

Working Papers of the Finnish Forest Research Institute 38: 14–27

# National Forest Program in Sustainable Forest Management

Pekka Ollonqvist

Finnish Forest Research Institute, Joensuu Research Unit

## 1 Introduction

This paper discusses the forest policy agenda, National Forest Program (NFP), developed through an international process from 1992 on, towards a transparent national forest policy formation for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). This new policy agenda “ a generic expression for a wide range of approaches to the process of planning, programming, and implementing forest activities in countries” (UN-IPF 1996) has been introduced towards the formation of SFM policy replacing Progressive Timber Management (PTM) policy through the adoption of a new agenda (dimensions of NFP agenda, see Egestad 1999).

There was a wide spectrum of national solutions on legislation and regulations applied in the use of forest resources under PTM objective. The legal rights of forest management, both restrictive and supportive, were traditionally formulated through hierarchical, top-down policy agendas. Policy instruments included a) positive incentives for forest users to promote the economics in forest resource utilization and b) negative sanctions for behaviors jeopardizing PTM targets. The norms, ranging from outright private holdings up to sole public ownership (by means of various kinds of lease and tenure arrangements) constituted the foundations for the administration and supervising principles in industrialized countries. These top down processes have produced relatively simple rules for towards a progressive timber production eg. by defining strict separation between forest conservation and management through land classifications. The classic policy instruments of subsidies, taxation, regulations and education were mainly used to govern economic actions. The preservation of ecological sustainability was an issue restricted to the lands of conserved forests. The use of these instruments in forestry required extensive administration resources.

The new sustainable development challenges to policy outcomes during the past fifteen years made the principles of PTM outdated. The new challenges, faced by the international community of policy stakeholders, related to the management of commonly owned resources and factors external to industrial societies on a global scale. The new foundations of political systems, constituting solutions on sovereignty, the division of power between parliament and government and the independence of the judiciary have challenged the fundamental principles of forest management. The principle of transferring the costs of global forest conservation while enjoying the short-term

benefits of unsustainable resource extraction has become untenable.

## Policy agenda towards Sustainable Forest Management

Forests were formally identified as global commons through inter-governmental negotiations towards an international forest policy regime from the mid 1980s. A formal agreement on non-legally binding statements for a global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests, “Statement of Forest Principles”, was achieved at the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992 in Rio. The UNCED agreement was the first step towards a new model for international forest policy agenda. The new agenda, covering the principles of sustainable management, conservation and sustainability of all forests, encouraged international deliberations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF)(1995 – 1998), the International Forum on Forests (IFF) (1998 – 2002) and the ongoing UN Forum on Forests (since 2003). <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/>. The proposals from IPF and IFF are being implemented and are internationally monitored and reported through subsequent joint meetings (the 6<sup>th</sup> session 2/2006 see:<http://www.un.org/esa/forests/session.html>).

The key principle, to manage and conserve forest resources in a sustainable way, has also been stated formally:

Stewardship and use of forests and forest lands in a way, and at a rate, that maintains their biodiversity, productivity, regeneration capacity, vitality and their potential to fulfil, now and in the future, relevant ecological, economic and social functions, at local, national, and global levels, and that does not cause damage to other ecosystems<sup>1</sup>.

Forest policy actions towards SFM can be identified on three levels:

- Global/transnational: Global Forest Conventions (IPF/IFF Proposals for Action) and inter-governmental processes (e.g., the Montreal Process, the Central American Initiative and the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forestry in Europe MCPFE).
- National: National Forest Programs (NFP) (2003 MCPFE Vienna Resolution) and Criteria and Indicators (C&Is) for the evaluation of national policy targets and their implementation.
- Local/individual tenure: Forest Certification covering certification of forest (PFCC, FSC) and timber (ISO standards) management. Standards of NFP are domestically determined whereas C&Is and certification (PFCC, FSC) schemes follow principles allowing international monitoring.

The new international policy agenda implies the formulation of C&Is to monitor and evaluate the fulfillment of SFM targets.

The national solutions to achieve the principles of SFM, as well as those covering the NFP targets in national forest policy have been unique. The key issues, capacities and conflicting interests, are discussed next.

## 2 Empowerment to participation through National Forest Programs

NFP as a policy agenda introduce new approach into a) the governance of forest resources and b) policy instrument formulation towards SFM (Gluck 2004). The grave deficiencies in the implementation of Tropical Forestry Action Plans (TFAPs), have provided lessons for the NFP agenda

<sup>1</sup> Second Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe. 16-17 June 1993, Helsinki/Finland

formation. Lessons cover the deficiencies caused by the lack of concern of local populations in the IPF process. NFP was adopted as an umbrella to provide wide ranging agenda solutions within different countries, to be applied at national and sub-national levels.

