest Finland Regional Environment Center reporting for the Ministry of the Environment. The SW Finland Regional Environment Center carries out development and research projects in cooperation with various partners. Reserve management is overseen by a steering group of six. The group was established in 1994 and comprises representatives from the main municipality of Houtskär, Metsähallitus, the local community, the University, the relevant government department, plus the biosphere reserve coordinator.

An advisory committee for the biosphere reserve provides input to the steering group. This committee consists of representatives from the following bodies: all four municipalities, the

association for permanent inhabitants of the biosphere reserve, two universities, the environment centre, the employment and economic development centre, Metsähallitus, the Finnish maritime administration (traffic, ferries), and the Regional Council of South-West Finland.

The advisory committee has the following remit:

- to act as a reference group and support the coordination of the biosphere reserve;
- to act as a communication channel to the Archipelago National Park;
- to handle questions concerning data exchange, ferry operations, energy (e.g. wind energy), socio-economic issues, culture and most importantly the environment within the biosphere reserve;
- to act as a communication and information channel for decision makers and authorities.

To achieve these tasks the advisory committee can:

- draw up declarations/ position statements concerning important issues;
- address questions to the board of the sub-regional council;
- initiate projects (e.g. EU-projects);
- establish working-groups or seminars for special issues.

Biosphere reserve projects include the creation of village plans to support sustainable development, supporting sustainable leisure fishing and sustainable tourism in the Archipelago Sea area.

Local stakeholders stress the importance of the committee to facilitate local and regional communication. The biosphere reserve has no legal authority so all activities are carried out on a voluntary basis. In reality, this means that the advisory committee can only come up with recommendations, express opinion and make a contribution to public discussion.

Major habitats and land cover types of the biosphere reserve

Coniferous forests characterised by Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), spruce (*Picea abies*) and birch (*Betula pubescens*); mull-soil forest with spruce, birch and aspen (*Populus tremula*), characterised by alder (*Alnus glutinosa*), ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) and hazel (*Corylus avellana*); wood meadow including *Ranunculus acris*, *R. auricomus*, *Dianthus deltoides* etc.; field, heath and rocky meadow with *Cladonia* spp., *Empetrum nigrum*, *Arctostaphylos uva-ursi*; rocky treeless islets with *Allium schoenoprasum*, *Tripleurospermum maritimum*, *Cochlearia danica* etc.; sandy islets with *Urtica dioica*, *Sedum acre*, *Fragaria vesca* etc.; seashore supporting *Angelica sylvestris*, *A. archangelica litoralis*, *Isatis tinctoria*, *Linaria vulgaris*, *Festuca polesica*, *Carex* spp. etc.; Baltic marine area with species such as *Fucus vesiculosus*, *Cladophora glomerata*, *Furcellaria* sp. etc.; forestry ecosystems with Scots pine and spruce. Crops have never been cultivated far out in the archipelago due to the harsh climate, animal husbandry being the only form of agricultural livelihood.

Research in the biosphere reserve

Basic research and monitoring activities are carried out through the two universities - Åbo Akademi University and Turun yliopisto (University of Turku). Turku University has a research station within the biosphere reserve; Åbo Akademi has recently put up a research unit at Korpoström. The scientific resource and basic monitoring could be said to be competent in the Archipelago Sea. Recent reports do however indicate that additional funding would be required to investigate the effects of strong eutrophication in the marine environment.

The role of management plans

Under the Nature Conservation Act (1096/1996) all national parks are required to have their own management plans. The plan is produced by Metsähallitus and confirmed by the Ministry of the Environment. Its purpose is to guide and instruct the activities of the authority which administers the area. It has no legal jurisdiction over other organisations.



The ANP has a 46 page management plan, first confirmed in 1990 and revised in 2000 when it defined the park's zones. A lot has been done to develop the management plan recently and it is considered (by park management) to be working well since the scope and content have been widened. The next plan (2010) will cover the whole Natura 2000 site, including private areas.

The Nature Conservation Act defines general restrictions. Specific restrictions for the ANP and activities which require permission are defined in the Decree and the Regulations.

The traditional Finnish legal concept of Everyman's Right is not valid in the ANP or other protected areas, and the restrictions of this Right are defined in the regulation for the national park. In general, Everyman's Right is defined as everything you can do outdoors (move, pick berries and mushrooms, light a fire, etc.) which is not forbidden or restricted by any law. In national parks there are usually many restrictions concerning these rights and it is therefore understood that Everyman's Right does not apply in national parks.

The content of the management plan can be roughly divided into two:

1. Description of the natural and cultural heritage of the area;
2. The plan itself - comprising objectives derived from the area description and park zonation details.

The following 'zones' are used in the management plan and apply to the ANP land:

Restricted zone - often associated with bird or seal colonies these zones can have an impact on the lives of both visitors and local people. The restricted zone has two areas:

1. Landing prohibited April 1 - July 31 (ca. 150 ha of land)
2. Landing and boating prohibited all-year-round (ca. 12,370 ha of water)

Recreational zone - visitor facilities exist;

Wilderness zone - no visitor facilities or services are provided. Free movement is allowed within the recreational and wilderness zones (ca. 3,070 ha of land and 34,630 ha of water of the ANP).

