

Minutes of the fifth Working Group Meeting of Working Group 1 in Savonlinna / Finland , 5 April 2002

Place: Paviljonki, Savonlinna

Participants: Johan Barstad (Norway), Pedro Ochoa de Carvalho (Portugal), Gloria Dominguez (Spain), Antonio Morcillo San Juan (Spain), Laura Nieto Zas (Spain), Miguel Fabra Cresto (Spain), Peter Elsasser (Germany), Olav Gislerud (Norway), Frank Hofman (Germany), Claus-Henning Schmidt (Germany) Karl Hogn (Austria), Josef Hackl (Austria), Georg Rappold, Alexander Buck (Austria), Noel Lust (Belgium), Heikki Pajuola (Finland), Piotr Paschalis (Poland), Jürgen Pretzsch (Germany), Margaret Shannon (USA), Sven Svensson (Sweden), Tamas Szedlak (Hungary), Ilpo Tikkanen (Finland), Dimitros Trakolis (Greece), Lorenzo Venzi (Italy), Davide Pettenella (Italy), Evelien Verbij (Netherlands), Ilze Silamikele (Latvia), Yves C. Dubé (FAO), Lennart Ljungmann (FAO), Christian Mersmann (World Bank), Robert Flies (EU), Tove Enggrob Boon (Denmark)

Time: Friday, 5 April 2002, 09.00 – 15.30

Moderator Heikki Pajuola, Finnish Forest Research Institute

Minutes by: Tove Enggrob Boon (Denmark)

Agenda

- 9.00 - 9.30 Adoption of agenda, minutes of 4th meeting and WG1 working method
- 9.30 - 10.15 Presentation of background theory papers
- 10.15 - 10.30 Discussion
- 10.30 - 11.00 Coffee
- 11.00 - 11.45 Presentation of empirical papers on inter-sectoral approaches,
- 11.45 - 12.30 Discussion
- 12.30 - 14.00 Lunch
- 14.00 - 15.30 Discussion in sub-groups and drafting a list of propositions
- 15.30 Departure to study tour

Minutes

1. Opening and adoption of the agenda

H. Pajuoja welcomed the participants and opened the fifth meeting of WG1. He excused I. Neven, who unfortunately could not take part in the Savonlinna meeting. H. Pajuoja was elected as chairman of this meeting of WG1.

The suggested agenda for the meeting was presented by Pajuoja and adopted by the members of the Working Group. Afterwards, the minutes of the 4th meeting were approved, and Tove Enggrob Boon was elected to take the minutes of this 5th meeting.

Margareth Shannon introduced the working method for WG1, which was hereafter approved by the WG members:

Two paper types are being presented, that is, theoretical background papers, followed by empirical papers. Each of these papers contains a set of propositions. The authors are urged to outline these propositions themselves. As a special assistance, Margareth Shannon would aim at picking up the propositions that are being presented during the paper presentations.

After the paper presentations, the resulting propositions from 5 April as well as the propositions that arose from the papers presented 4 April 2002, will be compiled in thematic clusters to be used for further discussion in sub groups. This session will end with a plenary WG1 session to present and discuss the subgroup results.

2. Presentation of research papers followed by discussion

The following presentations were made, to facilitate the future discussions of WG 1:

FAO Forestry Department activities on cross-sectoral policy impacts in Forestry
Yves C. Dubé, FAO

Inter-Sectoral Coordination in NFP processes
Karl Hogl, Agricultural University of Vienna, Austria

Mechanisms of Inter-Sectoral Co-ordination in forest policy making
Evelien Verbij, Wageningen Agricultural University, The Netherlands

Iterative Planning Processes; Supporting and Impeding Factors
Johan Barstad, Møre Research Volda, Norway

Discussion:

Alexander Buck asked Johan Barstad how a process can be both iterative *and* set the goals at the outset.

Christian Mersmann commented Evelien Verbijs paper on boundary setting. He suggested that there is a need to identify the points of entry, the common interests, cf. Hogs discussion about common interests. Otherwise boundaries are nothing but palisades.

Christian Mersmann further commented Johan Barstads paper on iterative processes, asking where the group is having the overview so that it doesn't go in the wrong direction.

Gerard Buttoud challenged Karl Hogl, suggesting that Hogl promotes 'common interests', whereas there may also be hidden interests that are not being reconciled. As a consequence one may have some non-interest driven motivations. More over, there are many, - 8-9 forms of negotiations.

Karl Hogl commented, that he did not aim to promote 'common interests'. It could as well be 'common conflicts'. The main point is that the actors are on board.

Gerard Buttoud suggested Johan Barstad, that rather than using the theory of 'muddling through', one might as well consider using communicative planning theory, which Barstad agreed upon.

