



Journal
of Danubian
Studies
and Research

Local Community Development in the Context of Biodiversity Conservation: Challenges and Conflicts in Romania

**Codruța Mihaela Dobrescu¹, Anca Gabriela Turtureanu², Oana
Alexandra Luțu³, Ionuț Popa⁴, Magdalin Leonard Dorobăț⁵**

Abstract: The intersection between rural economic development and biodiversity conservation constitutes one of the most polarizing challenges in contemporary environmental governance. In Romania, the expansion of protected areas - especially through the European Natura 2000 network - has frequently clashed with the socio-economic aspirations of local communities, which were often divided, manipulated in the short-term interests of some. This paper examines the systemic conflicts that arise between the need to develop local infrastructure, expand tourism and modernize agriculture, exploit different resources on the one hand, and strict legal requirements for ecosystem conservation on the other. Using a multidisciplinary approach rooted in socio-ecological resilience and environmental sociology, this study analyses different typologies of conflicts in diverse Romanian landscapes, from vulnerable wetland ecosystems in the Danube Delta, on the Danube in monte, in areas adjacent to other rivers, to fragmented forest habitats in the Carpathian Mountains. The research highlights that top-down conservation policies often trigger localized resistance, mainly due to

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Science, Physical Education and Informatics, The National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Romania, Address: Str. Târgu din Vale 1, Pitesti, Argeș, Romania, E-mail: codrutza_dobrescu@yahoo.com.

² Professor, PhD, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Danubius University of Galati, Romania. Address: 3 Galati Blvd, Galati 800654, Romania, Corresponding author: ancaturtureanu@univ-danubius.ro.

³ Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Science, Physical Education and Informatics, The National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Romania, Address: Str. Targu din Vale 1, Pitesti, Arges, Romania, E-mail oana.draghiceanu@upb.ro.

⁴ Scientific Researcher III, Romanian Academy - Institute of Speleology "Emil Racoviță", Calea 13 Septembrie, No. 13, Bucurest, Romania, E-mail: ionut.popa@iser.ro.

⁵ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Science, Physical Education and Informatics, The National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Romania, Address: Str. Targu din Vale 1, Pitesti, Arges, Romania, E-mail: coltanabe@yahoo.com.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY NC) license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

economic marginalization, restricted access to resources (such as grazing and timber exploitation, ballast, sand mining, etc.) and inadequate compensation mechanisms for wildlife damage. In addition, the study assesses how unregulated infrastructure and real estate development in biodiversity hotspots threaten critical ecological corridors. The findings indicate that the current institutional framework in Romania fails to adequately bridge the gap between scientific conservation objectives and community-driven development needs. Ultimately, this paper argues that mitigating these environmental conflicts requires a shift from strictly punitive enforcement of conservation laws to participatory management models. By actively integrating local stakeholders into decision-making processes and implementing sustainable bioeconomy initiatives, policymakers can transform biodiversity from an economic barrier into a catalyst for community resilience, ensuring long-term ecological stability and social cohesion, with the ultimate goal of reaching a convergence of interests of all parties involved.

Keywords: Local development; biodiversity conservation; environmental conflict; Romania; Natura 2000

1. Introduction

The conflict of interest between economic development (particularly for smaller communities) and biodiversity conservation represents one of the most contentious challenges in contemporary environmental governance, not only in emerging or less developed nations but on a global scale (Ostrom, 2009). Over the past three to four decades, the environmental protection paradigm has undergone a fundamental shift, moving from the traditional, restrictive conservation model based on the near-total isolation of protected areas (the “fortress” model) toward integrated socio-ecological approaches (Stringer et al., 2006) that harmonize short-term community interests with environmental needs. However, in post-communist European countries such as Romania, this transition was marked by deep tensions, distrust in institutions, and socio-economic polarization (Ioja et al., 2010).

Following its accession to the European Union (EU) in 2007, Romania was required to rapidly expand its network of protected areas to comply with the Birds and Habitats Directives. This expansion was achieved primarily through the designation of the Natura 2000 network, which currently covers approx. 24% of the country's land area (This expansion was achieved primarily through the designation of the Natura 2000 network, which currently covers approximately 24% of the country's land area (Romania Sălbatică, n.d.; Government of Romania, n.d.). Very recently, on June 26, 2026, the Government of Romania adopted a decision amending and supplementing Government Decision no. 685/2022, designating 19 new sites corresponding to Sites of Community Importance for which conservation measures have been established in accordance with approved management plans as an integral

part of the European Natura 2000 ecological network in Romania (*Rețeaua Natura 2000 are 19 situri noi*, n.d.).

