

Edited Volume of National Reports

FRAMEWORK FOR NATIONAL REPORTING: AUTHORS' GUIDELINES

Prepared by the COST Action E19 Publications Task Force

November 2001

Acknowledgements

This framework has been through four drafts. It was commented on at a full meeting of the Action in March 2001 and a meeting of the Publications Task Force in Oslo in September 2001 where two countries – Finland and Switzerland – kindly presented pilot reports based on an earlier draft. Thanks to those who have submitted written comments: Peter Glück, Harri Hänninen, Karl Hogl, Ingrid Kissling, Américo Carvalho Mendes, Pekka Ollonqvist, Heikki Pajujoja, Michael Pregernig, Olli Saastamoinen, Heiner Schanz and Willi Zimmermann.

Queries and submissions

Queries on this framework should be addressed to David Humphreys:

- tel: +44-1908-654480
- fax: +44-1908-654488
- email: d.r.humphreys@open.ac.uk

Papers should be submitted electronically by email. Hard copies may be sent to:

Dr David Humphreys
Faculty of Social Sciences
Open University
Milton Keynes MK7 6AA
United Kingdom

Timetable

end December 2002	First drafts all country reports to be submitted to the editor. (To avoid bottlenecks it would be most helpful if some delegates could arrange for their drafts to be submitted before this date.)
end March 2003	Editor returns annotated drafts to country authors.
end June 2003	Country authors return full and final drafts to editor
end September 2003	Editor submits full manuscript to publishers
2004	Publication

Marketability of the book

The book will appeal to forest and government policy makers across Europe, both within and outside the EU. In addition, forest owners, NGO campaigners and businesses with a stake in forest management will also find the policy relevance of the book appealing. Given the interdisciplinary breadth of the authors the book will find a broad readership within the university sector for postgraduate and undergraduate students in environmental studies, forestry, development studies, geography, economics, law and policy studies. The various networks in which COST Action E19 members circulate should ensure that the book reaches a wide audience across Europe.

Introducing the framework

This document is intended to provide an overarching framework from which broad conclusions can be identified, while at the same time leaving authors free to draw their own conclusions based on their analysis of the unique situation within their country.

The framework is based on the COST Action E19 work plan and will involve analysis of supporting and impeding factors and the four core elements of a NFP, namely:

- participatory mechanisms
- negotiation and conflict resolution
- intersectoral approaches
- long term iterative processes.

As a group the Action represents a wide diversity of countries, each with different political, social, cultural and economic conditions. All countries will have a different story to tell. It is not the purpose of the book to allow each individual country to tell a story that has interesting historical value. The book will only produce generic advice for policy makers and policy analysts if authors make a conscious effort to adhere to the framework.

However it is also recognised that a tight overprescriptive framework can be counterproductive, hence authors are asked to adhere to the agreed framework *in the majority of cases*. The qualification ‘in the majority of cases’ is made so that the framework does not constrain national authors too heavily. The framework should allow authors to ‘breathe’ when writing their reports and not squeeze out the uniqueness of individual NFPs and the broader lessons they may offer for other countries. Hence if a particular country has a particularly unique story to tell then the relevant author(s) may ‘opt out’ of parts of the framework. For example, an author may wish to:

- describe and analyse in depth a novel type of economic instrument that may have future salience for other countries.
- describe and analyse in depth the synergies between different policy instruments and the four core elements
- use a particular methodology for writing the chapter (this methodology may have particular explanatory power for the country in question, while also offering useful lessons for others).

Hence where a country has a particularly important story to tell then the author in question may be exempt from certain parts of the framework. However authors are asked not to opt out of parts of the framework unilaterally. *Such exemptions should be agreed between the authors of the country report and the editor.* It is intended that such exemptions will be the exception rather than the rule, as clearly a high number of exemptions will prejudice the integrity of the general conclusions, which will be provided in the opening chapter. It is not intended that any single country will be exempt from *all* of the framework, only from certain mutually agreed parts of it.

This approach will allow encourage expression of our own individual strengths and also allow for discrete lessons to be drawn from individual countries. It will yield findings both of general applicability while drawing out wider lessons from the experiences of individual countries. It is, therefore, a distinctive approach with value in its own right that will allow us to meet the objectives of the Action ('to provide policy makers in Europe with improved means for formulating and implementing national forest programmes') using the full range of approaches and empirical material available to us.

