



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

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN FORESTRY IN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Report of the Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry

Sectoral Activities Department
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE • GENEVA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xi
ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the initiative	1
1.2 Mandate of the Team	1
1.3 Scope of the report	2
2. Why public participation in forestry?	4
3. What is public participation?	6
3.1 Definition and characteristics	6
3.2 Purposes and benefits	8
3.2.1 Purposes of public participatory processes	8
3.2.2 Benefits and contributions to sustainable forest management	11
3.3 Limits, levels, and degrees of public participation	11
3.3.1 Limits	11
3.3.2 Which level?	13
3.3.3 Degree or intensity	14
4. Country experiences with public participation	15
4.1 Types of public involvement process	15
4.2 Lessons learned from country experience	18
4.3 Back to the definition and the purposes	18
5. How to implement public participation?	21
5.1 Framework for best public participatory management	21
5.2 About the people organizing the process	23
5.2.1 Internal collaboration, skills and motivation	23
5.2.2 Gathering and managing information	23
5.2.3 Conflict management within and outside the process	24
5.3 About the people taking part in the process	25
5.3.1 Who is the public?	25
5.3.2 How to identify stakeholders?	25

5.3.3 Five main reasons for lack of participation by the public	26
5.4 Models and techniques of public participation	27
5.5 Evaluation of participatory processes	28
6. Specific contexts of public participation in forestry	30
6.1 Public participation in public forests	30
6.2 Public participation and private forest ownership	32
6.3 Participation of workers and unions in forestry	35
6.4 Participation in the context of community based forest management in Europe	36
6.5 Public participation in countries in transition	39
6.6 Public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society	42
7. Synthesis, conclusions and recommendations	45
Annex 1 - Recommended reading on public participation in forestry	65
Annex 2 - Case studies on national experience of public participation.....	69
1 User councils in state forest districts in Denmark	70
2 Strategic forest and land use planning in the Metsähallitus (Forest and Park Service) in Finland	72
3 City forest management in Hämeenlinna (Finland)	76
4 Creation of new urban forests in Flanders	78
5 Opening a public forum on the internet in France	81
6 The Icelandic Forestry Association	83
7 "To Live is to Share" (Viver é Conviver) in Portugal	85
8 Fire watchers in Portugal - Sapadores Florestais	87
9 Public participation in Russia	90
10 Afforestation of lands unsuitable for agricultural production in Slovakia	92
11 Spanish forest strategy	94
12 Crofter forestry in the North West Highlands of Scotland	97
13 Regional forest planning in Switzerland - example of the Lake District	100
14 Public participation in an increasingly urbanized society in the USA	102
Annex 3 -	

<u>Descriptive matrix of country profiles</u>	<u>105</u>
1 <u>What is the participatory process about?</u>	<u>105</u>
2 <u>Why are people developing/ using the public participation process ?</u>	<u>110</u>
3 <u>Who is organizing and taking part in the public participation process ?</u>	<u>111</u>
4 <u>How are the public participation processes designed and implemented ?</u>	<u>113</u>
<u>Annex 4 -</u>	
<u>List of members of the FAO/ECE/ILO Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry</u>	<u>117</u>

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table 1 - Purposes of public participation</u>	9
<u>Table 2 - Types of country public involvement process</u>	16
<u>Table 3 - Stages to consider when planning a public participation process</u>	22
<u>Table 4 - Models of public participation</u>	27
<u>Table 5 - Monitoring parameters for the evaluation of participatory processes</u>	28

FOREWORD

The Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry was established by decision of the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee¹ on Forest Management, Technology and Training at its 22nd Session in 1998. The mandate was to "Clarify the concept of « participation » and develop the conceptual framework for participatory forest management (involvement of the public)". The Team was made up of 23 specialists² (Annex 4) from across Europe and North America with wide experience, background or interest in the subject - managers, researchers, practitioners, and policy, private forestry and non-government organisation advisers.

The work was intensively carried out by an initial background paper in August 1999, a 2½ day workshop in Switzerland in November, a synthesis of this workshop, country examples and case studies, an Interim Report in February 2000, a further 2½ day workshop in Sweden in March, and this Final Report. I would like to thank all the Team for their perseverance and goodwill throughout, not least for being able to engage with this on top of normal work. Although very much a Team product, 2 people, Yves Kazemi and Andréa Finger, made it possible. They produced all the papers including the initial background paper. As Team co-ordinators they prompted and collated individual papers and comments, were the mainstays in organizing and facilitating the 2 Workshops, and proactively organized, researched, elaborated and summarized the Team's work in coherent and endorsed reports, including this one. Peter Poschen (ILO Secretariat) made a vital contribution also, with sound advice throughout, and in finalizing the key Team definition of public participation.

The work on this subject is of course not finished, indeed scarcely begun. We hope what we have done will help the subject, that opportunities are taken to report more widely on developments in this field, and more emphasis is given to evaluation. Finally, although all found working with Team members from different backgrounds very rewarding, with their already full commitments it would not have been possible without significantly funded, co-ordinator support. For this we are indebted to the Swiss and Flanders Forest Services, and to our workshop hosts the Swiss Forest Service and Swedish Forest Owners' Association.

Miles Wenner
Team Leader

¹ The role of the Joint Committee is to help promote best forest practice on priority topics which its European and North American member countries have identified, by organizing international seminars and workshops, and commissioning teams of specialists and surveys.

² Specialists are appointed to Teams in their personal capacity, not as representatives of their countries or institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report on "Public Participation in Forestry", prepared by the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry is the result of close co-operation of many people and organizations. The Team would like to warmly acknowledge the indispensable contribution of the following:

- ◆ Prof. Hans. Höfle, Chairman of the Joint Committee, for his support and encouragement.
- ◆ The Swiss Forest Agency - Mr Andrea Semadeni, Vice-Director, and the former and present Heads of Branch Society and Forest Messrs. Pierre Muhlemann and Christian Kuchli - for funding the first half of the work and hosting the 1st Workshop in Eggwil in November 1999.
- ◆ The Ministry of Flanders, Division of Forests and Green Spaces – Mr Dirk Van Hoye Head of Division, and Wim Buysse of the same Division, for funding the second half of the work, including preparation of the final report.
- ◆ The Swedish Forest Owners' Association – Mr Ulf Osterblom Chief Executive, and Mr Jan-Ake Lunden Chief Forester, South Sweden Forest Owners' Association, for hosting the 2nd workshop in Vaxjo March 2000, and Mrs Karin Ohman, Forest Officer, for its preparation and organization.
- ◆ All the countries and organizations for supporting the work of their specialists during the year, and at the 5 international workshop days, in particular The UK Forestry Commission – Mr Paul Hill-Tout and Mr Tim Rollinson, Heads of Policy and Practice Division, for funding of the Team Leader.
- ◆ Mr Yves Kazemi and Ms Andréa Finger of "Forest & Society Consulting" for their outstanding Team co-ordination support, organization and facilitation of the content of the 2 workshops, and preparation of papers, including this report.
- ◆ Mr Peter Poschen and the ILO, for contributions to the work, for logistic support, and for printing this report.
- ◆ Mr Tim Peck and Mrs Evelyn Coleman, for their valuable comments on the report, and their enormous help in correcting and editing this report. Mrs Christiane Kind of FAO/ECE for her logistic support throughout the workshop in Vaxjo, and Ms Elizabeth Arnfield of ILO for the final review of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Scope of the report

I. This report "**Public Participation in Forestry**", has been prepared as an input to the clarification of the concept of public participation in forestry and to integrate it more fully and transparently into forest policy making and management. Since UNCED Rio (1992) -- and more recently the Third Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe (Lisbon, 1998) -- the interaction between forestry and society and the concept of public participation have been recognized as important and integral parts of sustainable forest management (SFM). The First Expert Level Meeting on the Follow up of the Lisbon Conference (Vienna, March 1999) invited the joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training to submit a paper on the subject. The creation of the Team of Specialists and the mandate for this work were decided at the 22nd Session of the Joint Committee (Slovakia, September 1998).

