

Study of Integrated Management Plan of UNESCO International Protected Area -Focusing on comparing between Jeju Special Self-Governing Province and Foreign Country Case¹-

Department of Public Administration
Jeju National University Graduate School
Doctorate Program
Kwon Oh Kang

Abstract

It is well known fact that Jeju Island's successful management of world class scenery resulted in the designation of Jeju Island as the UNESCO Jeju Biosphere Reserve in 2002, as the UNESCO World Natural Heritage in 2007 and Global Geo-park Network in 2010.

Nevertheless, Jeju has some problem to integrated management for 3 kinds of UNESCO world heritages. Because of different purpose of each heritages, we always involve many problems.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to prepare for some realistic and desirable alternative to conserve world heritage through establishment of global governance for an integrated management for world heritage.

Key words :

World Natural Heratage, Global Geopark Network, Biosphere Reserve, Integrated management

1) This is a revision of my Master degree, Study of Integrated Management Plan of UNESCO International Protected Area - Focusing on comparing between Jeju Special Self-Governing Province and Foreign Country Case - (August 2015, Jeju National University, S. Korea)

Background and Purpose

A heritage, according to the definition of UNESCO, is 'something handed down from the past which we should live around and hand down to the future generations (National Museum of Jeju, 2005). As mentioned above, UNESCO World Heritage conveys the meaning of 'heritage,' especially the traditional values, culture, and natural environments that are worth preserving for the mankind around the world in several categories.

Thanks to the endeavors of various organizations and countries around the world, the efforts to preserve the heritages were quite successful. Various conventions have been primarily aimed at protecting the values, but the designation of various international protected areas including the world heritages leads to enormous subsequent effects, e.g., effective promotion and increase in local income. However, the primary purpose of international protected areas is basically to conserve the region and those areas are rarely removed from the list once they are designated. For this reason, the conservation areas have quickly increased over time and are expected to keep increasing in the future. Also, there often are cases that are difficult to manage when an area is given several titles for its heritages or an area is too broad spanning more than one country.

In order to resolve these issues with the management, studies have been conducted for integrated management around the world. However, these studies have begun to be conducted only recently and the contents of the studies on integrated management are very limited. Also, it is difficult to conduct the studies because the meaning of integrated management is very broad. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the definition of integrated management and consider which direction integrated management should be carried out. Here, the concept of 'new governance' is suggested as a measure of integrated management. The theory of new governance was suggested as an alternative measure to pursue democracy and resolve national failure or market failure through cooperation between the private and the government sectors outside the traditional government-centered management. People have constantly adjusted to the failure of government and market for the past years and made efforts to make a new paradigm not to repeat the same mistake again. The concept of new government has emerged in this process and has been adopted by numerous areas, fulfilling the needs of globalization and informatization.

As the private sector has risen to be the mainstream along with the paradigm of new governance, the government's role has been

reduced and replaced by small governments. However, it is still impossible to eliminate the role of government altogether and the government will continue to exist as an active entity even in the age of new governance. Therefore, it would be useful for the management of international protected areas in terms of new governance to discuss how the current government-centered heritage management systems are carried out and the strengths and weaknesses of the current government-centered integration management by comparing the cases of Korean government with the cases of other areas.

Concept of Heritage and Integrated Management

A. Concept of Heritage

The inclusive meaning of world heritage always implies sustainability for transmission to the future generations in addition to the basic meaning of 'heritage.' In fact, these heritages come in various types and it is very important to categorize them based on appropriate standards for efficient management. Currently, a number of international organizations designate and manage heritages based on internal standards, and UNESCO is one of the most active organizations. UNESCO has designated various international protected areas with different characteristics to make efforts to protect those areas. The international protected areas designated by UNESCO are as follows:

World Heritage

World heritage is designated by the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage ("the World Heritage Convention"), but the Convention does not directly define 'world heritage.' The Convention begins by defining what cultural heritage and natural heritage are. Then it states that the cultural and natural heritages with exceptional universal values are included in the list of world heritage (Hyo Sang Cho, 2013). It is rather shocking that the World Heritage Convention for the protection and management of world heritage has no definition of world heritage. However, it is difficult to define the heritage in one short statement as it is divided into cultural heritage and natural heritage and further classified into smaller groups. Therefore, the World Heritage Convention separately describes cultural heritage and natural heritage in detail in place of the 'one definition.'

