

Chairman's word:**COMMON RESEARCH DESIGN**

COST Action E19 consists of two working groups. WG1 addresses the basic factors determining a substantive NFP, while WG2 concerns the factors supporting or impeding a substantive NFP. From the outset of the Action the need existed to co-ordinate the work of these two working groups because both depend upon the output of the other. For example, WG2 must have a clear understanding of substantive NFPs and their constituent elements, but this is the topic of WG1. Similarly, WG1, in examining the influences affecting the basic elements of NFPs, requires the output of WG2, e.g. with respect to financial incentives, as well as political culture or land tenure considerations. The solution to this dilemma to date are the background papers on participation (Marie Appelstrand), inter-sectoral co-ordination (Karl Hogl), iterative planning (Johan Barstad) and decentralisation (Ine Neven). These papers (see <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/papers.htm>) are not only important for the work of WG2, but also help to focus the work. The mutual learning between the working groups should be encouraged by plenary sessions in future meetings at which the results of both WGs can be exchanged and discussed. As the background papers link the work of both WGs they may be useful as a starting point of the final report.

Two meetings took place in 2001: one in Aberdeen, hosted by Hugh Miller, and the other one in Oslo, hosted by Olav Gislerud. It is my pleasure to thank both colleagues for the excellent organisation and the exciting atmosphere provided. The papers on the legal aspects of NFPs have already been published in proceedings, edited by Willi Zimmermann and Franz Schmithüsen (see below); the Oslo papers will appear in the proceedings series of EFI. Both meetings were milestones in the development of a workable research design for E19. WG 1 successfully reviewed and finalised its methodological approach and was also adopted by WG 2. The considerable time required to achieve consensus concerning the research procedure reflects the challenges of inter-disciplinary co-operation in international research networks. This is not at all unusual as the good assessment of Action E19 shows (see <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/reports.htm>).

The work of Action E19 may benefit from the following events. The Second MCPFE Workshop on NFPs, held on 2-3 July 2001 in Lillehammer, Norway, confirmed that NFPs should be addressed at the 4th Ministerial Conference. It recommended the convening of a preparatory group for this purpose, and this will meet from 23 to 26 April 2003 in Riga,

Latvia. Further, the EU-FAIR project "Multifunctional Forestry as a Means for Rural Development" is close to its termination and may deliver interesting insights into the role of forests in rural areas (see Freerk Wiersum below). Finally, the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry has finished its work and published the working paper "Public participation in forestry in Europe and North America" in 2000 (ISBN 92-2-112268-9).

Peter Glück

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1

Working Group 1, in its effort to specify the basic elements and procedural requirements of NFPs, is dealing with four *conceptual essentials* of NFPs, namely participatory approaches, collaborative approaches, intersectoral approaches, and procedural approaches.

In its methodological design WG1 proceeds on the assumption that COST Action E19 has two main groups of addressees: (1) the *scientific community* and (2) the *political community*. Correspondingly, two types of products can be delivered:

- for the scientific community "bold" hypotheses and interesting research questions, i.e. gaps in the current state of knowledge;
- for the political community decision-support by means of scientific statements based on theory and/or empirical evidence.

To cope with these tasks, WG1 intends to elaborate a list of *propositions*. These propositions are based on *theory-oriented research papers* and *experience reports* presented by the members of the WG as well as on the subsequent discussions.¹

Results from the Aberdeen meeting, which was dedicated to participation in a NFP context:

In Aberdeen, three presentations were meant to provide additional theoretical insights: Tove Boon (Denmark) raised the question whether it is possible to "Govern forestry by means of participation"; Lena Hytonen (Finland) presented selected results of a literature review on "Participatory planning tools in forestry decision-making in Finland"; finally, Peter Elsasser (Germany) reflected upon "Negotiation rules within participatory processes and their possible influence on the content of a NFP".

¹ All papers are to be included in the proceedings prepared by the organisers; contact: h.g.miller@abdn.ac.uk and olav.gislerud@forskningsradet.no. The complete list of propositions is included in the WG minutes.