Definition

II. For the purpose of this report, the concept of public participation in forestry has been defined as **various forms of direct public involvement where people, individually or through-organized groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome of specific forestry issues**. To differentiate between public participation and other ways in which people in the forestry sector can interact with the public, the Team characterizes public participation in forestry as a process which is **inclusive** with respect to interests, **voluntary** with respect to participation, may be a **complement to legal requirements**, is **fair** and **transparent** to all participants, is based on participants **acting in good faith**, and does **not guarantee - or predetermine - what the outcome will be**. The intensity of public involvement varies from simple information exchange to more elaborate forms of collaborative decision-making or implementation. This definition emphasizes the "process" rather than the content of participation. This corresponds to the Team's approach of considering public participation in forestry mainly as a tool, rather than an end in itself.

Aim

III. The aim of public participation is constructive co-operation and widely acceptable results, which can be justified from different perspectives, and which commit involved parties to implementation. When related to forestry issues, *public participation* may:

- increase public awareness of forests and forestry among the public through active collaborative learning, mutual recognition and constructive co-operation among forest related actors;
- maximize the total benefits of forests in offering opportunities -- for society and the forest sector -- to mutually improve multiple use forest products and services, and to define jointly how costs and benefits of forests may be equitably shared;
- enhance the social acceptance of sustainable forest management through better informed and more widely accepted forest management outcomes.

Levels, stages & intensities

IV. Public participatory approaches offer a wide range of possible applications at all institutional or geographical levels. Depending on the situation, they may occur earlier or later -- and more or less frequently -- in the decision-making or implementation cycle. Indeed, the Team considers that there are no ideal -- or *per se* restricted -- levels (such as national, regional, forest management unit levels), stages or intensities (exchange of information, consultation, joint decision-making) of public participation in forestry. These depend on the issues tackled by the participatory process, the objectives of the initiators and the participants in the process, and the existing cultural, political and institutional context.

Requirements from organizers and participants

V. Public participation is much more than a technique, it is a way of acting and working. It requires from both organizers and participants a clear understanding of what the participatory approach is about and what participation opportunities are being arranged. Public participation should be based on mutual trust, improved communication and co-operation among all people involved in the process:

- *organizers* should see the participatory process as an important task and have an attitude favouring mutual understanding and joint problem solving;
- *participants* should feel that they are able to take part in the process given their available resources (time, skills, budget, etc.) and have a fair opportunity to express their opinions and to represent their interests on an equitable basis.

Working arrangements

VI. In order to achieve commonly agreed solutions, commonalities should be highlighted, differences recognized and divergences openly addressed. This requires adequate competencies and skills -- from both organizers and participants -- as well as the use of appropriate participatory models and techniques. When defining the working arrangements of the process, particular attention should be paid to meeting the specific characteristics of public participation as set out in the definition. Learning from experience, good or bad, through regular evaluation is most helpful.

Limits

VIII. Public participation -- as a process -- is part of a broader societal and institutional context. As a system, it functions in a network of complex power relationships. Whatever the many expectations associated with public participation, such processes also have their limits, which originate from within and beyond the public participatory process:

- There are limits related to the cultural or institutional - including regulative and ownership - context which may or may not be favourable to participatory approaches; whatever the context, public participation may be a complement to legal requirements, but cannot conflict with legal provisions, property and user rights.
- There are limits related to the issue motivating the participatory process; indeed perceived costs of participation may restrict wide participation, while representative participation entails communication related constraints.
- Finally some stakeholders may be unable to participate because of lack of information, of interest, of trust, or of access, or because they find other options to influence decisions.

Limits are not excuses

VIII. These aspects constitute tangible limits to effective public participation, which need to be clearly recognized. In fact, they should be seen more as a challenge to create the best possible conditions for successful public participation, rather than an excuse to avoid any form of public participation.

Social sustainability of forest management

IX. In the early stages of the concept of "sustainability", particular attention was paid to what was ecologically necessary and economically feasible. More recently, the social dimension has been recognized as an integral part of the solution to sustainable forest management. In this context, public participation represents a potential tool to help enhance the social sustainability of forest management.

National experiences

X. Based on observation of practical examples, the Team found that public participation processes evolve not only at all institutional and geographic levels but also across legal, strategic and operational stages of forest policy-making. The Team crystallized four main types of public participation process according to their main focus: forest policies, programmes or plans; the promotion of a specific forest project; public audits; and advisory boards.

Special contexts

XI. The aim of this report is to offer guidance for decision-makers and practitioners in forestry to better understand the concept of public participation and to create the best possible conditions to develop, implement and evaluate public participatory processes. To this end, the Team singled out six special contexts of public participation in forestry which generate particular questions, approaches or technical considerations. These contexts are summarized in Table I.

International & regional co-operation

XII. To act effectively on the considerations outlined in this report requires coherence and a broad consensus on policy measures, programmes and investments as well as a medium- to long-term perspective. The considerations presented here demonstrate that much is to be gained from cooperation within the European region. Emphasis should be on policy, on research, and on education and training of practitioners. In addition, regional institutions such as the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training should adapt their general programmes to incorporate a participation dimension where it is relevant to their work, such as in the Joint Committee's forthcoming seminars on "Women in forestry", "Forestry meets the public", "Partnerships in forestry", "Afforestation" and "Management of protected areas".

Finally

XIII. In the modern framework of sustainable forest policies and forest management strategies, the human dimension is intrinsic to environmental and forestry issues. The Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry is convinced that public participation in forestry, used creatively and with an open mind as a means of communicating more directly with people, could help:

- * public forests better meet social demands;
- * private forestry to be better understood by society and related to public interest;
- * workers in forestry to be more involved in sustainable management;
- * rural communities to receive greater support;
- * urban people make the best use of forests;

and therefore has much to offer.

Table I - Specific contexts of public participation in forestry

CONTEXTS	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Public participation in public forests</p> <p>In the mid-1990s, about 30% of all forest and other wooded land in the EU-15 were in public ownership. For the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) it was 100%, but as a result of privatization and restitution the percentage is currently decreasing. Achieving public participation in public forests is important because public managers are acting essentially on behalf of the public as the ultimate "owner".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Public participation in public forests</i> is a means to improve multiple use forestry through balanced integration of the various social demands towards public forests and to enhance the social acceptance of their management. • It also meets society's growing concern for more transparency, accountability and efficiency in the activities of public forest services. • To improve the effectiveness of public participatory approaches, the organization and technical capacities of public forest services have to be adequately developed.
<p>Public participation and private forest ownership</p> <p>Almost two-thirds of the forests in Western Europe, outside the countries in transition, are privately owned. In the Central and Eastern European countries, restitution and privatization of forests leads to an increasing share of private forest holdings. There are also new private forest owners in western countries with large afforestation programmes (e.g. Iceland, Ireland, United Kingdom, etc.).</p> <p>Within the legal framework all forest owners, be they private or public, are expected to practise sustainable forest management. The decision of all, including private, forest owners on whether to get involved in a public participatory process will depend on their perceived benefits and costs (including intangible costs and benefits).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participation by private forest owners</i> is clearly essential for balanced development of forest policies, programmes and legislation. • Further, participatory approaches open new opportunities to improve relations with the public and to enhance recognition of private forest owners' investment in SFM. • It also opens new perspectives to respond to the demand for new forest products and services. • To make best use of these opportunities, institutional and technical support is necessary, particularly for small private forest owners (i.e. better organization and assertion of their interests) or in countries where private forest ownership is recent and increasing (i.e. CIS countries). Support is especially needed where private forestry issues and opportunities can go beyond management unit levels.
<p>Participation of workers and unions in forestry</p> <p>Participation is a basic requirement for workers in the forestry sector. Unions have a long tradition of developing their own models of participation. For unions, "partnership" could be a possible positive outcome of a participation process with equally distributed rights and duties for each participating</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The participation of forest workers and unions</i> is essential for the knowledge they offer and for ensuring that the social issues of workers' health, safety and equity are included in forest management. • Since forest workers implement forest