Global Geopark

Global Geopark is a name assigned to geological heritages implying the concepts of protection, education, and eco-friendly development (Tae Yoon

Kim, 2012). In other words, an area's policies, educational programs, and sustainable development A concept presented by the World Commission on Environment and Development² for conservation are required for the selection of Global Geoparks in addition to the geological characteristics.

According to the UNESCO Guidelines, Geopark is a concept inclusive of all concepts of protection, education, and sustainable development and it is stated that an area should not be selected solely by its geographical importance considering its geographical environments. UNESCO's ultimate goal is to select Global Geoparks to protect their geological values and use them for tourism, education, and research purposes to balance the values of conservation and use for sustainable development, so it is meaningless to pursue either development or conservation.

Biosphere Reserve

Biosphere Reserve is MAB (Man and the Biosphere Programme) established by UNESCO in 1971. MAB is an inter-government program that conducts projects related to Biosphere Reserves and was founded to study how men impacts the animals/plants, atmosphere, seashores, and the entire biosphere including men and work together with the world to prevent further destruction of the biosphere (Chul Soo Kim, 2001). Each country or region is clearly designating and managing various conservation areas, but there are ongoing problems related to the lack of global protection standards, ambiguity of protection zones, and lack of participation of local people. Biosphere Reserve was established to assign global standards to continue the protection of biodiversity and sustainable development and to discuss the issues with related countries and regions.

UNESCO has adopted World Biosphere Reserve Network Protocol for the efficiency of Biosphere Reserves and reinforced understanding, interaction, and cooperation of the reserves in the regional or international level. This network is designated by the MAB International Coordinating Council (ICC) with the request of each country, but each region is solely governed by its country's rules as it is still under its country's sovereignty. In other words, this protocol is not enforced, but a path for mutual cooperation.

2) A concept presented by the World Commission on Environment and Development in Our Common Future in 1987 and refers to fulfilling the needs of the current generation without damaging the environment or nature to be used by the future generations.

3) A Geopark is a geographical area where geological heritage sites are part of a holistic concept of protection, education and sustainable development. The Geopark should take into account the whole geographical setting of the area, and shall not solely include site of geological significance.

B. The Concept of Integrated Management and New Governance

Integrated management of international protected areas is traditional not an area with history. However, the importance of integrated management has quickly risen to the surface as UNESCO has suggested conventions for various heritages and designated various areas in the world as international protected areas based on the conventions. The number of those areas has to increase over time due to the characteristics of heritages and it is very important to create a manual for integrated management for an effective response to this.

The primary purpose of integrated management of heritages is protection. Integration management was developed to protect the heritages through efficient management, and it is a product of consideration for the ultimate purpose as to 'how efficiently heritages or values can be protected.' Currently, the number of international protected areas, including World Heritages, Biosphere Reserves, and Global Geoparks, are quickly increasing. In 1994, 94 countries were participating in the World Heritages, but this quickly increased to 161 countries by 2004 and 191 countries by 2014. The number of designated areas reached 1,007 as of 2014. In case of Biosphere Reserves, the number of designated areas increased by about 60% between 2000 and 2014. As the relevant areas increase, there have often been cases where several heritages were redundantly designated in a single area or a heritage broadly spans over several countries. When the heritages had different purposes or different groups of interested parties, there have always been possibilities of mutual collision. This is the major reason why it is necessary to clarify the concept of integrated management and consider its action plans as soon as possible.

The concept of integrated management is very broad and complicated, but largely classified into the following:

1. When a heritage spans over several regions (or countries);
2. When several heritages are assigned as a single heritage;
3. When several heritages are redundantly registered for a single area.

These issues often rise where heritages are designated and efforts are being made to resolve them. Integrated management measures are studied as a means to resolve these issues and can be a powerful weapon to resolve the issue of heritage management and reinforce the

competitiveness compared to other areas as international protected areas.

Then the next step is to contemplate the measures to resolve these issues. Many researchers and experts are repeating studies to resolve the issues, but I wish to discuss integrated management measures from the perspective of new governance and this paper discusses the characteristics and situations of government-centered management of international protected areas as the preceding process.

