

Distr.
RESTRICTED

TIM/EFC/WP.1/SEM.53/2002/2
6 June 2002

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Timber Committee

European Forestry Commission

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION



JOINT FAO/ECE/ILO COMMITTEE ON FOREST TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING

Seminar on
PARTNERSHIPS IN FORESTRY

Brussels, Belgium, 3 to 6 June 2002

REPORT
(as approved by the seminar)

Introduction

1. The seminar on Partnerships in Forestry was held at the Conscience Building of the Flemish Community in Brussels from 3 to 6 June 2002, under the auspices of the Joint Committee and at the invitation of the Government of Flanders, Belgium. Participants from the following countries attended: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Opening of the seminar

2. The seminar was opened by Mr. D. van Hoye, chief of the Forest Service of Flanders, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Ministry of the Flemish Community. Mr van Hoye underlined the importance of this seminar for addressing the challenges facing the forestry sector today. Partnerships between different interest groups can help to accommodate the diversity of needs, to promote sustainability and to create a policy from the bottom up.

3. As on behalf of the Joint Committee secretariat, Mr. P. Poschen (ILO) also welcomed the participants and outlined the objectives and the programme of the seminar. The seminar was a response to

the call by the Third Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe in Lisbon 1998 to communicate better and to build partnerships, in particular with groups outside the forestry sector. Partnerships within the sector but also with groups outside the traditional forest sphere are seen as a vital means to cope with the growing demands on forestry. The hope is that they can mobilize resources and support for a sector with otherwise dwindling political and economic importance. The seminar was structured around four themes: partnerships in forest policy, in timber production, in the delivery of non-wood goods and services and in employment creation and rural development. The discussions should culminate in conclusions and recommendations to member countries as well as to the Fourth Ministerial Conference to be held in Vienna in 2003 that clarify the role of partnerships, the potential as well as the limitations of the concept, the conditions for successful partnerships and how they can be used more widely and in innovative ways.

Adoption of the agenda (item 1)

4. The provisional agenda, as set out in the second announcement (TIM/EFC/WP.1/SEM.53/1/Add.1) was adopted.

Election of officers (item 2)

5. The following discussion leaders were appointed:
- | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|
| Item 3 | Mr. Carl de Schepper (Belgium) |
| Item 4 | Ms. Christine Holding Anyonge (FAO) |
| Item 5 | Mr. Christian Salvignol (France) |
| Item 6 | Ms. Ana Noriega (Spain) |
| Item 7 | Mr Carl de Schepper (Belgium) |

General introduction (item 3)

6. Under this topic the following papers were presented: Mr. D. Bills (United Kingdom) on the Role of partnerships in forestry in the United Kingdom; Mr. J-O. Thorstensson (Sweden) on “The partnership in forestry – the Swedish experience”; Mr. P. Canaveira (Portugal) on “Partnerships in Forestry – The Case of the Portuguese Paper Industries and Climate Change” and Mr. M. Lammertz (Germany) on “A social contract for sustainable forest management and use of wood in Germany”.

7. In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Bills maintained that partnerships played a major role in extending the forest cover in the United Kingdom as well as in diversifying forests. Economic pressures from imports were intense and timber revenues alone no longer covered the cost of forest management. Devolution and decentralization had generated many new opportunities for partnerships with regional and local institutions and for access to new sources of funding. This development in forestry was part of a broader shift in the economy and in society. Concerning the driving forces behind the changes in legislation and forest practices in Sweden, Mr. Thorstensson explained that environmental organizations

together with demands from the European markets had played a major role. Legislation had changed from detailed, stringent prescriptions to more open and orientational goal setting.

8. Queried about the difference between CELPA's new approach and conventional lobbying, Mr Canaveira insisted that the industry wanted to be a partner and that the need to be proactive was now widely recognized. The pulp and paper industry had a favorable energy balance due to the high share of biomass used in the process. A general increase in the use of wood for energy generation was a source of concern as it would lead to competition for raw material. CO₂ emissions originating from the pulp and paper industry in Portugal were rising because rapid growth of output more than compensated the reductions in emissions per ton of product. This dilemma was as yet unresolved in the face of competition on global markets. Other energy intensive industries like cement manufacturers where simply relocating production to North Africa were they will not have to pay for emissions. Mr. Lammertz confirmed that the social contract would be incorporated into the National Forestry Programme (NFP), thereby making up for some of the deficits that had been criticized with regard to participation in the formulation of the NFP. In Germany, compensation for environmental services was still limited to cases where the cost of providing these far exceeded normal operating cost. Some inroads were however being made to extending compensation. Mr Bills referred to this as the forestry sector's 'difficulty in capturing rent'. In the UK, partnerships had created new sources of rent but there was still no market mechanism or clearing-house to bring together demand and supply.