In six further presentations, *national experiences* with participatory approaches in relation to forest policy planning were presented: Spain – Gloria Domínguez, the Netherlands – Evelien Verbij, Belgium – Noel Lust, Germany – Frank Hofmann, Norway – Johan Barstad, and Scotland – Hugh Miller. In the discussions, the presentations were refined and supplemented with additional theoretical and empirical findings. The following statements are only an exemplary selection of the results of this exchange of ideas.

- The NFP process in Finland showed, for example, that the main outcomes of such processes are often legitimacy and political commitment, mutual information on values and preferences of interested actors, and the mobilisation of additional knowledge and expertise.
- Several participants stressed that participation at the local level is not the same as participation at the national level because both the problem structure (managerial vs. strategic) and the involved stakeholders (“concerned” citizens vs. organised interest groups) are different. So in the case of the UK there is a strong tradition for broad and intensive consultations with interest group representatives, but the situation gets more complicated as soon as less “empowered”, local people are to be involved.
- Stakeholder groups are more likely to leave the “bargaining table” when there’s no clear *code of conduct* (which, for example, regulates how to deal with minority votes). Moreover, if such a code of conduct is not developed *within* the group it may not be accepted by the relevant actors.
- The Spanish case suggested that NFP processes will be accepted more broadly by the actors involved when the process is moderated (or at least co-ordinated) by an independent, i.e. non-biased, third party.
- There also seems to be a tight connection between the degree of participation on the one hand and the level of organisation of actors on the other hand: When people get involved into participatory processes they frequently start to “organise” themselves. At the same time, a higher level of organisation can make participation processes more efficient.
- As soon as a NFP process is under way, it is important to have its outputs and outcomes assessed by a well-elaborated system of monitoring, evaluation and feed-back. This usually promotes learning, which brings common understanding through active participation and means that actors change their behaviour, values and attitudes.

Karl Hogl & Michael Pregernig

Results from the Oslo meeting, which was dedicated to collaborative approaches in a NFP context:

In Oslo, four presentations were meant to provide additional *theoretical insights*: Margaret Shannon (USA) presented her paper about “Collaboration”; Johan Barstad (Norway) explained that “partnership” should be considered as an aspect of collaboration; Jürgen Pretzsch (Germany) presented a communication about joint decision-making with multiple actors and finally Karl Hogl (Austria) reflected upon problems and proposals for solution in relation to multi-level Co-ordination.

In three further presentations, *national experiences* with collaborative approaches in relation to forest policy planning were presented by Ilpo Tikkanen (Finland), Piotr Paschalis (Poland) and Josef Hackl who talked about adaptive collaboration and conditions like social relevance of the theme, clear mandate and adequate resources (Austria).

The following statements are only an exemplary selection of the results of the exchange of ideas in smaller sub-groups:

- Adaptive collaboration planning/management is based on an iterative learning process between multiple stakeholders, requiring clear institutional rules.
- The clearer the mandate of collaborative group the higher the chances for successful discussion (task as well as legitimacy, the latter may come from public authorities or bottom up).
- The group needs a well developed and balanced concept for the elaboration process. This includes balanced background information and options for gathering new information and flexibility for sustaining momentum.
- Requirements for successful partnership are: common understanding of the goals and objectives on different levels; more clearly identified roles of the actors to have higher partnerships probability of success; an administrative structure; commitment and that the partnership is rooted in; stable relations over time; an optimal representation in relation to mandate and tasks; competence on process-working in the partnership; an open exchange of information; and that partners benefit from taking part in the partnership.
- The willingness to enter into partnership is dependent on the partners believing there will be a positive-sum game.
- Too much emphasis is placed on tasks and results and too little on how humans interact.
- The template for collaboration covers: use a participatory approach for social inquiry; create deliberative forums for social learning; create collaborative forums for social learning; create collaborative capacity through joint action; and

create governance capacity through institution building.

- The capacity for organisation learning depends upon the nature of relationships among actors and the type of communication characteristics of these relationships.
- The greater the opportunities for collaborative deliberation, the greater the capacity for social learning and joint action.
- Co-ordination by pure intergovernmental negotiations runs the risk: to exclude highly relevant but conflicting issues; to end up in agreements reflecting the lowest common denominator; and/or to end up in vague terms.
- The more possibilities to agree on inter-sectoral package deals do exist, the higher the chance for common agreement.
- Overall complexity of multi-level processes can be reduced by territorial differentiation of arenas and applying bi- or tri-lateral modes of co-ordination rather than multi-lateral settings.