The character of nation-states has weakened with globalization and the functions and structures of traditional administration are shrinking with the increasing role of cyber space. Globalization has weakened national boundaries and expanded global governance to spread the slogan of 'smaller government, greater governance' among the advanced countries (Cleveland 1972; Frederickson; 2000; Peters1988;)³. This accords with the notion that it is no longer meaningful to resolve everything with the government alone and what is truly efficient is the operation through mutual cooperation between the government and the private sector.

The term new governance is used very frequently nowadays because of these social changes. The time of a society of citizens that conforms with the government decisions is over and now is the time when the general public takes charge of a part of the government to actively apply their opinions. In Korea, however, the power or scale of NGO is very minuscule compared to the western societies. Western societies such as the U.S. were founded and built on liberal democracy, so their NGOs are basically more natural with much greater funds compared to Korea. For this reason, the citizens can easily join the organizations and the NGOs can actively engage in the development and execution of policies. In Korea, on the other hand, the number of NGOs is limited and most of them are small in scale.

This makes it difficult for the citizens to directly participate in the integrated management of international protected areas as a group of decision-makers. The management of international protected areas inevitably requires the participation of local residents. In case of Jeju Island, in particular, the entire island is designated as an international protected area and many people are residing in it. Although their participation is desperately needed, participation is actually difficult because of the many restrictions mentioned above. Also, the importance of an upward management model is emphasized for the many reports or policies on integrated management, but many only repeat the fact that 'active participation of residents is necessary' without any specific mention as to 'how to induce

civil participation.'

Under these circumstances, integrated management based on new governance is absolutely necessary. Korea still does not have any NGOs that are as active and powerful as those of the western societies and the government has taken charge of the management of international protected areas. Then it is necessary to explore how government-centered management has taken place before considering integrated management in terms of new governance. Thus, this paper mainly discusses the role of the government and the process of integrated management as a preceding step for the study on integrated management in terms of new governance.

C. Methodology

This study discusses Jeju Island's integrated management plan and the integrated management plans of Ukraine, Slovakia, and Germany for an Engler Beech forest. These areas have constantly attracted the attention of IUCN and UNEP that are internationally accredited and have made ongoing efforts for integrated management. In case of Jeju Island, it is redundantly assigned as three heritages and needs an appropriate management plan for each heritage. The case of Ukraine, Slovakia, and Germany is where a single heritage is designated for the three countries and the heritage uniquely has several spots of importance within, requiring an appropriate solution for integrated management more than any other areas. By comparing the two areas, this study discusses the characteristics of each case to examine what Jeju Island actually needs and the results of comparison will be applied to a future study on the integrated management of international protected areas in terms of new governance.

Comparing the two areas, several factors were selected as the scales of evaluation considering that these two groups are still in the toddler stage of integrated management plans.

First, it is planning. This study discusses how the two groups have selected the responsible organizations for integrated management, the background of selection, and the process of integrated management.

Second, it is staffing. This is essential for the management of selected areas, but there are some cases where the integrated management plan has a blueprint and other cases that have not reached that stage just yet. The cases where the plans have been organized, those resources will be used. For the other cases, staffing will be compared based on the current availability.

Third, it is budgeting. Budgeting is as important

4) Seok Jun Kim et al., 2000 recitation.

as staffing. Securing funds is essential for the protection of each area and the operation of manpower. Therefore, each area's funding methods and funding for integrated management will be discussed.

These three scales are the basic factors for international protected areas' integrated management and are absolutely necessary. Therefore, the two areas will be compared based on the three scales to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each area and help both areas with the development of integrated management plans.

Comparison and Analysis of Integrated Management Cases

A. Planning

As Jeju Island was registered as Biosphere Reserve in 2002, World Natural Heritage in 2007, and World Geopark in 2010, it achieved the three areas of UNESCO's natural science designations. The heritages have many things in common, but various problems were derived in the process of management because of the differences in area and purpose, thus the needs for integrated management have risen.

