

**European Natura 2000 Award  
2015 edition  
Guidance for applicants**

## **Contents**

Filling in the application form .....	2
Screen 1 – Administrative information .....	3
Screen 2 – Summary information .....	5
Screen 3 – Natura 2000 site(s).....	7
Screen 4 – Category .....	8
Screen 5 – Targeted species and habitat types .....	10
Screen 6 – Evaluation criteria.....	12

## **Filling in the application form**

All fields marked with an asterisk (\*) are mandatory, and you will not be able to submit your application if any of these fields are left empty. Applications can be submitted in any of the official EU languages, with the exception of Gaelic and Maltese. However, some fields in the application form (indicated below) must be completed in English only.

## Screen 1 – Administrative information

**Title of your application (only in EN):** The title should accurately and concisely reflect the content of the application. The title must be **in English**.

**Name and contact details of the lead applicant:** Fill in the name and contact details of the lead applicant, including an e-mail address that will be checked frequently.

Any entity officially registered in the EU can submit an application.<sup>1</sup> Joint applications comprising more than one applicant are permitted; however, one entity must be appointed as lead applicant and be responsible for the application.

Only one application per principal Natura 2000 site can be accepted under the same category. Therefore, in the case where several organisations wish to submit applications for the same principal site(s) under the same category, they must submit a joint application; otherwise, the applications will be ineligible. Different applications for the same principal site(s) can only be accepted if they: a) are under different categories; AND b) cover completely different activities / achievements.

**Description of the lead applicant:** Provide a short, concise description, including the lead applicant's legal status, its mission /vision and main activities. This text might be used for statistical and benchmarking analyses, to help us better target our future activities, so it should be factual rather than promotional.

**Name and contact details of partner applicants (if any):** If you are submitting a joint application, please click on the **Add new partner button** to add partner applicants. You will have to provide the same information for each partner applicant as for the lead applicant.

Partner applicants should be organisations who have been directly involved in the activities / achievements covered by this application. In principle, partner applicants should also be based in the EU; however, non-EU partner applicants can be accepted in cases where they bring a real added-value to the application.

**Treat this partner as an additional lead applicant:** You should tick the **box** if the partner applicant should be given the same prominence as the lead applicant, if the application wins (e.g., the applicant's name should also appear on the trophy and certificate).

**Main photo:** Provide one main photograph, which will be your "identity photo". This photo will be published on the Natura 2000 Award website, with the summary of your application, and may also be used for other communication purposes. It should therefore provide an attractive and accurate impression of the application. This photograph must be in jpg, jpeg or png format, of a maximum 2 Mb, and minimum a resolution of 150px \* 150px.

**Additional photos (max 5):** You are free to provide a maximum of five additional photographs to support your application. These photographs will be used by the evaluators assessing your application. They may also be used by the European Commission for promotional purposes for Natura 2000. Please therefore select pictures carefully. It is recommended that you include some that illustrate the key values of the site (such as the habitats and species present).

**Videos:** If you have a video from YouTube or Vimeo that relates closely to the activities reported in your application, you may also provide a link to it. These videos will be used by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Except organisations involved in the selection process of the European Natura 2000 Award 2015.

evaluators assessing your application. They may also be used by the European Commission for promotional purposes for Natura 2000. Click on the [Insert Url button](#) to add up to five additional video links.

By uploading the photos and videos you accept that the EC has the right to use them for purposes related to the communication of the Natura 2000, both printed and web, that you have read and accepted the [copyright rules](#), and that you have the permission from any adults or the legal guardian of any children appearing in the pictures.

**Did you apply for the same category last year?:** Indicate whether you were an applicant for the same category last year, either as lead or partner applicant (“Yes” or “No”).

**Did you apply for the same principal site(s) last year?:** Indicate whether you submitted an application that addressed the same principal site(s) last year, either as lead or partner applicant (“Yes” or “No”).

**Is this a resubmission of a previously submitted application (i.e., same, similar or updated activities / achievements)?** If the reply to either or both of the previous questions was “yes”, please indicate whether you are basically resubmitting the same application, albeit with improvements and / or updates (“Yes” or “No”).

**Comments:** Please briefly describe how this year’s application differs from last year’s.

Unsuccessful applications from previous years can be resubmitted so long as all other requirements are met. However, applications that show evidence of improvement or additional success compared to the previous year are more likely to be successful.