CONTEXTS	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>person or group.</p>	<p>management decisions, they should be systematically involved in both the planning and the monitoring of sustainable forest practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women working in forestry face special issues that need to be addressed as a priority.
<p>Participation in the context of Community Based Forest Management in Europe (CBFM)</p> <p>CBFM may be considered forest management by, for and with the local community. Self-mobilized forms of public participation can be found in just about all European countries. Participation in the context of community based forest management is special because the motive and outcome is usually to redress the existing asymmetrical patterns and relations of power between different actors in favour of marginalized rural communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participatory processes at local community level</i> enable the special roles of CBFM in sustainable forest management to be recognized by many stakeholders. • Effective participatory processes at local-community level, traditional forms of CBFM and new self-mobilized initiatives should be supported through appropriate policy, institutional and economic frameworks.
<p>Public participation in countries in transition</p> <p>After the political and economic changes of the late eighties, the forest sector of former planned economies of eastern European has been substantially transformed. However, the "countries with economies in transition" are not changing in a homogeneous way. They are facing major challenges, for instance in: restitution of public forests to private owners, involving new private forest owners in SFM, increasing public awareness about forests, improving provision of multiple goods and benefits from the forests, enhancing the interest of local communities in forest management, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Public participation in countries in transition</i> can contribute to involving new private forest owners in the sustainable management of their forests and raising public awareness about forestry issues in general. • It can also improve the provision of multiple forest goods and benefits, including non-timber forest products, so as to enhance the interest of local communities in forest management. • To this end, institutional frameworks, as well as organization al and technical capacities of the forest sector, need to be strengthened adequately.
<p>Public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society</p> <p>Across Europe as a whole 70 to 80% of people live and work in sizable towns and cities. In many countries the percentage of the population directly employed in the primary sector (farming, fishing, mining and forestry) is already less than 5% and is still declining. These current trends in urban development strongly influence the evolution of society's interest in forests. While their knowledge about forests and forestry is tending to decline, urban dwellers have an increasing direct influence on the way forests are used as well as a growing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society</i> is a way of increasing mutual understanding of various urban and rural people's interests and values in forests, and to avoid and/or manage conflicts in the use of forests and forest resources. • By effectively participating in sustainable forest management, both urban and rural people also enhance their awareness of its benefits. • This implies a need for forest authorities and

CONTEXTS	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
indirect impact on forest conditions -- whether in urban, suburban or rural areas.	forest managers to develop adequate opportunities for people to be more fully involved in sustainably managing forests.

ABBREVIATIONS

B	Belgium
CBFM	Community based forest management
CEPF	European Confederation of Forest Owners
CH	Switzerland
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
COST	The European Cooperation in the field of Scientific and Technical research
DK	Denmark
ECE (or UN-ECE)	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
ENGO	Environmental non-governmental organization
F	France
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FIN	Finland
FMU or <i>FMUL</i>	Forest Management Unit or <i>Forest Management Unit Level</i>
GO	Governmental organization
H	Hungary
IC	Iceland
IFBWW	International Federation of Building and Wood Workers
IPF/IFF	International Panel / Forum on Forests (UN)
ILO	International Labour Organization

IRL	Ireland
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
NGO	Non governmental organization
P	Portugal
PP	Public participation
RFMP	Regional Forest Management Plan
SFM	Sustainable forest management
S	Sweden
SK	Slovakia
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
ToS	Team of Specialists (FAO/ECE/ILO)
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Introduction

Background to the initiative

1. Public participation in forestry has become an issue of growing importance in world-wide forest policy discussions over the past few decades, even though various forms of participatory forest management have been practised for a long time. Since the UN Rio Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, the need for interaction between forestry and society and the concept of public participation have been recognized as integral to Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). Pan-European countries further confirmed this in Resolution H1 "*General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe*" (Second Ministerial Conference, Helsinki 1993) and Resolution L1 "*People, Forests and Forestry - Enhancement of Socio-Economic Aspects of Sustainable Forest Management*" (Third Ministerial Conference, Lisbon 1998)

2. This evolution reflects a clear transformation of society's interest in the environment in general and in forests in particular. It brings to light new considerations in the perception of *Sustainable Forest Management*, taking greater account of the diversity of social needs and demands. It looks for new ways to integrate public interests and forestry and to share costs and benefits of forest goods and services equitably. It also raises the need for an enhanced social and political acceptance of forest management.

3. While public participatory processes have been implemented in many different contexts -- inside or outside the forest sector -- there are some major uncertainties as to what public participation in forestry actually implies, for instance about opportunities and limits of its application, how to balance public participation and private ownership rights, how to define the role of stakeholders and or their representatives in the process, what methods and techniques are available to implement participatory processes, what are the short and long term costs and benefits of these processes and how they should be distributed.

4. In order to better understand the concept of public participation in forestry and to integrate it more fully and transparently into forest policy making and management, the First Expert Level Meeting on the Follow up of the Lisbon Conference (Vienna, March 1999) invited the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training to submit a paper on the subject. Considering the input of the Team of Specialists (ToS) on Socio-Economic Aspects of Forestry with its report "People, Forests and Sustainability" to the drafting of Resolution L1 of the Lisbon Conference (June 1998), as well as the advice of its ToS on Multiple Use Forestry (MUF Report ECE/TIM/DP/18), the Joint Committee expressed its willingness to continue its contribution to the Pan-European Process and established the Team of Specialists on Public Participation in Forestry at its session in Slovakia (September 1998).

5. The present report has been prepared by the Joint Committee's Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry. It is based on the views expressed by the team members at meetings held in Eggwil (Switzerland) on 22-24 November 1999 and Vaxjo (Sweden) on 27-29 March 2000. The Team was chaired by Mr. Miles Wenner (United Kingdom), and the ILO and ECE/FAO Geneva acted as secretariat. The members of the Team (see Annex 4), who come from countries in Europe and North America, served in their personal capacity, not as representatives of their countries or institutions.

Mandate of the Team

6. The Team was mandated to produce a report, which should:

- ♦ clarify the concept of «participation» and develop the conceptual framework for participatory forest management (involvement of the public), awareness of the forest and use of forest products and services by the public;

- ♦ draw up proposals for follow-up action;
- ♦ collect and even initiate case studies;
- ♦ assist in the preparation of the proposed seminars on "Women in forestry" (Portugal, April 2001), on "Public relations and environmental education in forestry" (Switzerland, October 2001), and on "Partnerships in forestry" (Belgium, 2002).

Scope of the report

7. In the time available, the Team concentrated on the three first items of its mandate and, recognizing the diversity of participatory forest management, it focused on "public participation" in forestry, as being most in need of clarification in the present pan-European and North American forest context. The Team also recognized that public participation is a way among others of promoting public awareness and use of the multiple benefits of forestry (cf. Section 3.2).³

8. In defining the characteristics of public participation processes commonly practised in forestry, the Team noted that these are usually different from the "classical" expressions of democracy - such as elections, votes, popular initiatives, referendums, legal appeals, etc. Recognizing the importance of democratic debates in forest policy discussions, the Team decided to focus its work on concepts of "public participation" which imply more direct forms of public involvement in forestry issues.

9. To this end, the Team agreed on a working definition of public participation which considers all types of processes where « *people, individually or through organized groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome of specific forestry issues* ». This definition emphasizes the "process" rather than the content of participation, and corresponds to the Team's approach of considering public participation mainly as a tool rather than an end in itself. By the same token, it is a tool among many which could be used to solve a given problem. More details on the working definition are presented in Section 3.1 of this report.

10. The word "public" in this report has been kept as generic as possible. It should be understood as a vast and heterogeneous group of people -- whether organized or not -- who are concerned by a specific problem or issue and should be given the opportunity to take part in discussions, and to influence and/or jointly make decisions regarding the issue at hand. To identify "the public" in a specific process, the Team agreed to use the generic term of "stakeholders"⁴ to describe all individuals or organized groups interested in the issue or opportunity driving the participatory process.

11. In view of the large amount of literature on the subject, this report does not set out to provide an exhaustive account of all that pertains to public participation in forestry. It aims, however, to provide a contribution to the discussion about opportunities and limits of the concept and its practice in a European context. Based on practical experience the report also offers general guidance to forestry decision-makers and practitioners to help in developing and implementing the concept. Even if most of the public participation experience in this report is based on relatively large-scale processes generally driven by institutions, guidance here may also be of use for smaller or more informal participatory processes.

³ Other elements of awareness raising and of the use of forest products and services by the public such as public relations and environmental education have been or are being dealt with by other Teams of Specialists (e.g. the Team on Social Aspects of Forestry, the Team on Public Relations or the Team on Multiple-Use Forestry), in national forest services, privately owned forest research, and non-governmental organizations.