Jeju Special Self-governing Province, as all may know, has a very powerful natural environment and the quality of its environment is highly superb with most parts designated as international protected areas. Also, the brand power of Jeju Island is on the top among the tourist attractions of Korea as it has been named one of the seven great natural landscapes by New Seven Wonders in addition to the three designations of UNESCO. This is very helpful for attracting tourists, and the number of tourists in Jeju Island is actually increasing year after year. However, we should explore and consider the weaknesses or threats as it is necessary to reduce the risks as much as possible when establishing integrated management plans for each heritage. As Jeju is an island, it has both strengths and weaknesses compared to other areas. The biggest weakness is that its environmental capacity easily meets the limit with the constant increase in the number of tourists or residents because of its limited territories. With its selection for various international protected areas, Jeju Island has attracted countless tourists, but Jeju's ecosystem has confronted its limit as the number of tourists and residents have increased without any preparation to accommodate all of the tourists. Jeju Island is currently undergoing unprecedentedly rapid changes and a crisis because of various reasons, e.g., sharp increase in tourists, lack of related laws and regulations, lack of social infrastructure such as

roads, airports, and ports, lack of awareness of local residents, increasing surface of seawater due to global warming, and climate changes affecting the habitats of various species.

Under these circumstances, Jeju Special Self-governing Province is developing various strategies to overcome them based on the SWOT analysis to stress the strengths and eliminate the weaknesses and risks. According to the strategies following Jeju Special Self-governing Province's SWOT analysis, the key is to bring the culture, maritime, and other related fields together for protection and expansion and make a comprehensive approach to establish integrated management plans.

Currently, Jeju Island is on an unmatched place with no competitor in the natural science field because it has achieved the Triple Crown in natural science. For this reason, an integrated management should include cultural heritages with a broader scope to grow into the world's top model area. Jeju Island also has Chilmeoridang Yeongdeunggut registered as a World Cultural Heritage in addition to the field of natural science and is working to register the Haenyeo (female divers) culture or 4.3 as new heritages. Its request has been supported as Jeju Stone Walls have been registered as an agricultural heritage.

On top of the integration with cultural heritages, Jeju Island is currently planning to utilize the maritime resources along with the natural resources on the ground. Most of the resources on the ground are already designated and protected as international protected areas and the development and utilization of the ground area of Jeju Island are likely to meet the limit in the near future. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that it is close to the limit. For this reason, Jeju Island is currently seeking a new path by developing its maritime resources. The development and utilization of maritime resources can greatly contribute to Jeju Island's fishery industry and to the registration of the Haenyeo Culture as World Cultural Heritage.

The integrated management plan for the primitive forest of Engler Beech in the Carpathian Mountains and the ancient Engler Beech forest in Germany ("the Engler Beech forest") has been discussed since when the heritage was first registered in 2007. At that time, the primitive forest of Engler Beech in Germany was not included when the forests in Ukraine and Slovakia were registered, causing the two countries to discuss the issue. It was only recently when the three countries including Germany signed an agreement for integrated management.

The countries have undergone appropriate steps for this area's integrated management and their efforts are still on the way. The progress of integrated management plans for the Engler Beech

forest is as shown:

- ① Adjustment and cooperation for activities in the protected area: This is a premise for “integrated management.” In case of this area, unlike Jeju Island, a single heritage spans more than one country, so it is necessary to clarify who is responsible for the management. For this reason, the first step of this area's integrated management plans was adjustment and cooperation.
- ② Most efficient protection of the area: This is the ultimate purpose of integrated management plans. Integrated management plans involve the measures for best management of the targets. For this reason, the second step is clarifying and understanding the purpose.
- ③ Sustainable resource management for the buffer areas and the surrounding areas: The management of natural resources should be more delicate and organic than any other areas of management. In this step, a buffer zone is established to manage the target area more efficiently and more safely, aiming to organically connect the target area and the buffer zone to build an ecosystem that is operated naturally within the boundaries. Also, the buffer zone should be used appropriately to secure a sustainable source of income.
- ④ Organizations and human resources: For sustainable management of heritages, the system should operate for multifaceted aspects, including building a database, monitoring, and creating a profit structure using appropriate resources. Sufficient manpower should be secured for this process.
- ⑤ Education and awareness for environment: As mentioned above, legal restrictions or support are not the only ways to protect the heritages. Legislating laws may be effective for a while, but it would not last long without the local people's awareness. Guiding the local people to have pride in the heritages and have a sense of ownership is more important than building a legal frame. The most effective way to change the awareness is education, so this step emphasizes the education to change the local people's awareness.