However, winning applications cannot be resubmitted by any applicant. This means applications reporting on the same activities / achievements regarding the same principal species / habitat types as in previously winning applications, even under a different category.

**Please indicate last year’s application number:** Please add number if possible.

## Screen 2 – Summary information

**Summary of the application (in EN only):** Please provide a clear and well-written summary of your application, **in English**, highlighting:

1. The main Natura 2000 sites, species and /or habitat types covered;
2. The initial, baseline situation, the main problem(s) targeted and the key objectives;
3. The main activities carried out (with clear reference to the category applied for);  
and
4. The main achievements.

Consider the following questions – Where? Why? When? Who? What?

Please note that, if your application is considered eligible, this summary will be published on the Natura 2000 Award website. It will also be used as a basis for the European Citizens' Award.

The Citizens' Award will be decided by a public vote on the finalist applications. Once the finalists for each category have been selected, the public will be able to vote on the Natura 2000 Award website for the one application they consider most deserving. The finalist receiving the most votes will be awarded the European Citizens' Award at the Award ceremony. It is therefore important that the summary accurately reflects your application, and that it is written in an accessible and concise style.<sup>2</sup>

Please note that by submitting an application you agree that it will be put forward for the Citizens' Award.

**Description of the activities carried out (in EN only):** Please provide a clear overview of the activities that are covered by this application, **in English**. This description should include the following:

- The methodology used including a clear qualitative and quantitative description of your achievement. In case of multi-partner applications it would be helpful to describe which partner undertook what activity. Please include only the activities / achievements relevant to the category of your choice, and not an account of all activities undertaken.
- The target species / habitat types, audience or stakeholders, depending on the category under which you present the application.
- Monitoring methods.
- How the activities are related to the conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 site.

This description will be used by the evaluators to better understand your application and could be used for publicity purposes.

**Location of the activities (in EN only):** Describe the location of the activities vis-à-vis the Natura 2000 site (e.g., on what part of the site the activities took place), **in English**.

**Duration of the activities covered by the application:** Provide the start and end dates

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission may edit the text to ensure a consistent style.

covered by this application. Applications for the 2015 Award may only cover activities / achievements completed between 01.01.2010 and 31.12.2014 inclusive.

## Screen 3 – Natura 2000 site(s)

**Official name of principal Natura 2000 site targeted by the application:**  
**Official EU code (as shown in the Natura 2000 Viewer) of the site:**

All applications must explicitly refer to at least one Natura 2000 site. Provide the name and official EU code (a unique code of nine characters) of the main site covered by your application (please check the [Natura 2000 Viewer](#) where you will find the codes). If your application concerns multiple sites, provide here the one which is the most relevant. You can add more sites below.

**Type of site:** Indicate if the site is:

1. A Site of Community Importance (SCI) / Special Areas of Conservation (SAC);
2. A Special Protection Area (SPA); or
3. Both.

**Add additional Natura 2000 site(s) (max 5):** Click on [Add new site button](#) to add up to five additional sites if your application covers more than one Natura 2000 sites. These should only include sites where concrete activities were carried out. There is no advantage to providing a list of sites if they add no value to the application. You will need to provide the same information as for the principal site.

**Comments:** If your application covers multiple sites, which are too many to include above, please describe this here.

## Screen 4 – Category

**Please choose the category for which you are applying:** Your application can be for only one of the five categories below. If you wish to apply for more than one category, you must submit a separate application for each category. However, multiple applications from the same applicant can only be accepted if they: a) present completely different activities / achievements; AND b) for different sites. If the same application is simply resubmitted under different categories, it will be rejected under all categories.

**Communication:** This award recognises communication achievements that led to increased awareness about Natura 2000, and which brought lasting positive changes in attitudes or behaviour towards the network.

Applications to this category must be targeted at specific Natura 2000 sites. If an application addresses multiple sites or the whole Natura 2000 network by targeting a whole interest group or the general public, it must nevertheless show a tangible positive impact on at least one Natura 2000 site.

**Socio-economic benefits:** This award recognises the creation of socio-economic benefits for local stakeholders that have come about as a result of activities linked to a Natura 2000 site or project. Examples of such achievements could include: the introduction of a Natura 2000 label, which supported local producers using the natural resources of the site to create a niche market or obtain better prices; nature-based tourism activities which have been developed around a Natura 2000 site, etc.