The principles adopted in the NFP agenda are:

- appropriate participatory mechanisms to involve all interested parties;
- decentralization, where applicable, and empowerment of regional and local government structures;
  
- recognition and respect for traditional and customary rights of, i.e. indigenous groups, local communities, forest dwellers and forest owners;
- secure land tenure arrangements; and
- the establishment of effective coordination mechanisms and conflict-resolution schemes.

The NFP agenda challenges the prior policy paradigms applied when promoting inter- sectoral approaches at all stages of policy development, including the formulation of policies, strategies and plans of action, as well as their implementation, monitoring and evaluation. These participatory mechanisms are intended to substitute the prior networks for policy formation in forest sector. These networks were frequently characterized by discriminatory features (see: clientelism, Hogl 1998 and corporatism, Ollonqvist 2002). The essential novelty related to NFPs, include the enlarged definition of SFM, new mode of governance (networking, co-ordination, including all policy means), communication and trust among major policy actors, and the adoption of open-ended iterative processes) (Glück et.al.2005).

The international forest policy dialogue has put much effort into the viable solutions of NFPs to meet these policy targets. NFPs are intended to be implemented within the context of each country's socio-economic and political environment and should be integrated into wider programmes for sustainable land use (Yudego 2002).

The NFP agenda is especially challenging for nations having forest resources and sector within the major contributors of national economy position. The typical features applied in prior solutions of forest policy governance can be classified through the mental capacities among the public sector and key Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) respectively (Rayner & Howlett 2004).

TABLE 1 Modes of Policy Agenda based on capacities. Rayner, J & Howlett, M. 2004. National Forest Programmes as vehicles for next generation regulation. In: D. Humpreys (ed.) Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg p. 49

		<b>Public capacity</b>	
<b>Capacity of NGOs</b>		<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>High</i>		Self regulation with public rationing	Self regulation NGO Dominated
<i>Low</i>		Public interventions	Public interferences

The feasibility of the NFP agenda depends, in addition to the capacities among government and main NGO's respectively, on 1) financial resources to cover the transaction costs originating from forestry practice transformations to meet the conditions of SFM, 2) the capacities where the governance can be delegated (when these resources can not be provided by the central government and 3) the political strength of a government and/or NGO's with major economic interests challenged.

Forest policy agenda in countries with high public and NGO capacities has frequently followed the institutional management approach i.e. high self-regulation supervised by public authorities (the corporatist solution in Finland: Ollonqvist 2003). The role of NGOs can become dominating when public governance capacity remains low and favors the self-regulation of major NGOs. Traditional top-down public policy agenda has been applied in countries with weak NGO structures. The basic solution between the public intervention and interference depends on the public capacity available.

### NFP in policy planning

The NFP agenda has challenged the traditional top down policy formulation approach (characterized by extensive expert knowledge use and co-operation arrangements among the major forest sector stakeholder experts). The self-regulation approach, based on policy networks instead of hierarchy, relies on a new understanding of policy planning (Rayner & Howlett 2004). Participation, involving all relevant actors into the process, expands the sphere of knowledge and influence and emphasizes expert knowledge empowerment among the new stakeholders. The comprehensive ("holistic") and inter-sectoral co-ordination among the actors towards internalizing the externalities is challenging because of the expert knowledge deficiencies.

TABLE 2 Modes of NFP Outcome. Rayner, J & Howlett, M. 2004. National Forest Programmes as vehicles for next generation regulation. In: D. Humpreys (ed.) Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg p. 52

<b>NFP Policy Process</b>		
<b>NFP Outcome</b>	<i>Formal</i>	<i>Informal</i>
<i>Substantive</i>	Classical NFP	Equivalent NFP
<i>Symbolic</i>	Failed	Rhetoric NFP

The mode of participation is among the key variables identifying the NFP outcome categories. The formal policy processes can produce substantive policy outcome (Classical NFP) if open access to participation and adequate institutional arrangements are available. Equivalent NFP relates to policy cultures covering the major features of NFP agenda what concerns participation and institutions but without formal status. Groups with low financial resource base run the risk of being unheard in the latter phases of the process. Actors will invest more time and effort if they can assume their input will have impacts on the outcome. The outcome can be equivalent NFP when stakeholders with internal participatory capacity carry out the process with the relevant public stakeholders. However, the likelihood of substantive agreements seems to increase with

an expanded representation among the actors of the process. If some of the participants have no clear mandate, the probability of substantive agreements decreases. Rhetoric NFP is the outcome from a process characterized by limited capacity and resources involved into the policy formation process. NFP outcome is symbolic if the essential modes of policy process cannot be fulfilled. Substantive NFP implies actors who are well endowed with resources with high empowerment on process management.