Claus-Henning Schmidt commented Karl Hogls overheads – that there was no need to both put in markets and negotiations, as in his view, those were one and the same. The reply to this was, that hierarchies need to solve distributional issues but don't need to ask the actors. Negotiations need to solve distributional issues and need to ask the actors, whereas the market doesn't care about any of these.

Jürgen Pretzsch asked to Evelien Verbij's paper who sets the boundaries. André Dubé suggested the answer that one could identify the linkages of public policies impacting on forest policies and vice versa.

Frank Hoffmann suggested that there is a shadow hierarchy that fits the iterative planning process need for governance. Karl Hogl disagreed to this, finding that shadow hierarchy' is only theoretical, not applied. Frank Hoffmann replied by asking how people would know if results are implemented, if there are no shadow hierarchies.

André Dubé suggested that public participation can be a means to integrate an iterative planning process.

3. Empirical papers on inter-sectoral - advocacy coalition approaches

Intersectoral aspects of the National Forest Policy in Portugal

Pedro Ochôa de Carvalho, Portugal

Intersectoral Co-operation and NFPs - Experiences from Finland

Heikki Pajuoja, Finnish Forest Research Institute, Finland

Guidelines for Forests: Sustainable management in Catalonia - the detected need for inter-sectoral co-ordination

Gloria Dominguez, Centre Technologic Forestal de Catalunya, Spain

Discussion

Karl Hogn asked Heikki Pajuoja who finally decided on the NFP document, considering the prior extensive participation process. Heikki Pajuoja answered that the NFP process was participatory but that the outcome is still partly to be implemented. That casts serious doubts on the real effect of public participation in terms of creating 'ownership'.

Lennart Ljungmann commented that the Finnish NFP should be considered as only a 5 % add-on to already existing policies and actions towards sustainable forest management.

Jürgen Pretzsch asked Heikki Pajuoja how he can evaluate a normative plan. Heikki Pajuoja replied, that maybe that would have be a task for COST E19 to do.

Heikki Pajuoja was asked how representativeness has been controlled in the finnish NFP participation process. Heikki Pajuoja answered, that it had not been an issue, as the participants had not been delegated any power, but merely been consulted.

There were several positive comments as to the way Gloria Dominguez made use of Karl Hogn's theoretical framework to analyse Catalonian forest policy.

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

Margareth Shannon introduced the group work to be carried out.

The propositions emerging from the background papers and empirical papers, were compiled and ordered in four thematic clusters in order to allow for more effective discussion. Within each cluster, the propositions had been subdivided into theoretical and empirical propositions, see Appendix 1. The members of WG1 split up into four sub-working groups, each group covering one cluster:

Cluster 1 Different approaches for defining sectors
Margaret, Ilze, Josef, Karl, Evelien, Dimitros,

Cluster 2 Conditions for successful Inter Sectoral Co-ordination(ISCo)
Yves, Sven, Tamas, Noel, Claus-Henning, Tove, Jürgen, Gloria,

Cluster 3 Defining scales of Intersectoral co-ordination - what levels ? what are the ambitions for ISCo in order to reach SFM?

Laura, Pedro, Frank, Piotr, Johan, Davide, Georg,

Cluster 4 Expectant or pro-active attitude of the sector towards ISCo?

Miguel, Olaf, Antonio, Heikki, Alexander, Robert, Lennart, Gerard

Each group was provided with print-outs of the propositions. The task of the sub-groups was then, based on the presentations and their own country experiences, to refine and further develop relevant and concise theoretical and empirical propositions and presents the results to the WG plenary.

The results of the sub-working groups were written down on transparencies and presented by each subgroup in the WG1 plenum. These results can be found in Appendix 2, prepared by Margareth Shannon.

The joint results of the WG1 5th meeting were compiled and presented by Margareth Shannon in plenum, see Appendix 3.

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

The next working group meeting will take place in Porto, Portugal, planned to be 7-9. november 2002 (**NB!! postponed to spring 2003** due to severe COST fund limits, ed.). The last meeting is planned to be 4-5 July 2003 in Vienna.

Margareth Shannon stressed the need to focus on social learning and iterative processes. Claus-Henning Schmidt explained that social learning and knowledge management is about how to manage information and create learning processed that reflect such knowledge.

Jürgen Pretzsch suggested Claus Eland, Zürich, as a speaker, besides a good, regional planner.

Gerard Buttoud suggested to invite the chairman of the GtZ as they have a new way of evaluating projects.

Johan Barstad suggested the Amdam brothers, as the good, regional planners.

André Dubé suggested to also focus on institutional reform and institutional change.

Shannon urged researchers from countries with weak institutional structures to prepare country presentations, in order for all to see how these countries go about developing these structures.