Partnerships and forest policy (item 4)

9. Papers were presented under this item by: Mr. G. Buttoud (France) on "Developing partnerships between forestry agencies and stakeholders: the mixed model as a strategic planning tool" and Mr. S. Schenker (Austria) on "Forest enterprises as partners in society".

10. In the discussion, Mr. Buttoud emphasized that he did not consider French forestry as a role model. The public forest service was struggling with poor returns from timber production, which no longer covered the cost of management for other objectives. A new formula had yet to be found. He suggested that it was rather an example of the current redefinition of the role of the state. In this political process, partnerships played an important role. Mr. Schenker acknowledged that private forest owners are rather inward looking and do not usually take the initiative to establish partnerships. A change in attitude was desirable.

Partnerships in the mobilisation and use of timber (item 5)

11. This subject was explored in presentations by Ms. A. M. Furuberg Gjedtjernet (Norway) on "Partnership in forestry - some Norwegian examples"; Mr. S. Difle (France) on "Closer cooperation among timber suppliers"; Mr. Breznikar (Slovenia) on "Ways of improving forest owners' participation"; Mr. H. Jokiluoma (Finland) on "Social sustainability, quality of work and partnership"; Mr. B. Hudson

(United Kingdom) on “Forestry contractors – link in the forestry-wood-chain (challenges-threats-visions)” and Mr. M. Höbarth (Austria) on “Cooperation for strengthening family forestry in rural areas”.

12. Mr. Difle agreed with comments that the logistics management systems now being introduced in France, have been around in other countries for years. The technology and lessons learned elsewhere had in fact been used to design the systems now being installed in his projects. Technology had not been the obstacle though. Traditional supplier-customer relations had no room for the kind of partnerships needed in order to be able to use this technology. This had only changed in recent years under the pressure of problems with timber supply at competitive prices. Mr. Breznikar explained that there was still little inclination to establish forest owners’ associations in Slovenia. Timber production was not profitable on very small woodlots. Some consolidation into larger holdings through sales was under way but this was unlikely to alter the picture in the near future.

13. Mr Jokiluoma was asked why the partnership between forest owners, industry and contractors under timber contracts found in Finland a decade ago no longer existed. He explained, that it had to be abandoned because it was incompatible with cartel regulations of the European Union. Even state forest districts, who wanted to retain the services of good contractors on a continuous basis, were forced to go through a public tendering process. The current situation on the market for forest services with three large companies buying from some 2,000 contractors was rather imbalanced, but industry was trying to improve conditions.

14. Queried about representation of the forestry workforce, Mr. Hudson pointed out that fledgling organizations of contractors were faced with serious resource constraints. It was also very difficult to organize micro-enterprises, but progress had been made for example in the UK. Contractors in his country had by-and-large survived the price competition generated by the strong appreciation of the Pound Sterling in recent years by two types of adjustment: concentration into larger firms had reduced overheads and diversification into more general land management services, which were more lucrative.

Partnerships in the delivery of non-wood goods and services (item 6)

15. The following papers were presented under this item: Ms. J. Levinson “Partnership in forestry – South-Western Australia – a regional perspective” (Australia); Mr. M. Vanwijnsberghe (Belgium) on “Arriving at a new management scheme for the Forêt de Soignes, Capital Region of Brussels”; Ms. Ch. Jenssens (Belgium) on “Social learning and urban forestry planning – the case of Flanders”, a paper co-authored by Prof. D. Wildemeersch; and Ms. E. Kopylova (Russian Federation) on “Building partnerships for forest conservation and management in Russia”.

16. In the discussion, Mr. Vanwijnsberghe supplemented that the involvement in public participation was gradually changing the attitude of the staff of the forest service. The majority had come round to seeing participation as useful, but most foresters were not exactly born communicators and it would take more than a few years to fundamentally change the mindset. Ms. Jenssen agreed with an observation that

participation could be used to impose a dominant institutional interest. The concept of social learning could help to overcome barriers and bring in non-traditional stakeholders and new ideas.