Although this expansion marks a crucial milestone for European ecological networks, its rapid, top-down implementation came into direct conflict with the socio-economic aspirations of rural communities (Angelstam et al., 2013). Romania's rural population, often facing high poverty rates and a historical reliance on natural resources, frequently views these environmental regulations as bureaucratic impositions that exacerbate economic marginalization and restrict access to vital sources of livelihood (Hossu et al., 2020); this perception is fueled by local and national governance, often characterized by ill-advised or flawed decisions, as well as by a lack of environmental awareness among many community members and poor communication between decision-makers and these communities. This paper examines the systemic conflicts that arise between the need to develop local public infrastructure, expand tourism, modernize agriculture, and exploit natural resources (such as timber, grazing lands, sand, and gravel) on one side, and the strict legal requirements for ecosystem conservation on the other. The core problem lies in a structural disconnect: conservation policies are frequently designed using a rigid, centralized scientific approach, whereas rural development strategies are driven by immediate socio-economic survival or short-term political and capital gains (Ioja et al., 2010).

Consequently, local communities are often divided, marginalized, or actively manipulated by local elites and political actors in the short-term interest of specific resource-extraction groups (Popescu et al., 2016).

Using a multidisciplinary lens rooted in socio-ecological resilience theory (Ostrom, 2009) and environmental sociology (Stringer et al., 2006), this study analyzes different typologies of environmental conflicts across diverse Romanian landscapes. These range from vulnerable wetland ecosystems in the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve (DDBR) and adjacent inland river corridors to fragmented forest habitats in the Carpathian Mountains. Ultimately, this paper argues that mitigating these environmental conflicts requires an institutional shift from strictly punitive enforcement of conservation laws to participatory co-management models. By actively integrating local stakeholders into decision-making processes and implementing sustainable bioeconomy initiatives, policymakers can transform biodiversity from an economic barrier into a catalyst for community resilience, ensuring long-term ecological stability and social cohesion (Hossu et al., 2020).

2. Theoretical Framework: Socio-Ecological Resilience and Environmental Sociology

2.1. Socio-Ecological Resilience (SES)

The SES framework, pioneered by Ostrom (2009), conceptualizes human societies and biophysical ecosystems as deeply interconnected, co-evolving feedback loops. Within this context, resilience does not merely imply the capacity of an ecosystem to absorb external biophysical shocks; it encompasses the adaptive capacity of the human communities embedded within those systems. When external environmental governance frameworks - such as EU Directives - impose strict conservation boundaries without considering local adaptive capacities, they disrupt traditional feedback loops between local populations and their natural environment (Stringer et al., 2006). This disruption reduces the overall resilience of the system, leading to social vulnerability, economic decline, and aggressive localized resistance against environmental regulations (Rozyłowicz et al., 2011).

2.2. Environmental Sociology and Political Ecology

Environmental sociology highlights that environmental disputes rarely boil down to simple matters of ecology or wildlife management; fundamentally, they represent conflicts over power, equity, and institutional trust (Stringer et al., 2006). Political ecology complements this perspective by analyzing how asymmetrical power relations influence access to resources and the environmental policymaking process. In Romania, the designation of Natura 2000 sites through centralized decisions, a “top-down” approach, often bypassed local consultation, fueling a sense of “ecological injustice” and suspicion among both rural and urban communities (Ioja et al., 2010). Local communities feel they bear the full burden of conservation-related opportunity costs (such as lost income due to restrictions on grazing, logging, or fishing, a situation observed in the Danube Delta), while the benefits (such as global carbon sequestration or European biodiversity indicators) are realized at the national or international level. Furthermore, a lack of transparency in local governance allows local elites to exploit public discontent, framing conservation as the primary enemy of local well-being in order to facilitate unregulated resource exploitation (Popescu et al., 2016). Given that population density in Romania, as in most of Europe, is high, and that many endangered wildlife species inhabit increasingly restricted areas, a compromise must be found between allowing communities to sustain their livelihoods through the sustainable use of local

resources and preserving spaces where pristine nature can be safeguarded (Bleahu, 2019). Regarding the resentment felt by local communities, often exploited by political entities with obscure agendas through the distorted portrayal of apparent conflicts between local interests and broader environmental concerns, one need only consider the recent issues surrounding the unfinished section of the A1 motorway. Blame there has been attributed to bears or to environmental standards deemed “excessive,” rather than acknowledging the flawed design or the choice of a difficult, costly route requiring tunnels, a choice made to the detriment of an alternative route that would have followed the open Mureș River corridor toward Lipova and Arad; this latter option would have required no tunnels, would have been shorter, and, consequently, would have been less polluting and less expensive. Ultimately, governance must explain to communities that natural systems play a significant economic role—particularly through their biological components, by highlighting biodiversity's contribution to human nutrition and health, as well as to agriculture, industry, commerce, and tourism; this underscores the critical importance of its conservation (Bleahu, 2004).