**Conservation:** This award recognises achievements that have improved the conservation status of a particular natural habitat type and / or species. Targeted habitat types or species must be in the Habitats Directive Annex I or II or Birds Directive Annex I, or be a regularly occurring migratory bird. This means that species in Annex IV of the Habitats Directive, for instance, cannot be the target (thus applications exclusively targeting them would not be eligible), as Natura 2000 site designation is legally irrelevant for them.

Projects / actions which create or improve connections and corridors between sites in the Natura 2000 network are welcome, as they respond to an important concern for the implementation of Natura 2000.

**Reconciling interests / perceptions:** This category rewards successful conflict-resolution efforts that have brought together different socio-economic or political forces, or land or resource users, in a way that has benefitted Natura 2000. Applications should focus on an evolution from a polarised situation to an honourable compromise, with mechanisms in place for the various stakeholders to work together.

**Cross-border cooperation and networking:** This category concerns the establishment of effective partnerships between stakeholders involved in the management / conservation of Natura 2000 sites that are aimed at resolving Natura 2000 issues more constructively than would have been the case if the partners had operated individually.

Two types of partnerships are covered by this category:

1. Cross-border collaboration in order to achieve better conservation of a species / habitat type whose geographic distribution requires such an approach. Cross-border cooperation may be between countries or self-governing regions in a federal state (such as in Germany, Belgium, Austria and Spain). It can also

include the transfer of knowledge / best practice in the explicit framework of a biogeographic region context.

2. Networking among structures with similar thematic targets (e.g., wetland Natura 2000 sites, managers of Natura 2000 sites) within the same country (or same region for federal countries).

## Screen 5 –Targeted species and habitat types

Does the application explicitly target particular species?  
Does the application explicitly target particular habitat type(s)?

Applications under the **Conservation category** must explicitly target one or more species or natural habitat types and must therefore reply “Yes” to explicitly targeting a species and / or a habitat type.

Applications under **the other categories** should chose “Yes” only if the application focuses explicitly on particular species and/or habitat type(s). There is no advantage to providing lists of species or habitat types that are not a primary focus of your application.

If you choose “Yes” for either of these questions, the following questions will appear:

Scientific name of principal species explicitly targeted by the application (if any):  
Name and official EU code (as presented in the Habitats Directive) of principal habitat explicitly targeted by the application (if any):

If an application focuses explicitly on a (or several) particular species / habitat type, it / they must be the species / habitat type for which the site is designated:

- **Species** must be in the Habitats Directive (Annex II) or the Birds Directive (Annex I or commonly occurring migratory birds not in Annex I). Provide the scientific name (not the vernacular) as listed in the correct Directive Annex for the principal species covered by the application. If several species are covered, provide here the main (or one of the main) species, and add others using the link below.
- **Habitat types** must be in the Habitats Directive (Annex I). Provide the official name and the official EU code for the principal habitat type covered by the application. If several habitat types are covered, provide here the main (or one of the main) habitat type, and add others using the link below.

Is the species / habitat in the Standard Data Form (SDF) for the site?

- If no, please add a comment below explaining why not. The only case in which the application can be considered eligible if the cited species / habitat type is not in the SDF is if you have a letter of support from the competent authority indicating that the SDF has been changed, or is in the process of being changed. Please attach here such official letter of support.

**Comments:** If the species / habitat type is not in the SDF, please explain the situation here.

**Add names and codes of additional species / habitats (if any):** If your application covers more than one species / habitat types, click on [Add new species/Add new habitats buttons](#) to add up to five additional species and / or habitat types. Again, these should **only** be species / habitat types explicitly targeted by your application. There is no advantage to providing lists of additional species / habitat types if they do not add value to your application. You need to provide the same information as for the principal species / habitat type.



## Screen 6 – Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will be based on five key aspects of your application: effectiveness, originality, durability, cost-benefit and replicability. Each criterion has a different weighting, depending on its importance for the category you chose (shown below under each criterion).

There is one form per criterion, each limited to 4,000 characters. Below are some suggestions on the kind of information expected for each criterion. Applications providing descriptive yet to-the-point qualitative AND quantitative information are likely to score better. You may provide links to background, contextual or other relevant information, but the evaluation will be based on the information provided in the application form itself.