17. As an answer to a question whether other stakeholders would also be able to benefit from forestry, Ms. Kopylova emphasized the importance of land-lease in the Russian Federation. Land-leases have become more frequent and enjoy strong support from the government. At the same time as Russian authorities are promoting land-lease arrangements, the number of protected areas is increasing which reduces the level of the annual allowable cut. Annual harvest is, however, well below the allowable levels. The question was raised whether it could be ensured that investors would not run away with the revenues and Ms. Kopylova admitted that this is indeed a problem. Efforts have been made to pass on responsibility in the administration and to establish a control system.

Partnerships creating new sources of income and employment and contributing to rural development (item 7)

18. The following papers were presented under this item: Mr. R. Flies (European Commission) on “Forestry and rural development at the EU level”; Ms. V. Augutaviciene (Lithuania) on “Lithuanian perspective on and experience with partnerships”; Mr. E. Kastenholz (Germany) on “The Role of contractors in rural development”; Mr. M. Düzgün (Turkey) on “Employment and income generating opportunities for forest-dependent rural communities through effective partnerships in state-owned forest administration” and Ms. C. Holding Anyonge (FAO) on “Partnerships, poverty and markets”.

19. Strong criticism was directed towards the European Commission in connection with the project Natura 2000 in Germany and how it was managed. Mr. Flies agreed that Natura 2000 was certainly a good example how projects should not be handled, especially as regards the lack of dialogue with the local public. The main failures were, according to Mr. Flies, the lack of consultation with the stakeholders and hasty decisions on high political level before financial matters had been cleared. Although a failure, it had been a good lesson for future projects. There were also concerns that the bottom-up approach would not reach the target groups and Mr. Flies mentioned that the Commission had no resources for implementing policies and for acting as a catalyst. The main stimulus has so far proved to be involvement of local and regional politicians and media. Mr. Flies admitted that the European Commission had neglected to highlight successful examples in the European Union and that this would be a big potential for boosting the EU Forestry Strategy.

20. Mr. Düzgün underlined that policies tend to be oriented by the views of the implementing organisations. This can sometimes lead to situations where stakeholders in rural areas are fed with guidelines instead of taking a more active part in the process. The question was raised whether there could be potential to employ people in forest work by utilizing a “green wave”, e.g. people who relocate to rural areas and enter ‘green jobs’. Mr. Kastenholz replied and gave an example from Poland where unemployment in rural areas is so high that people are willing to accept any job that would be offered. A more common situation, however, is an ever stiffer competition for the workforce. Young people

interested to enter the “green sector” can also choose other occupations, such as landscape planning, agriculture and service-oriented jobs in the sector. Another constraint are temporary shortages of labour, e.g. during the summer season. One participant emphasized the fact that forest work is undergoing a steady decline in the areas of safety and health and working conditions. As an example Slovenia was mentioned where fatality rates have reached levels comparable with those in some developing countries. Mr Kastenholz rounded up the discussion by emphasizing that ENFE (European Network of Forest Entrepreneurs) could serve as a facilitator in making the forestry workforce more mobile. Something that has proven to be necessary in the case of major storms. He also reminded the audience that there still are major problems to solve for forestry contractors. He addressed the needs of making jobs safer, more sustainable in terms of employment, and more attractive. Otherwise, forest work would continue to be regarded as “3D”, dirty, difficult and dangerous.

Other business (item 8)

Working groups

21. On Tuesday afternoon three working groups were established to discuss the following topics:

- “Why partnerships in forestry? What are the reasons for the growing interest in recent years?”
- “What are the benefits of partnerships in forestry? Who benefits and how? What are good examples of partnerships? What are the opportunities (traditional or new) and the limits of partnerships?”
- “Partnerships to fulfil requirements of social sustainability, in particular the forestry workforce.”

22. The working group discussions were continued on Thursday afternoon on three topics. One group discussed the first and the third of the topics listed below and the second group selected topics two and three.

- “How to build effective partnerships in forestry?”
- “What are the areas with greatest potential for partnerships in forestry? Which are the most urgent?”
- “What should be done to use partnerships more widely and more effectively?”

23. The findings of all working groups were presented and discussed in plenary sessions. Outlines of the findings of the working groups are provided in annex II to of this report.