The framework allows that a country may satisfy some core elements of a NFP, but not others. Indeed a country may have adhered to some or all of the core elements of a NFP *before* the IPF/IFF process produced its Proposals for Action. In other words, there may be some relevant research material dating to the period before the mid-1990s. The mere fact that a country may at present be formulating – on a formal level – a NFP does not necessarily mean that all of its previous forest policy experience is irrelevant to the NFP concept. Indeed discussions in the Action suggest that countries without a NFP have engaged with the NFP concept (see box below).

This framework also applies to countries without a NFP

Not all COST Action E19 countries have set in motion a formal NFP process (for example, the Netherlands).

The framework has been designed to apply to *all* COST Action E19 countries, both those who have initiated a formal NFP process and those who have not. For countries without an NFP authors should assess national forest policy changes since the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action were produced in 1997.

1997 is the obvious break point for non-NFP countries given that, first, this is the year when the IPF reported and, second, that all EU countries and most, if not all, non-EU European countries helped to negotiate the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action which outline the elements of a NFP. Non-NFP countries that partook in these negotiations have thus adopted the concept of 'NFP' as defined by the international community in consensually-agreed soft international law.

Hence for NFP countries: in all cases where 'NFP' appears please read this as 'NFP or equivalent'.

Supporting and impeding factors (Section 2 of the framework)

The supporting and impeding factors we are considering are land tenure, legal regulations, financial incentives, political culture and institutional aspects. Each factor may be subdivided into two sub-categories:

- (i) those that directly affect forest use, and
- (ii) broader factors that may indirectly affect forest use.

For example:

Supporting and impeding factors	Directly affects forest use	May indirectly affect forest use
Land tenure	Land tenure in forests.	Land tenure in areas surrounding forests e.g. the agriculture-forestry interface, urban areas.
Legal regulations	Legal regulations designed exclusively or principally for forests.	Legal regulations on national sustainable development policy and agriculture.
Financial incentives	Grants and tax breaks directed at the forest owners and users.	The broader national tax/revenue structure.
Political culture	The culture of national and regional forest authorities.	The national political culture.
Institutional aspects	Institutions with an exclusive or predominantly forest mandate.	Institutions with other mandates, including (i) those that include an indirect forest-related mandate, and (ii) those with no forest-related mandate but which may affect forest use.

Many of the factors in the second column will form part of the NFP, broadly defined. They may be seen as ‘internal’ impeding and supporting factors. Those in the third column will not form part of the NFP in many countries, and may thus be seen as ‘external’ impeding and supporting factors. Part of the measure of the ‘success’ of a NFP is the extent to which it addresses external impeding factors, or harnesses external supporting factors in pursuit of SFM.

At Oslo it was recommended that the sections in the framework on impeding and supporting factors be merged, as certain factors may be supporting factors in some cases, and impeding factors in others. For example, a road may promote ecotourism,

yet also open up a forest to logging. The framework reflects this recommendation, and all other recommendations made in Oslo.

Synergies and innovations

A NFP is a policy tool. However it is tool in which other tools are nested, such as forest legislation and financial incentives for ensuring SFM. These tools are constituent parts of the NFP. A NFP can therefore also be seen as an *original assemblage* of policy tools that may result in new synergies and innovations. If the country chapters are to represent accurately the holistic and integrated essence of NFPs it is important that these synergies and innovations are captured and represented.

Policy makers are likely to use many of the *types* of tools, and in some cases the same tools themselves, in the early stages of a NFP as they did in forest policy prior to an NFP. However synergies and innovations may become apparent if the NFP has successfully integrated all the relevant dimensions of forest policy. For example, a particular policy may lead to adverse consequences. If the NFP represents a genuinely iterative process, these consequences may be noticed and policy connections made, whereas this may not necessarily have happened in the pre-NFP situation. Furthermore, the *combination* of particular policy tools may generate new interactions amongst stakeholders. Of course we should not assume that a NFP leads only to positive results, and need also to be aware that in some cases a NFP may lead to negative effects (for example, the generation of a new policy elite that in time excludes other stakeholders).

Synergies and innovations do not belong in any one part of the framework. In order to ensure that synergies and innovations are captured in the country chapters the framework concludes with a separate section which authors are asked to bear in mind when writing the whole paper.

Working with this framework

Word limit: The word limit for each chapter is 5500 words maximum. *This word limit cannot be exceeded.* There are eight sections to the framework, each of which should form a separate section heading in your chapter. Indicative word limits have been given for each section.