On-land signage to define restrictions for the public

Official blue and white signs are distributed throughout the national park e.g. in natural harbours and at visitor points on the islands that belong to ANP to indicate park status. Restricted areas are marked by yellow or yellow-red signs, where landing or landing and boating is prohibited. Boundaries are also shown on visitor information maps.

Zoning is intended to address nature conservation rather than cultural values. However, the maintenance of traditional rural landscapes is important within the ANP. The core zone

doesn't include all important habitat types; some are dependant on human activity which is prohibited in the core zone. Where necessary, the restrictions detailed in the original management plan have been changed in response to conservation needs. The Nature Conservation Act (1996) set strict preconditions for restricted zones of protected areas i.e. only the protection of plants and animals justified such restrictions. At present, only scientific work and the military are allowed within the ANP with permission from Metsähallitus. An effective zoning system reduces scope for conflict and minimises human impact.

Within the management plan, after the zoning section, the different activities taking place within the park e.g. nature conservation, recreational services, information etc. are described in more detail. There is a section defining the legal rights of local people, including those relating to fishing, grazing and hunting. Monitoring and assessment of the impacts of the plan are also included.

In the next version of the plan, marine habitats will be taken into consideration based on the baseline inventories currently being compiled. Discussion around hunting issues is expected to continue. When the Decree limits those who can apply for permission, demands will focus on the current restrictions at species level (grey seal and greylag geese likely to be on the list).

Management plan process

The current management plan process includes the following phases:

- preparing a project plan;
- public information and hearings;
- running a cooperation workshop;
- preparing objectives for the management plan;
- preparing the first draft of the plan;
- discussing the draft through a workshop;
- preparing the proposal;
- publishing it on the internet;
- public hearings and asking for formal consultation responses/statements (authorities, municipalities, stakeholders, NGOs etc.);
- finalising the management plan, with a consideration of the consultation commentary;
- confirmation of the management plan by the Ministry of Environment;
- publishing it in hardcopy and on the internet;
- advertising / informing others on completion.

In the late 1990s (when the current management plan was prepared) the process was more simple. The main differences: there was no official project plan, the first public hearings were not implemented before the first draft, and the advisory committee worked as cooperation workshop.

The sections of the plan outlined below identify the long-term management aims for the maintenance of ecological processes and biological diversity:

Chapter 6.1 Areas in natural condition

- no management activities

Chapter 6.2 Traditional landscapes

They are managed in order to:

- safeguard the traditional village and pasture landscape
- preserve certain plant communities as a part of traditional landscapes and to preserve endangered species there

- preserve rare organisms which need special protection and management activities
- keep panorama sites open
- maintain the tradition of voluntary work, traditional working methods and old buildings and structures

Chapter 6.3 Restoration areas

- areas with overgrown traditional landscape or abandoned commercial forest can be restored with a detailed plan

Chapter 6.4 Historical and prehistoric sites

- buildings, constructions etc. are maintained

Stakeholder groups

The following stakeholder groups have participated in the management planning process:

- Regional Council of the province - submitted a formal consultation response (statement) about the proposal;
- Four municipalities - they were very active both directly with the administration and through the Advisory Committee (A.C.), and they made statements regarding the proposal;
- Authorities - Regional Environment Centre was active both with direct contacts, through the A.C. and submitted a consultation response. National Board of Antiquities in a similar way and the Regional Game Management District, the Defence Forces and the Finnish Maritime Administration all submitted consultation responses;
- Research institutes - University of Turku and Åbo Akademi University provided information about the natural and cultural heritage, and were asked for a statement regarding the draft plan;
- NGOs - The Association of Professional Fishermen, two national boating organisations and the Archipelago Nature School submitted consultation responses and two regional nature conservation associations participated through the A.C.

In addition, all the organisations and stakeholders mentioned above, and many others, were contacted unofficially during the process.

The fact that the cooperation area is privately owned generates interaction with local inhabitants and entrepreneurs. Most people living in the archipelago area earn their living from the service sector and primary production is more common in the archipelago than in other parts of the country.

Management mechanisms

According to Jouko Högmander, the original park administration structure facilitated a close relationship with local communities and stakeholders, more so than the current structure allows. The first and second management plans were supported by the advisory board for the park, which effectively acted as a steering group for local forums and discussion. In 1999, Metsähallitus prepared new instructions on how the participation of local people and all stakeholders should be organised. A guide book was published (now available in English, Swedish, Russian and Sami languages) and the current system, based on this guidance, with public hearings, use of the internet and newspapers, formal consultation etc., is considered to be working well.

To some extent, the work of the biosphere reserve committee seems to 'fill the gap' in grass roots communication with local communities left by the changes to the national park administration structure. Local people and stakeholders are represented on both the main advisory group and on local project groups. In addition, the coordinator is located at the sub-regional council offices which facilitates a close working relationship.

