

Minutes of the fourth Working Group Meeting of Working Group 1 in Oslo / Norway, 13-15 September 2001

Place: Soria Moria Conference Center, Oslo

Participants: Johan Barstad (Norway), John Bowers (U.K.), Guenaelle Coudrec (France), Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho (Portugal), Miguel Fabra-Crespo (Spain), Gloria Dominguez (Spain), Peter Elsasser (Germany), Olav Gislerud (Norway), Frank Hofman (Germany), Karl Hogl (Austria), Josef Hackl (Austria), Helene Lundkvist (Sweden), Noel Lust (Belgium), George Malamidis (Greece), Hugh Miller (U.K.), Heikki Pajuola (Finland), Piotr Paschalis (Poland), Jürgen Pretzsch (Germany), Margaret Shannon (USA), Sven Svensson (Sweden), Tamas Sverdlak (Hungary), Ilpo Tikkanen (Finland), Dimitros Trakolis (Greece), Lorenzo Venzi (Italy), Evelien Verbij (Netherlands).

Time: Friday, 14 September 18:00-19:00
Saturday, 15 September 9.00 – 15.30

Minutes by: Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho (Portugal)

Agenda

Friday, 14 September (18:00-19:00)

1. Opening and adoption of agenda
2. Election of a new WG1 chairperson
3. Reflections on plenary presentations by Margaret Shannon and discussion, preparation of the WG1 session on Saturday

Saturday, 15 September (8:30-15:30)

4. Presentation of research papers followed by discussion
5. Presentation of experiences with collaborative approaches followed by discussion
6. Discussion about and work on propositions (four sub-groups) and presentation to the WG1 plenary
7. Preparation of the next working group meeting in Finland (April 4-6, 2002)
8. Other topics
9. Closing

Friday, 14 September

1. Opening and adoption of the agenda

H. Pajuola welcomes the participants and opens the fourth meeting of WG1. He excuses H. Schanz and I. Neven, who unfortunately cannot take part in the Oslo meeting. H. Pajuola chairs in this meeting of WG1 for he is the vice-chair. K. Hogl and

E. Verbij offer to facilitate the making of the propositions. H. Pajuola presents the preliminary agenda for the meeting. The members of the Working Group adopt the agenda without further comments.

2. Election of a new WG1 chairperson

Because H. Schanz has withdrawn as a chair of WG1, I. Neven is nominated as the new chair. All members of WG1 agree with her nomination and she is welcomed as the new chair.

3. Reflections on plenary presentations by Margaret Shannon and discussion, preparation of the WG1 session on Saturday

M. Shannon briefly reflected on the plenary presentations, and provided some structure for further WG discussions, and pointed out relevant sub-issues.

Saturday, 16 September

4. Presentation of research papers followed by discussion

The following presentations are meant to provide the group with an additional theoretical background in order to facilitate the future discussions of WG 1 :

- 1) Margaret Shannon (USA): Collaboration paper Working outline
- 2) Johan Barstad (Norway): Partnership/shared resources, shared organization
- 3) Jürgen Pretzsch (Germany): Joint decision-making with multiple actors
- 4) Karl Hogl (Austria): Multi-level Co-ordination: Problems and some proposals for solution

Discussion:

M. Shannon presented her paper about collaboration. Questions and aspects focused in discussion:

- Conflict should also be considered, not just collaboration (Tikkanen).
- Costs of institutions should be considered (Hofmann).
- Why create new institutions and not try to adapt existing institutions (Lorenzo)?

J. Barstad presented partnership communication. Questions and aspects focused in discussion:

- Differences between collaboration and partnership should be emphasized (Verbij). Barstad explained that partnership should be considered as an aspect of collaboration.

J. Pretzsch presented a communication about joint decision-making with multiple actors. He preferred the case-study (inductive) approach (as a forester) and highlighted the importance of understanding between foresters and sociologists. Action and its

results depend on adaptive collaboration, influence in different degrees by either traditional approach or participation action (see acetate and propositions).

- Shannon referred to the two types of collaboration that she presented (see knowledge-organization slide), as an interpretation to Jürgen's view.
- Referring to Shannon and Buttoud diagram, Bowers stated that the sphere of applicability of the collaboration typology is not well defined.

5. Presentations on experiences with collaborative approaches followed by discussion

- 1) Ilpo Tikkanen (Finland): Process model for National Forest Programmes
- 2) Piotr Paschalis (Poland): Biakowieza Forestry Programme in a European context.
Case study, Poland
- 3) Josef Hackl (Austria): Collaborative Approach

Discussion

- I. Tikkanen presented a communication about Process model for NFP's.
- K. Hogl stated policy issues as easier to approach versus finding common goals. I. Tikkanen reacted that strong partnerships are long term processes.
 - J. Pretzsch replied that it would than be bargaining and not adaptive collaboration.
 - F. Hofman highlighted the importance of information availability.
- P. Paschalis presented a communication about a case study in Poland.
- When asked about specific collaborative aspects in that particular case by P. Elssasser, Piotr referred to the importance of local key-people so that communication between participants can be accomplished.