1. Introduction	400 words
2. Supporting and impeding factors	1300 words
3. Participatory mechanisms	700 words
4. Negotiation and conflict resolution	700 words
5. Intersectoral approaches	700 words
6. Long term iterative planning	700 words
7. Other NFP elements/The next steps	500 words
8. Conclusions	500 words
TOTAL	5500 words

It is acceptable to exceed the indicative word limit for any one section, providing that commensurate reductions are made in other sections so that the chapter total does not exceed 5500 words.

Guidance: Each section of the framework comprises guidance in the form of *section notes* and *question prompts*. I hope that this advice will be helpful. The question prompts have been designed to provide a steer on the sort of things that authors should address. They are intended to be suggestive. It is unlikely that all countries will find all prompts useful, although all countries should certainly find some prompts useful.

Broad questions: The framework concludes with some broad questions on synergies and innovations that are not section specific and which authors are asked to bear in mind when writing sections Section 2 to 8 of their papers.

Background details: Authors should avoid descriptions of background factors and international contextual details that are common to all countries, such as details of the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action and MCPFE process. This detail will be provided in the introductory chapter.

Whose authorial voice?: It is emphasised that what is sought is an objective and dispassionate evaluation from the perspective of an independent analyst. The ‘establishment view’ and justification of a country’s NFP is not sought. It is recognised that there may be different views, and if so please outline these, perhaps by setting your chapter up as a debate (‘The government says X, but our analysis says Y). Authors should feel free to criticise forest policy where this is appropriate, although it is strongly suggested that such criticisms be constructive and policy relevant, so that they may later feed positively into NFP policy making.

Prioritisation: Authors will have a lot of material from which they can draw when writing their chapter. Part of the challenge will be deciding which material should be included in the chapter and which should not. Authors should aim to include original and innovative material, and to prioritise policy relevant analysis and evaluation over lengthy description. Original policy measures and new recommended best practice should be favoured over established and orthodox policy measures on which a wide literature is already available. Writing a short chapter of just 5,500 words is thus likely to prove more challenging than writing a longer chapter in which more material can be included.

<p>Thank you for your interest in this project and for volunteering as a country report author. The framework now follows.</p>

THE FRAMEWORK

1. Introduction (400 words)

Section Notes

Briefly:

- give a overview of the country and its type of political system
- describe the main forest policy issues
- note the key points in the planning and evolution of the NFP
- give the main aim, objectives, standards and long term commitments of the NFP or equivalent, and the current status of the NFP
- sketch the main arguments developed in the paper
- signal the structure of the paper.

Question prompts

- (i) What were the main principles and rules that guide the NFP planning process?
Question Notes: These principles and rules need not necessarily have been explicitly elaborated. However, it is safe to assume that in most countries there is a framework of principles and rules that guides the process.

2. Supporting and Impeding Factors (1300 words)

Section Notes

Supporting and impeding factors are those factors that support and contribute to, or impede and detract from, SFM. This section should explore the supporting and impeding factors identified in the pre-NFP period, as well as also those factors identified during the formulation and implementation of the NFP. Factors may be broad and structural (e.g. factors that support and impede the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests on a national level), or they may exist at another level of governance (e.g. local conditions that enhance or diminish the effects of a particular policy instrument in a certain locality). Supporting and impeding factors may also be analysed with respect to (i) land tenure, (ii) law and regulations, (iii) financial incentives, (iv) political culture and (v) institutional aspects.

Question prompts

- (i) What were the main supporting and impeding factors known to exist in the pre-NFP period with respect to:
- Land tenure
 - Law and regulations
 - Financial incentives
 - Political culture
 - Institutional aspects?
- Question Notes: Also describe and analyse those supporting factors known to exist in the pre-NFP situation with reference to general forest policy for SFM.
- (ii) Has the NFP planning and implementation process led to the identification of additional supporting and impeding factors with respect to:
- Land tenure
 - Law and regulations
 - Financial incentives

- Political culture
- Institutional aspects?

Question Notes: As a holistic and integrated process, the NFP may have enabled the identification of supporting and impeding factors that existed prior to the NFP, but which were not identified until the NFP process was initiated. Also describe and analyse those supporting factors known to exist in the pre-NFP situation with reference to general forest policy for SFM.

(iii) Has the NFP planning and implementation process directly resulted in the emergence of additional supporting and impeding factors with respect to:

- Land tenure
- Law and regulations
- Financial incentives
- Political culture
- Institutional aspects?