The mixture of theory-oriented papers and national experience reports since the Aberdeen meeting turned out to be quite a fruitful approach. Therefore the set-up will be kept up in the up-coming meetings.

Ine Neven

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2

Things to look for in the coming sessions of WG 2:

In the coming meetings, the effort to move the discussions towards an *integrated framework* (conceptual and operational) for the whole action will be increased. Therefore, more time will be allocated to joint WG 1+2 discussions. In order to facilitate the effectiveness in coming up with substantive propositions, the discussions in WG 2 will be split in small groups according to the two topics in the agenda, each one assisted by a group of volunteer moderators and note takers.

Concerning the development of an integrated framework based on *theoretical sound* and *operationally useful* concepts, one contribution from the WG2 proceedings was discussed in the Aberdeen meeting and described in the respective minutes, available in the web site (see <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/meetings.htm>). An example of such type of *integrative* concept taken from that framework is "*implementability*". Given the fact that, in most of the countries, the NFP processes have not yet fully reached the implementation stage, implementability conditions are the most relevant features to focus on, at this stage. This is also a forward looking and operationally useful concept relevant for the coming stages of the NFP processes where implementation successes or failures will certainly be the major issues at stake. Focusing on "*implementability*" means to

examine the way the "essential elements" of NFPs (WG1 main task) and the "supporting and impeding factors of NFPs" (WG2 main task) are considered and related, at the policy formulation stage, in view of actually meeting the NFP targets (sustainable forest management). Future developments of social systems are very difficult to anticipate, but some successes and failures at the policy implementation stage can be anticipated by looking at some implementability issues such as the following:

- do the NFPs targets have *appropriate* (controllable, in sufficient number, with sufficient material and human resources, addressing the adequate targets, well integrated, etc.) *means of implementation* (financial and institutional instruments, legal regulations, secure tenure rights, etc.)?
- is the social (degree of participation) and sectoral (degree of intersectoral coordination) scope of the forest policy making process likely to be effective in promoting *individual rationality* (willingness to participate in the NFP process) by the major stakeholders and in preventing *opportunistic behaviours* impeding the attainment of the NFP targets?
- does the NFP process contain *corrective and adaptive mechanisms* (transparent monitoring, assessment and review processes, conflict resolution schemes, etc.) capable of coping with problems which might arise at the two levels mentioned above (relations between targets and means of implementation, stakeholders' behaviours with respect to the NFP targets), and dealing with changes in the NFP environment?

Américo M. S. Carvalho Mendes

BOOK OF NATIONAL REPORTS ON NFPS

After going through extensive peer review from members of the Action and pilot reports prepared by delegates from Finland and Switzerland, the framework for national reporting was finalised and distributed to COST Action E19 members in November 2001.

The challenge faced during the drafting process was how to design a common methodology that would enable meaningful comparison across countries, while also allowing the uniqueness of individual countries' experiences to be told.

The solution was two-fold. First, guidance and suggestions are offered to guide authors on the topics they might want to address. Section notes' appear under the section headings (which are based on the COST Action E19 work plan and cover supporting and impeding factors, and the four core elements of a NFP). There are also several 'question prompts' for each section, again with supporting notes. 'Section notes' and 'question notes' have been drawn from

work within the Action. They are intended to be suggestive rather than prescriptive. It is unlikely that any one country will find all the notes useful, though all should certainly find some notes useful. Second, where an author has a particularly interesting story to tell, that author may be 'exempt' from certain sections. However the intention is that exemptions will be the exception rather than the rule, and that they will be agreed in advance between the author of the country report and the editor of the book (David Humphreys). This framework has thus been designed to provide a clear, common methodology while also leaving plenty of scope for the judgement of individual authors.

An important feature of the framework is its emphasis on synergies and innovations: how do the combinations of policy tools in a NFP enhance the realisation of sustainable forest management? By adopting the COST Action E19 work plan the framework is also applicable to COST Action E19 countries that have not set in motion a formal NFP process.