6. Discussion about and work on propositions (four sub-groups) and presentation to the WG1 plenary

H. Pajuola reports to the WG that on Friday evening K. Hogl and E. Verbij) have tried to derive a list of propositions from the from the research papers and the experience reports which were presented to WG1. To allow more effective discussions in the following WG session these propositions have been assorted to four thematic clusters:

- Cluster 1: Josef, Piotr, Ilpo and Jurgen
- Cluster 2: Partnership (J. Barnstad)
- Cluster 3: Concepts of M. Shannon
- Cluster 4: Multi-level governance (K. Hogl)

The members of WG1 are asked to split up into four sub-working groups (each group covering one cluster) of about four to six persons according to their interest and background. Every group member is provided with print-outs of the propositions (for the original lists of propositions see the Appendix).

The sub-groups are asked to make the propositions more clear and more precise. To do so, they can reformulate them, define the key words included in the propositions, and remove or add propositions to the list. Finally, after about an hour, one speaker from each sub-working group presents the results to the WG plenary.

The results of the sub-working groups were written down on transparencies. The following enumeration is based on them.

Cluster 1: Josef, Piotr, Ilpo and Jurgen

- Adaptive collaboration planning /management is based on an iterative learning process between multiple stakeholders, requiring clear institutional rules (*JP*)
- Adaptive collaboration planning/management is a combination between social constration of reality and technological rationality (*JP*).

Social relevance of the theme:

- Motivation of stakeholders to participate and active involvement in the callaboration process rises with the social relevance of the theme (the theme must be up to date) (*Empirical, JH*).

Clear mandate:

- 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) (*Empirical, JH*)
- The collaborative group shall be given the mandate to discuss options for a concept for implementation (this includes evaluation). This may support the motivation of the group and the probability of the implementation of a concept. (*Empirical, JH*)

Adequate resources (time, personnel, financial, information):

- The forum charged with the elaboration of a concept, strategy, etc. shall be equipped with adequate resources (preparation, elaboration itself and implementation stewardship) (*Empirical, JH*)
- 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. (*Empirical, JH*)
- Adequate qualification of the participants is a prerequisite for a fruitful collaboration process. Even more important is the qualification of the chair (and his staff). This means specific qualifications in moderation/mediation. (*Empirical, JH*)

Focus of collaboration

- Collaboration/participation approaches are focussing on policy issues identification - less focus on policy formulation and implementation perse (*Empirical, IT*)

- Collaboration is limited mainly kept inside forestry sector cross-sectoral collaboration and policy coordination still missing (*Empirical, IT*)

Extra propositions made in the subgroups:

- There is a risk of limiting collaboration to the forestry sector only; cross sectoral collaboration and policy coordination often missing.
- Collaboration approaches should cover the policy cycle (including policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation).
- The collaborative group shall be given the mandate to discuss options for a concept for implementation (this includes evaluation). This may support the motivation of the group and protocolability/feasibility and the implementation of a concept.
- The participants of the collaborative process should be adequately and properly qualified to participate.
- The qualification of the participants should be recognised and accepted by the group as a whole.
- The qualification of the facilitating team is important. This means specific communicative skills.
- The forum charged with the elaboration of a concept, strategy, etc. should be provided with adequate resources (time, personal, financing).
- Motivation of stakeholders to participate and actively involve themselves in the collaboration process rises with the relevance of the theme in the society.
- Adaptive collaboration is based on an iterative learning process of the multiple stakeholders, requiring clear institutional rules (process and implementation).
- The clearer the mandate of the 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.

Cluster 2: Partnership

Successful partnership requires:

- 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
- That partners benefit from taking part in the partnership
- An established system for continuous learning and co-ordination between the partners (*Theoretical/empirical, JB*).
- The partnership must have any consequences for political steering and democratic control. (*Theoretical/empirical, JB*)
- The success of a partnership is closely linked to the quality of the process leadership. (*Theoretical/empirical, JB*)

During the sub-group session some propositions were added:

- In order to be successful, the partnership must have the opportunity to induce change (in tasks, activities, institutions,...)
- 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 result – and too little on how humans interact.
- The more authority vested in the partners, the more the partnership can influence future events.
- The chance of achieving efficient governance is higher where partnerships are involved.