Jouko Högmander:

'An Advisory Board (A.B) might be a useful tool in communication with the world around us. However, in most Finnish cases problems have occurred because the representatives of stakeholders, especially those from the municipalities, see the board as a forum for protecting their own interests. At the same time the objectives of the N.P. are often less important for some members of the A.B. This has been the main reason why Metsähallitus has seen this arrangement as 'cumbersome' to maintain and relatively 'unproductive', and has gradually reduced the use of this kind of communication with stakeholders.'

Hunting and fishing

Hunting and fishing are now of limited importance as a means of income. However, they are clearly a very important part of the local cultural heritage and identity. While fishing rights have never caused problems within the ANP, hunting has always been an area of conflict and continues to be so.



Hunting

Hunting has been the main area of conflict with local communities within the ANP since the establishment of the park. Hunting has been allowed from the outset; however, there are problems associated with the original definition of the restrictions imposed. The first decree stated that "hunting is allowed for local people" without defining the meaning of local. Consequently, during the preparation of the first management plan, this issue dominated discussion. It was proposed that only people living within the cooperation areas (or in villages at least partially within), had the right to get permission to hunt from Metsähallitus, but with some restrictions (for example: an exclusion on geese and seals and some parts of the park were totally restricted). Local people in the cooperation area were 'pro' the proposal, while hunters outside the cooperation area were strongly against. This proposal was finally accepted, the decree adjusted and the arrangement is part of the current management plan. However, opposition from hunters was extremely strong and although the relationship between the main players and management is now more amicable, the issue is likely to dominate the next revision of the management plan again in 2010.

The serious problem of grey seals disturbing local fishing will give hunters grounds to lobby in favour of hunting in the ANP. The grey seal is a difficult species to hunt. It's very shy and only comes ashore in a few places far away from the bigger islands. The grey seal population has increased greatly in the last 10 years and the Finnish hunting authorities want to start reducing the population. Hunting of the ringed seal is forbidden countrywide - grey seal hunting is forbidden in the ANP. The ANP covers around one third of the best potential hunting grounds on the southern edge of the whole archipelago. Thus, effective hunting there could play an important role in the control of the seal numbers. However, from the point of view of the national park, this would not be acceptable. Moreover, ringed seal numbers have now decreased from several thousand to just 2-300 and there is a danger that hunters who don't know the difference could mistakenly shoot ringed seals.

Fishing

Fishing regulations are controlled by licences obtained from Metsähallitus and 'have never caused problems in the ANP'. Licences fall into three main categories: professional fishermen, private use and recreational fishing. All three types of fishing play a minor role in the local recreation and economy due to the distance from major cities and extent of the archipelago. In addition, fishing is currently difficult along Finnish coasts and archipelagos due to a wide number of factors including over-fishing of some species, eutrophication of the sea, environmental toxins, increasing numbers of grey seals disturbing fishing and cheap fish imported from fish farms in Norway.

Professional fishermen used to buy a 5 or 10 year lease. However, licence costs are under discussion and likely to change. Fishermen are requesting sole rights on the area. Future plans are for licences covering a specified number and type of tackle. Demand is currently low and only a small number of leases have been bought. The main catch is whitefish, perch and Baltic herring. Flounders are smoked and sold to tourists in the summer, but flounder numbers decreased recently, with the likely cause being the poor state of the sea bed.

Private fishing is mainly undertaken by families living in or near the park. A common practice is to buy a licence for 4 nets (at the moment less than 5 €/net/year). Only 10-15 licences are currently in use.

Recreational fishing has been recently reorganised to allow anyone to buy a license from any Metsähallitus customer service point (mainly the visitor centres) or via the web. A map and information on restrictions for fishing in the national park are provided with the licence. Recent changes to legislation will mean there is no difference between private and recreational fishing regulations.

Sustainable Development

The main task of the Metsähallitus with respect to the national park is nature conservation with everything else coming second. However, the management recognises the importance of sustainable development projects both for cultural heritage and for the maintenance of local communities.

Tourism

The park receives approximately 60-70,000 visits pa with the majority of people staying in their own boats and yachts. Approximately 90% of visits take place between 20th June and 31st July. Historically the majority of visitors have been Finnish. Foreign visitors constitute approximately 6% of the total, mainly from Sweden although the numbers of German and Russian tourists is increasing. Tourist companies are generally small, although some larger companies have shown interest in investing in the area in the past 2 years. The short season is generally the greatest problem.

The area has a network of information points and cottages, ten nature trails and a series of way marked routes, plus two visitor centres, mainly for tourists and run by Metsähallitus.

The Blamusslan or 'Blue Mussel' visitor centre was built 1993 in the village of Kasnas. There is a land and marine exhibition (open all the year and providing approximately 250 guided tours/annum), an aquarium, a reference library and a geological nature trail. Most visitors come to the centre from May to October and total around 20,000. The centre provides information about the diverse nature of the archipelago and national park and the development of the Baltic Sea generally together with the services available on the islands and the range of archipelago boat trips provided by local operators. This cooperation with

local entrepreneurs is considered by the manager of the Blamusslan Centre to be the most successful tourist initiative to date. Local services also include a shop, spa hotel, restaurant, swimming beach and guest harbour.