Study visit

24. A full day excursion was organized on Wednesday 5 June including visits to two forest areas in the vicinity of Brussels. A summary of the visits in provided in annex II to this report.

Acknowledgements

25. On behalf of all participants Mr. Bills warmly thanked the organizers for the hospitality and the excellent organization. It had been a rich as well as enjoyable seminar. Many participants were having the seminar from it with clearer concepts and new ideas.

Conclusions and recommendations (item 9)

Conclusions

26. Partnership is an old concept, which until recently has only been applied to a limited extent in forestry, often in reaction to pressure. The concept has attracted much more interest in the last few years, and is beginning to be used pro-actively and strategically. A wide range of examples for partnerships in forestry was presented at the seminar involving a cross-section of actors: forest services, chambers of agriculture, private and public forest owners, contractors, research and training institutions, forest industry, and forestry sector-wide organizations.

Why partnerships?

27. The increasing number of partnerships between forestry enterprises and institutions is a response to a changing environment:

- Demands on forestry have risen and become more diverse;
- Traditional forestry focussed on timber production is losing its relevance to society in many European countries;
- Globalization is putting intense pressure on timber markets;
- All actors in the forestry sector face constraints on financial and other resources. This is particularly true for owners of family forests, small firms and their organizations.

28. As a result, the relative weight of forestry in national economies is dwindling and the sector attracts little attention from decision makers. Partnerships are one way of regaining the initiative rather than finding oneself at the receiving end of regulations and demands. Partnerships have thus rightly been identified as a key strategic concept for the forestry sector by the Third Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe in the Lisbon declaration and in Resolution L1. Partnerships are by no means only relevant to public forest services, they are a sector issue.

What is partnership?

29. While participation is about decision-making and hence about governance, partnership is about implementation. The partners follow an agreed course of action, sharing resources in pursuit of commonly understood goals.

30. There is a great variety in goals, in the nature and numbers of partners as well as in the scale and depth of the partnerships entered into.

What are the benefits of partnerships?

31. Partnerships increase the knowledge and resources available to attain forestry objectives. They give access to expertise and creativity not available to the partners individually. They can be a way of capturing rent from otherwise non-marketable goods and services and enable the forestry sector to market ideas and know how to others. Partnerships presented during the seminar have been instrumental in attaining a wide range of objectives.

32. Partnerships within the forestry sector increase competitiveness quality, productivity, image and market position. Specifically they made it possible to:

- create large-scale timber processing and value-added capacity;
- mobilize additional timber resources from private forests;
- establish logistic chains to improve quality and reduce cost of timber delivered to mills;
- create and market new value-added products;
- better manage mountain forests;
- improve work quality and well-being at work;
- provide better access to forestry education;
- promote gender equality in forestry.

33. Partnerships beyond the forestry sector can leverage significant resources. They also have the potential to build political support for forestry in other sectors and with the public at large. In the examples presented they served to:

- provide and/or market recreational services;
- rehabilitate land;
- contribute to rural development;
- conserve nature and protect cultural heritage;
- professionally deliver public relations, extension and environmental education;
- address climate change;
- build a broad coalition for forestry with other social groups.

What does it take to establish effective partnerships?

34. Benefits have to be tangible for all partners. They may be clear, but are not always be readily measurable, particularly in economic terms. Trust, credibility, transparency, and the absence of a hierarchy among partners are preconditions for true partnerships.

35. Whereas participation can live with compromise, partnerships require consensus. They need clearly defined goals and resources. Goals, the agreed course of action, and the resources committed should preferably be spelled out in contracts. Training can help partners to develop effective partnerships. Political decisions can be implemented through the generation of partnerships.

How can partnerships be used more effectively and more widely?

36. Partnerships along the forest products value-added chain from forest to consumer could make major contributions to increase competitiveness. They could also address the looming forestry workforce issues, which threaten the sustainability of forest management. Cross-sectoral partnerships are particularly promising opportunities for well-resourced partnerships in the areas of education, health, water management, recreation, rural development, nature conservation and climate change. This can be achieved by an area-based approach. The pursuit of narrow agendas and exclusive search for immediate financial gain would severely restrict the usefulness of the concept.

