

# The scenario

Fulufjället/Fulufjellet, and other national parks / nature reserves in the area

- Draft scenario alternatives:
  - extend the “undisturbed zone” (the strictly protected area)
  - extend the national parks
  - create corridors to neighbouring parks/reserves



# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Establishment & extension of strict conservation areas

---

*Establishing or extending areas under strict conservation, in so-called undisturbed zones as the best way to preserve Fulufjället/Fulufjellet in its natural state.*

### **What do undisturbed zones imply?**

- leaving nature develop without human intervention
  - no control of bark beetles or deceases affecting plants or animals,
  - only large forest fires would be considered to be stopped by human intervention!
- no entering without previous application for a permit
- entering only allowed to small, guided groups
- Traditional performed activities would be prohibited:
  - no logging,
  - no hunting,
  - no fishing and picking of berries and mushrooms,
  - no motor vehicle would enter or fly over the area.

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Current situation at Fulufjället/Fulufjellet

### Sweden

Undisturbed zone	60%
low human activity (hiking & seasonal hunt on elk/moose/small game)	15%
high human activity (recreational activities and visitors facilities)	25%

### Norway

No division into zones  
Restrictions are similar as those of  
the high activity zones on the  
Swedish park side, though no  
facilities for visitors exist  
(recreational activities, including  
hunting/fishing)



**Further extension of the national park or undisturbed zones would demand bilateral co-operation between Sweden and Norway as well as support from their citizens**

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Balancing benefits and costs

### Benefits

- Regeneration of habitat and ecosystems
- Increased environmental function
- Preservation for scientific purposes
- Preservation for future generations

### Costs

- Limitations on the existing business activities
- Reduction of business and local income?
- Limitation of recreational function for present generations



**Compensation of the costs and lost profits is required, first of all in terms of the local inhabitants.**

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Means of compensation

---

**An annual compulsory tax for adult citizens of Sweden and Norway.  
Taking into account that Fulufjället/Fulufjellet is the natural heritage of  
the Swedes and the Norwegians**

- The collected amounts would form the target Swedish-Norwegian Fund for Conservation of Fulufjället/Fulufjellet
- It would be spent exclusively on the provision of undisturbed zones of Fulufjället/Fulufjellet in accordance with the adopted conservation programme.
- The funds would be assigned in order to cover
  - conservation costs
  - the lost profits of local populations due to the more strict protection regime.
- The Fund would function under the auspices of an international organisation like UNESCO or IUCN.

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Alternatives for conservation

---

Below you will be suggested a number of situations in order for you to choose the option of Fulufjället/Fulufjellet conservation programme which you consider the best.

Different options emphasise different aspects and imply different level of cost which you would have been had to bear.

Please get to know the programme attributes and their possible levels before you start choosing

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Suggested options

**Surface of establishment of an undisturbed zone of Fulufjellet on the Norwegian Part**, which implies ban on any human activities (except research and small guided tourist groups).

### **Suggested options:**

- +0 ha (the share of undisturbed zone in the Norwegian part of Fulufjellet would remain as it is, thus making up 0% of the national park)
- +25000 ha (a total of 30% of Fulufjellet on the Norwegian side would be managed as an undisturbed zone of the national park)
- +50000 ha (a total of 60% of Fulufjellet on the Norwegian side would be managed as an undisturbed zone of the national park)
- +85000 ha (100% of Fulufjellet national park on the Norwegian side would be managed as an undisturbed zone)

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Suggested options

**Surface of the expansion of the undisturbed zone of Fulufjället on the Swedish Part**, which implies ban on any human activities (except research and small guided tourist groups). **Suggested options:**

- +0 ha (the share of undisturbed zone in the Swedish part of Fulufjället would remain as it is, thus making up 60% of the national park)
- +25000 ha (a total of 66,5% of Fulufjället on the Swedish side would be managed as an undisturbed zone of the national park)
- +50000 ha (a total of 73% of Fulufjället on the Swedish side would be managed as an undisturbed zone of the national park)
- +150000 ha (100% of Fulufjället national park on the Swedish side would be managed as an undisturbed zone)



# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Proposed compulsory tax

- **Annual rate of the compulsory tax, every adult Swedish/Norwegian citizen would have to pay.**
- The tax will exclusively enter the target Swedish-Norwegian Fund for Conservation of Fulufjället/Fulufjellet and would have totally been spent on the extension of undisturbed zones in accordance with the conservation programme adopted.
- FOR INSTANSE, IF IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROGRAMME THE UNDISTURBED ZONE WOULD HAVE BEEN SPATIALLY EXPANDED EXCLUSIVELY ON THE SWEDISH SIDE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDS WILL BE SPENT IN SWEDEN, AND VICE VERSA FOR EXCLUSIVE EXPANSION ON THE NORWEGIAN SIDE.
- The fund would have functioned under an international organisation, for instance UNESCO or IUCN. Additional conservation costs and lost profits of the local population induced by the undisturbed zone enlargement programme would have to be covered from the Fund.

# The scenario – “pilot version”

## Suggested options

- The scenario will be entered into an internet-based questionnaire, to be applied in SE and NO (and PL and BY)
- The realism/plausibility of the scenario is of great importance for the validity of the responses
- A realistic/plausible scenario of increased provision of nature (habitat) preservation might still be controversial – and it will be, in both case areas
- Although non-use values represent the main focus of our study, should we clarify some elements of the provision, e.g.:
  - local/regional measures/facilities (an interpretive predator centre has been proposed in relation to Fulufjellet, in NO)?
  - compensation / exchange of real estate for private forest owners?