The Korpoström Archipelago Centre in Korpoo is jointly owned with Metsähallitus by the Åbo Akademi University Foundation and Svenska Kulturfonden. The centre provides full tourist information, temporary exhibitions on the natural environment and way of life in the Archipelago, and seminars, lectures and events on the same subject. Facilities can be hired for conferences and private functions. It attracts around 10,000 visitors pa.



With respect to a tourism strategy, the ANP management plan does not include a full list of target groups or a communication plan. Only the following two groups are mentioned: provision of information services for the general public; and supporting school and university activities.

Metsähallitus educates guides for the summer season, mainly for the visitor centre and also to provide tours at the most important sights. Cooperation with professional guides and the nature school is another delivery option.

New nature trails, better facilities and improved information have all been planned. However, the fulfilment of these plans will depend on funding. Open and constructive communication and agreements with local entrepreneurs are seen as key for both parties in order to improve tourist facilities.

Visitor survey

In 2003 the Finnish Government confirmed a programme for developing recreation and tourism in state-owned areas. A survey was carried out in ANP between 2003 and 2005 which aimed to measure the regional economic impact that tourism may have in nature conservation areas. The visitor survey (2003) assessed, via questionnaires, how much visitors spend in the local area near the national park. The entrepreneur survey 2004 - 2005, involved asking local entrepreneurs via a postal questionnaire about the effect that national park tourism has on their business. The response rate was just under 50%.

The results showed a cumulative annual income figure of 3.6 million euro, received mainly by entrepreneurs through direct sales of goods and services to tourists. The multiplier effect is very small as the archipelago area doesn't cater for supply and local businesses make major purchases further afield, e.g. in Turku. Fuel, food and drink, retail shops, restaurants and cafes received the highest proportion of income.

Nature tourism and the maintenance of visitor services amount to around 30 man years of employment. Local archipelago municipalities receive approximately 100,000 euro tax income annually as a result of national park tourism and while comparisons between different regional surveys can be misleading, the effects of the ANP fall into the same category as those in some areas of Eastern Finland.

Visitor numbers can only be estimated on an annual basis due to the fragmented nature of the ANP and difficulties with access. Only regular counting at the visitor centres is reliable,

although questionnaires have also been distributed to visitors and entrepreneurs to assess tourist numbers and attitudes.

Good practice projects

Sustainable tourism in Finland and the ANP was discussed in a report by Stevens & Associates (2006). Updated information from people interviewed in the course of our research is given below.

The 2006 report highlights the following areas as those where the ANP represents 'good practice':

- market research;
- branding;
- TIC gateway with network of support centres;
- touring routes, trails, paths;
- guided boat tours using traditional boats;
- network of discovery centres;
- business advice support and development;
- emphasis upon gateway communities;
- private sector involved in managing the park;
- transport - shuttle service, traditional sailing and fishing boats;
- litter removal and keep park tidy schemes.

The ANP is a good example of cooperation with and between local entrepreneurs to provide services, one of the best being the use of fishing boats to provide visitors with transport to, and tours within, the protected areas. Involving local fishermen in tourism activities appears to have been reasonably successful.

There have been a number of successful initiatives carried out in cooperation between the ANP and the biosphere reserve and in collaboration with regional tourism schemes.

- The 'Archipelago and man' - a nature-culture-tourism project (2005/06) involved research and the production of a biosphere reserve brochure (Villages in the Outer Turku Archipelago - Nature & Culture) detailing the nature, culture and services of the archipelago, together with a report on the history of the biosphere reserve area. The research involved substantial input from local people via face to face interviews and has contributed to a stronger local connection with tourism.
- South Finland Coastal Zone Programme - Tourism Scheme: a pilot study involving the island of Jungfruskär - as part of a wider EU part-funded programme, a nature tourism project was carried out in the ANP and Estonia in 2002-2004. The objective of this project was to promote nature tourism within the biosphere areas of the archipelago and the western regions of Estonia, the aim being to find an economically, socially, ecologically and culturally sustainable model for nature tourism. The islands of Jungfruskär formed one of the main pilot study areas for this project.

Comments from Annastina Sarlin / Jouko Högmänder:

The project provided resources to introduce the concept of cooperative working with local entrepreneurs and to organise study tours for them. Some small-scale investments at Jungfruskär were also important (nature trail development, bird-watching tower construction etc.). The lessons learnt included:

- *have a clear vision and delivery plan with targets before you involve other parties as entrepreneurs;*

- *good communication with local inhabitants is essential (Jungfruskär and neighbouring islands have a number of private holiday homes used in the summer months) to avoid any misunderstandings and to get ideas for the management plan/tourism strategy.'*

Is Jungfruskär now, some years later, a good sustainable model for Nature tourism as a result of the pilot?

'We are currently analysing whether the activities are sustainable (they are) and what kind of indicators can be used in the future to monitor the impacts of visitors. Jungfruskär is a good target area, both terrestrial and marine baseline inventories are complete and reliable data are available. A number of small-scale activities are taking place at the moment e.g. camps, boating and charter groups but the island has the capacity for greater use and serves as a good example of how to combine nature tourism and nature protection with demonstrable cooperation between Metsähallitus and private stakeholders.'