B. Staffing

Currently, Jeju World Natural Heritage Center, which takes charge of studying the integrated

management of Jeju Island's international protected areas, consists of six departments with 76 members including the president. The arrangements and responsibilities of each department are as follows:

Being operated in six independent departments, Jeju World Natural Heritage Center has special responsibilities for each department. Considering the departments focusing on various policies and researches on heritage management and the departments for management and operation, the World Heritage Policy Department–Heritage Policies, Biosphere Reserve Research Department, Bioresource Research Department, and Forestry Environment Research Department engage in establishing policies, monitoring, and promotion, while the World Heritage Policy Department–Heritage Center Management, Natural Heritage Management Department, and Arboretum Operation Department engage in managing the tickets in each area and the vegetation and surrounding areas of the heritage area. In case of the organization, there are 31 members in the policy·research areas and 44 in the management·operation areas with 1.5 times more members assigned to the management over policies and research.

Among the policy and research members, 11 are assigned to the World Natural Heritages of UNESCO and seven are assigned to the Biosphere Reserves and Global Geoparks, manifesting that more importance is put on the World Natural Heritages for the actual management.

The Engler Beech forest is still managed separately by each country. As the discussion on integrated management is still in the early stage, the countries are management it independently. Each of those countries' management manpower is as follows:

In case of Ukraine, a total of 310 people are engaging in the job including those working in the surrounding buffer zones. Among them, about 200 are focusing on the protection of forests. The numerical records alone show that Ukraine is operating a large number of manpower for the protection of the area. On the other hand, Slovakia manages the area with only a small number of people. Slovakia's manpower for the management of heritage area is only 24. Among them, 16 are scientists, ecologists, management staff, and researchers. The remaining eight are the park rangers patrolling the area with the help of 32 volunteers. They might not seem enough compared to Ukraine, but most of them are professionally trained to manage the areas professionally with the latest equipment.

Germany divides the area into five sections and assigns management staff to each section. All of them are experienced experts and take charge of each section for the protection of heritages and education of visitors. The following table lists the

number of staff assigned to manage each section of the primitive Engler Beech forest in Germany.

〈Table 1〉 The number of staff in Beech Forest (Germany)

Area	Numbers	
Jasmund National Park	18	11 certified nature&Landscape guides 2 administrative officials 3 graduate forest engineers 1 marine biologist
Serrahn National Park	18	2 graduate forest engineers 8 rangers(certified nature&Landscape guides) 8 forest managers
Grumsin site	8	4 nature watch employees 1 forest engineer 1 district forester 2 certified landscape guides
Hainich National Park	35	2 district directors 8 administrative employees 25 forest rangers(some nature&landscape managers) (150 trained volunteer nature guides)
Kellerwald-Edersee National Park	26	6 graduate forest engineers 1 biologist 1 agriculturist 18 rangers (forest managers with nature & landscape manager qualification)
Total	105	

Source : UNEP & WCMC, 2011.

Germany has assigned different teams of manpower to manage each section and makes efforts to ensure professional and effective management by assigning monitoring staff and professional researchers in addition to the simple management staff for the protection of the heritage areas. Also, most related staff members are professionals with related licenses and experiences and even the volunteer guides are assigned to jobs after completing related training.

C. Budgeting

Considering the relative evaluation results of Jeju World Natural Heritage Center's Final Reports in 2014, current budgeting for the international protected areas is still not enough and there is still no specific profit model based on the corresponding area's ecological service functions. This means that the current management of international protected areas is funded by the local or center government with no income from admissions to the international

protected areas. The following shows how the management of Jeju Island's international protected areas is funded:

〈Table 2〉 Protection and Funding for Jeju Island's international protected areas

Protected · Managed Areas	Financial Support		Remarks
	Central Government	Jeju Special Self-governing Province	
World Natural Heritage	Management for national cultural heritages – World Natural Heritage Center	Funding	Mt. Halla National Park is funded fully or partially by Jeju Island.
Biosphere Reserves	Support for UNESCO Biosphere Reserves	Funding	
Global Geoparks	No support for Global Geoparks in National Parks	Funding	
Ramsar Wetlands	Subsidies by the Ministry of Environment		

Source: Jeju World Natural Heritage Center, 2014. Tae Yoon Kim, 2012.