## National Forest Programs in Europe

There was an immediate reaction in the European forest policy context to the Rio resolutions. The processes towards realizing NFPs were taken into the agenda of the second Ministerial Conference PFE in Helsinki 1993. The agenda was further elaborated in Lisbon 1998 and formally adopted in Vienna 2003. Vienna Resolution 1 explicitly dedicated to NFPs with its own NFP approach:

*Strengthen Synergies for SFM in Europe through Cross- Sectoral Co-Operation and National Forest Programmes*<sup>2</sup>

Recent European research efforts<sup>3</sup>, for analyzing the formulation and implementation of NFPs, have delivered more insight into the preconditions of substantive NFPs from which ongoing or future NFP processes may benefit. Findings from four countries Finland, Norway, Sweden and UK are discussed and compared next.

## 3 Forest Policy Formation in Finland, Norway, Sweden and UK

The initiation of NFP-processes can be traced to the late 1990's in Finland, Norway and UK respectively (Zimmermann & Mauderli 2001). There has so far not arranged any formal NFP-process in Sweden (Svensson 2002). The initiation towards NFP process came from NGOs in Norway and from public authorities in Finland and UK. Formal initiation was launched by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Finland and Norway but Forestry Committee in UK. The major drivers to initiate NFP process came from the challenges of international commitments in Finland and Norway whereas in UK there was an internal need for a new policy agenda. The multi- sectoral NFP agenda was adopted in Finland and Norway but covered forestry agents in UK. There was a formal commitment in Finland and Norway but not in UK. Forest scientists, the stakeholders of forest industry and relevant NGOs (including NIPFO) as well as forest related interest groups participated to policy process in Finland, Norway and UK. In addition there were regional authorities from municipality level among the participants in Norway and UK. The arrangements to mobilize regional participation were formal in Finland but active also in Norway and UK. The NFP has legally binding status in Norway and UK but not in Finland. The included financial forest management incentives are the core elements in Finland and Norway whereas the program is only persuasive in UK. NFP includes environmental commitments in Finland, Norway, and UK but formal targets towards the promotion of forest industries only in Norway.

---

<sup>2</sup>The fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe. 28 – 30 April 2003 in Vienna/Austria

<sup>3</sup>The comparative evaluation apply the findings in COST E19 Action "National Forest Programmes in a European Context" (2000-2003) <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/>

And the prior actions: EFI Seminar in Freiburg (1998), MCPFE Workshop in Tulln (1999)

The participants of the COST E19 process identified several impeding factors related to NFP process (Zimmermann & Mauderli 2001). Conservative productivist viewpoint were identified in Finland, Norway and UK. Forestry has a low priority in UK when compared with biodiversity and landscape issues in rural spaces.

TABLE 3 NFP Outcomes . Rayner, J & Howlett, M. 2004. National Forest Programmes as vehicles for next generation regulation. In: D. Humpreys (ed.) Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg p. 52

<b>NFP Policy Process</b>		
<b>NFP Outcome</b>	<i>Formal</i>	<i>Informal</i>
<i>Substantive</i>	Classical <b>FINLAND</b>	Equivalent <b>NORWAY, SWEDEN, UK</b>
<i>Symbolic</i>	Failed	Rhetoric

## National Solutions to NFP Agenda

The country surveys below are based on the National reporting to UNFF 4 (Switzerland 2004, [www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff4](http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff4)) and UNFF 5 (New York 2005 [www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff5](http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff5)) of the countries concerned in addition to the specific references.

### *Finland pioneered with formal NFP process*

The Government of Finland decided to initiate the drafting of Finland's National Forest Program (FNFP) in 1998 with a wider scope than earlier programmes and specifically designed to take into account the relevant international documents and commitments (Hänninen et al. 2004). The program outcome was reported in 1999 and expressed as the first process outcome, subject to revision. The first follow-up report was published already in 2000 and process has continued thereafter ([http://www.mmm.fi/kmo/toteutus\\_seuranta/Liitteen1bliite.rtf](http://www.mmm.fi/kmo/toteutus_seuranta/Liitteen1bliite.rtf))