37. While little analytical work has been done on partnerships in forestry, it is clear that meaningful partnerships require significant cultural changes in the forestry sector. These include overcoming the inward looking and reactive attitude only all too common in all types of forest ownership. They also call for a change in business culture, with organizations accepting to relinquish control much more than is the case traditionally. This concerns control in the form of regulation, of verification, and of decision making and resource allocation within organizations. An enabling environment at national level should include clearly defined land and forest tenure. Within institutions, in particular in public forest services, it supposes communication skills among staff at all levels as well as a delegation of authority and resources for partnerships at the local level.

38. Information gaps about opportunities, institutions, modalities and potential partners constitute a major obstacle to a wider use of partnerships in forestry. Resource constraints are a significant barrier for small firms and organizations to enter into partnerships.

Recommendations addressed to the Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe:

39. The Fourth Ministerial Conference to be held in Vienna in 2003 should include the promotion of partnerships within and among countries in its programme of implementation of resolutions adopted at earlier conferences. As a matter of urgency the Conference should address the need for partnerships to remedy serious problems with the forestry workforce in Europe. (The rationale for addressing this issue and possible ways forward are set out in greater detail in Annex I).

Recommendations addressed to the Joint Committee:

40. The Joint Committee should organize a further seminar to analyse concrete examples of partnerships with respect to their role in promoting sustainable forest management as defined by the

Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe. This should cover partnerships along the entire wood supply chain from the forest to the consumer as well as cross-sectoral ones. Particular attention should be paid to the applicability of the concept in central and eastern European countries. Lessons learned should be extracted and widely disseminated concerning: promising fields for partnership building and ways to create an enabling environment.

41. The Joint Committee should discuss how stakeholders who currently tend to be excluded from dialogue in the forestry sector, such as forestry contractors, other small enterprises, forest workers and their organizations can acquire voice and representation. Existing good practices related to these matters in certain countries provide learning opportunities.

42. The Joint Committee should support policies and partnerships that facilitate the strengthening and establishment of forest owners' associations, in particular in Central and Eastern European countries.

43. The Joint Committee should take steps to ensure that the ILO continues to contribute expertise and networking on social and labour issues in forestry to the Committee's work programme.

44. The Joint Committee should consider organizing study tours linked with workshops to exchange information about partnerships between government, industry and private forest owners for the development and sustainable management of forest resources and for the conservation of natural resources.

Recommendations addressed to member countries:

45. Partnerships can be an effective way of coping with the complexity of sustainable forest management, the diversity of interests and the large number of stakeholders. Member countries should develop strategies and build the capacity to use this tool. Particular attention should be paid to promoting cross-sectoral partnerships in the areas of health, education, rural development, landscape management, water resources, nature conservation, and environmental services. Capacity building should be initiated to enable forest service staff and forest owners to engage in participation and partnerships. The rich international experience should be taken advantage of and disseminated.

46. Governments should further develop the 'mixed-model' approach to improve interaction with other stakeholders in forestry.

47. Indispensable stakeholders such as contractors, other small enterprises and forest workers are currently often left out of partnerships for lack of voice and representation. Member countries should assist these groups to partake in partnerships for the benefit and viability of the forestry sector at large. Workforce issues as outlined in annex 1 should be addressed as a matter of priority.

48. Forests have become places of consumption as well as of production. Forestry education should reflect this. Training and education should cover consumption and process as well as production and product. Communication skills are particularly important in this respect.

Recommendations addressed to research institutions and IUFRO:

49. Research should focus more on the social components of sustainability, including institutional arrangements for dialogue, participation and partnerships. Opportunities should be explored for partnerships across national borders, e.g. for the promotion of timber and other forest products. Tools and techniques to make participation and partnerships more effective and efficient should be developed and widely disseminated.

50. Studies should be initiated to analyse the role of forests in human health and well-being and to trace effects back to specific features in the forest.

51. Due to the far reaching changes in technology and modalities, renewed efforts are needed to improve working conditions and in particular to analyse the effects of new forms of work organization and the introduction of advanced equipment on well-being at work.

52. All of the above projects would greatly benefit from international, collaborative efforts in research and in the dissemination of findings.

Adoption of the report (item 10)

53. The seminar adopted the conclusions and recommendation prepared by the secretariat and an annex to these drafted by members of working group 3 on Tuesday 4 July with a number of modifications, which have been incorporated into this text. It approved the other parts of the report with the provision that the secretariat would incorporate changes communicated by participants. The latter have been reflected in the above text.