The table above shows the financial support for the four heritage areas Jeju Island has set for integrated management. Only the World National Heritages and Ramsar Wetlands are funded by the central government. In case of the World National Heritages, it is governed by the Cultural Heritage Protection Act to be managed as national cultural heritages, while Ramsar Wetlands area financially supported by the Wetlands Preservation Act and the Natural Environment Preservation Act. In case of the Biosphere Reserves and the Global Geoparks, on the other hand, there is no relevant legal evidence to secure the financial support of the central government. It seems that the lack of legal systems is one of the reasons why the management of heritage areas is centered around the World Natural Heritages. Therefore, it is urgent to enact new local regulations that apply to all heritage areas for the two heritage areas that are currently not protected by law for successful integrated management plans.

Also, it is important to establish a profit model using the ecological services of the two unsupported area. One of the major functions of Biosphere Reserves or Global Geoparks is to use the resources to achieve sustainable economic

development, and Global Geoparks allow their farm produce to be distributed with the Global Geopark mark to contribute to the local economy.

Not only that, Jeju Island has settled as a tourism landmark that attracts many local and foreign tourists, and it is necessary to establish an appropriate profit model to use the admissions fees to fund the management of protected areas.

The major source of funding for JMC which was jointly established by Slovakia and Ukraine was the two countries' national budgets. The two countries organized JMC for joint management of the protected areas and supported 25,000 EUR each year for its activities. For additional funds, if necessary, they grant more funds from national or local budgets. In case there are special projects or plans, they also request international budgets from the organizations such as EU Funds. The biggest characteristic of JMC budget is that any funds for special projects or plans are paid separately in addition to the annual budget of 25,000 EUR.

Also, the Engler Beech forest was expanded in 2011 with the participation of Germany. The preparatory process required about 12 million EUR and the additional funds were secured by the EU Program, local governments, Natural Conservation Organization, and other donations.

Suggestions

Both cases of Jeju Island and the Engler Beech forest of the Carpathian share in common that the integrated management plans are more desperately needed than any other areas, but they have many differences in various aspects. Therefore, it is difficult to compare them directly. Nonetheless, it is necessary to refer to other regions' cases and take advantage of them in the process of developing a right model as there is no "integrated management model for international protected areas" anywhere in the world and it is still in the toddler stage.

As a result of comparison with the Engler Beech forest of the Carpathian, Jeju Island seems to be much ahead in term of the integrated management planning. As responsible organizations in Jeju are brought together for comprehensive management for the primary management, there is no need to establish new organizations, unlike the Engler Beech forest. If the current systems are improved to correct the weaknesses, it would be easier to establish the integrated management plans.

Considering the two areas' for the progress of integrated management planning or the current management, Jeju Island's biggest weaknesses are staffing and budgeting. Currently, only the

5) ...Projects such as habitat reconstruction and ecotourism development will be funded separately...(UNEP&WCMC, 2011)

World Natural Heritages and Ramsar Wetlands of Jeju Island are receiving budgets from the central government by law and the Global Geoparks and the Biosphere Reserves are not funded due to the lack of legal protection. These circumstances seem to have affected staffing as Jeju Island is currently short in the number of management staffs or experts compared to the Engler Beech forest of the Carpathian.

Considering these circumstances, what is most important at this moment for the integrated management planning is enacting the laws and regulations to integrate and support the heritages. If each of the heritages are managed and funded by different central offices, the heritages would not be managed equally and any budgeting regulations for the Global Geoparks or Biosphere Reserves would only be temporary. Budgeting or management for the heritages would still remain unequal over time in this way.

Currently, Jeju Island is promoting detailed strategies in various related areas based on the "2020 Jeju World Environmental Capital Basic Plans." When executing the plans, Jeju Island's current titles for World Natural Heritages, Global Geoparks, Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Wetlands, and Seven Wonders of Nature will be the powerful weapons for Jeju Island to successfully achieve its goals. In order to use and manage these weapons more efficiently, it is essential and inevitable to establish the heritages' integrated management measures. Therefore, what should be done first for the development of Jeju's local community is to communicate and negotiate with the central government to enact integrated laws for Jeju to achieve its goals with the integrated management measures.