As soon as facilities exist such activities can develop further (proposed restoration of former army barracks to serve as accommodation). The aim is to have a larger volume of visitors undertaking a broader range of activities utilising more local products (enhanced economy). At the moment Jungfruskär is not well marketed and there is no systematic traffic to the island.'

Branding

There have been some attempts to use branding in marketing the Archipelago as a whole via regional websites (see Appendix 1) and Metsähallitus's own web pages. A substantial volume of information has been made available in different languages including a wide range of materials and images. However, interview discussions indicated that the website marketing has had limited impact to date in terms of attracting increased numbers of overseas visitors. Jouko Högmander - *'there are insufficient numbers of sizeable local businesses to push this initiative forward and further investment by larger organisations may be needed'*.

A further initiative 'Scandinavian Islands' has been launched recently with a main objective of marketing the whole of the Stockholm-Åland-Turku archipelago to target clients in central Europe. It is too early to gauge the success of this project, however, part of the challenge is to increase the number of visitors all the year round, extending the very short six week season into spring, autumn and then winter.

There are currently two Interreg projects training tourist entrepreneurs, developing our cooperation with and between them - BALANCE and *'Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge'*.

Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge

Metsähallitus is currently heading up an INTERREG IIIB project dealing with nature tourism in several partner national parks and biosphere reserves in the Baltic Region. The project involves 18 partners and stakeholder organisations covering six national parks (in Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Germany). Running between 2005 and 2007 the project aims to *'increase communication between different protected areas and between protected areas and their local actors and stakeholders.'* The goal of the project is also to support sustainable use and good environmental management of valuable areas.

These aims are achieved through smaller operative activities, such as workshops, grass-roots level work, education, information collection and comparative studies. Some of the activities are common for all project partners, whereas some are implemented regionally by only one partner with experiences then shared.

'Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge' was established to increase communication between protected areas which face similar problems in coastal areas around the Baltic Sea. The goal is to develop and test management models for sustainable use of protected areas, and to develop methods to improve communication with local stakeholders. The idea is to give local communities the opportunity to use protected areas in a sustainable way without jeopardizing the natural values of those areas. The experiences gained from pilot activities will be communicated and discussed within the project network and, hopefully, new recommendations will be forthcoming.

Project Coordinator Annastina Sarlin described the benefits of the project in general:

'Personnel and stakeholders now have more knowledge about the administration of the national parks and biosphere reserves (nationally and internationally). They understand that their problems are not unique and have an improved knowledge about their own areas resources and about other areas experiences. Information and cooperation at a local level are improved but it may prove difficult to maintain contacts after the project due to a lack of resources. Access has been provided to successful seminars and courses on nature tourism, EU-legislation, guidance etc.

The project has helped local entrepreneurs to understand the opportunities, consider common marketing and share information and actions.

In the archipelago area nature tourism exists, but now its starting to become a 'product' and soon it will be possible to market it as such.

On the whole, tourism here is small-scale, and this suits our area well, with boating dominating in the summer of course.

At the moment there are 15 cooperation agreements with companies in the ANP. Twelve of these were established during the Coast project. The direct benefits of this project to the area are:

- *companies can provide services for visitors which Metsähallitus don't e.g.: guiding, charter, accommodation etc.;*
- *stakeholder firms are now more aware of sustainable nature tourism and can also inform their guests/visitors;*
- *the visibility of the national park will improve, entrepreneurs now often have a link to the national park home page and will also market the park in connection with local products;*
- *it is perhaps easier to convince people of the need for high quality information/materials (guides, maps etc.) such as those developed by other areas;*
- *to urge a continuity in educating stakeholders (guides, entrepreneurs);*
- *start to follow the impacts of tourism, develop frameworks and produce guidelines.'*

Whilst it may be difficult to measure the success of this project, the long terms effects of like-minded people networking and exchanging experiences will undoubtedly prove invaluable for future local initiatives.

Carrying capacity

No carrying capacity assessment has yet been undertaken for the ANP. However, the LAC method and its suitability for the archipelago area is currently under investigation - issues associated with applying this model to marine areas are also being discussed. Many people indicated that there is plenty of scope for visitor numbers to increase before any adverse effects on nature conservation occur. Inevitable differences of opinion exist between local people for whom tourism provides an income, and those who have summer homes on the islands and would prefer not to have their peace disturbed by an increase in tourist numbers. Future tourism management will require a balance that can satisfy both groups.

Pan Parks - the ANP has recently submitted an application to join the Pan Parks European network which should offer some new opportunities in tourism.

Interviewees were asked to highlight interesting examples of nature tourism projects elsewhere in Finland. Oulanka National Park, Ruuna (a hiking area in the east of Finland), and the Kvarken Archipelago in the Gulf of Bothnia were highlighted, but have not been investigated within the scope of this study.