Annex I

Sustainable forestry needs a sustainable forest workforce

Recommendations to the Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe

The contribution of sustainable forest management to the economic, ecological and social well-being of rural areas is delivered most clearly by the provision of secure, long term employment. It stems from the activities of a skilled workforce who are themselves part of the economic and cultural fabric of rural communities.

The contribution and value of the skilled forest workforce is recognised in the Helsinki and Lisbon Ministerial declarations and in the UNCED process including IPF, and IFF proposals for action.

The maintenance and development of this skilled and viable workforce cannot be taken for granted. The workforce is ageing, recruitment of skilled individuals is diminishing in the face of competition from other sectors and capacity for training is constrained.

The workforce has undergone radical structural change and fragmentation as contracting has replaced direct labour. Whilst this has led to benefits of increased productivity and competition, small enterprises and individuals are less able to fund training and development. The ability of forestry and training agencies to deliver training has been affected by a lack of organisational and representational infrastructure among the self-employed workforce, whose voice is unheard in the international processes. Action in these areas would be particularly valuable for CEEC countries.

To maintain the contribution to SFM of this key group we therefore propose action to enhance the quality, environmental and safety conditions of the forest workforce:

- promote the further development of organisational infrastructure both national and European;
- encourage quality, skills development, environmental and safety conditions for forest workforces in national forestry programmes in Europe;
- recognise the place of forestry work in rural development planning;
- identify and disseminate best practices.

Annex II

Summaries of working group results (based on presentations in plenary sessions)

Tuesday, 4 June 2002

Group 1:

Why partnerships in forestry? What are the reasons for the growing interest in recent years? (Questions 1)

Regarding the question “why partnerships in forestry?”, the following objectives and outcomes of partnerships were identified:

- Raising awareness
- Exchange of experiences through a developed dialogue
- Taking account of different interests among different stakeholders
- Help understanding and identifying what consumers want from multifunctional forestry
- Promote participation by including people and non-traditional stakeholders
- Overcoming and avoiding conflicts
- Bringing balance into the process by sharing power, e.g. forest owners

- Partnerships are an alternative to usual approaches
- Added value through creating a win-win situation
- Sharing of resources, competence, reducing energy costs

- Gathering more resources and capacities by national, and also global, cooperation (“together we are stronger”)
- Achieving cross-sectoral benefits by breaking down barriers
- Alliances give more political weight

The answer to the second part of question 1, “what are the reasons for the growing interest in recent years?”, was summarized by the group as follows:

- The importance of forestry has declined in today’s society and in an ever changing world
- To justify your existence and survival in a changing world, e.g. the case of forest owners.
- Cross-sectoral approaches are adopted for other policies in society, e.g. in the areas of health, education, security, and rural development. The function of forestry needs to be redefined.
- The idea of forestry has changed. In the period from the 18th century until today the function of forestry has gone from just being a wood and non-wood products’ resource to nature conservation and multi-functionality.

- Increased and reconsidered importance of the social agenda in forestry
- In particular, growing importance of job creation.

Group 2:

What are the benefits of partnerships in forestry? Who benefits and how? What are good examples of partnerships? What are the opportunities (traditional or new) and limits of partnerships? (Question 2)

The group focussed on the last two topics, limits and opportunities, and identified the following factors.

Limits:

1) due to attitude:

- Single objective being pursued
- Lack of courage, creativity and interest
- Traditions and conservative attitudes, e.g. towards new working methods
- Cultural differences between countries and social groups
- Suspicion and negative experiences with forest services or organization in the past

2) due to the policy framework:

- No political will
- Centralized government policies
- Politicians do not have partnerships as a priority
- Legal constraints on decentralization and delegation

3) Resources: time and funding

- Time-consuming, e.g. delay in decision-making due to necessary discussions between stakeholders
- Short-term thinking
- High costs in combination with money constraints and low investments in forestry

Opportunities:

1) Factors that are supportive for partnership development:

- Legal framework for forest management planning that prescribes the involvement of all stakeholders
- Self-regulation of relations between
 - urban populations and forest owners
 - small private forest owners and industry
- National Forestry Programme (NFP) framework
- Local, national, regional and global forestry dialogue
- Cooperation between people representing different regions of the world
- Changes in government forest policies
 - more decentralized and participatory approach
 - taking part in the international debate

