

СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ ТУРИСТСКО-РЕКРЕАЦИОННОГО ОСВОЕНИЯ ТЕРРИТОРИИ

УДК 338.45:796.5(043)

Alhojärvi Pekka
Alhojärvi Tuomo
Demidova Natalia

INTEGRATED APPROACH FOR CERTIFYING FORESTS, NON-WOOD FOREST PRODUCTS AND FOREST BASED TOURISM, SOME EXAMPLES FROM FINLAND AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The article deals with the current issues, the forest certification, the non-timber forest product, and sustainable ecological tourism. The authors advocates the strengthening of the process through the complex approach, taking into account the principles of the sustainable development of natural parks and use of the techniques of the ecological footprint as an assessment of the impact of human activities, including tourism. The examples from the Finnish and Russian experience are given.

Алхоярви П., Алхоярви Т., Демидова Н. Комплексный подход к сертификации лесов, недревесных лесных продуктов и экотуризма, некоторые примеры из финской и российской практик

В статье рассматриваются актуальные вопросы сертификации лесов, недревесных лесных продуктов и устойчивого экологического туризма. Авторы выступают за активизацию данного процесса на основе применения комплексного подхода, с учетом принципов устойчивого развития природных парков и использования методики «экологического следа» как оценки влияния антропогенной деятельности, в т.ч. туризма. Приводятся примеры из финского и российского опыта.

Certification of forests

The main methods for forest certification both in Finland and in Russia are the Pan-European Forest Certification (PEFC) and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). The Finnish Forest Certification Scheme is designed to follow the principles and methods of conformity of PEFC, and the recently approved Russian National Forest Certification System is complying with it. FSC has been used in the Russian Federation for roughly 10 years and the number of FSC certified forests has increased there remarkably in recent years due to well-designed and detailed standard. In Finland FSC has been applied only to limited extent so far, but the current updating process of the existing FSC standard is expected to be finalized in 2010 aiming at designing a more comprehensive and acceptable FSC standard in Finland.

Chain-of-Custody (CoC) is the system that provides verification that all the parts of various production chains from the forests to the end-use markets are being certified. This production chain may comprise, for instance, forest management and transportation, sawmilling, importer of sawn wood and other raw materials, furniture manufacturer, wholesaler and the retailer follow the same principles of sustainability. The main criteria for industrial production concepts are described in relevant ISO standards. If the full production chain follows the principles in practice assessed through verification, appropriate logo (PEFC or FSC) can be used in the wholesale- or retail marketing.

There are certification organizations, typically private companies that are eligible to certify and validate the production chains in PEFC and/or FSC systems and accredited organs that also acknowledge the certifiers monitor these processes.

Certification of NWFP

In Non-wood Forest Products certification methods vary to large extent, depending on the products discussed. In Russia the proof of sanitary control has been the most usually used certificate so far. The main issues to be dealt with these certificates have comprised pesticides, lead content, and the probable radioactive contamination. All these factors have had to be analyzed before getting certificate for exports of berries or mushrooms, for instance. The western wholesalers and retail networks of organic food have also inquired these types of certificates, for instance.

If NWFP are food products, they should follow the food standards of Codex Alimentarius monitored a commission within an international system created by Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organisation (WHO). It is the global reference point for consumers, food producers, and processors, national food control agencies and international food trade. The Codex general standards for food additives, contaminants, and toxins in foods contain both general and commodity-specific requirements. As standards relate to product characteristics, they can be applied wherever the products are traded. Production, processing, manufacturing, transport, and storage practices for individual foods are defined by the codex codes of practice, which include codes of hygienic practice. They are considered important to ensure the safety and suitability of food for consumption.

The Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point System (HACCP) principles and guidelines for their application

are integrated in the Codex Alimentarius. The HACCP is used to identify specific hazards and its preventive measures to ensure the safety of food. As well as improving food safety, it can promote better use of resources and a more timely response to problems and assist inspection by regulatory authorities. It is the most effective for food business to ensure consumer protection. The HACCP System is a safety system and no quality system. The HACCP System is the most important system used to enforce the legislation on the hygiene foodstuff and is becoming an international method.

Sometimes, but still very seldom, NWFP certification is combined or integrated into forest certification. However, this need is increasing and tendencies for verification of full production chains of NWFP will become increasingly common. In principle, both systems, PEFC and FSC, can provide a solid basis for CoC of NWFP. This process has been so far mostly used by some NGOs, for instance, in Far-East Russia in marketing honey products from FSC certified forests to Asian markets.