3. Methodology

This paper adopts a multidisciplinary, comparative case-study approach to capture the heterogeneous nature of environmental conflicts in Romania. Following the framework for evaluating collaborative planning, this study evaluates three distinct ecological and socio-economic landscapes across the country:

The Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve (DDBR) and Riverine Wetlands: Characterized by strict aquatic conservation zones, declining traditional fisheries, and expanding, unregulated tourism infrastructure (Bănăduc et al., 2020).

The Carpathian Mountain Forest Habitats: Dominated by intense conflicts over timber harvesting, post-communist land restitution anomalies, and large carnivore management.

Hilly and Sub-Carpathian River Corridors: Defined by widespread conflicts regarding resource extraction (sand mining, gravel/ballast exploitation) and local infrastructure development.

The analysis is based on secondary data synthesis, including peer-reviewed academic literature, environmental impact assessments (EIAs), reports from the European Commission, jurisprudence from the European Court of Justice regarding Romanian

environmental breaches, and sociological survey data regarding public perception of Natura 2000 in Romania.

4. Typologies of Environmental Conflicts in Romanian Landscapes

The operationalization of environmental conflicts in Romania requires analyzing how specific geographical areas face unique resource pressures. Environmental friction occurs when top-down institutional boundaries overlap with traditional resource dependency (Ostrom, 2009). These conflicts express themselves differently across water, forest, and riverbed ecosystems.

The nature of environmental conflicts in Romania is deeply contingent on the economic liquidity of the resource in question. In forest ecosystems, the conflict is driven by the immediate cash-value of timber, which creates a highly volatile political economy where local communities feel dispossessed of their historic land rights (Munteanu et al., 2014). Conversely, in riverine environments, the conflict is institutional, driven by local authorities who weaponize public development goals to bypass European conservation restrictions (Hossu et al., 2020).

4.1. Wetland Ecosystems: The Danube Delta and Riverine Corridors

The Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve represents one of Europe's most vital wetlands, yet its institutional management has long been characterized by extreme friction between international conservation mandates and local survival (Bănăduc et al., 2020). Following the collapse of the communist state-led economic model, local communities lost centralized employment and reverted to traditional resource extraction, primarily fishing and animal husbandry.

The conflict typologies in this region are split into two major axes. First, the enforcement of strict fishing bans designed to protect endangered sturgeon species has targeted local Lipovan and Romanian fishermen (Bănăduc et al., 2020). Locals argue that industrial poaching and commercial fish-trawling operations—often protected by corrupted local networks—cause the real degradation, while traditional, small-scale fishermen bear the brunt of punitive law enforcement (Ioja et al., 2010).

Second, the expansion of unregulated tourism infrastructure has intensified local resentment. While local communities face strict architectural and environmental guidelines that prevent them from modernizing their homes, influential outside

investors have successfully bypassed local planning laws, constructing massive hotel complexes (Bănăduc et al., 2020). High-speed boat tourism causes severe noise pollution, disrupts avian nesting patterns, and accelerates bank erosion, generating a profound sense of relative deprivation and environmental injustice among local inhabitants (Ioja et al., 2010).

4.2. Forest Habitats: The Carpathian Mountains and Human-Wildlife Friction

The Carpathian Mountains are home to some of Europe's largest remaining areas of continuous primary forest and populations of large carnivore like brown bear (*Ursus arctos* Linnaeus 1758), lynx (*Lynx lynx carpathicus* Kratochvíl & Štollmann, 1963), wolf (*Canis lupus lupus* Linnaeus, 1758) (Dorresteijn et al., 2016). The post-communist restitution of forest lands to private owners, a process involving instances of illegal or improper transfers and to local administrative entities (such as associative ownership structures like “composesorate” or “obști”) has triggered a series of socio-ecological conflicts. These conflicts stem from the overlap of property rights with conservation mandates (Munteanu et al., 2016), as well as from a lack of the technical, scientific, and managerial expertise required to manage forest areas (Dorresteijn et al., 2014).