A proposal to publish the book of national reports has been submitted to Earthscan (London). A decision will be taken at the next meeting of the Earthscan Publications Committee in late-March. If you have any queries on the framework for national reporting please contact: d.r.humphreys@open.ac.uk

David Humphreys

SPECIAL ISSUE OF FOREST POLICY AND ECONOMICS

Professor Max Krott, the Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Forest Policy and Economics*, has kindly agreed for a special issue of the journal to be devoted to the work of COST Action E19. The issue will be published in 2003 and the guest editors will be Peter Glück and David Humphreys. Each paper will be reviewed by two independent referees.

The level of support for the special issue has been very encouraging. Thank you to the following who have agreed to write papers; Marie Appelstrand, John Bowers, Américo MS Carvalho Mendes, Peter Elsasser, Karl Höggl, Aigar Kallas, Cristina Montiel and Luis Galiana, Margaret Shannon, Heiner Schanz and Johannes Voitleithner. Amongst the subjects that the papers cover are public participation, multi-level coordination, economic theory, legal regulations, Mediterranean forests and Estonian forest policy.

The papers therefore offer a rich mixture of theory and case study. The special issue promises to be an important showcase for the work of COST Action E19 that will reach a worldwide audience.

David Humphreys

MULTIFUNCTIONAL FORESTRY AS A MEANS TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural development concerns the strengthening of the liveability in rural areas by means of improving and/or restructuring the rural economy and by improving the rural identity. Forestry can contribute towards rural development by either stimulating improved or innovative production processes, providing an ecological infrastructure, or stimulating an attractive rural landscape.

The Multifor.RD research project investigates the multiple role of forests and forestry within rural development. The project is funded by the EU/FAIR programme and started in 1999. The objective is to make a comparative European study about the nature and dynamics of the landowners' and public's opinions towards forests and forestry and its relation to rural development. This information will be used to develop criteria for distinguishing regional-specific strategies for multifunctional forestry to serve rural development.

The research involves a series of comparative case studies in 9 European countries (Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands and Spain). In each country two case studies areas in a region representing a traditional forest region and a region with new forests resulting from recent afforestation were selected at a level of a local administrative unit and range from 10.000 – 40.000 ha in size. In six countries a qualitative survey was carried out to collect information about the kind of mental models of representation people have of the study areas and its desired future and the role forests play in it, as well as the cultural and regional explanations for these opinions. The findings of this qualitative survey were elaborated in a quantitative survey in 9 European countries. This survey had three aims:

1. to assess the quantitative distribution of the opinions of different stakeholders with regard to multi-functional forestry in a rural development perspective.
2. to verify hypotheses derived from the results of the qualitative survey, concerning some characteristics of the different groups sharing different opinion.
3. to improve understanding about factors influencing the opinions of different stakeholders with regard to multifunctional forestry and rural development as found in the qualitative study.

In total 2,750 landowners and 4,900 community inhabitants completed the questionnaire; this meant an overall response rate of 46%.

Both a national and a European synthesis of research findings are under preparation and will be completed by the middle of 2002. For further information see <http://www.dow.wau.nl/multifor/>.

Freerk Wiersum

NFPS IN THE WORK OF THE MCPFE

The MCPFE has been working on a pan-European approach to nfps in Europe during the last two years. European countries consider nfps to be an important tool to promote sustainable forest management and to contribute to overall sustainable development.

Participation, inter-sectoral and holistic approach, iterative process with long-term commitment as well as capacity building were identified as elements and principles of particular relevance for nfp processes in Europe. In addition, a number of other elements and principles were considered as relevant. The common view of MCPFE participants on the meanings and dimensions of each of these elements and principles of nfps in Europe was laid down in a draft MCPFE paper.

As a next step a preparatory group will be convened to further deepen the common approach of the MCPFE to nfps in Europe. In addition, a recommendation on how to address nfps with a view to the 4th Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, 28-30 April 2003 should be given.