⁴ « A *stakeholder* is any person, group or institution that has an interest in (.) activity, project or programme. This definition includes both intended beneficiaries and intermediaries, winners and losers, and those involved or excluded from decision-making processes ». Overseas Development Administration (1995): Enhancing Stakeholder Participation in Aid Activities. Technical Note No. 13. London: Overseas Development Administration.

12. In the next chapter, the Team attempts to describe *why public participation* has become an important issue in world-wide forest policy discussions. Chapter 3 spells out *what public participation in forestry means* and what could be possible *objectives* and *benefits* of this process, while Chapter 4 compares *experience in different countries*. Chapter 5 develops a conceptual *framework for how best to implement public participation* in forestry. Chapter 6 identifies *specific contexts* in the forest sector where problems need to be tackled, and Chapter 7 offers *suggestions for a better integration of public participation* in forest policy making and management.

Why public participation in forestry?

13. In recent decades, public interest in forestry has increased and so have the concerns and intensity of public involvement in forest-related activities and/or decision-making processes. Whatever the reasons, this evolution mirrors profound changes in the functioning of modern democratic societies, as well as a clear transformation of society's interest in forests and a greater need for forestry to interact with the public. How can these changes be interpreted?

Changes in democracy...

14. In the past 40 years, new social movements representing diverse perceptions, values and needs have been challenging the legitimacy of centralized and hierarchical management institutions everywhere (Anderson et al 1998; Ockerman 1999 in Jeanrenaud ToS 1999). As a response to these popular demands, and to the need to develop new "governance strategies" in which public, private and civil actors are interactively seeking solutions to societal problems (Kooiman 2000), « most American and European governments have greater opportunities for direct citizen input in government decision making or become more lenient in extending opportunities for public involvement, particularly in environment and nature conservation issues. » (Renn, Webler and Wiedemann 1995, p.19). Likewise, there is a growing demand from society for more consultation and involvement, and more transparency and accountability within forest-related institutions (Jeanrenaud ToS 1999).

Changes in society's interest in forests...

15. Changes and trends in society have an obvious impact on social attitudes to forests. In most industrialized countries, the relative declining share of wood and wood products in national economies, combined with the growing importance of environmental issues, and the increasing demand for recreational activities, has shifted the social perspectives of forest uses. As the FAO/ECE/ILO ToS on Socio-Economic Aspects of Forestry pointed out, « over the last fifteen years, society's interest in forests has shown that in many European countries traditional property rights fiercely defended by individuals and strongly related to primary use of wood production have been more and more balanced by moral rights actively propounded by society and related to non-market forest benefits. » (Broadhurst in ILO 1997, p.10). This growing diversity of society's interest in forests -- and the resulting potential for conflict among the various interests -- has brought new environmental and social considerations into the management of forest resources.

Changes in the sustainable management of forests...

16. As a response to these broader shifts in social values, the concept of sustainable forest management has gradually evolved from the traditional principle of sustainable yield to a system in which environmental and social issues, besides the economic viability of forestry, are taken into greater consideration. This evolving understanding in forest ecological processes, silvicultural and management systems as well as global economic factors influencing forest management, are having significant implications for forest policy making, the functions and structures of organizations, as well as for the forester's role and behaviour (Jeanrenaud ToS 1999).

17. The evolution is reflected in various international environmental and forest policy agreements which increasingly call for citizens to be offered opportunities to influence affairs related to environmental, natural resources or forest management issues. Related statements are to be found, *for example*:

- in Agenda 21 for sustainable development in general⁵, in Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 "combating deforestation"⁶ and the Forest Principles of the UN Conference on

⁵ « One of the fundamental prerequisites for the achievement of sustainable development is broad public participation in decision-making. (23.2) »

⁶ « Governments at the appropriate level (...) should, where necessary, enhance institutional capability to promote the multiple roles and functions of all types of forests (...). Some of the major activities in this regard are as follows: (...) Promoting participation of the private sector, labour unions, rural cooperatives, local communities, indigenous people, youth, women, user groups and non-governmental organizations in forest-related activities, and access to information and training programmes within the national context. (11.3.b) »

Environment and Development⁷, as well as in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)⁸ and the proposals for action of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF);⁹

- more recently, in the Resolution L1 on People, Forests and Forestry of the Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (Lisbon, 1998);¹⁰
- similar statements - even though not specifically related to forestry, were also made in the UN/ECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus, 1998).

18. Over time, the forest sector has continuously adapted its focus to more fully consider social demands toward forests in the management and conservation of forest resources. Forest and ecosystems manager have recognized that decision making must adapt and remain flexible within a dynamic, ambiguous and uncertain world, and that management strategies must somehow be integrated with democratic processes (Shannon & Antypas 1997). Public participation can be a tool to help meet this need and contribute to enhancing sustainable forest management.

⁷ « Governments should promote and provide opportunities for the participation of interested parties, including local communities and indigenous people, industries, labour, non-governmental organizations and individuals, forest dwellers and women, in the development, implementation and planning of national forest policies. (2d) »

⁸ Art 8j calls on countries « to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles (...) promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge (...) and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices. »

⁹ Proposal for action 9 (national forest programmes) says: « the need should be emphasised for appropriate participatory mechanisms to involve all interested parties; decentralization, where applicable, and empowerment of regional and local government structures, consistent with the constitutional and legal frameworks of each country, recognition and respect for customary and traditional rights (...). »

¹⁰ « The interaction between forestry and society in general, should be promoted through partnerships, and be strengthened by raising general awareness of the concept of sustainable forest management and the role of forests and forestry in sustainable development. Therefore an adequate level of participation, education, public relations and transparency in forestry is needed. (L1 General Guidelines) »

What is public participation?

Definition and characteristics

19. There are a number of definitions of public participation, the differences between them resulting from the contexts in which they were developed and used. It is not in the mandate of the Team to propose an all-purpose definition, but to put forward a working definition which is most meaningful in the light of the experience in their respective countries. The Team agreed on the following for the purpose of the present report:

« Public participation is a voluntary process whereby people, individually or through organized groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome of the matter at hand »

20. While the definition has been kept as generic as possible, a number of qualifications have been deemed necessary to differentiate between public participation and other ways in which people in the forestry sector can interact with the public. To this end, the Team characterizes public participation in forestry as a process which complies with the following principles. The process:

- is *inclusive* rather than exclusive;
- is *voluntary* with respect to participation and - except where a legal requirement specifies otherwise - to the initiation of the process and to the implementation of its results;
- may be a *complement to legal requirements*, but cannot conflict with legal provisions in force, in particular with ownership and user rights;
- is *fair and transparent* to all participants and follows agreed basic rules;
- is *based on participants acting in good faith*;
- *does not guarantee* or predetermine what *the outcome* will be.

21. During its discussions, the Team recognized that the participatory process may occur earlier or later in the decision and/or implementation cycle, and that it may take place at one, several or all points of the entire cycle. There are varying degrees of intensity of public participation ranging from sharing information to collaborative decision making and one or more levels of intensity may be used in any one process.

22. Recognizing that there are various forms of interaction between the forestry sector and the public, the above working definition and principles make it clear that public participation is different, for instance, from public relations, in that a major element of the latter consists of a one-way flow of information. Likewise, it excludes forms of interaction that involve an element of coercion such as boycotts or strikes.

Comments on the principles

23. The first of the Team's principles qualifying the definition is that of *inclusiveness*, which expresses the willingness to involve all interests concerned by the issue which drives the public participatory process. The formulation appears ambitious in providing the opportunity to articulate their views also to people who are seemingly only remotely concerned with a given question or project. This does not mean that only processes involving large numbers of participants should be considered as public participation under the above definition. In practice, because public participation is largely self-selecting, only those who see a potential benefit will

participate. The number of people directly involved may well be small, particularly if interests are articulated by representatives as is often the case.

24. Attempts to somehow restrict participation to some ‘stakeholders’, ‘concerned parties’ or the like generate the need to demonstrate the legitimacy of the ‘stake’ or the relevance of someone’s ‘concern’. This clashes with the need for inclusiveness, as all participants - including the initiators - are party to the process. There is thus no neutral party to judge the legitimacy of a stake or relevance of a concern. Section 5.3 of this report provides guidance on how the need for openness can be met in practice.