Forest policy was comprehensively revised in Finland during the mid-1990s prior to NFP process. Parks and Forest Services Law initiated this revision in 1993 and it was culminated by the passing of the Forest Act and the Nature Conservation Act in 1997. One major objective of the revision was the wish to bring Finnish forest policy in line with international agreements and political commitments. The first set of Criteria and Indicators for SFM was agreed 1998 and their regular revision was adopted into the agenda. First 13 Regional Forest Programs (RFPs) were completed in the same year and these RFPs cover the whole country. The first Finnish solutions to European Forest Certification system were implemented in 1999 (Mäntyranta 2002). There was an arrangement for public participation to FNFP process via Internet. This participation channel was available throughout the program process. The transparency of the policy process was continued also after the formal acceptance of FNFP. The subsequent FNFP documents have been available in Internet pages in 4 different languages <http://www.mmm.fi/english/forestry/program.htm>

FNFP outcome put special interest into the development of forest industries (products, processes and business structures), combined with a sustainable management of forests as well as to options to expand aggregate income generation. The preservation of traditional forms of forest utilization as well as new challenges related to the issues of social sustainability are taken into account. Program contains eight main objectives developed with some further measures. These objectives accentuate production and forest improvement, environment, social uses, research and education, as well as international forest policies. Strong importance is given to the wood input needs in forest industry, other uses of wood and productive forest management (objectives 2, 3 and 5). Many of the actions are oriented to increase the competitiveness of Finnish forest industry, profitability of timber management, viability of biodiversity issues and sustainable development (Objectives 1 and 4). In addition the issues related to the social sustainability of rural communities (Objective 6) are included by adding eg. the issues of recreation and environmental tourism. The objectives in research innovation and education (Objective 7) are involved and the final one focuses on the active participation into international agreements and forest policies (Objective 8).

### *Norway applied equivalent NFP process*

The process towards NFP in Norway can be traced to the “Living Forests” Project carried out during 1995-1998. Forest policy agenda was thereby broadened through the program towards sustainable forest management. The development of a set of performance level standards was among the main challenges related to the Living Forests project. The consensus among all involved stakeholders on 23 performance level standards for sustainable forest management was achieved in 1998. This consensus enlarged forest policy agenda on environmental issues, e.g. within the market, as well as the desire within Norwegian forestry to practice responsible forest management in a long-term perspective. The Living Forest Standards were based on the Pan-European Criteria for Sustainable Forest Management, and the corresponding indicators were included among the 95 Living Forest Indicators. All of these indicators have not yet been fully implemented in the context of national forest policy. The impacts of Living Forest Standards into the actual forestry measures were evaluated and consequently revised to the Living Forest Indicators. The Living Forest Standards constitute the basis for the forest certification applied in Norway. Large parts of the Norwegian forests are certified in connection with the ISO 14001 environmental management system, in accordance with the Living Forest Standards.

The White Paper on Norwegian Forestry and Forest Policy, endorsed by the Parliament in 1999 preceded the policy process towards the consensus on the Living Forest Standards. Expert committee started to prepare Norwegian legislation changes towards biodiversity protection thereafter and the outcome was a survey: protected forest areas in Norway, that were published in 2002. Ministry of Agriculture started NFP process next year and the preparation of a new Forest Act is on going.

Policy process characterized by limited participation and adaptive approach can be considered the major shortcomings making Norwegian NFP process equivalent. Participation approach used was considered valid for conflict resolution instead in technical issues because resources available to the stakeholders may not reflect the legitimacy of their claims (Tromborg & Lindstad 2004). Inter- sectoral coordination is challenging in Norway due to the competition among the Ministries. Major forest resource use implies inter- sectoral communication by their features (eg. Ministries of Agriculture, Energy and Environment are concerned in use of biomass in energy production). Inter- sectoral coordination implies hierarchy of processes and consequent consistencies to be

able to preserve the consistency with sector specific policy characteristics (Tromborg op.cit.).

### *Sweden applies fully equivalent NFP process*

Increased regionalization and expanded autonomy among Non Industrial Private Forest (NIPF) owners were the major forest policy reforms in Sweden during the late 1990's to meet the international forest policy commitments and challenges. The Swedish agenda with a strong emphasis on stakeholder involvement when developing forest-sector objectives satisfies many of the requirements of NFPs without indicating the specific measures to be taken. These forest-sector objectives are considered to meet the essential components of NFP concerning Sweden (<http://www.svo.se/minskog/templates/Page.asp?id=18033>).

