

Ignoranca Birokratskega Aparata (IBA)

Multinacionalna BirdLife International (BLI) je pognala svoj naravovarstveni stroj z vso paro. Pred sedmimi leti je v bliskovitem napadu pregazila Evropo in jo prepredla z mrežo oporišč, OPO imenovanih (OPO = ornitološko pomembno območje). Počasi, a odločno se polasča tudi drugega sveta. Navidez neustavljiva je na svojem pohodu k cilju - zagotoviti obstoj populacij danes živečih vrst ptic. To ni ofenziva z vsemi razpoložljivimi sredstvi. Nasprotno, sredstva so skrbno izbrana, merila za izbor pretanjena. Moderna so in kvantitativna. Morda najpomembnejša dobljena bitka je bila tista, v kateri je BLI-ju uspelo iztisniti iz ornitološko še tako molčečih evropskih držav odločilno priznanje: o številu svojih ptic. In smo vsi priznali, Slovenci po svoji naravi vselej pošteno, a še raje skromno. Malo tudi v strahu, da bi kdo preverjal. Naši južni sosede, naprimer, velikodušno. Od tod naprej je imela znanstvena objektivnost prosto pot. Namesto zamegljenih "eno pomembnejših, eno najjužnejših, eno največjih v tem delu Evrope ..." so nastale pregledne lestvice. Vsak podatek je opremljen s številko in uvrščen v rang. Iz teh rangov je jasno razvidno, kaj je pomembno in kaj ne. Z razmeroma enostavnimi matematičnimi operacijami seštevanja in deljenja so nam dali vedeti: Slovenija je za preživetje ptičjih populacij v Evropi nepomembna. Položite betonsko ploščo čez svojo deželo in nič se ne bo spremenilo, nam govorijo.

S spretnim kombiniranjem kriterijev in kakšnim pogledom čez prste bomo v Sloveniji vendarle zbrali za peščico OPO-jev. S seznama globalno ogroženih bomo lahko pobrali našo edino pravo ENPV (evropsko naravovarstveno pomembno vrsto) prve kategorije, kosca, in na njegov račun predlagali tri do štiri območja. Z malo sreče bomo na Dravi prešteli dovolj prezimovajočih vodnih ptic, da se obdrži status. Tudi Triglavski

narodni park bo lahko ostal OPO, če ne drugače, zaradi značilne avicenoze evrazijskega visokogorskega bioma. Nadalje lahko predlagamo OPO-je za vrste iz nižjih kategorij ENPV (2,3,4). Število takšnih OPO-jev je omejeno z relativno velikostjo ptičjih populacij v Sloveniji. Nekako po kopitu: kolikor odstotkov celotne evropske populacije živi v Sloveniji, toliko OPO-jev lahko predlagamo. Ti morajo biti naša najpomembnejša območja za te vrste. Sedaj se nam nekoliko maščuje skromnost pri ugibanju števila slovenskih ptic. Večine vrst ni v Sloveniji niti za en odstotek. Vrste, ki jih je pri nas teoretično sicer dovolj, imajo skrit nekakšen kavelj 22. So namreč izrazito razpršeno razširjene, tako da jim je z območnim varstvom težko pomagati. Le s težavo bomo zakoličili po eno najpomembnejše gnezdišče postovke, vodomca, vijeglavke, zelene žolne, prosnika ali rjavega srakoperja. V tolažbo so nam lahko vrste ENPV 4. kategorije. Med njimi smemo varovati celo kosa, ščinkavca in zelenca. Še več, BLI nam dovoljuje kar po dve območji za črnoglavko, kmečko lastovko in rdečeglavega kraljička.

Bolj ali manj diskretno so nam visoki možje pri BLI-ju že nekajkrat dali vedeti, da je zanje Slovenija ornitološko nezanimiva. Z izidom publikacije o številu ptic v Evropi je to vsakomur predstavljeno črno na belem. Temu primerno nizko je mednarodno zanimanje za vlaganja v ornitološko-naravovarstvene projekte v Sloveniji. Sodelovanje v veliki mednarodni igri kajpak prinaša določene koristi. Od (zaenkrat le obljubljenih) podpor nacionalni koordinaciji projekta OPO prek tako pomembne publicitete do možnosti uporabe mednarodnih intervencijskih orodij. In še kaj bi se našlo. Zato vsekakor velja sodelovati. Vprašanje je le, s kolikšnim vložkom. V Sloveniji deloma že imamo, deloma pa še moramo definirati lastne naravovar-

stvene cilje in smernice. Te naj nam bo glavno vodilo! Saj želimo ohraniti pestrost v majhnem in ne ogromnih populacij, kakršnih Slovenija tako ali tako ne premore. Ne slepimo se s cararji, komararji in črnoglavkami. Napak bi bilo s takimi vrstami igrati botra državni naravovarstveni politiki gozdnatih krajinskih in regijskih parkov. Kajti mi vemo, da so pri nas ogroženi tudi škurh in kozica, brškinka in polojnik, krehelj in sivka, repaljščica in kobiličar, čeprav sezname ENPV pravijo drugače. Te ptice naj bodo naša prva skrb. Našla se bodo stičišča dejansko ogroženih vrst z OPO-ji. Tam bodo OPO-ji v pomoč. Zahtevam po varstvu bodo dali mednarodno težo. In

kot vselej bo dobrodošla argumentacija tista, ki postavlja merila naši evropskosti z izpolnjevanjem mednarodnih dogovorov. OPO-ji so zasnovani kot globalno oz. evropsko pomembni. In država, ki ne varuje svojih OPO-jev, škoduje vsej mednarodni skupnosti. Tega Slovenija gotovo ne bi želela.