- Examples from the private sector
 - Strengthening of forest owners' associations
- 2) Sustainable Forest Management:
- To involve more private forest owners in sustainable management of their forests
 - Orientation towards multi-functionality
 - Increase efficiency in management and manufacturing of forest products
- 3) Optimising
- Optimising of consumption of forest products
 - Lower the risks of non-acceptance of the project
- 4) Participation and awareness
- Give voice to people who usually are excluded in the process
 - Expand the openness and transparency of the forestry sector
- 5) Processes
- Eliminate bureaucracy and focus on responsibility
 - Harmonization of private and public interest in forestry
 - Use and focus on the opportunity of dialogue instead of just debate
 - Utilize everybody's qualities and bring different perceptions together

Group 3:

Partnerships to fulfil requirements of social sustainability, in particular the forestry workforce.

(Question 3)

The topic is directly related to the Helsinki Declaration, the Lisbon Declaration and Resolution L1. Social sustainability is a vast and diversified subject. The group therefore decided to focus on the forestry workforce element. In this respect, the working group identified the following key areas of concern:

- Sustainable forest management needs a sustainable workforce
- Recruitment problems of forestry contractors are further accentuated by increasing competition from other sectors
- An ageing workforce has negative consequences for the industry and society
- Safety and well-being deficits for workers and visitors
- Forestry's importance for rural development
- Lack of a common voice that leads to exclusion in the process
- Unstructured workforce at present

The situation of forest workers and contractors should be addressed in international fora and the group summarized some conclusions to be directed to the ministerial conference in Vienna. Attention should be drawn to topics important for the forestry workforce and a message should be formulated and ideally transmitted through interested countries. The group suggested the following countries as possible transmitters: Poland, UK, Belgium and Finland.

The following action items should be pursued:

- A focus on national fora of actors, national forestry programmes and Central and Eastern European countries extension programmes
- Include social and labour issues adequately in criteria and indicators
- Promote organization and representation
- Skills and enterprise development
- Occupational safety and health and well-being
- Respect of basic human rights

A common vision for forestry contractors should focus on the following topics:

- Development of efficiency and productivity
- Legal protection and basic rights
- Well-being
- Rural development
- Job quality

The group formulated a recommendation addressed to the 4th Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe, which was adopted by the seminar as an annex to the conclusions and recommendations of the seminar (see annex 1 to conclusions and recommendations above).

Thursday, 6 June 2002

Group 1:

How to build effective partnerships in forestry? (Question 1)

The group identified the following main areas as important for effective partnerships:

A clear, realistic and consensual purpose of partnerships should be defined together with a communication strategy. Such a strategy should be based on transparency and continuity and communication should be done with an equal voice. Resources have to be made available. Resources in this context include money, people, networks and support of key stakeholders. Concerning the organisation around partnerships, the group emphasized the importance of formal agreements, including on the sharing of responsibility.

Training, mutual learning and access to the expertise are other areas of importance. Finally, partnerships should have a policy-based approach built on innovations.

What should be done to promote a wider and more effective use of partnerships? (Question 3)

The group emphasized the importance of a switch from a traditional forestry-based to a more area-based approach in establishing partnerships. Such a change would enable an involvement of stakeholders that otherwise could be excluded in the process. An additional suggestion was to broaden the perspective and to carry out case studies to get more specific information. Communication network needed to be established to widen access to partnerships.

Group 2:

Areas of greatest potential and urgency for partnerships in forestry (Question 2)

The group identified areas with potential for partnerships:

- Within the forestry sector, in particular along the wood-supply chain
- Cross-sectoral ones for integration into rural development, such as with farmers' organizations; and partnerships to promote the environmental benefits of wood products. This was the area of most potential and urgency. There was a need to get out of the 'forestry box'.
- For private forestry partnerships in the fields of bio-energy, rehabilitation, and nature conservation were most promising, in addition to the need for horizontal partnerships in forest owners' organizations. Organization was also a priority goal for the workforce.
- Partnerships on global issues could include illegal logging, certification, carbon management, human rights, decent work, and social dialogue.

What should be done to promote a wider and more effective use of partnerships (Question 3)

The most important measures concerned cultural change in the sector and in its organizations. This could be brought about by:

- Recruitment of new personnel
- Recruitment from outside the forestry sector
- Devolution of power within organizations
- Greater awareness of the needs of partners
- Acquisition of skills for needs assessment and communication.