The extensive forestry campaign "A Richer Forest", carried out in Sweden during 1987-94, initiated forest policy reforms. This campaign was designed to increase awareness of biodiversity issues especially in NIPFs before the Forest policy reformation (1992-93) was implemented. Environmental and timber production goals achieved parallel portion in the policy agenda. The major outcomes from the policy reforms were a) the removal of the silvicultural fees among NIPFs and b) transfer of all public subsidies from timber management to environmental benefits. The implementation of the new Nature Conservation Act (e.g. protection of key habitats) in 1994 was promoted by the "Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the Forest" – campaign. In 2001 the Swedish Parliament decided upon the environmental objectives for all sectors and these were synchronized with forest sector objectives

The Swedish Forest Agency formally adopted a set of objectives for the nation's forest sector in 2005. These objectives cover the overall policy reform and thirteen quantitative targets to be fulfilled within a specified time. Approval of the objectives in The parliament of Sweden culminated in a development process involving the Forest Agency and a wide range of interests within the forest sector. The similarities between the forest-sector objectives in Sweden and C&Is adopted by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) can be traced. Sweden adopted the international forest certification system (FSC) in 1998, contrary to numerous EU countries applying PFCC certification.

The political culture in Sweden applies the approach of mutual understanding and consensus related to the existing problem solutions. The principles of equality and agreement reached by applying local support and bottom up approaches are favored in the agenda (Svensson 2004). The essential communications related to forestry issues are based on direct communication between a single relevant government authority and individual NGOs providing opportunities to avoid bureaucratic overplay and duplication (Humphreys 2004). The large regional autonomy applied support this principle. Regional Advisory groups, attached to Regional Forestry Boards, provide a joint platform for the main authorities and NGOs, with the exception of some environmental NGOs. The Life-Environment project, "Urban Woods for People", introduced in 2001, promotes improved recreation utilities for the general public in urban woodlands. Swedish Parliament decided upon the environmental objectives covering forestry in 2001 and the National Board of Forestry (NBF) implemented these objectives. The process was participatory including stakeholders from industry, forest owners, Saami-people, environmental and social NGOs, research organizations and other pertinent government agencies. Progress will be monitored using the indicators developed for the project. Sweden has actively participated to IUFRO's European Forum on Urban Forestry, that provide an annual meeting place for urban forestry policymakers, practitioners

and scientists.

### *UK – three separate interdependent NFP processes*

The constitutional change in 1999 expanded the governance responsibilities in Wales and Scotland. NFP has been seen as a part of the ordinary forest-policy of those regions in UK. England, Scotland and Wales, have each developed their own strategy towards SFM. Regional and country level advisory panels, appointed by the Forestry Commission & Development Agencies, have been assisted through comprehensive iterative consultations. The creation of assemblies in Scotland and Wales became an important institutional driver of these changes (Humphreys 2004).

NFP of UK, adopted in 2002 covers: 1) Forestry Standard & Environmental guidelines, 2) Partnership for Action (forest certification, restoration, protection and use of timber in sustainable construction), 3) Indicators of Sustainable Forestry (40 indicators) and 4) full versions of the forestry strategies for England (England Forestry Strategy), Scotland (The Scottish Forestry Strategy) and Wales (Woodlands for Wales) and the consultation document for Northern Ireland. NFP is seen as a part of the ordinary forest-policy. The arrangements on public participation are based on communities that are defined territorially in terms of shared interests or identity. Local people have an opportunity to add input in planning and managing of local woodlands and the needs of local business and contractors are included in forest planning and management (Sangster 2004).

Public participation is a cross-cutting issue in the policy agenda in the UK, applied extensively in the public policy and linking rural development into policies concerned with social inclusion, rural governance, environmental justice and community development. It also applies the broad aspects of devolution, regional and local approaches to policy development. Participatory democratic processes cover forest policy issues as well. A further potential for involvement is the UK Forest Partnership for Action. The Partnership, including forest and wood processing industries, Government departments, devolved administrations and environmental NGOs, is the main platform for making commitments in forestry, as far as the UK is concerned ([www.ukforestpartnership.org.uk](http://www.ukforestpartnership.org.uk)). Forest Enterprise (FE), the Executive Agency managing the FC's forests, develops and expands community involvement, both in towns and in the countryside based on the blueprints set out for staff and local communities "Working with Communities in Britain: how to get involved" in 1999. FE engages an increasing number of partnerships. They involve local communities and other stakeholders in a wide range of innovative projects, in addition to the more routine aspects of forest planning and operational activities.

#### **Forest strategy:**

-for England, published in 1998, focuses on forestry for rural development, for recreation, access and tourism, for economic regeneration and for environment and conservation.

-for Scotland, developed and published in 2000, applies the forestry strategies created by Scottish Parliament.

-for Wales the Strategy was published in 2001, after a consultation exercise.