The recent efforts in developing markets for health products such as Seabuckthorn products, have remarkably broadened the approached and systems to be used also within NWFP. Various potential systems to be applied comprise, for instance, the Global Food Safety Initiative standard, selected ISO standards, such as ISO 22000, organic standards for different markets etc. All these activities strengthen the need for more integrated approaches of NWFP and forest certification.

Certification of tourism

The Russian national standard for tourism dates back to 2000 and it deals with tourist operators, hotels and other forms of accommodation. The concept is rather limited and lack, for instance, the linkages with natural resources to be used in the context of tourism. Green DQN and Green DMN are international quality assurance certificates that Finnish entrepreneurs aim at for verifying their operations in tourism sector.

The main international systems Finnish tourism service providers regarding nature-based tourism in national parks are 1) the PAN Parks approach (www.panparks.org) which applies very strict criteria and has provided certificate so far for two Finnish national parks (Oulanka and Saaristomeri) and 2) the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism (www.europarc.org/what-we-do/european-charter) (certified for Syöte and Koli national parks in Finland). PAN parks system is converted partly from the FSC forest certificate criteria, with the help of WWF expertise, and the second system has clear linkages with forest certification. In addition, there are two cross-border national park systems that are verified by their management systems, namely Oulanka (Finland)-Paanajarvi (Karelia Republic) and Pasvik-Inari concept involving Finland, Norway and Murmansk region. These concepts should build a more solid basis for improving the services provided in and marketing of tourism.

In addition, the World Heritage areas may have their own status which then can be used in verifying the sustainability of tourist operations applied in these areas.

Currently there are numerous development processes in developing criteria for sustainable and eco-tourism. One example, which is recommended to be followed, is Eco-Destinet-process which provides relevant information and training through its web-site (<http://www.ecoroute.eu/destinet/en/project.php?id=1>) regarding development of a European Quality label for ecotourism. This process has concentrated purely on protected areas and their relationship with tourism.

Needs for integrated approaches

The main concerns between forests and nature-based tourism deal with forests with recreational and commercial uses, without conservation status. Evidently, this is an area where rapid development is needed and even required if the quality of nature-based tourism is to be improved and quality management systems developed. In Finland, this development could take place, for instance, in integrating forest certification into organic production of food products and NWFP and tourist services provided by the private farms and their networks. In Russia, some interesting pilots have been studied and even practiced to some extent in Model Forests such as in the one in Komi Republic managed by Taiga Foundation dealing with commercial forestry, NWFP and increasingly nature-based tourism in FSC certified forests. This type of approach could be examined, tested, and practiced increasingly in present and future pilot or model forests all over the country. The fastest experiments could be designed and results achieved in model forests in Khabarovsk Kray, Murmansk and Pskov oblasts. This could be an interesting topic to be jointly developed in the borderline forest and nature areas of Finland and the Republic of Karelia as well.

Tourist ecological footprint

As described above there is an increasing need to certify and verify all the forest related production and service chains. Logically it is important to further develop and apply other methodologies regarding sustainable development simultaneously. Ecological footprint is a method to assess how large effects man-made activities create in various activities.

As tourism has become more global, so have its environmental effects. The notion of 'ecotourism' often concentrates on minimising local environmental impacts caused by tourism and building locally sustainable tourist systems. However, a more global perspective is needed to establish a picture of the real ecological sustainability of a certain tourist attraction.

One promising tool enabling stronger environmental assessment of (eco) tourism is the ecological footprint (EF). Developed to assess biological productivity and the burden posed by human consumption to nature, the EF is now being extended to new sector-specific uses, including tourism. The EF combines different environmental bur-

dens into a commensurable spatial indicator (global hectares), which shows how much land is required to sustain a certain human practice for a certain time.

Although not being a sharp indicator to analyse local environmental impacts, the EF gives an estimate of the global environmental impacts of a certain eco-tourist destination. In theory, leisure activities, accommodation, and transport can all be analysed with the EF, giving an estimate of the total impacts of the tourism activity at issue. Combined with local ecological indicators, the tourist EF could provide a broader perspective for analysing the environmental impacts of tourism – leaning on a more globally oriented definition of ecological sustainability. However, an EF assessment must be based on extensive statistical information about the tourists and their holidays, and the tourist EF is still in phase of development and academic discussion.