Partnerships would only thrive if resources were available for initiating and implementing them. Good partnerships were inter alia characterized by:

- Partners giving each other the room to use their respective strengths
- Clear contractual arrangements
- Identification of the mutual benefits
- Arrangements for monitoring and evaluation.

Annex III

Study visit Wednesday, 5 June 2002

The field excursion organized on Wednesday 5 June highlighted several examples of forestry management in or close to urban areas with the involvement of different stakeholders. The first excursion point was the forest of Soignes on the outskirts of Brussels. The Flemish part of the forest has an area of 2,492 ha out of a total of about 4,000 ha. It is managed by the Groenendaal Forestry Division which belongs to the Department of Forest and Nature of the Ministry. The dominating tree species is beech representing some 60% of the total area.

The managers of the areas administered by the Flemish community and by the city of Brussels, Messrs. Joseph Zwaenepoel and Stefane Vanwijnsberghe, gave a brief description of the history of the forest of Soignes and an update of today's situation. The history of the forest dates back to the Habsburg rule in the 18th century. The forest had been cleared and was reestablished by planting of beech which explains the dominance of that species today. Every year there are 1.5 million visitors to this forest which requires extensive management and also cleaning and maintenance activities. The costs for keeping the forest free from litter alone amounts to 3 million Euros annually. Every second week cleaning patrols are sweeping the area. Another problem caused by intensive public use is degradation of parts of the land. Rehabilitation measures have been taken in order to prevent further erosion. There are no significant problems with wild game and in fact most of the road kills take place on small forest roads rather than on the motorways.

The main objective of forest policy and forest management in the forest of Soignes is the maintenance of the existing forest in its present state. The legal instrument to ensure forest protection is the new Forest Decree of 13 June 1990. It provides, amongst others, for measures that will facilitate the maintenance of various functions simultaneously. This is certainly important for the forest of Soignes considering its identity and geographical location. The forest decree emphasizes the idea of multi-functional forestry.

Forest management in Soignes has to take five different functions into consideration:

- Social and educational function

Since the end of the last century the socio-recreational function of the forest has been indisputable and today there is a wide range of walkers, sportsmen, cyclists and horse-back riders utilizing the many accessible paths and roads. The forest of Soignes also provides educational material in the areas of history, archaeology, geology and soil science, forest ecology and afforestation.

- Economic function

The rich loamy soils provide are very productive and supply high quality hard wood

In recent years veneer logs have even been exported to China. Other important export markets are Germany and the Netherlands. There is also a market for smaller logs (<60 cm) that are exported to the Mediterranean region. Smaller logs are used for lower quality timber products such as various kinds of furniture, pallets and interior house construction.

- Protective function

The protective function includes the protection of the groundwater tables and the prevention of soil erosion.

- Ecological function

The forest of Soignes plays a very important role in the protection of the ecosystem, especially as urbanization has taken a faster pace over the past decades. The forest decree ensures that the ecological values are maintained and for this purpose two forest reserves have been established.

- Scientific function

In addition, the forest reserves will also serve and stimulate scientific research. The reserves will protect certain defined zones from external influences, which will promote long-term research and make sure it can be carried out in a more accurate and durable manner.

In the afternoon Mr. Bart Meuleman, forest manager in the forestry district of Leuven, guided the group through a forest of 550 hectares. This forest of Halle is an appreciated recreation area and it receives many visitors every year. To facilitate access, the forest district of Leuven has provided a network of 157 kilometers of forest roads and trails. The density of roads is 8 km per 100 hectare. As a complement to the roads, so called 'play forests' have been established in parts of the forest that are less environmentally sensitive. In these play forests, children can use tools and equipment as a part of a combined learning and play process. Six play forests have been created and twenty organized activities with 1,000 participants take place annually.

Considering the large number of visitors, about 750,000 annually, the forest district of Leuven has made an estimate of the recreational value of the forest based on the public's willingness to pay for forest activities. Using the results of a sample survey, the study arrived at an estimate of a total annual revenue of between 250 and 300 million Euros. This is more than a hundred times the value of the wood products from this forest.

The forest district of Leuven engages their stakeholders through meetings in different committees. One of them is the guidance committee that meets one to two times per year to exchange and discuss about ideas, information, targets and general principles. For more technical matters, a technical committee meets six to eight times per year in order to gather information and to discuss alternative solutions for practical forest management. Finally, a public platform has been created with the purpose to meet on special occasions and to consult and inform the general public.