In accordance with EU Natura 2000 directives, vast forest areas have been placed under strict protection regimes that prohibit or severely restrict logging (WWF, 2019; Rozyłowicz et al., 2011). For many isolated mountain communities, timber represents the sole economic driver and the primary source of heating fuel. Although Romanian legislation theoretically provides for financial compensation to forest owners unable to harvest their timber, the process is extremely slow, underfunded, and hampered by excessive bureaucracy (Rozyłowicz et al., 2011), rendering it practically unworkable in most cases. This situation creates widespread economic hardship and fuels illegal logging, which is perceived as a strategy for economic survival (Munteanu et al., 2016). At the same time, this situation is being exploited for propaganda purposes by certain political forces to oppose ideas related to environmental protection and ecology, fueling hostility among a segment of the population toward the EU - an institution held responsible for imposing such measures.

This situation highlights a critical paradox in environmental sociology: strict legal protection without local institutional backing is counterproductive to conservation goals. Because the state relies on slow, bureaucratic systems that take months to

award compensation payouts, local populations shift from passive non-compliance to active resistance. This results in an increase in unmonitored illegal poaching through hidden poisoning or mechanical traps, which ultimately threatens the long-term demographic stability of the protected wildlife (Popescu et al., 2016).

4.3. Riverine Landscapes: Ballast and Sand Mining

In areas adjacent to inland rivers (such as the Mureș, Siret, Olt, and Jiu), conflicts of interest primarily center on the extraction of non-energy mineral resources - specifically sand and gravel (aggregate) (Ioja et al., 2010). Local authorities often prioritize easy access to construction materials for local roads and public infrastructure, leading to the issuance of gravel extraction permits with minimal environmental oversight (Hossu et al., 2020). During field trips, we have encountered such situations in both mountainous and lowland areas where, acting on instructions from the local municipality, various materials (gravel, sand, limestone, sandstone, etc.) were extracted illegally and without any impact assessment, sometimes even leading to landslides or other issues. The temptation is strong because such resources are far cheaper than alternatives.

These extraction activities destroy the benthic habitats of native fish species, cause severe degradation of riverbeds, lower groundwater levels (leading to the drying up of local agricultural wells), and compromise the structural stability of bridges and levees (Ioja et al., 2010). When environmental authority representatives attempt to halt these operations in protected areas, they face strong opposition from mayors and local economic interest groups; the latter portray environmental protection as a direct obstacle to modernization and rural development, thereby dividing the local population into pro-development and pro-environment camps (Hossu et al., 2020).

5. Systemic Barriers in Romania's Institutional Framework

The persistent failure to align community development with biodiversity conservation in Romania stems from several structural deficiencies in the state's governance framework (Nita et al., 2016). Rather than functioning as an adaptive management system, environmental governance in Romania is hampered by centralization, sectoral fragmentation, and a profound lack of social capital (Rozyłowicz et al., 2011) or medium- to long-term vision.

Top-down decision-making: protected areas have historically been designated without community consultation or public mapping workshops (Ioja et al., 2010). This approach has completely failed to foster a sense of local ownership and engagement, instead generating institutional mistrust and active resistance toward conservation authorities (Hossu et al., 2020). Furthermore, during our field visits to various regions of Romania, we observed that local communities were uneasy and suspicious when they saw us conducting on-site research regarding flora, fauna, geology, ecological issues, and so forth. There was a fear that the aim might be to establish a protected area, thereby restricting their access to local resources.

This highlights the urgent need for better communication and interaction between authorities (national, regional, or local) and the inhabitants of these areas, specifically, a need to explain the situation and provide examples of successful models demonstrating that local communities stand to gain in the medium and long term.

Flawed compensation systems: delays of several years in the payment of compensation for damage caused by wildlife or for restrictions on logging, combined with complex bureaucratic requirements, disproportionately affect vulnerable rural households, driving them toward the illegal exploitation of resources (Popescu et al., 2016; Rozyłowicz et al., 2011).

Fragmented and contradictory governance: there is a major rift between the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the county councils. This situation gives rise to conflicting policies, such as agricultural subsidies that encourage intensive grazing in habitats where, simultaneously, conservation legislation protects vulnerable flora (Nita et al., 2016). This lack of policy alignment within environmental governance is often cited as a classic example.