Peter Mayer, Liaison Unit Vienna, MCPFE

EXPERIENCES FROM SHORT TERM SCIENTIFIC MISSIONS (STSM)

Since the last newsletter Cristina Montiel (Spain), Attila Lengyel (Hungary) and Johan Barstad (Norway) took the chance of a STSM abroad. In the following Cristina Montiel and Johan Barstad describe their experiences.

Cristina Montiel carried out a STSM for one week to the Agricultural and Environmental Engineering Research Center in France (CEMAGREF, Aix-en-Provence Centre) in December 2001. The main objective of the STSM was to identify the present priorities in forest policy in Mediterranean regions of Europe and to learn more about their insertion in national/regional forest programmes (N/RFPs) by the French example. The host institution arranged meetings with regional forestry stakeholders and authorities and facilitated the review of documents of forest planning and policy regarding the Mediterranean French environment. In brief, one benefit of this STSM is a list of common propositions for the Mediterranean regions in order to facilitate the formulation of N/RFPs and to improve their efficacy. Additionally, this STSM allowed her to strengthen the European network of researchers.

Johan Barstad carried out two STSMs, each for one week: the first to Scotland, hosted by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, University of Aberdeen in October 2000, and the latter to Austria (Vienna), hosted by the Institute for Forest Sector Policy and Economics, University of Agricultural

Sciences Vienna in October 2001. During the Scottish Mission he got to be present at the presentation of the Scottish Forest Strategy, and in Vienna he got to be an observer at the MCPFE Expert Level meeting. The objective of the STSM was much the same in both cases: through interviews and discussions with scientists and practitioners to learn more about how the issue of NFPs and accompanying issues such as criteria and indicators, participation and planning systems were handled. Another important objective was the fact that going on a STSM enabled him to make contact with highly qualified scientists, key-people in ministries etc. that are extremely important for a researcher when establishing international networks. Regarding both objectives, the STSMs have proved highly successful. Returning home he brought back a number of interviews and discussions that will keep me busy for a long time as a source of information. Thus, the two STSMs has meant a qualitative leap for me in my own work.

NEXT MEETINGS AND SEMINARS

3-6 April 2002, Savonlinna, Finland: Management Committee and Working Groups combined with EFI Forest Policy Forum Seminar. See: <http://www.efi.fi/events/2002/coste19/>.

28-29 June 2002, Sopron, Hungary: Working Group 2.

7-9 November 2002, Porto, Portugal: Seminar, Management Committee and Working Groups.

envisaged 4-5 July 2003, Vienna, Austria: Concluding meeting, Management Committee and Working Groups.

Working Group meetings and Seminars are open to all interested researchers. For more information, please contact your national Management Committee representative.

Other NFP relevant meetings:

25-26 April 2002, Riga, Latvia: MCPFE meeting of the preparatory group on NFPs

PUBLICATIONS

Glück, P.; Solano Lopez, J. M.; Rojas-Briales, E.; Schanz, H.; Zimmermann, W. (Eds.) 2000: National Forest Programmes. Social and Political Context. Proceedings of the COST E19 Seminar, 18.-21. October 2000, Madrid, Spain. Ministerio de Medio Ambiente. Madrid. (CD-ROM)

Zimmermann, W.; Schmithüsen, F. (Eds.) 2002: Legal Aspects of National Forest Programmes. Papers Presented at the Meeting of COST E19, March 2001, Aberdeen, Scotland. Forest Science Contributions - Volume 25. Chair Forest Policy and Forest Economics. Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. Zürich.

ORGANISATION OF COST E19

Professor **Peter Glück** from the Agricultural University of Vienna BOKU, Austria is the Chairperson of the Action. Vice-chairperson of the Action is director **Heikki Pajuoja** from the Finnish Forest Research Institute, Vantaa Research Centre, Finland. He is also the editor of the Newsletter. Mrs **M.G.G. (Ine) Neven** from Alterra Green World Research, Netherlands, is the Chairperson for the Working Group 1 "Elements and procedural requirements of NFPs"; professor **Americo M.S.Carvalho Mendes** from Universidade Catolica Portuguesa, Portugal is the chairperson of Working Group 2 "Significance of NFPs as compared to other policy means" will be elected in Aberdeen. These four chairpersons form the Steering Committee of the Action. Professor **Noël Lust** from the University of Ghent, Belgium is the Tutor of the Action. Senior researcher **Harri Hänninen** from Finnish Forest Research Institute is the editor of www-homepage of the Action.