Cluster 3: Concepts of Margaret

Template for collaboration (normative statement):

- 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
- Create governance capacity through institution building
- Ensure that choices are accountable to human values and scientific knowledge (*Theoretical/empirical, MS*)
- When actors are loosely organised, collaboration can build social capital for social organisations through deliberative processes and thereby strengthen organisational capacity for joint action (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*).

- When interests are diffuse, collaborative processes among well-defined actors can generate learning through deliberation leading to visions of desired future conditions and joint action (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*).
- The capacity for organisation learning depends upon the nature of relationships among actors and the type of communication characteristics of these relationships (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*).
- The more the communication is directive, the less the capacity for learning (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*).
- The greater the opportunities for collaborative deliberation, the greater the capacity for social learning and joint action (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*).
- Social learning entails changes throughout the deliberative community. . (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- Experience in collaborative processes may change values, interests, visions and understanding among actors (*M.S.*)

The following propositions were made in the subgroups:

- Social capital (actors, organizations, human and financial resources) needs to be strengthened in the forest sector for collaborative processes to be possible.
- Rapid change in human value and scientific knowledge necessitates greater opportunities for collaborative public and scientific deliberation.
- Motivation and/or creation of independent scientific institutions is important to ensure that choices are accountable to scientific knowledge (-competition-).
- Bureaucratic organisations and decisions making can be an impediment in implementation (practical or financial) of policies developed in participatory or collaborative processes.
- Collaborative processes need to develop "process rules" that take into account lobbying pressures and tendency of actors to advocate their own interests.

Cluster 4: Multi-level governance (original in appendix)

- Actors in charge of decision-making and implementation should be actively involved in vertical co-ordination arenas regularly (not just the international liaison officials) (KH).
- Multi-level, multi arena processes should also include actors who are not primarily oriented towards party competition, potential policy brokers and policy entrepreneurs (KH).
- Co-ordination by mutual adjustment easily runs into problems entailed by competition of systems (pressure to lower standards) (KH).
- Co-ordination by pure intergovernmental negotiations runs the risk to exclude highly relevant but conflicting issues and end up in agreements reflecting the lowest common denominator and/or in vague terms (KH).
- The more possibilities to agree on inter-sectoral package deals do exist, the higher the chance for common agreement (KH).

- If simultaneous integration and co-ordination of arenas is practically impossible, multi level NFP processes can probably be structured by differentiating arenas with regard to their functions. Problems can be divided into sub-tasks which can be dealt with in separate but coupled arenas. Differentiation can be done according to the **level of political decision-making** (meaning differentiating between basic goals, principles, budgets, regional programmes, projects, e.g.), between **distributive issues and substantial issues** (KH).
- 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 (KH).
- Arena differentiation has to be complemented by patterns of "loose coupling" which ensure information flows and co-ordination among arenas (vertical and horizontal). This can be provided by boundary-spanning actors (brokers, mediators) (KH).
- The dominance of one leading sector at every level of co-ordination enhances vertical co-ordination at the expense of inter-sectoral co-ordination. In that case, additional opportunity structures for inter-sectoral co-ordination have to be institutionalised, if desired (KH).
- The readiness of actors in an NFP to cooperate in elaborating common programmes is likely to be considerably increased when a clear financial commitment (funding approach) is integrated in NFP formulation (KH).

7. Preparation for the next working group meeting in Finland (April 4-6, 2002)

The next working group meeting will take place in Savonlinna, Finland. At the time of the meeting, the exact date was open, because of an overlap with the forest policy meeting of German speaking countries. The meeting in Finland will be combined with and EFI Seminar on the same issue and with input from the IUFRO division 6.12-00 on Forest Policy and Forestry Administration.

Voluntary speakers for the next meeting of our working group are:

Theoretical contributions:

- Margareth Shannon (USA)
- Johan Barstad (Norway)
- Evelien Verbij (Netherlands) and Karl Hogl (Austria): *The why and how of inter-sectoral co-ordination?*

Empirical contributions:

- Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho: Portugal
- Heikki Pujuoja: Finland
- Gloria Dominguez/Miguel Fabra Crespo (Spain): *Guidelines for the Catalan Forest: the detected needs of inter-sectoral coordination comparing to the present situation.*

8. Other topics

No other topics

9. Closing of the meeting

H. Pajuola expresses his thanks to the organizers for the perfect set-up and their great hospitality, as well as to the participants for their interest and for stimulating and fruitful discussions and closes the meeting.

