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What is an NFP?

Forest Principles
- International consensus on sustainable use of forest resources UNCED in Rio 1992
- Principles to manage and conserve forest resources

New instruments for ensuring SFM at the
- Global level: Global Forest Convention (IPF/IFF Proposals for Action)
- National level: NFP (2003 MCPFE Vienna Resolution)
- Management unit level: Forest Certification

What is the difference between an NFP and existing policy means?
Novelty of NFPs:
- Enlarged definition of SFM
- New mode of governance (networking, co-ordination, includes all policy means)
- Communication and trust among the actors
- Participants agree on specific rules, norms and values
- NFP is no end in itself, but an open-ended iterative process
Basic elements of NFPs

Unambiguous definitions on NFP
- Which are the most decisive ones?


Based on EFI Seminar in Freiburg (1998), MCPFE Workshop in Tulln (1999) and COST E19 Action, four “conceptual essentials” were selected:
- Participatory mechanisms (including conflict management)
- Collaborative approaches (partnership for implementation)
- Holistic and intersectoral approaches
- Iterative process with long-term commitment
  plus
- Secure land tenure arrangements
- Decentralisation (empowerment of regional and local government structures)

State of Art: NFPs in Europe according to COST E19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>implementation (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>to be approved 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>forest strategies for all 4 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>no (Flanders RFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>no (RFPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finland: milestones in recent forest policy

1993  Forest and Park Service Law
1994  Environmental Program of Forestry and its follow-up during 1995-98
1997  the new Forest Act (protection of key habitats)
1997  the new Nature Conservation Act
1998  a set of Criteria and Indicators for SFM
1998  13 Regional Forest Programs (RFPs)
1998  Forest Certification system (FFCS principles → PEFC)
1998  the Government initiated drafting NFP
1999  the NFP was completed
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 was launched
2003-7  the Forest Biodiversity Programme for Southern Finland

Norway: milestones in recent forest policy

1975  Renaming Forest Act to Act on Forestry and Forest Protection
1995-98  Living Forest Project
    •  non-governmental initiative (but Government supported financially)
    •  a set of criteria and indicators for SFM & "Living Forest Standards" as the main goal
1998  Forest Certification system (PEFC)
1998  White Paper on Norwegian Forestry and Forest Policy, endorsed by the Parliament in 1999
2001  Expert committee to prepare Norwegian legislation changes towards biodiversity protection
2003  Starting an NFP process (the Ministry of Agriculture)
2003  Committee to arrange the forestry issues of the indigenous people (Sami people)
2004  Preparation of a new Forest Act by the year 2004
Sweden: milestones in recent forest policy

1987-94 "A Richer Forest" – a campaign to increase consideration regarding biodiversity

1992-3 Forest policy reformation
  • environmental and timber production goals are of equal importance
  • silviculture fee was removed
  • public subsidies were limited to environmental benefits

1994 new Forest Act (substantial deregulation, increased freedom)

1994 new Nature Conservation Act (e.g. protection of key habitats)

1995 "Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the Forest" - campaign

1998 Forest Certification system (FSC)

1999 "The Greener Forests" – an extension and information campaign

-2002 targeted to forest owners

2000-1 Evaluation of the effects of the new forest policy

2001 the Parliament decided upon the environmental objectives for all sectors
  • operationalisation of forest sector objectives ongoing, planned to adopt in 2004

Political culture as supporting/impeding factor for NFP process according to COST E19 (1)

1. If the social and political culture of the country secures rights of participation, conflict resolution and adaptiveness, then it is more likely that the NFP process will succeed

2. A government’s anticipatory and active approach to problem solving and its tendency to make decisions through achieving agreement between interested parties is a supporting factor for NFPs

3. Close co-operation between government and a selected number of employers’ and employees’ interest groups is an impeding factor of participation, co-ordination and conflict resolution capacities in NFP processes with regard to involving actors outside such a narrow policy network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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++ +++ +++
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++ ++ ++

FI, SW, NO
++ ++ ++
4. If the political culture of a country is such as to deliver government driven forest programmes, then this likely leads to moderate or low participation, low inter-sectoral co-ordination and low conflict resolution capacities as well as “command and control” policy instruments.

5. If, as it is most frequently found, the leadership for steering the NFP process is the forest administration and participation is focused on the traditional clientele (forestry and forest industry), then this impedes inter-sectoral co-ordination in an NFP process.

6. The more rigid the distribution between formal authorities (e.g. ministries, departments), the less likely it is that inter-sectoral co-ordination will occur.

### Political culture as supporting/impeding factor for NFP process according to COST E19 (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Relative Economic Importance</th>
<th>Forest Sector</th>
<th>New Public Initiatives</th>
<th>Governmental Support</th>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1993-1998</td>
<td>Police trend</td>
<td>Reduced availability</td>
<td>Insensitive to proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>All direct subsidies were removed since 1993</td>
<td>Outstanding consensus via large campaigns</td>
<td>Large participation by tradition: is it not sufficient?</td>
<td>Findings in the evaluation 2001: growing shortages in regeneration and cleaning of seedling and juvenile stands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sweden and Norway: why without NFP process?

Consensus aimed extensive participatory culture by tradition
  • challenge to build up open access policy formulation

Pioneers in Forest Certification
  • provided sufficient solution to forest industry and forest owners to keep foreign consumers satisfied

Public subsidies to timber production
  • forest owners did not consider an NFP as an instrument to acquire additional subsidies

Finnish threatening example
  • hidden conflicts in environmental issues broke up during NFP process

MCPFE making NFP process inevitable: lessons from Finland’s NFP to be learned?