

Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting for co-ordinating work plans

Institute of Forest Sector Policy and Economics
University of Agricultural Sciences, Vienna
Vienna, Austria

2 December 2000 at 9:00 – 17:30

1. Opening

Mr. Glueck opens the meeting and wishes the participants welcome to the meeting.
The participants are:

GLUECK Peter	Chairman of the Action	Austria
HOGL Karl	adviser	Austria
MENDES Americo	for WG 2	Portugal
PAJUOJA Heikki	Vice chairman of the Action	Finland
PREGERNIG Michael	adviser	Austria
SCHANZ Heiner	WG1 leader	Netherlands
VOITLITHNER Johannes	minutes taker	Austria

The agenda of the meeting is approved. The presentation of the items in these minutes follows the agenda.

2. Co-ordination of the work programmes of WG 1 and WG 2 (based on a discussion paper prepared by Karl Hogl and Michael Pregernig)

Mr. Hogl presents reflections on the approach of WG 1 (Figure 1 of Annex 1) and says, the borderline between the four core elements is a weak point.

Mr. Pajuoja sees no problem for WG 1. The intersectoral approach should get the main focus, because there is a lack of literature.

Mr. Schanz: The challenge for WG 1 is not to fall back in political categories. So, instead of "core elements" the term "essentials" should be used to avoid misunderstandings. The main focus is on the relations between the essentials.

Mr. Pregernig presents reflections on a possible approach for WG 2 (Figure 2, Annex 1). The term substantive NFPs seems to be the main problem. So, Mode II (Figure 3, Annex 1) is more realistic, because it needs no normative decision.

Mr. Mendes presents his reflections on WG 1 and a possible approach for WG 2 (Annex 2). The issue of fixed or flexible targets (SFM) is relevant for an NFP. A workable definition of NFPs is an important starting point. WG 2 should ask, what is the structural model of the forest sector in each country. The implementability of an NFP is a basic question.

Mr. Schanz supports the viewpoints of Mr. Hogl and Mr. Pregernig, because they use an integrated approach of NFPs for policy planning. If WG 2 only focuses on supportive and impeding factors, it will lose this integrated approach. The question should be, what is the influence of e.g. financial incentives on national policy-planning. Another approach for WG 2 could be to ask, what are the influences of all supportive and impeding factors on e.g. participation.

Mr. Mendes: We already have some information about the content of an NFP in countries.

Mr. Schanz would synchronise the WGs by using core elements as a link. So, in advance of each meeting the preparation of one core element should be done.

Mr. Pajuoja: There is a huge gap between forest strategies and the reality. To help policy-makers, it is important to look on how a workable policy can be done.

Mr. Glück: The main question of many people is, what the advantages of NFPs are in comparison to other policy means.

Mr. Mendes: There is a great demand to specify constraints of possible NFPs. The information source of country representatives is very valuable.

Mr. Schanz presents his reflections on the co-ordination of WG 1 and WG 2. In advance to each meeting, background information should be sent to both WGs. This is also the goal of the planned virtual discussion forum. Background information papers should be seen as starting points or bibliographies, which summarise information along key words. Additionally, these papers have to be extended during the action by the WG members, so they grow with each meeting. WG 1 already is working on a paper about what is said on participation.

Mr. Mendes: It is important to link the results of each meeting in a plenary session.

Mr. Pajuoja: Also a progress report is valuable.

It is agreed, that Mr. Schanz is responsible for a background information paper on participatory mechanisms and intersectoral approaches. Mr. Pajuoja is responsible for a paper on long term, iterative processes and he will ask Eeva Hellström to write a paper on negotiation, collaboration and conflict resolution.

Mr. Schanz: Invited speakers of WG 1 should handle the topic "Theories and empirical insights". So, the focus of a meeting is on the relation of one core element to the others and not only to the core element itself.

Mr. Glück: Decentralisation is very prominent in actual political discussions.

Mr. Pajuoja: Decentralisation can be discussed with all core elements, but is a different dimension.

Mr. Mendes: Decentralisation is more a political instrument, not part of the core elements. It is a desirable feature of NFPs and it depends on whether a country is federalistic or centralised.

Mr. Schanz: Decentralisation, as new planning style, is inside the whole NFP-idea.

Mr. Mendes: The implementability of an NFP is a precondition of a possibly significant outcome. So, the research focus is on the output and the NFP process.

Mr. Pregernig: Mode II (Figure 3, Annex 1) specifically does not use normative levels.

Mr. Glück: We need some normative description of core elements, e.g. minimum requirements of participation. It seems to be possible to find minimum agreements of policy makers or researchers on core elements or parts of them which should be laid down in the papers on core elements and permanently reviewed.

Mr. Schanz: There is a danger to end up in Mode I (Figure 3, Annex 1). The background information papers on core elements serves as an interpretation, not as a definition. Also symbolic NFPs can have substantive effects. He suggests to keep out substantiveness of the next four meetings and to discuss it in the last meeting in Austria. WG 1 will not deal with normative aspects.