### Communication category:

#### How effective are your “Communication” activities? (Evaluation weight = 40%):

This criterion assesses how successful the activities were in delivering a real, measurable and measured change in attitudes / behaviour in the targeted audience(s). This change must either concern: attitudes to specific Natura 2000 sites / habitats / species; or behaviour which directly affects Natura 2000 implementation.

Outreach to civil society - to raise awareness and positive attitudes towards Natura 2000 - is the prime focus of the Award. Applications targeting the general public are likely to score better, although applications can target specific stakeholder groups too. A multi-level communication campaign tuned to different audiences, which targets both the general public and focus groups, would have an advantage.

- Describe the baseline situation prior to the interventions, why you launched the campaign / activities and your objectives (what you wanted to achieve).
- Describe the audience(s) targeted by your communication activities. Is the target audience widespread or very specific?
- Describe in detail the achievements: the current situation and the concrete changes in the attitudes / behaviour among the targeted audience(s) (where possible quantified).
- Explain how you measured the impact on the targeted audience(s).

#### How original are your “Communication” activities? (Evaluation weight = 20%):

Originality can be at various levels:

- Technical (e.g., innovative communication message / tool / method developed);
  - Contextual (e.g., existing tool / method used for new target audience or in different way); or
  - Geographical (e.g., existing tool used for first time in specific geographic area: EU level / Member State level / regional level, etc.).
- 
- Do you consider your communication activities to be original?
  - If so, explain why and at what level (technical / methodological, contextual, geographical, etc.). Provide links to supporting materials if such exist.

**How durable are your “Communication” activities and their results over time? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion concerns the durability of the results and the durability of the actions. Any proof of lasting attitude / behaviour changes as a result of the communication activities would be a distinct advantage.

- Describe the efforts undertaken to ensure the maximum lasting impact of your communication activities, beyond the end of your campaign.
- Explain if follow-up communication activities (to keep the message alive and to regularly refresh it) are ensured or foreseen, and describe them.
- Explain what lasting changes in attitudes and in behaviour you have recorded and (where the case) measured.
- Explain what the future funding needs are and how will they be covered.

**Describe and explain the cost-benefit characteristics of your “Communication” achievement. (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

This criterion operates at two levels:

1. To match the cost with the number of people / size of audience reached.
2. To match the cost with effectiveness: how big a change in attitudes? How big an impact on the target subject?

- How much did your communication activities cost (in €)?
- How many people were reached?
- What was the effectiveness of your communication activities (size of change / impact) in view of the money spent?

Please provide quantitative data for this criterion.

**How replicable are your “Communication” activities? What steps have been made to actually replicate them? (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

This criterion looks on one hand at the replicability potential of the actions / achievements and on the other whether specific steps have been made to actually disseminate the results and / or to replicate them.

- Which parts of your activities do you see as being replicable elsewhere?
- Describe any (actual or potential) cultural or financial barriers to ‘exporting’ the communication method to other circumstances.
- Have you already made concrete steps to disseminate the results and support the replication of specific elements of your activities (e.g., in other Natura 2000 sites, partnering organisations, etc.)? If yes, describe.

### Socio-economic benefits category:

#### How effective are your activities in terms of “Socio-economic benefits”? (Evaluation weight = 40%):

This criterion assesses how successful the activities have been in creating socio-economic benefits stemming from Natura 2000 (jobs, revenues, integration of disadvantaged groups, creation of a new label, etc.) for specific stakeholders. The socio-economic benefit must be explicitly linked to Natura 2000, even if only by means of a label. The public must be aware that the benefit is connected to Natura 2000. Intangible benefits (e.g., real estate values increase because the Natura 2000 site in question adds to the attractiveness of the lifestyle environment) must be backed-up by data as far as possible.

- Describe the baseline situation indicating the socio-economic situation of the targeted stakeholder groups prior to your activities and explain why this specific set of actions was required.
- Specify the stakeholders targeted by your activities.
- Describe the current situation both in qualitative and quantitative terms, indicating changes in the socio-economic situation of the targeted stakeholders (achieved results), or in resource use.
- Describe how you have measured the impact of the actions and what the final results are.

#### How original are your “Socio-economic benefits” activities? (Evaluation weight = 10%):

Originality can be at various levels:

1. Technical (e.g., new tool / method developed);
2. Contextual (e.g., existing tool / method used for a different/new stakeholder group);
3. Geographical (e.g., existing tool / method used for first time in specific geographic area: EU level / Member State level/regional level, etc.).