Conclusion

The three heritages currently possessed by Jeju Island have three different points of importance. World Natural Heritages pursue conservation, while Global Geoparks aims at both 'protection' and sustainable development with appropriate use. In case of Biosphere Reserves, it contributes to the local economy through conservation and use. There are clear differences in the use of each type of heritage. Nevertheless, the value which the three types of heritages aim to protect is the same. It is protecting the global 'value' of the corresponding region.

Integrated management plans for international protected areas are not simple enough to be established overnight. As the history of integrated management is not very long despite that it is essentially needed, undergoing countless trials and

errors is natural. We have accumulated experience through the many mistakes and trials and errors and the final report was made in December 2014. What is most important for this process is having the right 'standards.' The standards would be established by enacting the laws and regulations that can be managed in integration. The heritages would be managed more efficiently if they are equally managed under a single legal system.

Another thing to consider outside the systems is that the heritage conservation policy of Jeju Island should be upward, not downward. In fact, sustainable conservation can be achieved, and the policies for the protection of our homeland would last a long time, only when the conservation policies are led by the people living on the island and the people can have a sense of ownership for the national territories.

Jeju Island is an island, and its characteristics have made Jeju a unique place distinguished from the mainland of the Korean Peninsula. It has also created its unique 'culture.' Designating Jeju as a global heritage means designating the home and culture of Jeju people as a heritage. Therefore, we should have pride in it and beautify and fertilize this land to be able to leave a more beautiful Jeju for our descendants.

References

- Elisa, A. Gfeller(2013), "Negotiating the meaning of global heritage: cultural landscapes in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, 1972-92", *Journal of Global History* Vol.8, pp.483-503.
- Kim, C. S.(2001), "Jeju's Environment and Biosphere Reserve", *Jeju-do* Vol. 105, Seoul: Daeyoung Book Co.
- Eurosite(2011), "Report on Carpathian Biosphere Reserve and Uzhanskyi National Nature Park team participation in the workshop Adaptive Management Workshop: using the CMP Open Standards for the practice of conservation", Eurosite.
- Frederickson, H. G.(2000), "The Repositioning of American Public Administration", Paper presented at the Special Seminar in the Ewha Womans University.
- Jo, H. S.(2013), "Basic concepts of the world heritage convention: on outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity", Department of Cultural Properties, Graduate School of Hannam University.
- Kim, H. J.(2007), "Landscape analysis of Mt. Halla national park in a biosphere reserve, Jeju island: core area fragmentation", Department in Biology, Graduate school of Sungshin Women's University.
- Jeju Development Institute(2006), "Plan for Vitalization of investment attracting in Jeju", Jeju: Jeju Development Institute.
- Jeju National Museum(2005), "Korean World Heritages to UNESCO", Seoul: SeoKyung Book Co.
- Jeju Special Self-Governing Province(2003), "Jeju Biosphere Reserve", Jeju: Jeju Special Self-Governing Province.
- Jeju Special Self-Governing Province(2004), "Story of Beautiful Ecology : Jeju Biosphere Reserve", Jeju: Jeju Special Self-Governing Province.
- Kumaran, M., Jeong, D. Y.(2012), "The Rise of Jeju as a Global Model Environmental Hub: The Confluence of Nature, People, Government, Corporations and the NGO Sector", *World Environment and Island Studies* Vol.2, No.1.
- Guy, P. B.(1988), "Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 8:223-43.
- Kim, S. J.(2000), "Study of New-Governance", Seoul: Daeyoung Book Co.
- Kim, T. K.(2005), "Local Governance for Environmental Management: Focus on Dilemma Solving-Political Process for Determination of Nuclear Waste Treatment Place in Buan", *Journal of Environmental Studies* Vol.43, pp.307-321.
- Kim, T. Y.(2003), "Study of Efficient Management Plan for Jeju Biosphere Reserve", Jeju: Jeju Development Institute.
- Kim, T. Y.(2012), "Study for Effective management of Internationally Protected Areas in Jeju Special Self-Governing Province", Jeju: Jeju Development Institute.
- Schmitt, T. M.(2009), "Global Cultural Governance; Decision-Making Concerning World Heritage Between Politics and Science", *Erdkunde* Vol 63, No.2.
- UNEP & WCMC(2011), "Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forest of Germany", UNEP & WCMC.

Receiving Date: May 3, 2016

Reviewing Date: May 17 & 24, 2016

Reporting Date of Article Appearance: May 25, 2016

