

Minutes of the second Working Group Meeting in Madrid, 19-21 October 2000

Place: University of Madrid, Faculty of Forestry

Time: Friday, 20 October 14:00-19:00

Participants: Heiner Schanz (Netherlands, Chair of WG1), Heikki Pajuoja (Finland; Vice-Chair of Cost E19), Kurt Bisang (Switzerland), Tove Boon (Denmark), Gerard Buttoud (France), Gloria Dominguez (Spain), Peter Elsasser (Germany), Olav Gislerud (Norway), Josef Hackl (Austria), Karl Hogel (Austria), Noel Lust (Belgium), José Pérez-Vilariño (Spain), Georgios Malamidis (Greece), Hugh Miller (U.K.), Ine Neven (Netherlands), Micheal Pregernig (Austria), Margaret Shannon (USA), Jose-Maria Solano Lopez (Spain), Dimitrios Trakolis (Greece), Lorenzo Venzi (Italy), Evelien Verbij (The Netherlands),

Minute-taker: Evelien Verbij

Agenda

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Activity report (members, activities)
3. Identification of key words in relation to theory
4. Topics for the essentials
5. Preparation of Aberdeen meeting
6. Products of working group
7. Other questions

1. Adoption of the agenda

Mr. Schanz and Mr. Pajuoja are welcoming the participants and open the second meeting of Working Group 1. Change of the agenda is proposed by the chairmen. Instead to directly elaborate a theoretical framework as planned in the Freiburg-meeting, it seems more promising – given the relatively low commitment between the meetings and the low number of research projects directly related to the topic of the COST-Action – to start with collecting key words for a theoretical framework. In a second step it is suggested to elaborate titles of relevant “research projects” based on these keywords, in order to identify the possible scientific perspectives on procedural and institutional requirements for NFPs. The underlying assumption is that “project” titles reflect focus, theory and method. Respectively, lists of such “project titles” could frame the focus for the following working group meetings.

Objective of the working group meeting in Madrid would be therefore to provide these "framing" perspectives for the four essentials that have been identified during the Freiburg-meeting: participatory approaches, collaborative approaches, intersectoral approaches and procedural approach. Consequently a brainstorming structure is suggested for the working group meeting in Madrid.

In the following discussion this suggestion was seen as workable solution to provide structure to the following workshops. However, it was pointed out, that the lists with "project titles" per essential should be kept open in order to allow for the inclusion of new scientific foci or theoretical dimensions emerging during the progress of the action. It was agreed that the lists should be always updated in the preparation phase/begin of each of the upcoming working group meetings. Finally the proposed working approach was accepted and the agenda was adopted.

2. Activity report

- Quite some new members from different countries have shown their interest to participate in the work of working group 1 since the last meeting in Freiburg. The chairman pointed out that new members have to be officially registered with the webmaster of the action, Mr. Hanninen (harri.hanninen@metla.fi) in order to be included in the up-dated mailing lists. The same holds true for members who have not received information and mails between the meetings.
- Due to technical problems the virtual discussion forum, that was decided on in Freiburg, has not been installed yet. During several bi-lateral talks of the chairman with members of the working group as well as with the webmaster of the Action, it turned out that the main problem is to find an organization who is willing to take the safety risks and the time necessary to host and to install such a discussion forum on their server. A solution will be sought in co-operation with WG2 or the MC.

The chairman reports that the commitment to provide descriptions on the national research projects to be published on the Action-homepage has been rather low. Only a few people have contributed by sending a list of research project in their country. Project that will be discussed must be not too far from NFP, otherwise the discussion will be too wide. Mr. Pajuoja reminds the participants that the main aim of the COST meetings is to exchange and to combine experiences with national research projects in the respective participating countries. Given the actuality of the topic of the action and the beginning phase of most of the national projects, it is even more important to provide additional informations and input (in form of 'housework') between the meetings, if the objectives for WG1 will be met. As an example, the chairman was referring to the meeting in Freiburg, in which it was decided to start a literature list. Almost none of the participants has send a list of related literature. After a short discussion it is agreed that such an activity is still very worthwhile and efforts to install such a bibliography should continued. It is suggested to put also indirect literature on the list and everybody agrees.

3. Identification of key words in relation to theory

The brain-storm session started with collecting keywords which participants assigned to the four 'essentials' that are mentioned before. The underlying idea is that the keywords help to frame and to structure the subsequent discussions. The following keywords were provided by the participants. It was agreed that this list is not ultimate, but should be open to additions in the progress of discussions.