Question Notes: The NFP process itself may have catalysed the emergence of new supporting and impeding factors. Also describe and analyse those supporting factors known to exist in the pre-NFP situation with reference to general forest policy for SFM.

(iv) How have the supporting and impeding factors identified in (i) to (iii) above contributed to the planning and evolution of the NFP?

Question Notes: In the course of the answer note whether the pre-NFP forest policy had fully exploited all the potentially available supporting factors and fully addressed all the impeding factors. Note those impeding factors that were overcome and those that were not. In the case of the latter state why particular impeding factors have not been overcome. Also note any supporting factors that have not so far been fully exploited by the NFP.

3. Participatory Mechanisms (700 words)

Section Notes

This section should provide, where appropriate, any nationally-adopted definition of participation. The gains of participation should be analysed. Describe any significant events (e.g. national conferences) and the main channels through which stakeholder participate. Authors should try to give a sense of how the national political culture affected the NFP planning process. e.g. different modes and meanings of 'participative democracy'.

Question prompts

i. What mechanisms for stakeholder participation were adopted during the planning and evolution of the NFP?

Questions Notes: See ii below.

ii. What mechanisms for stakeholder participation have been implemented since the start of the implementation process?

Question Notes: For both questions i and ii, please do not only describe the participation mechanisms, but analyse how participation qualitatively affected the strategy, planning and evolution of the NFP. In other words, what benefits have emerged from participation, and how has participation enhanced the effectiveness and viability of the NFP? This may include comparison of the situation in the NFP period with the viability of participation mechanisms (if any) in the pre-NFP period.

4. Negotiation and Conflict Resolution (700 words)

Section Notes

In most countries NFPs will involve a mix of governmental actors, profit making (business) actors and non-profit making (civil society) actors. In many countries there will be different negotiation and conflict resolution mechanisms, depending on the mix of actors and the level of governance being examined. For example, where there is conflict between government departments, the procedures may be very different compared to, say, those for resolving conflict between a government ministry and business, or between business and civil society.

Please do not only describe the negotiation and conflict resolution approaches, but also analyse how they have qualitatively affected the strategy, planning and evolution of the NFP. In other words, what benefits have emerged from the negotiation and conflict resolution approaches adopted, and how have they enhanced the effectiveness and viability of the NFP? This may include comparison of the situation in the NFP period with the viability of the negotiation and conflict resolution mechanisms (if any) in the pre-NFP period.

Question prompts

- i. What conflict resolution mechanisms existed during the NFP planning process?
Question notes: This may take the form of, for example, a formal arbitration processes or referral to a government minister. However there are also likely to be more informal and less visible modes of conflict resolution.
- ii. What conflict resolution mechanisms and processes have been established since the start of the implementation process?
Question notes: As with question i, this may take the form of, for example, formal arbitration processes as well as more informal and undocumented modes of conflict resolution.

5. Intersectoral Approaches (700 words)

Section Notes

'Intersectoral approaches' include 'inter-ministry coordination', that is harmonised policy agreed among those ministries with a stake in forest and forest-related policy. But it is more than that. In the UN the term sectors also applies to the 'business sector' and the 'voluntary sector'. The concept of 'intersectoral' should therefore be broadly defined to include all stakeholders. In the course of this section any NFP focal points should be examined, as well as any other forest-related government and/or NGO and/or business focal points.

The following questions should be considered in the course of this section. For both questions, please do not only describe the intersectoral approaches, but also analyse how they have qualitatively affected the strategy, planning and evolution of the NFP. In other words, what benefits have emerged from the intersectoral approaches adopted, and how have intersectoral approaches enhanced the effectiveness and viability of the NFP? This will require comparison of the situation in the NFP period with the viability of intersectoral approaches (if any) in the pre-NFP period.

Question prompts

- i. What mechanisms and processes have been established for NFP-related intersectoral approaches within the state (i.e. intra-governmental cooperation)?
Question Notes: When answering this question evaluate any governmental coordination offices and inter-ministry coordination initiatives. Analyse and compare the situation both during the NFP planning period and the implementation period.
- ii. What mechanisms and processes have been established for NFP related intersectoral approaches involving non-state actors?
Question Notes: Some mechanisms may involve government (for example, where other stakeholders are invited to ministry meetings; public-private partnerships). Other mechanisms may involve only non-governmental actors (e.g. a joint forum of national business federations and conservation groups) whose views are then fed to government. Analyse and compare the situation both during the NFP planning period and the implementation period.