Poslanstvo slovenskega nacionalnega koordinatorja je zahtevno in delikatno. Ob čim manjšem birokratskem vložku mora iztisniti iz mednarodnega žaklja OPO kar se da koristnega in pri tem ne zakrivati naših lastnih prednostnih ciljev.

Peter Trontelj

Ignorance of Bureaucratic Apparatus (IBA)

The multinational organization BirdLife International (BLI) has set in motion its conservationist machinery with all its might. Seven years ago it trampled, in a blitz, the entire Europe and spun it with a web of strongholds called IBA's (Important Bird Areas). Slowly, but resolutely, it is now appropriating the rest of the world. The organization seems almost unstoppable in its march towards its goal: to secure the existence of the currently living bird species populations. This, however, is not an offensive with all available means. On the contrary, the means have been chosen with greatest care, and the selection criteria are truly sophisticated. They are modern and quantitative.

Perhaps the most triumphant battle was the one in which the BLI succeeded in squeezing, from the ornithologically most taciturn European countries, that decisive confession: about the numbers of their birds. Everybody conceded. We, the Slovenes, did it honestly, humbly and according to our nature, a little also in fear that somebody might do some

checking up. Our southern neighbours, for example, conceded magnanimously. From here on the way for the scientific objectivity was utterly unhindered.

Instead of those blurred phrases, such as "one of the more important", "one of the southernmost", "one of the greatest in this part of Europe", etc., certain synoptic scales came into force. Every datum is equipped with a number and suitably ranked. From these ranks it is more than evident what is important and what is not. With the aid of relatively simple mathematical operations of adding and dividing they let us know the following: Slovenia is insignificant as far as the survival of bird populations in Europe is concerned. Lay a reinforced concrete floor over your country and nothing will change, they tell us.

With a proficient combination of criteria and perhaps by condoning our shortcomings we will get a handful of IBA's in our country after all. From the list of globally endangered species we will be able to take our only real SPEC 1

species, i.e. the Corn Crake, and propose three to four areas for it. With a little luck we will count enough wintering aquatic birds on the Drava river to retain its threat status. The Triglav National Park will also be allowed to remain an IBA, if not for other reasons then due to the characteristic avicenos of the Eurasian upland biome. Then IBA's for the species from the lower SPEC categories (2,3,4) can be proposed. The number of such IBA's is limited with a relative size of the Slovene bird populations, in accordance with the model that as many IBA's can be proposed as there is the percentage of the entire European population living in our country. These must be our most important areas for these species. Now our modesty in guessing the numbers of our birds is slightly avenging itself on us. In Slovenia, the majority of species do not amount to even a single percent. In the species which in our country theoretically live in sufficient numbers, there is some sort of a hidden Catch 22. As they are distributed distinctly dispersedly, it is of course difficult to protect them in certain areas. With great difficulty we shall mark out a single most important breeding ground for the Kestrel, Kingfisher, Wryneck, Green Woodpecker, Stonechat or Red-backed Shrike. We may find some comfort in SPEC 4 species, among which we can protect even the Blackbird, Chaffinch and Greenfinch. And even more than that, the BLI allows us to have no less than 2 areas each for the Blackcap, Barn Swallow and Firecrest.

More or less discreetly, the big shots at the BLI have let us know a few times that Slovenia is not ornithologically interesting to them. This has been made clear to everybody with the publication of the numbers of birds in Europe. Adequately low is the international interest to invest in our ornithological-conservationist projects. Participation in the great international game yields, of course, certain benefits - from a firm support (only promised so far) in the national coordination of the IBA project, through the very important publicity, to the possibi-

lity of using international interventionist tools. And still more could be found. This is why it is certainly worth taking part. The only question is, how large the investment should be. In Slovenia, we partially already have - and partially still have to define - our own conservationist goals and guidelines. These should be our main guidance, for we wish to conserve diversity of small and in no way huge populations which we, in any case, do not have at all. Let us not delude ourselves with Mistle Thrushes, Ring Ouzels and Blackcaps. It would be wrong to act, with such species, as godfathers to the state conservationist policy of wooded landscape and regional parks, as we know very well that the Curlew and the Snipe, the Fantailed Warbler and the Black-winged Stilt, the Teal and the Pochard, the Whinchat and the Grasshopper Warbler are endangered in our country as well, even though the SPEC lists speak otherwise. These birds will not be our prime concern. For those truly endangered species junctures with IBA's will be found. There the IBA's will be of some help and the requests to protect them will be given international weight. And as always we shall welcome that particular argumentation which stipulates the criteria for our European character with the implementation of international agreements. The IBA's have been conceived as globally important entities. And the country which does not protect its IBA's is detrimental to the entire international community. This is certainly not what Slovenia is longing for.

The mission of the Slovene national coordination is very demanding and delicate. With as small as possible bureaucratic investment it must squeeze as many useful things as possible from the international IBA sack and at the same time ensure that our own preferential aims are not pushed into the background.

Peter Trontelj