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

Theoretical contributions:

- Claus-.Henning Schmidt, Germany, ' Network learning'
- Davide Pettenella, University of Padova, Italy
- Josef Hackl & Jürgen Pretzsch, Austria & Germany
- Margareth Shannon 'Processes of policy experimentation and learning'

Johan Barstad contacts the Amdam brothers for a paper on social learning

Empirical contributions:

- Ilze Silamikele, Ministry of Agriculture, Latvia
- Heikki Pajuoja, Finland
- Frank Hoffmann, Germany

6. Other topics

No other topics

7. Closing of the meeting

Appendix 1 Initial four sets of propositions based on papers

Prepared by Prof. Margareth Shannon (see acronym list at end of appendix)

Cluster 1 different approaches for defining sectors ?

How a sector is defined depends on the perspective and approach of the scientist or researcher making use of this concept. Is a sector a kind of (temporary) institutions or organisation with the aim to manage sustainable forestry efficient and effective?

Theoretical propositions and statements	Empirical propositions and statements
Inter-sectoral co-ordination can be defined as a process or a status; process refers to organisation and reconciliation of different activities while status refers to sectors are co-ordinated when their respective policies show minimum redundancy, minimum incoherence and minimum untackled issues. – KH -	Sectors are tread as equivalent to the levels of Europe, national state level, regional level and local level: these multi-level activities are requiring strong, systematic and effective mechanisms for co-ordination as regards forestry matters. – <i>RF</i> -
Sectors are more than just sections of economic life and can only be fully understand when the involved actors define sectoral boundaries. – EV -	Inter-sectoral linkages are described as multi-level activities: the impact of Community policies is described. – <i>RF</i> -
sectoral co-ordination can only be understood when the boundaries are clear, for otherwise no distinction can be made between sectoral and inter-sectoral co-ordination. – EV -	The strengthening of co-ordination is needed increasingly because of increasing globalisation and progressing urbanisation that leads to different values of forests between urbanised and people in rural areas. – <i>RF</i> -
	Inter-sectoral or intra-sectoral depending on your definition of a sector! – <i>RF</i> -
Inter-sectoral policy integration can only be reached through improved integration of policy across multiple sectors. The mechanisms 'how' are depending on the conceptions used for policy sectors. - MSh -	
Promoting integration is about the better facilities of participatory, planning, and institutional mechanisms.- MSh -	
	One issue like fire can have lots of public attention that diverts attention from the larger problem context, forests. (Pedro)
	Passive or active coordination depends on the attitude of the actors toward the interaction. (Heikki)
	Participation in coordination activities can create commitment to the NFP, but lack of resources and low participation of some sectors can undermine this potential. (Heikki)
	When a country already has a significant set of institutions achieving the basic processes and goals of the NFP process, then should identify the marginal improvements needed to reach SFM.
	A careful analysis of the types of coordination failure can focus resources and effort at the appropriate level of coordination. (Gloria)

Cluster 2 conditions for successful ISCo

Before discussion fill in what successful means:

By (pre-) conditions is meant - knowledge sharing; interdependency; motivation; participation exchange of informatie etc.

Theoretical propositions and statements	Empirical propositions and statements
Recent forestry assessments show that what happens in forestry is largely decided by what happens outside the forestry sector leading to the need for a holistic approach. – LL -	The main challenge for countries with a small forest sector is to establish sufficient political attention and support on the National Forest Programmes process and hence motivate for broad participation from stakeholders. - <i>KO&ET</i> -
In order to solve cross-sectoral problems the access to knowledge need to be strengthened in order to facilitate transparent decision-making. – LL-	The Catalonian NFP was mainly drawn up by a section in the department responsible for forests; inter-sectoral co-ordination means inter-professional co-ordination for only universities, landowners and forest professionals were consulted 'outside' the forest sector. – GD -
Successful cross-sectoral linkages will only happen when knowledge is shared and therefore knowledge and institutional capital needs to be built to address the problems across all the sectors. – LL -	Policy makers are aware of the need for inter-sectoral approaches, but no clear procedures are executed so far. – GD -
In order to 'really' achieve inter-sectoral linkages the empowerment of all key-stakeholders (also civil society) is needed. – LL -	
Co-ordination is desirable if concerted action can increase the overall welfare-gains and/or provide legitimacy and acceptance to public policy. – KH -	
The institutional frame of NFP's stimulates and supports actor-networks that facilitate cross-sectoral co-ordination. – KH -	
Actors define their sectors by setting boundaries and only when the show some level of permeability to other sectors are relationships with other sectors possible; these relationships are needed when interdependency and motivation for interaction are present with the actors involved. – EV -	
Need to clearly identify the points of entry based on the boundaries, gives security to actors to interact with actors "outside" (Chris Mersmann)	
Who keeps the overview in an iterative process? (Chris Mersmann)	
	Dispersed authority over forests creates difficulties in coordination of policy. (Pedro)
	Lack of awareness of forests leads to difficulty of engagement in coordination because low interest in public and not an attractive profession. (Pedro)
	Why when an NFP is developed with a participatory process is difficult to maintain participation in the implementation? It might be due to a lack of real ownership or a lack of time.