Sustainable Development

Jouko Högmander:

'The main focus of the national park management has been in restoring old, partially overgrown meadows and pastures, which have a specific flora and fauna, and where most of the park's endangered species can be found. These traditional landscapes currently occupy approximately 270 ha, the most valuable of which are some wooded meadows, a representative habitat of SW Finland, E Sweden and W Estonia. Statistics show that the work has aided the recovery of 368 species, many of which are nationally endangered. This is the highest number in any Natura site or protected area in Finland.'

It has been suggested that the success of this project may be due in part relate to the better resources dedicated to the park in the 1990s when there were sufficient enthusiasts to produce detailed inventories.

Metsähallitus' work over 20 years has resulted in good documentation of traditional land use and management methods. There has been a knock on effect to private land owners and the biosphere reserve has carried out projects aimed at training and educating local people in landscape management and different support systems. The result has been that some farmers within the cooperation area have also now returned to their old livelihood: rebuilding old, small cowsheds and buying animals. This model has also spread out to many private islands, even outside the biosphere reserve and the evidence of change is 'visible'. Importantly, cultural and natural heritage protection has provided employment for small (one-man) local companies in the work required to clear overgrown sites before animals can be taken there.



'Metsähallitus also started to collect and move cows and sheep from farms on big islands further in to the outer archipelago, to the N.P. islands in order to keep them open after restoration. This activity developed a lot in the late 1990s when Finland became a member of EU, which is now supporting the high costs of animal transports.' JH (ed.)

'Old' archipelago culture



Metsähallitus highlighted one element of the NP work which has been neglected - '*Preserving old archipelago culture*' (emphasised in the Act of this national park). Funding is not available for purchasing old properties to be incorporated into the ANP - even during the early years when prices were lower - and the restoration of old houses and farms to demonstrate cultural heritage has largely not been possible. At present, just a few houses, one small farm and some seasonal cottages for fishermen (and old army buildings)

represent the old archipelago culture. Until the 1960s - for hundreds of years - people from the inner part of archipelago sailed twice a year to the outermost part of the archipelago to catch Baltic herring. Other kinds of fishing needed permission from the village nearby, but Baltic herring was free and was available in May and August. Families would move out for 1-2 weeks and there could be tens of cottages on one small islet. Less than 10 in total are now left.

The current policy of the Ministry of the Environment regarding the purchasing, refurbishment and use of old houses with historic and cultural value is a good example of how local and national level priorities differ.

One individual indicated that there may still be opportunities to use existing buildings e.g. military buildings for conversion into remote, high quality conference facilities etc.

Sustainable development within the biosphere reserve

The objectives of the biosphere reserve administration focus on sustainable development. Projects and activities are run by the coordinator with the support of the management board and steering group.

In the late 1990s the biosphere reserve initiated Local Agenda 21 projects in all eight municipalities in the archipelago. The main aims of all projects were classic grass roots level environmental awareness raising. These were run by the biosphere reserve although the target area was bigger than that of the reserve and the one local group, Vastanfjärd, which is still active, is within neither the reserve boundary nor the ANP. Extending the borders for such projects is standard practice.

The biosphere reserve administration runs regular seminars, functioning as a local discussion forum for issues that require attention and for discussion amongst groups of people representing different backgrounds. Topics have included - fishing as a livelihood in the biosphere reserve; plans for cooperation in the preparation and marketing of products (spring '07); and housing and bio-energy. Most projects have been funded via EU-financing programmes (like Interreg, European Regional Development Fund, Leader+ etc.).

Mikael Nordström - ex biosphere reserve coordinator:

'I would say that the most important action for sustainable development in the archipelago during the last five years has been the establishment of a network of places where tourist boats can empty their waste-water tanks. Before this the waste was emptied directly to the sea, which is a problem here since the Baltic Sea is shallow, and has a small water-mass (compared to the Atlantic). The network is run by a range of associations, municipalities and private companies.'

The national park on the other hand is nowadays more and more using local entrepreneurs in landscape management. There is a lot of work to be done on the most overgrown sites before you can take animals there. So this way culture and nature protection can employ local, small (one-man) companies. The biosphere reserve had a project a few years ago where local farmers and other interested parties were trained in landscape management. Nowadays many of these guys are working as part-time or full-time landscape managers.'

Katja Bonnevier:

'It's very difficult to separate nature conservation and sustainable development as everything which is done for the latter, is done here with nature conservation in mind. The two work hand in hand.'

Nature School

The park also hosts a bi-lingual Nature School. Founded in 1992 in accordance with the structural plans for the ANP it was originally part owned by Metsähallitus. It is now owned and run by one individual and focuses mainly on environmental education, adventure and cooperative skills development through organised school camps. Courses for adults and teenagers are also available via day trips and working camps. Cooperation with the ANP enables tours and activities to be organised within the national park. Cooperation with local entrepreneurs facilitates transport and accommodation.

The operation is small but effective and considered important by ANP management. The school has already demonstrated how the summer season can be prolonged at both ends and there is a view that this business could be expanded to incorporate activities such as archipelago safari adventure tourism for adults.