Reciprocal information	Dependency
Expressing interests	Bargaining theory
Involvement of stakeholders	Formal/informal
Objectives	State/private
Conflicts	Referendum
Incentives	Willingness to compromise
Consistency	Unanticipated consequences
Inclusive/exclusive	Consensus
Transdisciplinair knowledge	Policy-space
Context	Policy decisions/making
Levels	Bottom-up
Kinds of/different knowledge	Power
Compromise	Motivation
Risk-assessment	Responsive to distribution
Multi-level communication	Pre-conditions
Institution change	Mental mapping
Communicative rationality	Legal
Power structure	SWOT analysis/instrument
Discursive constructions of actors en institutions	EU-regulations
Discourse	International convention
Adaptive	Deregulation
Mission statement	Chaos theory
Diffuse concept	Agreement
Motivation	Diffuse concept
Winner/loser	Discursive construction
Empowerment	Legitimization
Legitimization	Dependency
Levels of participation	Transparency

4. Topics for the essentials

Instead of grouping the different keywords (which could have been another approach) titles of relevant "research projects" based on these keywords and in relation to the four essentials were elaborate. in order to identify. The underlying assumption is that "project" titles reflect focus, theory and method, thereby allowing to focus the possible scientific perspectives on procedural and institutional requirements for NFPs for the following working group meetings in which the four essentials will be discussed separately. For this purpose the working group was split up in several smaller groups. When presenting their results each group was asked to refer with their 'titles' to the list of identified keywords, in order to find out wether really all aspects of a theoretical frame are reflected in the identified scientific perspectives.

Title	referring to keywords	referring to essential
<i>Presentation: Mr. Hogl</i>		
Institutional change induced by new demands (approaches of policy-making) meeting old structures	Policy networks, change, institutions	Intersectoral approach
Institutionalising long-term, iterative planning process – a comparative perspective		Procedural approach
Assessing economical, ecological and social impacts and equity of different NFP scenarios – developing and testing a new tool to enhance the transparency of decision making	Scenario-analysis, instruments	Collaborative approach
Differences in the mobilisation of participation in urban and rural areas	Transparency	Participatory approach
<i>Presentation: Mrs. Boon</i>		
The role and motivation of private landowners in different European countries in the content and process of participation in (small-scale) forestry planning by a illustrative case study	Empowerment, stakeholders, winners/losers, motivation, organisational learning, bargaining, conflict and compromising	Procedural and participation approach
<i>Presentation: Mr. Pretzsch</i>		
What is the objective, interest and motivation of different stakeholders in the forest policy planning process?	Motivation, visions, Behavior/attitude	Participatory approach
Impact of policy networks on the forest policy cycle?	Stakeholders	Collaborative approach
Reasons for the lack of intersectoral co-operation	Motivation, attitude, conflicts, objectives	Inter-sectoral approach
How can learning processes increase efficiency of state administration?	Learning process, vision	Procedural approach
<i>Presentation: Mr. Buttoud</i>		
In what ways can communication among stakeholders improve NFP processes?	Communication, information, knowledge, stakeholders, involvement	Participatory approach
How do social, cultural, political contexts affect collaboration, mediation and negotiation of NFP process in various European countries?	Mental mapping, psychology	Collaborative approach
<i>Presentation: Mr. Malamidis</i>		
Interest groups' participation of planning and management issues connected with acc.... of FP's	Interest groups, perceptions, behavior,	Participatory approach

COST-Action E19: "National Forest Programmes in a European Context"
Working Group 1: Elements and procedural requirements of NFPs

	attitudes, involvement of stakeholders, preferences, levels.	
<i>Presentation: Mr. Hackl</i>		
Analysis of pro's and con's of social conflict resolution systems related to forest matters	Conflict, expression, involvement of stakeholders, conflict, bargaining, consensus, interests, bottom up, instruments	Collaborative approach
Evaluation of approaches in formulation of NFP involving various hierarchical levels	Levels, mental mapping	Procedural approach
<i>Presentation: Mr. Elsasser</i>		
[An analysis of] bargaining rules within participatory processes and their influence on the content of a NFP	Bargaining theory, welfare theory, efficiency gains, winner-loser	Participatory approach
Empirical case studies on participatory approaches strategies used to achieve successful outcomes of NFP: A comparative perspective		Participatory approach
Solving all problems: a new, revolutionary perception on forest policy	Diffuse concept	General