Cluster 3 defining scales of Intersectoral co-ordination – what levels ? what are the ambitions for ISCo in order to reach SFM?

There are all kinds of scales, the *Policy co-ordination scale* of Metcalfe 1994 ; The *participation scale* of Arnstein (Information - participation (have a say) – consultation – co-production – delegation – self-management) , The *scale from linkages to integration* coordination communication etc.

Theoretical propositions and statements	Empirical propositions and statements
Co-ordination needs to be clearly defined, for levels of co-ordination range (like levels of participation) between exchange of information and total integration of sector policies. – EV -	
Who defines the boundaries when political interests may strongly affect the nature of boundaries? (Jurgen Pretzsch)	
	Iterative processes only work when there is the shadow of hierarchy - democratic, legitimate authority supporting the need for the outcome. (Frank Hoffman)
	True participation could be a mean for introducing an iterative process. (Yves Dube)
	Portugal: forest sector includes all levels and all official, NGO and stakeholder groups, organizations, and individuals, so coordination is difficult to define and carry out. (Pedro Caravalo)
	Watershed management plans in Portugal did not consider forests, therefore lack of information and knowledge of and in plans. (Pedro)
	When approved national strategy with requires for plan, then coordination is needed and can be maintained. (Pedro)
	Iterative policy elaboration process can engage actors at different levels and allow multiple coordination opportunities without having a comprehensive intersectoral coordination process of all issues/levels. (Pedro)
	When regional forest councils are located in areas with low populations, then the informal relationships (social control) and the degree of representativeness support NFP processes. (Heikki)
	When there are already numerous institutions responsible for forestry policy and management, then the marginal contribution of an NFP may be low and may also divert resources from other programs.

Cluster 4 expectant or pro-active attitude of the sector towards ISCo

At what level and under what conditions is it possible to act in an expectant or pro-active way; what actors at what level are important to pro-active management and why; what about problems of autonomy of the actors

Theoretical propositions and statements	Empirical propositions and statements
Inter-sectoral co-ordination can be unmanaged (the outcome of a process, a status) or managed in a process of policy making to co-ordinate the different activities. - EV -	
	Difficult to use a "common interest" approach when there are "hidden" or "abstract goals" in the process? (Gerhard Buttoud)
	Identifying "common goals" can help get and keep actors at the table for negotiations. (Karl Hogl)
Theories of decision processes are insufficient taken alone rather need a mixture of approachers. (Buttoud)	
	Difficult to activate private stakeholders if you have nothing to offer them. (Heikki)
	Using joint "projects" (in both public and private sector) is a means to carry out an NFP. (Heikki)

Acronyms used

<i>Robert Flies (EC-DG for Agriculture)</i>	- RF
<i>Lennart Ljungman (FAO)</i>	- LL
<i>Oistad, K and Tromborg, E. (Ministry of Agriculture, Norway)</i>	- KO&ET
<i>P. Mayer (Liaison Unit Vienna)</i>	- PM
<i>Karl Hogl (University of Agriculture Sciences Vienna)</i>	- KH
<i>Evelien Verbij (Wageningen University)</i>	- EV
<i>Margaret Shannon (USA, Buffalo)</i>	- MSh
<i>G. Dominguez, E. Plana, M. Fabra (Spain and Finland)</i>	- GD e.a.

(Johan Barstads paper:)

DEGREE OF ITERATIVITY

LOW	HIGH
Quantitative	qualitative
Objective	subjective
Non-symmetry	empowered discourse
Solution oriented	holistic and comprehensive strategies
Comprehensive strategies	complex, dependent upon the outcome of the process
Well-defined time scope	time = maturity, gain knowledge from the time
Welldefined goals	goals imprecise
High degree of measurability	low degree of measureability
Optimum seeking	seek knowledge
Low degree of certainty	high degree of certainty
Know all stakeholders	# of stakeholders is responsive to process
Full knowledge - evaluation	high uncertainty - need to evaluate to form process
Less critical	
Welfare = sets of goods	Welfare = control of our own situation

Appendices 2 and 3 – see attached files prepared by M. Shannon ‘Cluster reports to WG1’, and ‘clusters report’, respectively