Other initiatives

Keep the Archipelago Tidy is an environmental protection organisation which was established before the national park. They promote environmental awareness amongst the boating community and organise waste disposal on some of the small islands, instead of this being done by the municipalities. Their work is considered important by management in relation to slowing down eutrophication of the archipelago. Funding is however an ongoing issue.

The Pro Abolands Outer Archipelago Group is comprised of inhabitants of the outer islands, mostly in the cooperative area. The group aims to encourage year round habitation of the outer archipelago, maintain the heritage of the maritime culture by improving communication, arranges housing for incomers, works with schools, and aids the development of small-scale tourism.

Overall strengths and weaknesses associated with the designation

In line with the objectives of the national park, the primary benefits derived from the designation have related to nature conservation.

Achievements

Nature conservation

- extensive inventories made in 1990s in order to know what to conserve;
- reviving traditional methods of meadow management and making these an active part of the national park work programme;
- working with and monitoring the status of white-tailed eagles, ringed seals, grey seals and a number of threatened plant species;
- setting up and maintaining a monitoring network for waterfowl and shore birds;
- providing shelter for birds and seals via a network of restricted areas;
- successfully combating the American mink. There is now a large established and maintained area which is free of mink. It is next to the open sea, and bird (as well as snake, toad, vole etc.) populations have recovered well. There are plans for this area to be widened;
- current (national) research includes the ANP as the main pilot area for compiling marine inventories.



One interviewee commented on how difficult it is to design biodiversity performance indicators and evaluate whether the national park designation is a clear influence or whether observed changes are a result of other factors such as annual and ongoing climate change.

Recreation

- a network of tourist information points, cottages and two visitor centres;
- training and developing cooperation with and between tourist entrepreneurs via two Interreg projects;
- mutually beneficial open and constructive communication with entrepreneurs.

Sustainable community development

- achievements in rural development are described above (management of meadows, reviving animal husbandry etc.).

Mutually beneficial relationship between the ANP and the biosphere reserve

The work of the biosphere reserve seems to have successfully supplemented the work of the national park administration at grass roots level. While their 'powers' are less, their priorities address the issues closest to the local communities and local people have an appreciation of their work even if the concept of the biosphere reserve is less tangible than that of the national park.

Weaknesses

No significant weaknesses arising from the national park designation were identified by interviewees. Even with park aims focusing on nature conservation, the management has cooperated widely with other organisations to manage initiatives which support the development of local communities.

The main areas of weakness mentioned were where it was felt that the aims of the national park had not been fulfilled or where future difficulties in supporting projects had been identified.

- Concern has been expressed regarding the future maintenance and development of the nature conservation monitoring programme and for continuing the successful work in restoring more meadows. *'This is largely due to a lack of resources on the ground'* (Jouko Högmander).
- The ANP management has not participated greatly in projects which involve the development of housing or communications within local communities.
- The area of neglect in preserving the cultural heritage of the archipelago has been outlined. Equally, the national park management have done little to preserve the traditions of the Swedish speaking community. Across the whole country there is a Swedish minority of 5%, but in the cooperation area approximately 95% of residents are Swedish speaking. Some local history books have been produced, and material included within national park information, but those interviewed clearly felt more could be done and that the continuing population decline meant that opportunities should not be missed in the future.
- Resources within Metsähallitus itself dedicated to recreational services appear limited, whilst the two tourism projects which they support have enabled some activity, there are concerns about progress once funding for these projects runs out. Plans for further, more extensive projects are being discussed at present.
- Conservation of natural heritage. The issues surrounding the extension of the protected area might have been avoided if the whole cooperation area had been proposed or confirmed as a Natura 2000 site. Only 6,000 ha of islands are currently included.

'Management Effectiveness Evaluation of Finland's Protected Areas'

Metsähallitus commissioned a review entitled *'Management Effectiveness Evaluation of Finland's Protected Areas'* in 2004 and this work represents one of the largest protected area assessments undertaken to date and is the first such national level assessment initiated by a protected area agency in a developed country. While the evaluation concluded that protected areas were achieving their aims in conserving biodiversity, a number of areas were highlighted for further action. Full details of the review are available online at <http://www.metsa.fi/page.asp?Section=3009>.

Metsähallitus personnel have highlighted some of these issues with respect to the ANP, in particular: the **Conservation of Cultural Heritage** - work in this area has clearly been limited to date, in part probably due to a prioritisation of other workstreams but a strategy/action plan is required to take this forward and; **Stakeholder communication** - where according to the management evaluation recommendation, *'specific efforts should be made to poll opinions and build arguments for protection outwith rural local communities to reduce still continuing antipathy for the protected area.'*

Bibliography, weblinks and contacts

Publications

Participatory Approach to Natural Resource Management - A Guide Book, Metsähallitus Villages in the Outer Turku Archipelago - Nature & Culture Stevens & Associates (2006). *A review of relevant experience in sustainable tourism in the coastal and marine environment*. Consultancy report for Scottish Natural Heritage. Available online at <http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/strategy/CMNP>

Maps

The map available via the weblink below (and shown on Page 1 of this case study), includes the boundaries for the biosphere reserve. The areas marked with green belong to the national park and are state owned land. The grey areas of the islands inside the pink borders are private land. The areas inside the blue border form the transition zone of the biosphere reserve.