Karl Hogl; Evelien Verbij
Facilitators

Heikki Pajuola
Vice-Chairmen, Working Group 1

Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho
Evelien Verbij
Keepers of the minutes

Wageningen, 31 January 2002

Appendix: Original list of propositions as basic input for the group work

Cluster 1: Josef, Piotr, Ilpo and Jurgen

- Adaptive collobaration planning /management is based on an iterative learning process between multiple stakeholders, requiring clear institutional rules (JP)
- Adaptive collaboration planning/management is a combination between social constration of reality and technological rationality (JP).

Social relevance of the theme:

- Motivation of stakeholders to participate and active involvement in the callaboration process rises with the social relevance of the theme (the theme must be up to date) (*Empirical, JH*).

Clear mandate:

- 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) (*Empirical, JH*)

Adequate resources (time, personnel, financial):

- The forum charged with the elaboration of a concept, strategy, etc. shall be equipped with adequate resources (preparation, elaboration itself and implementation stewardship) (*Empirical, JH*)
- The collaborative group shall be given the mandate to discuss options for a concept for implementation (this includes evaluation). This may support the motivation of the group and the probability of the implementation of a concept. (*Empirical, JH*)
- 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. (*Empirical, JH*)
- Adequate qualification of the participants is a prerequisite for a fruitful collaboration process. Even more important is the qualification of the chair (and his staff). This means specific qualifications in moderation/mediation. (*Empirical, JH*)
- Collaboration/participation approaches are focussing on policy issues identification - less focus on policy formulation and implementation perse (*Empirical, IT*)
- Collaboration is limited mainly kept inside forestry sector cross-sectoral collaboration and policy coordination still missing (*Empirical, IT*)

Cluster 2: Partnership

Successful partnership requires:

- 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
- That partners benefit from taking part in the partnership
- An established system for continuous learning and co-ordination between the partners.
(*Theoretical/empirical, JB*)
- The partnership must have any consequences for political steering and democratic control.
(*Theoretical/empirical, JB*)
- The success of a partnership is closely linked to the quality of the process leadership.
(*Theoretical/empirical, JB*)

Cluster 4: Concepts of Margaret

Template for collaboration (normative statement):

- 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
- Create governance capacity through institution building
- Ensure that choices are accountable to human values and scientific knowledge
(*Theoretical/empirical, MS*)
- When actors are loosely organised, collaboration can build social capital for social organisations through deliberative processes and thereby strengthen organisational capacity for joint action. (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- When interest are diffuse, collaborative processes among well-defined actors can generate learning through deliberation leading to visions of desired future conditions and joint action
(*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- The capacity for organisation learning depends upon the nature of relationships among actors and the type of communication characteristics of these relationships
(*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- The more the communication is directive, the less the capacity for learning.
(*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- The greater the opportunities for collaborative deliberation, the greater the capacity for social learning and joint action. . (*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- Social learning entails changes throughout the deliberative community. .
(*Theoretical/empirical, M.S.*)
- Experience in collaborative processes may change values, interests, visions and understanding among actors. (MS)

Cluster 4: Multi-level governance

- Actors in charge of decision-making and implementation should be actively involved in transregional co-ordination areas (not just the international liaison officials). (KH)

Working Group 1: Elements and procedural requirements of NFPs

- Multi-level, multi arena processes should also include actors who are not primarily oriented towards party competition, potential policy brokers and policy entrepreneurs. (KH)
- Co-ordination by mutual adjustment easily runs into problems entailed by systems competitions (downward pressure on standards). (KH)
- Co-ordination by pure intergovernmental negotiations runs the risk to exclude highly salient but conflicting issues. (KH)
- The more possibilities to agree on inter-sectoral package deals do exist, the higher the chance for common agreement. (KH)
- If simultaneous integration and co-ordination of arenas is practically impossible, multi level NFP processes can probably be structured by differentiating arenas with regard to their functions. Problems can be divided into sub-tasks which can be dealt with in separate but coupled arenas. Differentiation can be done according to the "generality of issues" (basic goals, principles, budgets – regional programmes – projects – implementation/monitoring, eg.), between distributive issues and substantial issues. (KH)
- 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. (KH)
- Arena differentiation has to be complemented by patterns of "loose coupling" which ensure information flows and co-ordination among arenas. This can be provided by boundary-spanning actors (brokers, mediators). (KH)
- The dominance of one leading sector at every level of co-ordination enhance multi-level co-ordination at the expense of inter-sectoral co-ordination. In that case, additional opportunity structures for inter-sectoral co-ordination have to be institutionalised, if desired. (KH)
- The willingness to co-operate at decentralised levels often strongly depends on the stimulating effect of funding from the central level. I.e. the readiness of actors in an NFP process to co-operate in elaborating common programmes is likely to be considerably increased when a common funding approach is integrated in NFP formulation; the promise of funding increases the cost of non-agreement. (KH)