IMPORTANT LINKS

Homepage of the Action can be found at <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/>

More information about COST can be found at <http://COST.Cordis.LU/src/home.cfm>.

20 COUNTRIES HAVE SIGNED

Until now, 20 countries have confirmed their participation to the Action. These countries are:

Austria	Greece	Poland
Belgium	Hungary	Portugal
Cyprus	Ireland	Spain
Denmark	Italy	Sweden
Finland	Lithuania	Switzerland
France	Netherlands	United Kindom
Germany	Norway	

According to COST rules, it is possible to join the Action also later. Interested countries should declare their interest through their National COST Co-ordinator.

HOW RESEARCHERS CAN PARTICIPATE INTO COST E19?

Management Committee meetings. MC meets twice a year. There are one or two officially nominated MC delegates from each participating country.

Working Group meetings. COST E19 has two Working Groups: WG1 Elements and procedural requirements of NFPs, and WG2 Significance of NFPs. All interested researchers can participate into WG meetings. COST covers the travel expenses of one or two researchers per country.

Seminars. Seminars are open to all. COST can

cover the travel costs of invited speakers and maximum of 4 researchers per country.

Short-Term Scientific Missions. Young researchers from participating institutions can benefit COST funding up to EUR 1500 for a mission abroad into another participating COST E19 institution. The duration of a mission can be from three days to one month. COST funding for these activities is co-ordinated by National MC members and the Steering Committee. **At the moment there is no decision from the COST secretariat for continuing the funding of STSMs.**

National networks. Because of limited funding, all interested researchers may not be able to participate into COST meetings and seminars. It is therefore recommended that MC members create national networks in order to assure timely flow of information to all interested researchers and institutions.

CONTACTS

National delegates in the Management Committee are key persons for all inquiries about COST E19. They'll be glad to give further information.

AUSTRIA	Peter Glück , glueck@mail.boku.ac.at Josef Hackl , hackl@ubavie.gv.at
BELGIUM	Noël Lust , noel.lust@rug.ac.be
DENMARK	Finn Helles , fh@kvl.dk
FINLAND	Heikki Pajuoja , heikki.pajuoja@metla.fi Olli Saastamoinen , olli.saastamoinen@forest.joensuu.fi
FRANCE	Gerard Buttoud , buttoud@nancy-engref.inra.fr
GERMANY	Jürgen Pretzsch , pretzsch@forst.tu-dresden.de Karl-Reinhard Volz , volzkarl@ruf.uni-freiburg.de
GREECE	Dimitrios Trakolis , trakolis@fri.gr Alexandra Vakrou , alexandra.vakrou@cec.eu.int
HUNGARY	Karoly Meszaros , uzemtan@efe.hu
IRELAND	Diarmuid T. McAree , dtmcaree@indigo.ie John Gardiner , valerie.guilfoyle@ucd.ie
ITALY	Lorenzo Venzi , lvenzi@unitus.it
LITHUANIA	Stasys Mizaras , ekonsk@mi.lt
NETHERLANDS	Heiner Schanz , heiner.schanz@bhbk.bosb.wau.nl
NORWAY	Birger Solberg , birger.solberg@isf.nlh.no Olav Gislerud , olav.gislerud@forskningsradet.no
POLAND	Piotr Paschalis-Jakubowicz , paschalis@delta.sggw.waw.pl
PORTUGAL	Americo M.S. Carvalho Mendes , americo@porto.ucp.pt
SPAIN	Eduardo Rojas Briales , edrobr@prv.upv.es Jose Maria Solano Lopez , josemaria.solano@ctv.es
SWEDEN	Sven A Svensson , sven.a.svensson@svo.se
SWITZERLAND	Willi Zimmermann , willi.zimmermann@waho.ethz.ch
UNITED KINGDOM	David Humphreys , d.r.humphreys@open.ac.uk Hugh G. Miller , for239@abdn.ac.uk

Helsinki, 18 March 2002