- Explain in what way (if any) your actions are original / innovative.
- Clearly identify and describe at which level they are original (technical / methodological, contextual, geographical, etc.).

#### How durable are your “Socio-economic benefits” activities and their results over time? (Evaluation weight = 20%):

This criterion concerns the durability of the results and the durability of the actions. It relates to the permanence and future prospects of the new socio-economic activities started / supported through your activities. Schemes / activities that generate a profit and are thus self-sustaining would score higher than those relying on subsidies. Commercial benefits (jobs, sales of products, increased tourism, etc.) must have been showing a positive trend over some years in order to judge the positive trend, on the basis of reliable data.

- Which of your activities will continue after the end of the project / action, and how?
- What measures or conditions are in place to ensure the continuation of the benefits after the end of the project / action?
- Please provide data showing the trend of commercial benefits (jobs, sales of products,

increased tourism, etc.) over the duration of your initiative.

- Explain if the activities are self-financing / self-sustaining now and, if yes, explain how. If not, please explain what the future funding needs are and how they will be covered.

### **Describe and explain the cost-benefit characteristics of your “Socio-economic benefits” achievement. (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

This criterion operates at two levels:

- a) To match the cost with the number of people / stakeholders affected; and
- b) To match the cost with effectiveness: how big a change? How big an impact? For example, the cost of the actions can be assessed against the income generated (e.g., through new tourism activities, brands and labels for local products, etc.).

- How much did your socio-economic activities cost (in €)?
- How many and what types of stakeholders were reached?
- What was the effectiveness of your activities (size of socio-economic change/impact) in view of the money spent?

Please provide quantitative data for this criterion.

### **How replicable are your “Socio-economic benefits” activities? What steps have been made to actually replicate them? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion concerns the replicability potential of an action / method: an added value which has not widely been thought of or used yet, or a particularly successful business model that ought to be disseminated to others who could use it. In addition to the potential of replicability it is of interest to know whether specific steps have been made to actually disseminate the results and to replicate them.

- What key points of your activities do you see as being replicable elsewhere?
- Describe any (actual or potential) cultural or financial barriers to ‘exporting’ the socio-economic method / scheme to other circumstances.
- Have you already made concrete steps to disseminate the results and support the replication of specific elements of your activities (e.g., in other Natura 2000 sites, partnering organisations, etc.)? If yes, describe.

### **Conservation category:**

#### **How effective are your “Conservation” activities? (Evaluation weight = 40%):**

This criterion assesses how successful the activities have been in producing concrete and measurable positive results affecting the conservation status of habitat types and / or species. This assessment also involves an examination of the size of the positive change. Actions aimed at improving the management of the area and to promote a more integrated management can be considered under this category.

- Describe the baseline situation prior to your actions, as well as the key issues addressed.
- Describe the current situation both in qualitative and quantitative terms indicating changes in the conservation status / surface / population of each species / habitat type

targeted.

- How well and how much of the initial problem(s) negatively affecting conservation status has been solved?
- How have your actions contributed to this change (results)?
- Describe the monitoring mechanisms in place, i.e., data collection, reporting and analyses.
- How have you measured the effectiveness of your actions? Have you had a third partner assessment of your work?

#### How original are your “Conservation” activities? (Evaluation weight = 10%):

Originality can be at various levels:

- a) Technical / methodological (e.g., new conservation tool / method developed);
- b) Contextual (e.g., existing tool / method used for a different species / habitat type);  
or
- c) Geographical (e.g., existing tool used for first time in specific geographic area: EU level / Member State level / regional level, etc.).

- Do you consider your conservation activities to be original?
- If so, explain clearly how they are original and at what level (technical / methodological, contextual, geographical, etc.).

#### How durable are your “Conservation” activities and their results over time? (Evaluation weight = 20%):

This criterion is related to:

- a) The durability of actions and their impact over time (for instance, raising water level is technically more durable than clearing scrub); and
  - b) The steps that have actually been put in place to ensure recurring management / recurring actions, where this is necessary.
- Describe the efforts you have made to ensure the maximum lasting impact of your conservation activities.
  - How will the work and the investments evolve in the future? Does the success you achieve depend on further interventions? If yes, who will be responsible and how will they be funded?

#### Describe and explain the cost-benefit characteristics of your “Conservation” achievement. (Evaluation weight = 10%):

The first level of a cost-benefit analysis would be to match the cost of the actions with the surface of habitats / population sizes of species targeted. The second level would be to match the cost with effectiveness: how big a change in the conservation status of the targeted habitats/species? How big an impact?