Based on this results the preliminary foci of the discussions will be

for the NFP-essential "**participatory approaches**" in **Aberdeen**

- *Differences in mobilization (urban-rural)*
- *Objective, interest and motivation for participation*
- *Role of communication*
- *Bargaining rules and –processes*
- *Strategy and success*

with following keywords framing the possible input of supportive theories:

Transparency, Motivation (3x), Visions, Behavior/attitude (2x), Communication, information, knowledge, stakeholders (2x), involvement (2x), perceptions, involvement, preferences, levels, empowerment, stakeholders, winners/losers, organizational learning, bargaining, conflict and compromising

for the NFP-essential "**collaborative approaches**" in **Norway**

- *Transparency of decision-making (via scenarios)*
- *Impact of policy networks on the forest policy cycle*
- *Relation between context and ways of collaboration, mediation, negotiation*
- *Social conflict resolution systems*

with following keywords framing the possible input of supportive theories:

Scenario-analysis, instruments (2x), mental mapping, psychology, conflict, expression, involvement of stakeholders, bargaining, consensus, interests, bottom up

for the NFP-essential "**intersectoral approaches**" in **Finland**

- *Institutional change - new demands meeting old structures*
- *Reasons for the lack of intersectoral co-operation*

with following keywords framing the possible input of supportive theories:

Policy networks, change, institutions, motivation, attitude, conflicts, objectives

for the NFP-essential "**procedural approaches**" in **Portugal**

- *Learning processes and efficiency of structures*
- *Role and motivation of private landowners*
- *Involvement of various hierarchical levels*

with following keywords framing the possible input of supportive theories:

Empowerment, stakeholders, winners/losers, motivation, organisational learning, bargaining, conflict and compromising, learning process, vision

5. Preparation of the Aberdeen meeting

The Aberdeen meeting will take place from March 29 – 31 2001. Mr. Miller will send more information within a few weeks time. As agreed in Freiburg, the Aberdeen-meeting will focus on the essential "participatory approaches".

Given the situation with ongoing research projects three possible inputs are thinkable: (1) Results from ongoing research projects, (2) experiences of participants with ongoing processes in relation to forest policy planning in their respective home country, and (3) invited speakers. After a short discussion asking students to prepare a study on interesting subjects was indentified as a fourth possible type of input into the work of the working group.

With regards to the Aberdeen meeting it was agreed that in any case the list of research titles as well as the keyword lists should be revised. Research results will be presented from Denmark (Ms. Boon), Finland (to be nominated by Mr. Pajuoja), and Germany (Mr. Elsasser). Furthermore experiences with participatory approaches in relation to forest policy planning will be presented for Spain (Ms. Dominguez), Germany (Mr. Elsasser, Mr. Pretzsch), Netherlands (Ms. Neven), Scotland (to be nominated by Mr. Miller), Ireland (Mr. McAree).

With respect to invited speakers two key persons can be invited. The only direct suggestion from the group was John Forester, a specialist in perceptions of planners. The chairman asked all participants to suggest possible invited speakers before mid of December via email. Suggestions for reports on research projects as well as experiences are also very welcome.

At the end of the Aberdeen meeting preparation for the Norway meeting should be underway. Mr. Gislerud briefly pointed out some details about the meeting. The Norway meeting will be 13-15 September and the meeting will probably be organized in combination with a national workshop. The Norway meeting is about the collaborative approaches (negotiation, communication and conflict resolution). For this meeting it is important to think about 1 or 2 speakers also. Mr. Pajuoja suggest to ask Eeva Hellström from Finland who is doing research about conflicts.

6. Products of working group

Some discussion was started about what the products of the working group can and must be. As pointed out by several members of the WG as well as by the two chairmen the working group not only has to give account about its activities but should also provide useful "products" to policy-makers and other interested persons/organizations. During discussion the following suggestions were made: book with good and bad experiences, general framework for NFP, guide-lines for NFP's and an article. Given the limited time it is agreed to continue the discussion about WG-products and the presentation of outcomes at the end of the Aberdeen meeting.

7. Other questions

No other questions

Closing of the meeting

Mr. Schanz and Mr. Pajuoja expressed their thanks to the organizers for the perfect set-up and the great hospitality, as well as to the participants for their interest and close the meeting.

Heiner Schanz
Chairman, Working Group 1

Evelien Verbij,
Minutes checker