Poor law enforcement and corruption: Selective law enforcement creates a profound sense of environmental injustice (Ioja et al., 2010). Small-scale local users are severely penalized for minor infractions (e.g., collecting firewood), while large-scale illegal operators act with relative impunity, often protected by local political elites who instrumentalize anti-conservation rhetoric to win local elections (Popescu et al., 2016).

6. Discussion: Reconceptualizing Conservation through Participatory Co-Management

The empirical evidence from Romania demonstrates that enforcing conservation laws solely through punitive measures and a top-down approach is socially unsustainable and ecologically counterproductive (Ioja et al., 2010; Nita et al., 2016). When local communities are excluded from the benefits of protected areas, they feel marginalized, turning into active or passive agents of environmental degradation (Stringer et al., 2006). To resolve these systemic conflicts, Romania must shift toward a participatory management paradigm that balances human development with ecosystem integrity (Ostrom, 2009).

Furthermore, this ill-advised approach by the authorities fosters community mistrust over time, leading to reactions that run counter to the efficient and effective functioning of protected areas; public resentment is often exploited by political forces whose interests diverge from those of the local communities or the nation. Significant investment is needed in transparent communication and consultation, environmental education, countering misinformation and mass disinformation with serious consequences, and debunking manipulative narratives.

6.2. Implementation of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)

The financial burden of conservation must be decentralized so that it no longer falls exclusively on rural land users (Ostrom, 2009). Implementing reliable Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) systems, featuring rapid payment mechanisms—ensures fair and predictable compensation for private forest and agricultural landowners for the ecological benefits their lands provide to the public (such as carbon sequestration, microclimate regulation, erosion and landslide prevention, groundwater regulation, water purification, and wildlife habitats) (Stringer et al., 2006). It is deeply concerning that these ecosystem services are not even understood by many of those responsible for the efficient management of these areas, such as forestry professionals. Their limited ecological and environmental knowledge, and frequent inability to grasp these perspectives, likely stems from their training, which views the forest primarily as a source of immediate benefits like timber, game, and other products. Nowhere is there a specified list of these ecosystem services, let alone an attempt to quantify their value. Furthermore, forest landowners, even if they do not harvest anything, extract timber, or generate income from their land, must pay state taxes and are required to pay for security services provided by forestry districts.

Thus, the state not only fails to incentivize forest owners who refrain from logging to preserve these areas but actually taxes them. Local or national authorities could at least exempt these forest owners from taxes and fees and provide free forest protection services. This would encourage efforts and the intention to refrain from logging, while communities would indirectly reap ecological benefits. Funding should come directly and transparently from EU structural funds, carbon tax revenues, or earmarked tourism levies, thereby bypassing sluggish national bureaucratic mechanisms (Rozyłowicz et al., 2011).

6.3. Participatory Zoning and Co-Management Councils

Instead of imposing rigid, static boundaries designed in remote ministerial offices, protected areas should implement flexible, participatory zoning (Hossu et al., 2020). Local community representatives, traditional resource user groups (pastoralists, fishermen), environmental NGOs, and scientific experts must hold equal voting seats within localized Co-Management Councils (Ioja et al., 2010). This shared governance allows for collaborative rule-making, such as defining specific rotation schedules for livestock grazing or setting community-monitored fishing quotas, eliminating the manipulation of communities by external political actors (Nita et al., 2016).

6.4. Sustainable Bioeconomy Initiatives

Biodiversity should be repositioned as an economic asset rather than a development barrier (Ostrom, 2009). Policymakers should actively finance and support localized bioeconomy initiatives. This includes establishing a certified “Natura 2000 Certified Product” eco-label for local organic agricultural goods, traditional cheeses, honey, and sustainable crafts, allowing local producers to command a premium price in national and European markets (Stringer et al., 2006).

Furthermore, developing community-owned ecotourism cooperatives ensures that tourism revenues remain within the local economy rather than being siphoned away by external corporate hotel chains (Bănăduc et al., 2020). Finally, training and hiring local community members as conservation rangers, wildlife monitors, and certified nature guides transforms former resource exploiters into active stewards of the environment, successfully aligning conservation with community-driven development needs (Nita et al., 2016).

7. Conclusion

The ongoing conflicts between local community development and biodiversity conservation in Romania represent a major structural crisis in environmental governance. The current framework relies excessively on top-down, punitive command-and-control mechanics that foster local alienation, economic marginalization, and institutional distrust. These socio-economic vulnerabilities are easily exploited by short-term political and economic interests, leading to fragmented ecosystems and compromised local communities.