If we discuss the concepts and contents between nature-based and eco-tourism, it is evident that we should use the terminology very carefully as very seldom eco-tourism can meet the principles of ecological sustainability minimizing the EF, for instance, yet it could be a successful example of nature-based tourism.

УДК 338.48-6:502/504(285.3)(470.22)

Антипин В.К.

БОЛОТА КАРЕЛИИ КАК ОБЪЕКТЫ ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ТУРИЗМА

В работе приведены сведения, показывающие разнообразие болот Карелии. Многие из них имеют высокий туристский потенциал, но из-за отсутствия рекомендаций по их использованию, не являются востребованными объектами экологического туризма. Выдвинуто предложение о целесообразности проведения исследований, направленных на выявление и охрану болот как объектов экотуризма.

Antipin V.K. Bogs of Karelia as the Sites of the Ecological Tourism

There is an information concerning a variety of bogs in Karelia in the article. Many of them have the high tourist potential but because of an absence of recommendations to their usage, they have not been the sites demanded by the ecological tourism. There is a proposal about the practicability of organization of researches directed to revelation and protection of bogs as the sites of the ecological tourism.

Болото – это особый тип природных экосистем, сложенных многолетними растениями, способными произрастать в условиях обильного увлажнения проточными или застойными водами и слабой аэрации субстрата. Особым свойством болотных экосистем, во многом определяющим условия жизни растений на болотах, являются торфообразование и накопление торфа. С болотами связаны наши обычные представления об особом мире растений болот – сфагновых мхах, осоках, морошке, клюкве. Внешне болота могут быть очень различными – от облесенных болотных массивов до открытых пространств, где господствуют сфагновые мхи.

В Карелии болота и заболоченные земли являются одним из неотъемлемых компонентов ландшафтов. Они занимают более 30 % территории – 5,4 млн га, из них открытые и слабо облесенные болота составляют 3,6 млн га, а на лесные болота и заболоченные леса приходится 1,8 млн га. Большинство болот начали формироваться 8-9 тыс. лет назад, после деградации Валдайского ледникового покрова. Образование болот происходило в котловинах путем заболачивания суходолов и водоемов.

Болота играют важную роль в поддержании экологического равновесия, при этом в Карелии они ежегодно аккумулируют в торф и выводят из атмосферы на длительный период до 200 тыс. т углерода¹. В естественном состоянии болота являются местами сбора ягодных и лекарственных растений. Осушенные болота используются в сельском и лесном хозяйстве и для заготовки торфа.

Болота характеризуются высоким разнообразием на различных уровнях их организации – от флоры до типов болотных массивов. На болотах произрастают около 500 видов сосудистых растений, мхов и лишайников². Из них более 20 видов внесены в Красную книгу Республики Карелия³.

В растительном покрове карельских болот выделено 57 типов растительных сообществ (ассоциаций), которые относятся к четырем классам растительности⁴. В Карелии, в зависимости от структуры растительного покрова и режима водно-минерального питания, встречаются болота 13 типов из 28, представленных в европейской части России⁵. Среди них наиболее широко распространены олиготрофные сфагновые грядово-мочажин-

¹ Кузнецов О.Л., Антипин В.К., Грабовик С.И., Дьячкова Т.Ю., Токарев П.Н. Растительные ресурсы болот Карелии // *Фундаментальные основы управления биологическими ресурсами*. М: Товарищество научных изданий КМК, 2005. С.195-201.

² Кузнецов О.Л. Флора и растительность болот Карелии // *Болотные экосистемы Севера Европы: разнообразие, динамика, углеродный баланс, ресурсы и охрана*. Петрозаводск: Карельский научный центр РАН, 2006. С. 145-159.

³ Красная книга Республики Карелия. Петрозаводск: Карелия, 2007. 360 с.

⁴ Кузнецов О.Л. Структура и динамика растительного покрова болотных экосистем Карелии. Автореф. дисс... д-ра биол. наук. Петрозаводск: Карельский научный центр РАН, 2006. 53 с.

⁵ Юрковская Т.К. География и картография растительности болот европейской России и сопредельных территорий. СПб.: БИН РАН, 1992. 255 с.