The **England Forestry Strategy** contains a brief introduction and comments about the policy framework. The Strategy is based on four key programmes containing some information about the current as well as former situation without tables, graphs or detailed technical information. The final point contains actions structured in 4 different objectives not directly correlated with the key programmes. The English Strategy is composed of four key items, rural development, eco-

conomic regeneration, recreation, access and tourism and environment, and conservation. Society and recreational aspects are also well developed in the third point, with focus on access and education. The environmental point focuses on the preservation of native or semi-natural forest. In this last point, cultural heritage preservation is mentioned. The Strategy tend to increase the role of forestry in the rural economy, and the areas of woodland but environmental values are also important.

The **Scotland Forestry Strategy** includes an introduction to Scottish forest and current policy framework in Scotland with tables, graphs and pictures. The proposals are presented in five Strategic Directions with relevant priorities. The Scottish Strategy emphasizes the need to maximize the value of wood earned to the Scottish economy. In this point is recognized the necessity of having a diverse forest and to take care of the non-timber products market. Other targets are the same as in England and Wales, such as access to forest, social importance and recreation, and environmental contribution. Aspects of research and education are less developed than in other NFPs.

The **Wales Forestry Strategy** contains an introduction and guiding principles, and develops five strategic objectives with key priorities for action without tables, graphs, or pictures. The Wales Strategy includes five objectives; woodlands for people (from a social point of view), woodland management, forest industries and timber production, environmental and diversity issues and tourism and recreation. These objectives are derived from the reality of Wales, a country with a low forestry cover but with economic potentials and an important area of public land. Great importance is given to increment of the woodland cover, with different functions: landscape with environmental and social objectives, and improve access to those woodlands. Strategy is focused on the support to the existing timber industry, and on generating better marketing and trading strategies.

## 4 Summary findings

The success of the NFP process depends on internal procedural aspects but on external factors constituting the environment of agenda implementation. There are supporting and impeding factors on NFP agenda, depending on the specific characteristics of the political system in a country. Procedural aspects of NFP, referring to goal setting and the principles applied in the policy process are to be covered in the process documentation to make NFP Classical. This kind of documentation is a necessary condition for iterative collaborative processes between the multiple stakeholders. Otherwise policy processes are apt to take a symbolic mode without reaching substantial targets and inducing leading policy stakeholders to withdraw from the process.

The necessary conditions on the Classical NFP to be achieved can be divided into:

- *Institutional consistency* covering a) the constitutional and legal framework of the country and b) international agreements and related national commitments. In addition NFP must recognize and respect customary and traditional rights of indigenous peoples and local communities respectively and secure land tenure arrangements
- *Managerial consistency* meaning a) the inclusion of integrated ecosystem approach towards conserving biological diversity and maintaining sustainable use of biological resources, b) the provision and valuation of forest goods and services and c) the statements detailing the political commitment to sustainable forest development as a contribution to sustainable development.

- *An adequate NFP process* involving sector review as an assessment of the forest sector and its interrelationships with other sectors covering political, legal and institutional reforms within and outside the forest sector as well as objectives and strategies for the forest sector, including a financing strategy for sustainable development
- *Process and participation empowerment* covering arrangements a) to the partnership and participation of all interested parties in the NFP process, b) a holistic, cross-sectoral approach to forest development and conservation.

The NFP agenda is a long-term, iterative process of planning, implementation and monitoring. Its aim is to decentralize power to regional and local levels applying national sovereignty and country leadership in its formulation and implementation (see eg. BMZ 2004:7, Glück et.al. 1999).

### Supporting and impeding factors for NFP process in the political culture<sup>4</sup>

Close co-operation between government and a selected number of employers' and employees' interest groups is an impeding factor what concerns participation, co-ordination and conflict resolution capacities in the NFP process. This approach impedes the involvement of actors outside a narrow policy network (Ollonqvist & Hänninen 2004). A neo-corporatist mode of governance is an impeding factor, whereas a proactive and consensus-seeking policy style of the government can be considered supportive. By contrast, clientele capture of forest administration often impedes inter-sectoral co-ordination, but must not be taken as unalterable. A legally binding framework of an NFP would support the institutionalization of an adaptive, continuous co-ordination process.

The leadership of forest administration for the NFP process and participation focusing on the traditional clientele (forestry and forest industry) tend to impede inter-sectoral co-ordination in an NFP process.

The political culture securing rights of participation, apply adequate conflict resolution and adaptiveness supports the NFP process. Government's anticipatory and active approach to problem solving and its tendency to make decisions through achieving agreement between interested parties is typical in all countries concerned and that is also a supporting factor for NFPs.