This study demonstrates that long-term ecological stability cannot be achieved without social cohesion and economic justice. Mitigating these environmental conflicts requires an urgent institutional evolution toward participatory management models. By actively integrating local stakeholders into decision-making structures, creating efficient, functional compensation mechanisms, and supporting sustainable bioeconomy programs, Romania can foster a genuine convergence of interests. Ultimately, transforming biodiversity from a legal barrier into a socio-economic catalyst is the only path forward to build enduring socio-ecological resilience in the Romanian landscape.

References

- Angelstam, P., Elbakidze, M., Axelsson, R., Čupa, P., Halada, L., Molnar, Z., Patru-Stupariu, I., Perzanowski, K., Rozyłowicz, L., Standovar, T., et al. (2013). Maintaining cultural and natural biodiversity in the Carpathian Mountain ecoregion: Need for an integrated landscape approach. In J. Kozak, K. Ostapowicz, A. Bytnerowicz, & B. Wyżga (Eds.), *Integrating nature and society towards sustainability*, 393–424. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12725-0_28
- Bănăduc, D., Bănăduc, A., Pedrotti, F., Cianfaglione, K., & Akeroyd, J. (2020). *Human impact on danube watershed biodiversity in the xxi century*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37242-2>
- Bleahu, M. (2004). *Arca lui Noe în secolul XXI. Ariile protejate și protecția naturii*. Editura Național.
- Bleahu, M. (2019). *Ariile protejate și protecția naturii*. Editura Paideia.
- Dorresteijn, I., Hanspach, J., Kecskés, A., Latková, H., Mezey, Z., Sugár, S., von Wehrden H., & Fischer, J. (2014). Human-carnivore coexistence in a traditional rural landscape. *Landscape Ecology*, 29(7), 1145–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-014-0048-5>
- Dorresteijn, I., Milcu, A. I., Leventon, J., Hanspach, J., & Fischer, J. (2016). Social factors mediating human–carnivore coexistence: Understanding thematic strands influencing coexistence in Central Romania. *Ambio*, 45(4), 490–500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0760-7>
- Guvernul României, (n.d.). *Guvernul României. Ședințe*. www.gov.ro/ro/guvernul/sedinte/

- Hossu, C. A., Ioja, I. C., Mitincu, C. G., Artmann, M., & Hersperger, A. M. (2020). An evaluation of environmental plans quality: Addressing the rational and communicative perspectives. *Journal of environmental management*, 256, 109984. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109984>
- Ioja, C. I., Pătroescu, M., Rozyłowicz, L., Popescu, V. D., Vergheș, M., Zotta, M. I., & Felciuc, M. (2010). The efficacy of Romania's protected areas network in conserving biodiversity. *Biological conservation*, 143(11), 2468-2476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.06.013>
- Munteanu, C., Nita, M. D., Abrudan, I. A., & Radeloff, V. (2016). Historical forest management in Romania is imposing strong legacies on contemporary forests and their management. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 361, 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.11.023>
- New LC coexistence report. (n.d.). *WWF Madagascar*. <https://www.wwf.mg/?355804/New-LC-Coexistence-Report>
- Nita, A., Rozyłowicz, L., Manolache, S., Ciocănea, C. M., Miu, I. V., & Popescu, V. D. (2016). Collaboration networks in applied conservation projects across Europe. *PloS one*, 11(10), e0164503. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164503>
- Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 325(5939), 419-422. DOI: 10.1126/science.1172133
- Popescu, V. D., Artelle, K. A., Pop, M. I., Manolache, S., & Rozyłowicz, L. (2016). Assessing biological realism of wildlife population estimates in data-poor systems. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 53(4), 1248–1259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12660>
- Rețeaua Natura 2000 are 19 situri noi. (n.d.). *JURIDICE.ro*. <https://www.juridice.ro/836294/reteaua-natura-2000-are-19-situri-noi.html>
- România Sălbatică, (n.d.). *Arii protejate*. <https://www.romaniasalbatica.ro/ro/arii-protejate>
- Rozyłowicz, L., Popescu, V. D., Pătroescu, M., & Chișamera, G. (2011). The potential of large carnivores as conservation surrogates in the Romanian Carpathians. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 20(3), 561-579. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-010-9967-x>
- Stringer, L. C., Dougill, A. J., Fraser, E., Hubacek, K., Prell, C., & Reed, M. S. (2006). Unpacking “participation” in the adaptive management of social–ecological systems: a critical review. *Ecology and society*, 11(2). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26266023>