http://www.turunmaanseutu.fi/biosphere/index_eng.php?id=yleistaeng

Weblinks

Management

www.metsa.fi/natural - natural heritage website

<http://www.metsa.fi/default.asp?Section=1176> - Metsähallitus home - in English

<http://www.ymparisto.fi/default.asp?node=4032&lan=en> - website of Finland's environmental administration in English including information on Everyman's Rights

<http://www.utu.fi/erill/saarmeri/en/> - Archipelago research institution - University of Turku

Tourism

<http://www.outdoors.fi/page.asp?Section=5300> - official Metsa tourism site

<http://www.luontoon.fi/page.asp?Section=4984> - National Parks website takes you to outdoors.fi

http://www.coastsust.net/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3&Itemid=6 - Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge

<http://www.balance-eu.org/> - BALANCE Interreg project

<http://www.scandinavianislands.com/> - Scandinavian Islands project

<http://www.saaristo.org/eng/> - 'Archipelago as an experience' Aboland Region tourist association very good website in English. Archipelago Nature and Culture document - some good background material

<http://www.luontoon.fi/page.asp?Section=5300> - Archipelago National Park pages - as above

<http://www.skargardscentret.fi/?menu=1&lang=en> - Korpoström, Archipelago Centre

<http://www.turkutouring.fi/public/default.aspx?nodeid=8198&culture=en-US&contentlan=2> - Tourist org. in Turku

<http://www.turkutouring.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=22887&nodeid=8202> - Interreg funded project

http://www.suomensaaristovaraus.fi/pdf/MM07_17-20_en.pdf - tourist information

<http://www.metsa.fi/page.asp?Section=2822> - background to Jungsfrukar pilot nature tourism project

<http://www.metsa.fi/page.asp?Section=2917> - Jungsfrukar pilot nature tourism project

<http://www.luontoon.fi/page.asp?Section=5445> - examples of sustainable tourism, Ruunaa

Biosphere reserve

<http://www.unesco.org/mab/index.shtml> - Unesco site

<http://www.unesco.org/mabdb/br/brdir/directory/biores.asp?code=FIN+02&mode=all> - MAB Biosphere Reserve - English

http://www.turunmaanseutu.fi/biosphere/index_eng.php - Region Aboland Biosphere Reserve info. in English

http://www.turunmaanseutu.fi/biosphere/files/mab_activities_in_finland.pdf - Unesco MAB programme & biosphere reserves in Finland

General

<http://www.metsa.fi/page.asp?Section=3009> - MEE

<http://www.luontokoulut.fi/en/koulut/15.htm> - Archipelago Nature School

http://www.saaristo.org/eng/skargarden_natur.htm - section on Archipelago Nature School
<http://www.baltic21.org/> - Baltic 21
http://www.pidasaaristosiistina.fi/in_english - Keep the Arch. Tidy: waste management initiative
<http://www.wildnorth.fi> - NB Wild North only really operates in the North of the country
<http://www.wildnorth.net/default.asp?Section=59> - Wild North
<http://www.euromonitor/Finland>
<http://www.panparks.org/>
<http://www.panparks.org/Cover>

Contacts

Jouko Högmänder

1987 - 1988 Preparation for the set up of the national park according to 1983 legislation
1988 - 2003 Park Superintendent living in the Archipelago
2003 - 2005 Area Manager with responsibility for a wider area but still living in the Archipelago
2006 - present: Senior Adviser for Natural Heritage Services based in Turku, Nature conservation division with specific responsibility for particular species

Email: jouko.hogmander@metsa.fi

Jouko Högmänder
Erikoissuunnittelija - Senior Adviser
Metsähallitus, Etelä-Suomen luontopalvelut
Natural Heritage Services, Southern Finland
Kärsämäentie 8, FI-20 300 Turku
Tel:+358-400-826 440
<http://www.metsa.fi>

Annastina Sarlin - Project Coordinator 'Coastal Sustainability as a Challenge'

Email: annastina.sarlin@metsa.fi

Project coordinator
Metsähallitus
Natural Heritage Services
Southern Finland
Korpoström
FI- 21 720
Tel:+ 358 400- 43 68 76

Katja Bonnevier - current coordinator for the biosphere reserve

Email: katja.bonnevier@aboland.net

Katja Bonnevier
Koordinator för Skärgårdshavets biosfärområde/ Saaristomeren biosfäärialueen koordinaattori
Region Åboland/ Turunmaan seutu
PB/ PL 120
FI-21601 Pargas/ Parainen
Tel: +358 40-5844559

Mikael Nordström - previous coordinator for the biosphere reserve

Email: mikael.nordstrom@metsa.fi

Same office address as J Högmänder
Tel: +358-400-445234

Inkeri Holma - Manager, the Blue Mussel Visitor Centre

Email: inkeri.holma@metsa.fi

Inkeri Holma
Visitor Centre Manager
Metsähallitus
Sinisimpukan luontokeskus
FI-25930 Kasnäs
Tel: +358-40-848 4342