- How much did your conservation activities cost (in €)?
- What habitat surface and / or species' population size was reached?
- What is the effectiveness of your conservation activities (size of change / impact,

changes in conservation status) in view of the money spent?

Please provide quantitative data for this criterion.

**How replicable are your “Conservation” activities? What steps have been made to actually replicate them? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion looks at the replicability potential of the actions: How widespread is the problem that this method solves? How easily can it be transferred? In addition to the potential of replicability, it is of interest to know whether specific steps have been made to actually disseminate the results and to actually replicate them.

- Do you think your activity is replicable? Describe why and how.
- Are there any (real or potential) cultural, technical or financial barriers to the exportation of the conservation tool / method, and if yes how can they be dealt with?
- Did you replicate your work? For example, did you package it in a format that other professionals can use, such as a manual, toolbox, guidelines etc., or did you present it at a conference or thematic workshop, etc.?

**Reconciling interests / perceptions category:**

**How effective are your activities in “Reconciling interests / perceptions” of various stakeholders? (Evaluation weight = 40%):**

This criterion assesses how successful the activities were in resolving a conflictual situation between key stakeholders with differing interests directly or indirectly related to a Natura 2000 site, a species or a habitat type.

- Describe the baseline situation and how it was related to the protection / management of the Natura 2000 site(s). Explain the interests of the opposing stakeholders involved in the site(s) at the start of the process. What were the attitudes of the relevant stakeholder groups / communities towards Natura 2000 prior to your actions?
- Describe in a qualitative and quantitative way how effective your activities have been in reconciling interests and / or perceptions, and in particular how the stakeholders benefited from the activities (socio-economic impact).
- How did this change benefit the Natura 2000 site / species / habitat types?
- What is the current attitude of the targeted groups towards Natura 2000? How was this measured?

**How original / innovative are your activities focused on “Reconciling interests / perceptions”? (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

Originality can be assessed at various levels:

1. Technical (e.g., new conflict resolution tool / method developed);
2. Contextual (e.g., existing tool / method used for new stakeholder group or in different way); or
3. Geographical (e.g., existing tool used for first time in specific geographic area: EU level / Member State level / regional level, etc.).

- Explain in what way (if any) the conflict resolution actions / methods are original.

- Clearly identify and explain the level of originality (technical / methodological, contextual, geographical, etc.).

**How durable are your activities and their results related to “Reconciling interests / perceptions” over time? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion is related to:

- The durability of actions and their impact over time; and
- The steps that have actually been put in place to ensure recurring management / recurring actions, where this is necessary.

Durability over time can be enhanced through the existence of organised structures, creation of new processes and / or joint commitments (e.g., signed declaration, written agreement, etc. – can be provided as weblinks).

- How has the new consensus been organised?
- Which mechanisms have you put in place to guarantee long-lasting reconciliation?
- How committed are the partners?
- How do you see the attitudes evolving in the future?

**Describe and explain the cost-benefit characteristics of your “Reconciling interests / perceptions” achievement. (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

This criterion assesses the costs of the activities undertaken against the concrete and measurable benefits (results) derived from the socio-economic activities. The first level of a cost-benefit analysis would be to match the cost of the actions with the number / type / population size of stakeholders involved. The second level would be to match the cost with the effectiveness of the actions: how significant is the result of the conflict resolution? What is the positive effect on Natura 2000 site(s) / habitats / species (or on attitudes to them)?

- How much did your conflict resolution activities cost (in €)?
- What is the reach in terms of numbers of previously opposing stakeholders?
- What is the effectiveness of your conflict-resolution activities (size of change / impact; extent of change in attitudes and impact on Natura 2000 site(s) / species / habitat types)?

Please provide quantitative data for this criterion.

**How replicable are your activities focusing on “Reconciling interests / perceptions”? What steps have been made to actually replicate them? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion concerns the potential for replicability: it depends on how widespread the kind of conflict which was tackled is, and how much it affects Natura 2000 elsewhere. The criterion also looks at actual steps undertaken by the applicant to communicate and promote its action / method to other relevant organisations/bodies etc., dealing with the same issue.

- Do you think your method could be disseminated to colleagues and replicated elsewhere? If so, why?
- Are there any (real or potential) cultural or technical barriers to the exportation of the activities?