25. The *voluntary* nature of public participation (second principle) cannot be overemphasized; it applies to all stages of the process, from the decision to take part in the process through to the agreement and the implementation of the final outcome. Because participation in the process is voluntary, the results of the process can only be based on a common agreement among all parties. If this is so, all participants have an equitable chance to defend their interests and no decision or solution can be imposed on anybody. If participants can agree collaboratively on a decision they will also commit themselves more fully to its implementation.

26. An element that tends to confuse the discussion is the relationship between public participation and the established legal and institutional framework. In democratic societies, participation by citizens is institutionalized through elected representatives in communal councils, national governments and supranational bodies, such as the European Parliament. These mechanisms generate and legitimize the legal and regulatory framework which sets the limits and opportunities for any policy making processes, including public participation.

27. In certain cases there is a legal requirement for some form of consultation concerning forestry matters. Depending on how it is defined and practised, this may amount to mandatory initiation of public participation. Even where some form of consultation is obligatory, it needs to be borne in mind by all that no obligations can be imposed on any party in a process over and above legal requirements. The role of public participation processes is thus rather to *complement the existing legal and institutional framework, to improve its functioning and sometimes to contribute to its evolution*. Indeed public participation may contain proposals for changes in laws and regulations, thus offering the possibility for stakeholders representing newly emerging interests to state their views. Going beyond legal requirements may be desirable and governments have committed themselves at UNCED and on other occasions to participation including co-decision making for some forestry matters.

28. Reservations have also been expressed concerning the geographical or organizational level at which participation can or should take place. It has been argued, for instance, that participation may not take place at the forest management unit level, while it may be appropriate at regional or national level. The Team has arrived at the conclusion that there is no limitation *per se*, provided that the process abides by the principles set out in the definition, in particular that it is voluntary and does not infringe on ownership and user rights. The appropriate level can only be determined as a function of the issue that the process is meant to address. Depending on the issues, the related objectives may best be achieved at higher or lower forest management levels. Examples and further explanations are provided in Section 3.3 of this report.

29. By the same token, public participation processes may in principle be applied to all types of forest ownership. While public participation cannot go ahead without their acceptance, private forest owners, for example, may choose to take part in or initiate a participatory process as defined in the foregoing like any other owner or actor in the forestry sector. It is, however, recognized that private ownership represents a different context for participation compared to public forests, with a different set of constraints and opportunities. These need to be taken into account in the design and implementation of a process. This aspect is developed further in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of this report.

30. *Fairness and transparency* are essential in order to achieve the objectives of public participation processes. Fairness includes participation and negotiation in good faith with best efforts applied to reach consensus, considering all interests equitably. However, *there is no guarantee what outcome will emerge*. Depending on the various inputs, the result may deviate significantly from what was originally envisaged; best result is when participants can identify with the outcome. On the other hand, the result of the process could also be that no consensus is reached, in spite of genuine good intentions. Information needs to be available to all participants, but *good faith* means this knowledge is not going to be abused to sabotage a process. Ground rules agreed by all participants at the start are a good way of avoiding misunderstandings and conflicts about roles and procedures. These are further developed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of this report.

31. It should also be noted that the above definition emphasizes the ‘process,’ i.e. the form rather than the content of participation. This is in line with the Team's working approach to public participation in forestry, considering it mainly as a tool rather than an end in itself. By the same token, it is one tool among many and may be more or less suitable to resolve a given problem or to seize an opportunity. Openness and transparency in daily work, small working groups, regular communication with stakeholders are among these other tools, which may be simpler and more efficient in a given context. Other options notwithstanding, public participation may offer significant benefits to all involved in managing, protecting and using forests in many situations, but it cannot be expected to solve all problems or conflicts.

Purposes and benefits

32. Based on its working definition of public participation and the experience of the members, the Team went on to consider the purposes of public participation and the benefits of these processes for the sustainable management of forests.

Purposes of public participatory processes

33. Based on a discussion of country profiles and case studies (cf. Chapter 4 and Annexes 2 and 3), the Team identified the following purposes (see Table 1):

- a) *Increase awareness of forestry issues and mutual recognition of interests*
 When people are actively involved in a participatory process, they have an opportunity to learn and to increase their awareness of specific forestry issues. Further, collaborative learning within the process aims at improving mutual recognition and trust among the various interests represented in the process.
- b) *Gather information and enhance knowledge on forests and their users*
 Public participation offers good opportunities to gather and exchange information and knowledge on the issues in hand. This exchange of information tends to increase the skills and competency of all actors taking part in the process. It is an important means for increasing the relevance and effectiveness of forestry policies, programmes, projects and operations.
- c) *Improve provision of multiple forest goods and services*
 Increased awareness and active participation in forestry issues may provide opportunities for people to improve their appreciation of the forest's multiple benefits and value. It may also enhance the integration of these qualities with other land uses and rural development objectives. Forest outputs stand to benefit from external experience, knowledge, skill and resources that can be tapped through participation. From a marketing point of view, a better understanding of public interests and demands towards forests improves the delivery of consumer-oriented goods and services.

Table 1 - Purposes of public participation

Main purposes identified (not in any order of priority)	Related categories proposed by the Team
a) Increase awareness of forestry issues and mutual recognition of interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - awareness raising on forest related issues - promotion of dialogue and mutual learning - means to build trust and engage people - recognition of stakeholders' interests/stakeholder empowerment
b) Gather information and enhance knowledge on forests and their users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - giving & receiving information on all issues - social impact assessment - increase knowledge about forests
c) Improve provision of multiple forest goods and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improve forestry as an output - increase benefits & beneficiaries - match supply with demand - improve forest outputs through external skills, interests, experience and resources - maintain and develop employment and livelihood opportunities - know what sort of services to deliver from public forests
d) Stimulate involvement in decision making and/or in implementation processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - find balance between different interests - involvement/buy-in of stakeholders - enhance stakeholders' influence in decision making
e) Enhance acceptance of forest policies, plans and operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - greater commitment to agreed plans - increase social acceptance of management decision and forestry practices
f) Increase transparency and accountability of decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - input on how best to spend public money - transparency in allocation of public funds - as a public service to guarantee public interest - protect individual and collective interests and rights
g) Identify and manage conflicts and problems together, in a fair and equitable way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify & prevent/anticipate conflicts - conflict & problem resolution
<i>Purpose depends on:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the issues; ➤ the perspective and interest of participants; ➤ the cultural, political and institutional contexts.

N.B. - This Table is based on the ToS country-based experience with public participation.

d) *Stimulate involvement in decision making and/or in implementation processes*

Apart from awareness raising, information sharing and mutual recognition, participatory processes seek to improve people's constructive participation in forest policy or management processes. When people are actively involved in decision making, outcomes resulting from co-operation are likely to better represent and balance various interests and thus to be more widely accepted. Such results may also help people to commit themselves more fully to their implementation.

e) *Enhance acceptance of forest policies, plans and operations*

By giving people a chance to take part in and influence the decision making and handling of forest-related issues, public participation aims at enhancing the acceptance of forest policies, plans and operations.

f) *Increase transparency and accountability of decision making*

Transparency and accountability are essential to democratic decision making among public authorities. Public participation improves accountability of public services and helps guarantee the protection of people's interests and rights. For public funding, public participation increases transparency in allocation of grants and subsidies in forestry and accountability of the actors involved, thereby improving efficiency of allocation of public funds for public interests.

g) *Identify and manage conflicts and problems together, in a fair and equitable way*

At its best, public participation aims to identify and resolve conflicts at an early stage of the decision-making or implementation processes (anticipation of conflicts). Sometimes it may also help to manage and/or resolve already existing conflicts. In both cases, public participation seeks to manage and/or resolve conflicts in a fair and equitable way through mutual recognition and co-operation.

34. While defining the purposes of public participation presented in Table 1, the Team pointed out that they were closely related to each other, and very often overlap. The Team also recognized that not all participatory processes focus on the same purposes in the same way. The varying relevance of one purpose or another depends very much on the context of the participatory process. This *context driven* definition of purposes is influenced by:

- the issue being addressed by the participatory process;
- the perspectives of the initiator of the process;
- the interests of the participants in the process;
- the existing cultural, political and institutional context.