6. Long term iterative planning (700 words)

Section Notes

Many long term iterative processes may be informal and difficult to document accurately. There may be different types of iterative planning depending on the actors involved, the issues at stake and the level at which governance takes place. One way of approaching this question is to consider how long term iterative processes affect the other three core elements: participatory mechanisms, negotiation and conflict resolution, and intersectoral approaches. The supporting and impeding factors that influence or otherwise contribute to long-term iterative processes can also be examined.

The following questions should be considered in the course of this section. For both questions, please do not only describe the long term iterative processes approaches, but analyse how long term iterative processes approaches have qualitatively affected the strategy, planning and evolution of the NFP. In other words, what benefits have emerged from the long term iterative approaches adopted, and how have the approaches enhanced the effectiveness and viability of the NFP? This will require comparison of the situation in the NFP period with the viability of such approaches (if any) in the pre-NFP period.

Question Prompts:

- i. What mechanisms and processes have been established for NFP-related long term iterative processes approaches within the state (i.e. intra-governmental cooperation)?
- ii. What mechanisms and processes have been established for NFP related intersectoral approaches involving non-state actors?

Question Notes: For both questions (i) and (ii) note both the formal bureaucratic and institutionalised structures and processes, as well as those informal and hidden structures and process and that are not explicit, that contribute to long term iterative planning.

7. Other NFP elements/The next steps (500 words)

[The exact title of this section is left to the discretion of individual authors]

Section Notes

There may be other NFP elements in your country that have received less attention in the Action. The following have been suggested by Working Group 2 (although there may be others):

- *Decentralisation*: See paper circulated by Peter Glück prior to Aberdeen which notes *inter alia* that decentralisation denotes a process or situation in which powers and responsibilities are transferred from a central authority to other, usually more local, organs. Decentralisation aims to improve performance ... A fully centralised runs the risk of being inefficient because it is poorly informed and does not create proper incentives.
- *Delegation*: The transfer of authority and management from public to private organisations. Are there any functions previously held by public authorities that have been transferred to private organisations? To what kind of organisations? Is it possible to assess the results of such delegation?

Country authors should also include any other significant NFP elements not dealt with elsewhere in the paper.

The four core elements are basically 'procedural' elements. This section should also provide the following if the NFP is at a stage that allows this kind of analysis:

- specify the 'content elements', that is, the policy targets and the policy tools that have been adopted to achieve SFM.
- give an informed speculation and judgement about implementation issues (as explained in the WG2 minutes from Aberdeen) e.g.
 - a. given the characteristics of the NFP process and the supporting and impeding factors described earlier in the paper, are NFP targets likely to be met with the policy tools adopted by the NFP?
 - b. given the available knowledge about the characteristics of the main stakeholders, have the policy targets and tools been framed so as to induce significant voluntary participation in those stakeholders in the implementation of the NFP in a way consistent with NFP targets?

8. Conclusions (500 words)

Section notes

This section should summarise:

- The achievements and strengths of the NFP, highlighting any significant innovations and synergies.
- Unresolved problems: i.e. those policies that have been unsuccessful in addressing a particular problem. Give the principal reasons for any policy failures, and the action currently being taken to address the problems.

This section may also take the form of an informed speculation and judgement on how the NFP is working out/will work out, and can also briefly sketch the next stages in the NFP process, outlining the main intended policy targets.

Bibliography

Section Notes

Please provide full references for any works referred to in your chapter.

Synergies and Innovations: Broad questions when completing Sections 2 to 8

Section Notes

One of the potential strengths of a NFP is that it brings together various policy tools - such as regulation, financial incentives and other policy tools which may previously have operated in isolation from each other - into a structured and mutually supportive framework. It makes sense to examine the added value of the NFP approach and to evaluate the benefits of a NFP as an integrated and coherent concept.

If it is possible try to be specific about the hypothetical (or empirically tested) relationships (causal dependencies or interdependencies) between:

- different supporting factors (each of them, subsets of them, or the whole set of factors), and
- different impeding factors (each of them, subsets of them, or the whole set of factors), and
- the core elements (each of them, subsets of them, or the whole set of factors).

Sections VI and VII of the WG2 analytical framework in the Aberdeen minutes provide some suggestions on how to do this.