- Describe the efforts made to replicate your work, i.e., to package it in a format other professionals can use, such as a manual, toolbox, guidelines, presentation in conference, etc.

### Cross-border cooperation and networking category:

#### How effective are your “Cross-Border Cooperation and Networking” activities? (Evaluation weight = 40%):

This criterion assesses how successful the actions have been in achieving the objectives that had been set out. It looks with particular attention at the strategic role of the cross-border cooperation / networking actions, and at their added value compared to independent approaches (i.e., if cross-border cooperation / networking had not occurred).

- Describe the baseline situation indicating the original status of the species / habitats on the site(s) or the Natura 2000-related problem targeted by the cross-border cooperation or networking actions, and the original relationship of the partners.
- Describe the partners involved, and how the cooperation was set up and why.
- Explain if there was joint field-work with concrete field activities. If so, describe.
- Explain if the focus was on exchanging information. If yes, describe which information and how it was used in practice by the partners.
- Describe the current situation indicating clearly the changes in the relationships between the partners (results) and the impact of those changes on Natura 2000 site / species / habitat types. Provide a quantitative description of the results wherever possible.
- Describe the monitoring and assessment mechanisms for the results obtained.
- What is the added value of the cross-border cooperation / networking, compared to similar independent actions (i.e., if partners had kept doing independently the activities, instead of forming a partnership and doing them jointly)?

#### How original are your “Cross-Border Cooperation and Networking” activities? (Evaluation weight = 10%):

Originality can be at various levels:

1. Technical (e.g., new cross-border cooperation / networking method developed);
  2. Contextual (e.g. existing tool / method used for the first time between a particular type of operators); or
  3. Geographical (e.g., existing tool used for first time in specific geographic area: EU level / Member State level / regional level, etc.).
- How original are your cross-border cooperation / networking activities?
  - Explain at what level they are original (technical / methodological, contextual, geographical, etc.).
  - Explain if there are other similar cross-border cooperation or networking activities that you are aware of.

**How durable are your “Cross-Border Cooperation and Networking” activities and their results over time? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion concerns on one hand the durability of the results (e.g., how permanent are the outputs of the partnership) and on the other hand the durability of the actions (e.g., which actions will have to continue in order to ensure that the attained results are preserved?).

- Describe the efforts you have made to ensure the maximum lasting impact of your cross-border cooperation / networking activities.
- If there were tangible activities in the field, how will these be continued in the future and for how long?
- Describe in particular which structures or processes have been set up to maintain the collaboration scheme and deal with any future internal differences.
- What are the future funding needs and how will they be covered?

**Describe and explain the cost-benefit characteristics of your “Cross-Border Cooperation and Networking” achievement. (Evaluation weight = 10%):**

The first level of a cost-benefit analysis would be to match the cost of the actions with the number / type / size of stakeholders involved. If the collaboration focuses on specific habitat types / species then the surface of habitat types / size of species population directly affected can be checked against the costs incurred. The second level would be to match the cost with effectiveness: how significant is the result of the cross-border cooperation / networking? What is the size of the positive effect on Natura 2000 site(s) management and / or habitats / species' conservation status?

- How much did your cross-border cooperation / networking activities cost (in €)?
- What is the reach in terms of stakeholders involved or Natura 2000 site / habitat types / species targeted?
- What is the effectiveness of your cross-border cooperation / networking activities (size of change/impact) in view of the cost of your actions?

Please provide quantitative data for this criterion.

**How replicable are your “Cross-Border Cooperation and Networking” activities? What steps have been made to actually replicate them? (Evaluation weight = 20%):**

This criterion concerns the replicability potential of an action / method (e.g., does the cross-border cooperation / networking address an issue prevalent throughout other Natura 2000 sites?). In addition to the potential of replicability, it is of interest to know whether specific steps have been made to actually disseminate the results and to actually replicate them.

- For cross-border cooperation: which other border regions could learn from it, or reproduce it?
- For networks: how much scope do you see for expanding the network (or perhaps reproducing it for similar groups)? Are there any plans to expand the partnership to new areas or members?
- Are there any potential barriers to the exportation of the cross-border cooperation / networking scheme?
- Have you made any attempts to expand or broaden the cross-border cooperation / networking? If yes, describe them and discuss the outcome.
- Explain your efforts to disseminate the results and to facilitate their replication.