35. A clear appreciation of the main purposes of the participatory process is key to successful public participation.

Benefits and contributions to sustainable forest management

36. The aim of public participation is constructive co-operation and widely acceptable end results which can be justified from different perspectives and which commit involved parties in implementation (Wallenius 1999 ToS). To this end, *public participation in forestry* may:

- *Increase public awareness of forests and forestry among the public*
Active participation, information exchange and collaborative learning are means to increase awareness of the public about more or less complex forestry issues. Mutual recognition between forest related interests improves general awareness of the multiple values of forests and strengthens trust between forest related actors.
- *Maximize the total benefits of forests*
Increased dialogue with the public opens up new opportunities for the forest sector to better define social demands toward forests and forest resources at all levels. This is a means to improve market-oriented delivery of forest goods and services. Active public involvement in forestry also enables one to track social changes in the uses of forests and facilitate integration of these changes in forest management. All these contribute to improving multiple use forestry and so maximize the total benefits of forests.
- *Share costs and benefits in a fair and equitable way*
In public participation, all parties involved in the process have an equal opportunity to express their opinions and an equitable chance to assert their interests and rights. Because of the voluntary nature of the process, no decision can be imposed on anybody. This implies that the results of the process can only be based on commonly agreed solutions and a sharing of resulting costs and benefits acceptable to all. In offering opportunities to mutually define how costs and benefits of forests may be equitably shared, public participation opens new perspectives -- for both society and the forest sector -- to improve the valuation of forest goods and services.
- *Enhance the social acceptance of sustainable forest management*
Finally, public participation in forestry may be considered a means to develop better-informed and more widely accepted forest management outcomes - at all levels. Social acceptance of forest management also enhances public commitment to sustainable forest management.

37. In the early stages of the concept of "sustainability", particular attention was paid to what was ecologically necessary and economically feasible. In the more recent development of this concept, the social dimension has been recognized as an integral part of the solutions to sustainable development in general, and to sustainable forest management in particular. In this context, public participation may represent a tool -- among others -- to enhance the social sustainability of forest management.

Limits, levels, and degrees of public participation

Limits

38. Despite the expectations associated with public participation, these processes also have limits. Some of these limits are inherent in the issues, some in the broader institutional and cultural context in which public participation processes take place, and some relate to the stakeholders¹¹ in a given process. This section describes in general terms the limits public participation processes contain:

- *Team's definition of the process*

Public participation as defined by the Team is a process which all participants undertake entirely voluntarily and in good faith. As such the public participation process cannot:

- guarantee or predetermine the outcome,
- require the involvement of any who do not wish to take part,
- require implementation from those who do not wish to abide by the process,

¹¹ These latter limits, concerning the various reasons why some stakeholders may be less able or willing to participate, have been developed in Section 5.3.3.

- determine areas or subjects, if others outside the process are responsible for these, without their agreement.
- *Cultural and institutional*¹² *contexts*
 The history of institutions - as of culture in general - varies among different countries and regions. Their formal and informal social, economic, political and cultural contexts may be more or less favourable to the development of public participation approaches in various sectors, including forestry. Furthermore, the very history and culture of forestry (public and private forestry organizations) within every country may be more or less conducive to understanding, adoption and development of public participation approaches.
- *Legal frameworks*
 The principles qualifying the definition say that public participation may be a complement to legal requirements, but cannot conflict with legal provisions in force. Legal frameworks vary considerably from country to country and also change with time. Chapter 4 shows that some countries have up-dated their forestry law, including requirements for public participation -- usually for planning -- at some level. It was noted that experience and information obtained in the course of public participation exercises can -- and in some cases actually has -- catalysed changes in legislation. Legal frameworks provide both opportunities and limits to public participation processes.
- *Property and user rights*
 The Team's section on definition and characteristics (Section 3.1) says that public participation may in principle be applied to all types of forest ownership. It further says that it cannot conflict with legal provisions in force, in particular with ownership and user rights. When it refers to private forest ownership, the Team recognized that, on top of the voluntary nature of public participation, the ability of the public to influence forestry decisions at forest management unit level is limited by the right of free action of private forest/property owners - within the framework of legislation. A public participation process on private forest, to be in good faith, needs to be accepted by the owners.

 The Team further recognized that some property or user rights may not be clearly recognized, as in the case of some indigenous peoples' traditional user rights. In these situations public participation processes may offer opportunities to increase recognition of interests.
- *Direct and indirect costs*
 Another important limiting factor for all who initiate, organize and take part in public participation processes is the availability of resources, be they financial, time, capacity, information or/and creativity (further developed in Chapter 5). Further it is often difficult to estimate beforehand the costs and benefits entailed.

 Perceived imbalances in the expected cost/benefit of a public participation process may prevent some parties from getting involved. For instance, forest owners (private

¹² « Institutions are bundles of rules and regulations governing social relations established by custom or accepted law that structure behaviour in fairly predictable ways. Institutions are sub-sets of social relations that correspond with settled habits of thought and action ». (in S. Barraclough and A. Finger, UNRISD, 1996 , 42).

or public) may fear that public participation raises expectations and demands without ensuring that the costs incurred for their fulfilment will be affordable and equitably distributed with the benefits. However, the voluntary nature of public participation and its implementation should allow the parties to contribute to the development of a mutually acceptable outcome, with an equitable sharing of resulting costs and benefits.

- *Representation*

If a certain selection of participants occurs for practical reasons, i.e. large public participation processes at national level, representativeness can constitute a further limit to the process (viz. principle of inclusiveness in the definition). The risk in representative types of public participation is that the views of spokespersons will evolve through contacts with others participating in the process. It may then be difficult for them to transmit the experience of this collaborative learning to their respective constituencies. To make the results of public participation acceptable to their constituencies, representatives need to be able to communicate effectively throughout the entire process.

- *Issue-driven limits*

Public participation as defined by the ToS may not always be the most appropriate process for addressing forestry issues, and other arrangements may be simpler and more efficient. For example, when the issue clearly concerns only a few readily identifiable stakeholders, regular consultation with these or working groups with a limited number of representatives may be more suitable. Such limited consultation, as well as openness and transparency in daily work, can be a first step for assessing potential conflicts and common interests, for identifying stakeholders and eventually assessing if a more open "public participation process" could offer good opportunities, depending on the issues and their contexts. One of the advantages of an inclusive public participation process is that unexpected stakeholders and perspectives come to light.

39. Public participation -- as a process -- is part of a broader societal and institutional context. As a system, it functions in a network of complex power relationships where existing conflicts, or fear of social pressures or of losing control or facing uncertainty, may hamper the willingness of some to enter into dialogue with others. These aspects constitute tangible limits to effective public participation, which need to be clearly recognized and openly considered. From that point of view, they should be seen more as a challenge to create the best possible conditions for successful public participation, rather than an excuse to avoid any form of public participation. Chapter 5 discusses how public participation processes can work within these limits.

Which level?

40. From the definition (Section 3.1) and practical experience of public participation (Chapter 4)¹³, the Team considered that public participatory approaches offer a wide range of possible application at all institutional or geographical levels -- whether

¹³ Chapter 4 presents a large selection of country experiences with public participation which take place at or across various national, regional and local levels. For instance, in Iceland, a country-wide afforestation programme includes participatory processes, which reach across national, regional and local levels. For some countries like Switzerland and Hungary, public participation in planning occurs only at the regional level, while in others it includes also local (FMU) levels (e.g. Belgium, Finland, Slovakia).

national, regional or local. However, the Team also recognized that the level of public participation should be appropriate to context. In particular:

- the level at which a public participation process is implemented should be issue-driven. Depending on the issues and the corresponding objectives of the public participation process, they may best be dealt with at higher or lower institutional levels, or larger or smaller geographic areas;
- related to the issue, selection of the most appropriate level for public participation depends also on how best to reach stakeholders, according to where they are located or active;
- finally, institutional frameworks (legal, regulative and organizational) vary according to the level, each level entailing particular opportunities and constraints to effective consideration of an issue.

41. Defining the most appropriate level at which a participatory process can take place is key to successful public participation. Chapter 5 further develops how this may be taken into account.