Each country will have different experiences. However the following is a list of indicative questions that authors can think through when completing this section:

Question Prompts

- i. Have any unexpected ‘pre-NFP’ supporting factors been identified during the NFP process?

Question Notes: A fragmented policy making process may not have previously identified all the supporting factors available in the broader policy environment. It is possible that some supporting factors, not previously known, emerged during the NFP process. An integrated NFP may be better positioned both to identify and exploit supporting factors. This would be evidence of the added value of a NFP as an integrated and integrating process

- ii. Has the NFP process generated any new (‘post NFP’) supporting factors?

Question Notes: An integrated process such as a NFP may be expected to yield some unexpected economies of scale. For example, money may be saved in one area that can be channelled into another.

- iii. Has the policy process been better able to address ‘pre-NFP’ impeding factors since the inception of the NFP?

Question Notes: An integrated NFP may be better able to address constraints on the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests compared to a ‘loose’ set of policy instruments. A NFP may make more ‘noise’ in a policy system compared to forest policy in the pre-NFP period. A NFP may enable a more coordinated policy at the agriculture-forestry and urban-forestry interfaces.

- iv. What ‘post-NFP’ impeding factors have been identified, and how well has the NFP process coped with these.

Question Notes: Impeding factors are not static. New impediments will emerge. In many ways the real test of a NFP, and of its iterative element, is how well it responds to and deals with new challenges. It is important to be honest about those impeding factors that a NFP has yet to overcome. From a policy makers perspective it is necessary to know what policies have not worked and why (and not just what policies have worked).

- v. What policy innovations have emerged since the inception of the NFP process?
Question Notes: A NFP bringing together the 4 core elements may yield previously unrealised synergies. For example, a financial incentive to increase participation may promote an original intersectoral approach.
- vi. How has the NFP contributed to our comprehension of SFM?
The objective of a NFP is to ensure SFM which, however, is not necessarily a clear objective. It is instead a model. Hence policy makers and planners are working with a concept which is not yet operationally defined, but which is undergoing a communicative and hermeneutic defining process. Hence one possible policy innovation is that the underlying definition of SFM and its operationalisation may change over time: a NFP may itself lead to modifications to our understanding of this elusive concept.
- vii. What legal innovations have resulted due to the NFP process?
Question Notes: Many countries will give their NFP legal status. Given that a NFP is an original concept, some countries may find that a particular legal innovation emerges during the law making process.
- viii. What institutional innovations have emerged due to the NFP process?
Question Notes: The NFP may have led to bureaucratic reorganisation in government, restructuring within environmental NGOs or foresters associations etc.
- ix. How is a long term iterative process realised in practice?
Question Notes: A genuine iterative and adaptive process requires behavioural changes by all stakeholders (and not simply a series of periodic reviews by government). One way of exploring 'adaptiveness' is to evaluate those changes that have already taken place in the NFP. For example, how was the NFP conceived at the start, and what significant changes have taken place to it so far, and why? If it was necessary to modify or amend the initial conception of the NFP say why this was so.
- x. In what respects is a particular financial incentive more effective in a NFP framework compared to the introduction of the same instrument in isolation (outside a NFP)?
- xi. What other innovations and synergies have emerged due to the formulation and implementation of a NFP?

Country reports authors

Country	Responsible
Austria	Johannes Voitleitner
Belgium	Noël Lust
Denmark	Finn Helles and Tove Enggrob Boon
Finland	Pekka Ollonqvist, Olli Saastamoinen and Harri Hänninen
France	Gérard Buttoud and Guénaëlle Cuederc
Germany	Jürgen Pretzsch and Peter Elsasser
Greece	Kostas Papageorgiou, Alexandra Vakrou, Dimitrios Trakolis and George Malamides
Hungary	Károly Mészáros and Attila Lengyel
Ireland	To be named by: Diarmuid McAree
Italy	Lorenzo Venzi
Lithuania	Stasys Mizaras and Diana Mizaraite
Netherlands	To be named by: Heiner Schanz
Norway	To be named by: Olav Gislerud and Erling Berge
Poland	To be named by: Piotr Paschalis
Portugal	Américo M.S. Carvalho Mendes, Inocêncio Seita Coelho and Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho
Spain	Christina Montiel and Gloria Dominguez Torres
Sweden	Marie Appelstrand and Sven Svensson
Switzerland	Willi Zimmermann
United Kingdom	Marcus Sangster, David Humphreys and Forestry Commission expert (to be named by Marcus Sangster)