If the political culture of a country is such that it delivers government designed forest programmes, this will likely lead to moderate or low participation, low inter-sectoral co-ordination and low conflict resolution capacities as well as "command and control" policy instruments. However the findings are contradictory in the Finish case. Finland had a prior top down culture in forest policy, but open access participation into NFP process turned out to be supportive.

Capacities to meet the participation costs can become an impeding factor to the NFP process. High capacity available among government and the key NGO's can challenge the arrangements for proper participation if additional resources are not available. The adequate agenda determination and process arrangements require resources that can become a barrier to the participation among the stakeholders without adequate financial resources. Countries with strong interest groups having important privileges challenged by the NFP process, must have arrange enough resources /capacities to establish the parallel policy process to re-evaluate /change the existing structures. (see the supporting and impeding factors in Glück et. al. 2005).

<sup>4</sup> A comprehensive list of supporting and impeding factors in the political culture for NFP process has been stated and discussed in COST E 19 homepage COST E 19 <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19>

## Comparisons between countries

The relative magnitude of forest sector inside GNP explains inter -sectoral participation in NFP Process. Finland has extensive forest sector and strong forest related policy stakeholders with

corresponding political and macroeconomic influence. The corporatist policy structure of the country has in the prior policy accentuated the relative importance of forest sector policy stakeholders. The recently identified shortages in the silvicultural management outcomes among NIPFOs during the late 1990's called for the new public initiatives towards preserving public financial support for forestry investments. The formal NFP process in Finland, preceded by the consensus on environmental issues dealt with from 1994 to 1998, appears to be prepared for an international audience (Rayner & Howlett 2004). The major target, the preservation of public subsidies on timber production investments was achieved in NFP Outcome and is intended to be preserved in the second NFP in Finland (FNFP 2015) that is in the preparation stage. There has been a continuous process to adapt FNFP 2010 Outcome<sup>5</sup>.

The forest sector has a minor relative economic importance in Norway what concerns GNP share. Norway was among the early adaptors to meet the UNCED/IFP/IFF minimum requirements. The removal of all direct subsidies for silvicultural investments beginning in 2003 can be derived from the general political trend in the country towards reduced availability of sector specific public policy instruments into commercially viable value chains (Ollonqvist & Hänninen 2004). This accentuated the policy agenda formation towards inclusion of ecological sustainability into the forest policy agenda of Norway.

All direct public subsidies to silvicultural investments were removed in Sweden in 1993 parallel with Norway and the adopted emphasis on ecological sustainability issues in the forest policy agenda (Ollonqvist & Hänninen 2004). The outstanding consensus target to be reached by extensive campaigns and participation characterizes the common policy agenda traditions in Sweden. This partly explain the passive reactions in Sweden what concerns the UNCED, IFP and IFF proposals. Growing shortages in regeneration and thinning of seedling and juvenile stands was shown in the evaluations of 2001, proposing policy reenactment related to economic sustainability in forestry.

Consensus aimed extensive participatory traditions in the political cultures of Norway and Sweden respectively challenge the open access policy formulation initials. Early Forest Certification has provided sufficient solutions for forest industry and forest owners to keep foreign consumers satisfied. The NIPFOs do not view NFP as an instrument for regaining government subsidies to public timber management investments.

NFP agenda in Scotland, England and Wales appears to be oriented towards the current needs of the general audience but not necessarily linked to the specific needs of forest sector development. UK Forestry Standard indicates the extent of UK policy and practices to fit with international understanding and commitments on SFM.

---

<sup>5</sup> 2000 revision of 13 RFPs, 2001 the first follow-up report (next ones in 2002, 2004), 2003 the first evaluation of the NFP, 2003 the Future Forum on Forests, 2002-7 METSO - the Forest Biodiversity Programme for Southern Finland