Degree or intensity

42. With respect to the intensity of public participation, the Team recognized that participatory processes can occur at any point, and at one or more times, in the decision-making/implementation cycle. The degree or intensity of public participation can range from a two-way exchange of information, to collaborative forms of decision-making, implementation and/or evaluation.

43. According to Sherry Arnstein (1969), the intensity or degree of involvement at any one of these stages depends on the extent to which participants have the potential to influence, share or hold the decision-making power¹⁴. The Team found that another important criterion to consider when evaluating the degree of involvement is the extent to which collaborative learning enables the parties involved to question and evolve in their own positions. Likening the situation to game playing, the "rules" on how the cake can be divided up as perceived by the players at the start, can be changed by the players as their understanding and perceptions change in the process. The result can be completely new and different outcomes, completely different "rules", a much bigger cake, or something else entirely. Such evolution can establish new shared views and further perspectives for developing common interests. The added common value from the process can change the "status quo" to one where everyone feels they are "winning".

44. As the report People, Forests and Sustainability mentioned "success or failure of participatory management will often depend on how the involvement of the different actors occurs, and finding the right intensity of participation" (Mühlemann in ILO 1997, p.101). Indeed, the Team found that no ideal or best degree of public participation was valid for all cases at all times. In practice, during the different stages of the public participation process, people's intensity of involvement often varies considerably, and this requires flexible management of the process. Some case studies suggest that degree or intensity of public participation should be higher at the beginning of the process, and at those points in the process where decisions are made, or where different alternatives are to be chosen (e.g. case No. 2, Annex 2).

¹⁴ The often cited "Arnstein ladder" evaluates the gradation of power or control along 8 degrees: 1-manipulation; 2-therapy; 3-informing; 4-consultation; 5-placation; 6-partnership; 7-delegated power; 8-citizen control. Sherry Arnstein (1969): A Ladder of Citizen Participation, Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 35, pp. 216-224.

Country experiences with public participation

45. To show *what* kinds of public involvement are being practised, the Team produced both country profiles summarising national experiences (Annex 3) and case studies illustrating specific processes (Annex 2). In order to present the profiles and cases comparatively, the Team applied a descriptive framework based on the following questions:

- *What* are the examples about (object, context and level of the process) ?
- *Why* are people developing/using the process (purposes and benefits) ?
- *Who* is organizing and taking part in the process (initiators and participants) ?
- *How* are the processes designed and implemented (models, techniques, degrees) ?

46. These examples were essential to the Team's work as they allowed public involvement processes to be seen in many different contexts and degrees, and indicate the very wide range of mainly institutional arrangements. Some of these current arrangements are of very long standing, others are more recent. However most of the examples collected by the Team are at an early or incomplete stage of development, in terms of public participation as defined by the Team. This in no way invalidates them as consultation, working, and other business arrangements, which may meet all public interest requirements completely, without fuller public participation. And while it was noted that not all these cases reflect equally the different principles of the definition, they all incorporate key elements of what is intended here by public participation, at some stage in their process.

47. The above country profiles and case studies make up the base information on which the Team worked. On this basis the '*What*' chapter describes different types of public participation process in forestry, '*Why*' is summarized in Chapter 3, and '*Who*' and '*How*' are covered in Chapter 5.

Types of public involvement process

48. Public involvement processes in forestry are applied to different types of forest-related decision making, management and practice. While working on the country profiles and case studies, the Team identified 4 main types of process (see Table 2). The country examples listed are not exhaustive and are subject to change.

1) *Forest policies, programmes and plans*

In many of the Team's countries, the processes were found mostly in the forest policy-making and forest planning context, and were quite evenly balanced between the three levels: national, regional and local.

These processes introduce public involvement at an early stage of decision making in order to anticipate conflicts and to enhance transparency and social acceptance of policies, strategies or plans. Their implementation is usually the task of national or regional forest services but can in some cases be directed by other actors (e.g. Framework for public involvement in forest management in the Russian Federation, Annex 2).

2) *Promotion of public involvement in specific forest projects*

Several of the examples aim to promote or increase direct public involvement in specific forest projects, public participation in them occurring mostly at regional and/or local levels. For instance, the ToS cases include creation of urban green spaces (Belgium), afforestation projects (Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Slovakia, United Kingdom), prevention of forest fires (participatory awareness-raising campaigns and creation of teams of fire-guards - Portugal). Public participation in these projects is often more related to the implementation of decisions taken earlier (with or without public participation). Such types of public participation may be led or supported by regional or local forest services and they may also be the result of other actors' initiatives, be they owners, unions, non-governmental organizations or/and local communities.

3) *Public auditing of forestry projects and practices*

Public participatory processes may also refer to formal procedures of public consultation about specific practices or projects, such as environmental/social impact assessments, allocation of public grants for specific forestry operations (Iceland, Ireland, United Kingdom) or citizens' juries (United Kingdom). They are often based on legal requirements related to transparency and accountability. They may also result from voluntary codes of practice. They follow more or less formal implementation procedures.

4) *Advisory boards/councils for public advice or management of conflicts*

The fourth type of process identified was advisory boards. Such boards can be found at various institutional levels, for example in Finland, Denmark, France, etc. These boards are permanent types of forum, often composed of members from various - mainly organized - interest groups, including non-governmental organizations and user groups. These types of public participation are institutional arrangements that can help the public to be better informed and to have a more direct influence in forestry-related matters.

49. In certain cases, forest certification processes can provide opportunities for public participation, as when all stakeholders are involved in the process of deciding on principles and corresponding standards for the sustainable management of forests. Although the Team did not specifically address the question of certification, examples in the ToS countries show that certification is helping to promote public interest in forest management (e.g. certification processes in Sweden).

Lessons learned from country experience

50. Country experience in Table 2 shows the diversity of recent and on-going applications of public involvement in forestry in the Team's countries. The Table gives examples of institutionalized forms of public participation and does not consider informal types of participation (more or less continuous contacts between foresters and people). In the limited time available, the Team was unable to collect examples of participatory processes at the international level, but that does not mean there are none.

51. Based on the above country experience, the following observations can be made:

- *Public participation occurs through all geographic and institutional levels*
Even though some public involvement occurs at national level - i.e. in particular in the development of national forest programmes and strategies - participatory processes seem to occur more often at regional and local levels. The institutional levels are elastic. The subnational level (regional and local) varies considerably in size and functions among countries. It may refer to a district (Denmark), a canton (Switzerland), a department or a region (France), a county (United States). It may also be defined according to landscape - ecosystem – or bio-geographical or socio-cultural representations of a given territory.
- *Across legal, strategic and operational stages*
The processes can take place not only at all institutional levels, but also across legal, strategic or operational stages of forest policy making and implementation. For instance, at local levels, there may be public participation not only in specific forest projects or operations but also in longer-term forest planning at municipal or community level, or for a given recreation or protected area (with or without legal implications).
- *With varying intensities*
The various types of public participation show differing degrees of intensity during the decision-making cycle. The examples quoted suggest that in most cases the public participation process affects decisions, even though the final decision remains in the hands of the initiator of the process. However, in some cases decision-making power can be considerably devolved to some group of stakeholders, usually at local level (viz. community based management, fourth column, Table 2).

52. Finally, the four categories of process in Table 2 should not be understood as fixed and unrelated. In fact public participation processes are essentially dynamic. Some may start with forest planning and later consider specific projects and practices or/and resolve conflicts; and while some are short-lived, others turn into more permanent arrangements (viz. advisory councils, fourth column, Table 2).

Back to the definition and the purposes

53. This section compares the practice of public participation as illustrated in the country profiles and cases with some elements of the definition and the purposes presented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

- *Inclusiveness*
Regarding *inclusiveness*, the reported experience and cases illustrate processes that involve a wide range of stakeholders, indicating that these processes tend to be

inclusive rather than exclusive. However, as participation is widely issue-driven, more project oriented participatory processes, such as those in the second column of Table 2, tend to address a more specific public. This is the case in the afforestation and forest fire control projects, which are quite specifically targeted at forest owners - be they private, public or community based owners (Iceland, Portugal, Slovakia). Because participation is self-selecting, this does not by itself mean that these processes are exclusive. However the test is perhaps whether all stakeholders as defined by the Team have had the opportunity to be involved and, if involved, to agree on the rules and be part of the process. Many of the existing arrangements do not appear to have gone through an agreed process.