Mr. Mendes: Mode I is not visible, but at least WG 2 should try to get normative information as much as possible. Maybe the solution is Mode 1,5.

It turns out that there are different wishes. On the one hand, to find political threshold values and on the other hand to look only on theoretical aspects. All participants agree with Mode 1,5.

3. Agendas of WG 1 and WG 2 meetings in Aberdeen, 29-31 March 2001

Mr. Schanz: The contributions of invited speakers, which are presented in the plenary session, should only be discussed in the WG sessions.

Mr. Glück: The plenary session should not take more than half a day, while the WG meetings should get as much time as possible (2 days). Then there is half a day for the excursion.

Mr. Schanz presents the preliminary agenda for the WG 1 meeting in Scotland.

Mr. Mendes pleads for a similar structure for the next WG 2 meeting.

It is agreed, that the following three country reports about experiences with legal aspects should be presented at the next WG 2 meeting.

- Austria (Johannes Voitleithner)
- Finland (to be nominated by Heikki Pajuoja)
- Portugal (Americio Mendes)

Mr. Glück: The whole range of legal aspects as supportive and impeding factors should be dealt with (national, European and international level).

4. Nomination/invitation of invited speakers for the Aberdeen meeting

Mr. Schanz presents the WG 1 suggestions of invited speakers for the Aberdeen meeting (presentations on participatory approaches). Then a ranking is done for the plenary as well as for the internal WGs sessions.

Mr. Glück also suggests two invited speakers for a presentation on effects of legal regulations on NFPs. He pleads for as clear as possible expectations for the invited speakers (terms of reference). Kristine Kern should be asked again about a presentation on effects of political culture on substantive NFPs.

Mr. Schanz: The invited speakers have to be asked by Hugh Miller. So, we have to send Mr. Miller the proposals, the ranking and the terms of reference.

Mr. Mendes offers to prepare a paper about the effects of financial incentives to the core elements until the next meeting in Aberdeen. It would serve as an example for future papers of WG 2 members. This paper will not be a part of a presentation or a discussion in Scotland. Mr. Berge will be asked to produce a similar paper for the Norway meeting on land tenure.

Mr. Schanz asks, what should be done with internal presentations in the WGs.

Mr. Mendes pleads for using the internet as cheapest distribution source.

5. Preparation of the Oslo meeting

Mr. Pajuoja: Although the EFI European Forest Policy Research Forum deals also with financial incentives, co-ordination of the Oslo meeting with the Rovaniemi meeting (June 2001) is not envisaged; the topics and the objectives are too different.

Mr. Glück: The members of the WGs should be asked soon for suggestions of invited speakers for the Oslo meeting.

6. Proceedings of the Madrid Seminar

Mr. Glück: The editors of the Proceedings should write only one foreword, which should explain the underlying philosophy of the Madrid meeting. Also conclusions of this meeting should be added.

Mr. Schanz: Conclusions of the Madrid seminar are for the WGs, but do not make sense for an overall level (for politicians). He reports, that Mr. Rojas Briales found the preparation of the Madrid meeting too much centralised by the Steering Committee of the Action.

Mr. Schanz offers to write a draft foreword including the rationale behind the election of invited speakers and sends the draft to the co-editors.

7. Any other business

Mr. Pajuoja: The planned second newsletter is still missing a contribution from the chairman and the WG leaders. Mr. Briales will write something about the Madrid seminar.

Mr. Glück: Mrs. Ingrid Kissling-Näf could be asked for a summary of her contribution at the Madrid WG 2 meeting (half a page).

Mr. Schanz: Mr. Peter Mayer also could be asked for a contribution, as an example of a political actor.

Mr. Glück: After the meeting in Aberdeen the Task Force on country reports, chaired by Mr. David Humphreys, should start its work soon in order to develop the terms of reference.

Mr. Glück suggests a paper of Mr. Pregernig on practice-science interface, which deals with the link between science and politics. It is agreed, that Oslo would be a good possibility for such a presentation.

Mr. Schanz asks, how the paper of Mr. Hogl and Mr. Pregernig should be handled, because it was the basis for the steering committee discussions.

Mr. Mendes pleads for not discussing it at the next meeting in Scotland. It should be distributed by the WG leaders referring to the Steering Committee meeting as soon as possible.

8. Closing

The Chairman thanks the participants for their contributions and closes the meeting.

Peter Glueck

Chairman

Johannes Voitleithner

Minutes taker

LIST OF ANNEXES:

Annex 1: Reflections on the approaches of WG 1 and WG 2 and their coordination (discussion paper prepared by Karl Hogl and Michael Pregernig)

see: <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/papers.htm> (Other papers)

Annex 2: Reflections on the approaches of WG 1 and WG 2 and their coordination (by Americo Mendes)