## References

- BMZ (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2004. National forest programmes – instruments for improving sector governance? Experiences of German development cooperation. BMZ. Information Material No. 129. Bonn.  
<http://www.bmz.de/de/service/infothek/fach/materialien/materialie129.pdf>
- Egestad, P. 1999. National Forest Programmes in Clear Terms. in Glück, P. & Oesten, G. & Schanz, H. & Vold K. eds. Formulation and Implementation of National Forest Programmes vol.1 Theoretical Aspects . EFI Proceedings No. 30. p. 11- 23
- Glück, P. 2004. Conceptual Framework of COST E 19 National Forest Programmes in a European Context. in Glück, P. and Voitleithner, J.(eds.). NFP Research: Its Retrospect and Prospect.. Publication Series of the Institute of Forest Sector Policy and Economics. BOKU. Volume 52. Vienna. p. 11-20
- & Rayner, J. & Cashore, B. 2005. Changes in the Governance of Forest Resources in Mery., G. et. Al. eds. Forests in the Global Balance- Changing Paradigms. IUFRO World Series. vol. 17. p 51-74
- Hogl, K 1999 National Forest Programmes- A Request for Inter- Sectoral and Multi- Level Coordination Some Actor Focused Considerations. in Glück, P. & Oesten, G. & Schanz, H. & Vold K. eds. Formulation and Implementation of National Forest Programmes vol.1 Theoretical Aspects . EFI Proceedings No. 30. p. 163-183
- Humphreys D. National Forest Programmes in Europe: Generating policy relevant propositions for formulation and implementation. In. Humphreys, D. ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg. P. 13-43.
- Hänninen, H. & Ollonqvist, P. & Saastamoinen, O. 2004. Finland: Sustainable welfare via forest diversity. In. Humphreys, D.ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg. P. 87-99
- Mäntyranta, H. 2002. Forest certification - An ideal that became absolute. Vammala.
- Ollonqvist, P. 2002. Collaboration in the Forest Policy Arena in Finland – from Neo Corporatist Planning to Participatory Program Preparation. in Gislerud, O. & Neven, I. Eds. National Forest Programmes in a European Context. EFI Proceedings No. 44. p. 27-47
- 2004. Political Culture and Forest Programmes in Finland in. Glück, P. and Voitleithner, J. eds. NFP Research: Its Retrospect and Prospect. Publication Series of the Institute of Forest Sector Policy and Economics. BOKU. Volume 52. Vienna. p.115-128.
- & Hänninen, H. 2004. National Forest Programmes in Scandinavian Political Culture. in: Pajuoja, H. & Karppinen, H. eds. Scandinavian Forest Economics. No 40, p.189-200. <http://www.metla.fi/tapahtumat/2004/ssfe/proceedings-SSFE-2004-Jarvenpaa.pdf>
- Tromborg, E. & Lindstad, B. 2004. Norway: Achieving a NFP through an adaptive strategy. In: Humphreys, D. ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg. p. 207-218.
- Rayner, J. and Howlett, M. 2004. National Forest Programmes as Vehicles for Next-Generation Regulation: Lessons from Canadian and European Experiences. in. Glück, P. and Voitleithner, J. eds. NFP Research: Its Retrospect and Prospect. Publication Series of the Institute of Forest Sector Policy and Economics.

BOKU. Volume 52. Vienna. p. 159-182.

— & Howlett, M. 2004. National Forest Programmes as vehicles for next generation regulation. In: Humpreys, D. ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg . p. 45 - 62.

Sangster, M. 2004. United Kingdom: A tradition of consensus in forest planning and regulation. In: Humpreys, D. ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg. p. 295- 310.

Svensson, S. 2004. Sweden: Meeting the IPF requirements without a formal National Forest Programme. In: Humpreys, D. ed. Forests for the future – National forest programmes in Europe. COST Action E19. Luxembourg p. 265- 276.

Yudego, B. 2002. A comparison between National Forest Programmes of some EU-member states. Sweden's National Board of Forestry. Rapport 10. Jönköping. 25 p.

Zimmermann, W. & Mauderli, U. 2001. National Forest Programs in European countries - An initial overview based on a quick survey in countries participating the COST E-19 Action. mimeo.

National reporting to UNFF 4 (Switzerland 2004, [www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff4](http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff4)) and UNFF 5 (New York 2005 [www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff5](http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff5)) <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/>

#### Finland

- National Report to the Fourth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests
- National Report to the Fifth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests

#### Norway

- National Report to the Fourth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests
- National Report to the Fifth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests

#### Sweden

- National Report to the Fourth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests
- National Report to the Fifth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests

#### United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

- National Report to the Fourth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests
- National Report to the Fifth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests

#### UK National Forest Programme

<http://www.forestserviceni.gov.uk/press/2003/uk%20national%20forest%20programme.pdf>

#### FNFP

[http://www.mmm.fi/kmo/toteutus\\_seuranta/Liitteen1bliite.rtf](http://www.mmm.fi/kmo/toteutus_seuranta/Liitteen1bliite.rtf)

<http://www.mmm.fi/metso/international/index.html>,

[http://www.mmm.fi/metso/international/MOSSE\\_english.html](http://www.mmm.fi/metso/international/MOSSE_english.html)