- *Voluntary participation*

Regarding the voluntary nature of public participation, the cases show that there is a wide variety of institutional frameworks backing public participation processes in the different countries. Quite a few have legal obligations for public forest authorities to initiate public participation processes in certain circumstances - especially for longer-term forest planning (e.g. column 1 of Table 2, Belgium, Switzerland, Hungary, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, United States). In many of these cases, the agreed plan becomes binding for forest authorities active in public forests. In several cases, participatory processes have also been promoted by a public agency's own fully voluntary initiative, without having a forest law that explicitly requires it (Spain, Iceland, Finland, France, Denmark). In other cases, the Team noted that there was a variety of traditional, more or less informal institutional arrangements which favoured public participation processes. For instance, Iceland has had a long tradition of multi-stakeholder-based Forestry Associations since 1930 (Case No. 6, Annex 2). The principle of voluntariness in the definition applies to all taking part throughout the process, and to being able to take part if they wish, without undue cost or other resource barriers. In many of the country examples, this aspect does not appear to have been fully incorporated.

- *Purposes*

In considering the different country profiles and case studies, the Team reviewed the list of purposes (Table 1, Section 3.2.1) and found that all apply but that their importance varies from case to case. For instance, in the case of Portugal, acceptance - purpose 3 - was considered more as a by-product of public participation processes than a primary purpose. Another advantage of public participation noted on the basis of the Swedish experience was that it lessened the need for a detailed, less adaptive legislation/regulation. Although evaluation is essential to all public participation processes, in practice very little appears to have been done. Without it, it is very difficult to establish whether the purposes intended have been achieved.

54. To conclude this chapter, the selection of the type of process and the level at which it is implemented should be guided by the issue(s) at hand, the objectives and stakeholders in question and, for more complete public participation, be undertaken more transparently and publicly. Thereafter it will be the methods and techniques adopted during the process, or *How* the process is implemented, which will become the focus of initiators' or facilitators' attention. The choice and development of these methods and techniques can favour a greater or lesser

degree of public involvement. The question of *How* public participation can be implemented is explored in the next chapter.

How to implement public participation?

55. In view of the large amount of literature already available on the subject - inside and outside the forest sector - the Team chose to concentrate in this chapter on their accumulated practical experience. Even if most of this expertise refers to formal and relatively large-scale public participation processes generally initiated by public agencies (Annexes 2 and 3), the considerations presented here may also be adapted to smaller or more informal participatory processes. The following sections aim at giving some general guidance to help forestry decision-makers and practitioners create the best possible conditions for developing, implementing and evaluating such processes. For step-by-step approaches to public participation there are numbers of "toolbox" publications with detailed guidance on how to go about a participatory process, which are not duplicated here¹⁵.

Framework for best public participatory management

56. Participatory management at its best is open, fair, long-term, planned and goal-oriented co-operation between organizers and participants. Nine possible stages of a public participation process were identified (see Table 3, over). Depending on the scale of the process, these stages may be more or less formally articulated.

57. When tackling the organizational steps, the following should be borne in mind:

- Before starting the process of public participation, existing interests should be extensively searched for and contacted, including non-organized interests.
- From the outset, clear rules should be established with participants - clarifying how and when they can participate, on what kind of subject matter, and how their inputs will be used in the process.
- Agreement on a work plan and on goals and commitments within a time frame, as well as clarity on tasks and responsibilities, are key elements.
- Adequate information management - within and outside the process - is a means to increase the transparency of the process and the competencies of participants.

¹⁵ For example, a large-scale public participation exercise was carried by the Finnish Forest Service for which an up-to-date "Guide Book" is available (see Loikkanen, Simojoki, Wallenius 1999).

Table 3 - Stages to consider when planning a public participation process

<p><u>Define the context of public participation</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Identify</i> subject, issue and geographic area for collaboration, and potential interests/stakeholders 2. <i>Define</i> expected objectives, <i>estimate</i> suitability, needs and budget for public participation (also for participants) and <i>draft</i> possible approaches to public participation (or alternatives) 3. <i>Decide</i> to start a participatory process (or to opt for another type of decision-making process) 4. <i>Open</i> the subject to all interested parties: Publicize / Inform / Inventory / Survey interests <p><u>Plan the process</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>Develop</i> a Participation Plan with participants including : <i>Goals, Timetable, Subjects and issues, Rules, Responsibilities, Management of information and inputs, Techniques to be used, Needs for training or external coaching, Internal and external communication, Evaluation</i> <p><u>Implement the process and evaluate the results</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. <i>Implement</i> the Participation Plan 7. <i>Evaluate</i> the Participation Plan and conclusions with stakeholders 8. <i>Communicate</i> the outcomes to all stakeholders and wider interests 9. <i>Implement</i> public participation conclusions and <i>provide feedback</i> on progress

- Providing feedback on visible results is important to maintain and increase the motivation and trust of the participants.
- Public participation has implications for intra-organizational functioning – it should improve communication between hierarchical levels. It often requires training.
- It is also important to identify and discuss existing or potential conflicts openly and fairly. Mediation techniques or an outside facilitator may be helpful.
- The participatory process should define not only its goal but also the criteria of success and indicators for monitoring progress. Transparency in evaluation is likewise essential.

58. Participatory management is much more than a technique, *it is a way of thinking and acting* for both organizers and participants. Developing a public participation process cannot be considered a formality. The real challenge is to adapt each process to a particular situation.

About the people *organizing* the process

59. Public participation experience presented in this report (Chapter 4 and Annexes 2 and 3) shows that there are many reasons for initiating a public participation process and that these processes may be organized and implemented by various types of actors (e.g. public authorities, agencies, NGOs, stakeholders, citizens' committees, etc.). To create the best possible conditions for successful public participation, those who are responsible for the process must have a clear understanding of what the participatory approach is about and what participation opportunities are being arranged (Loikkanen, Simojoki, Wallenius 1999, p.17). A good starting point for participatory management is co-operation between organizers.

Internal collaboration, skills and motivation

60. A clear, competent and motivated attitude of organizers toward public participation is a key to successful participatory management. Experience has shown that, for instance, fear of the changes that the process may bring about, lack of agreement on participation objectives or methods, unclear definition of tasks and responsibilities, lack of resources or insufficient competencies may prejudice the participatory process. Care should be taken to ensure that such issues are not neglected but are addressed effectively before involving the public.

61. Indeed, public participation should be based on improved communication and co-operation among all people organizing the process. In the case of large-scale public participation projects or when a whole organization is involved, all levels need to be implicated. This requires the acquisition of adequate competencies and skills in both public participation principles and participatory management methods and techniques (e.g. participatory mapping tools, database management, communication and public relations skills, conflict management, etc.). Learning from experience can also be very helpful.

Gathering and managing information

62. Impartial and comprehensive data compilation is crucial in handling public participation. Every participant should be capable of holding, giving and receiving information. The real challenge is to share the often complex information flow within the process and to present it in a form which is understood by all. Adequate information management facilitates dialogue and cooperative decision-making (e.g. stimulating interaction and creativity). The way inputs are to be used and how they affect the decision-making process have to be clarified with participants beforehand.

63. During the process, all inputs from participants should be gathered, stored and then responded to. In order to preserve the level of motivation, it is important to keep feeding back information and to show visible results to participants. These measures should help participants feel comfortable about the process, make them believe that its management is transparent and fair and that it is worth while and technically possible to participate.

64. Besides participants' inputs, information should be gathered from outside the process, for instance by undertaking national, regional or local studies on citizens'

interests and attitudes to forests, on specific forest user groups' needs and demands, on landscape perceptions and preferences, etc. Such studies are sometimes the only way to reach non-organized or less vocal groups of interests.

65. Like any activities of participatory management, data collection and information management require adequate skills and resources. Latest technological developments in information management programs, communication systems (e.g. internet) and geographic information systems provide new opportunities in this area.

Conflict management within and outside the process

66. It is likely that in a public participation process the perspectives, interests and values of the various stakeholders sometimes conflict. If these are not properly addressed the process may easily fail. Moreover, people's anxieties and points of view about the process should never be considered insignificant. They should be registered and discussed. « Conflicts, *per se* are not negative or positive: more essential is how they are handled » (Loikkanen, Simojoki, Wallenius, 1999, 11).

67. All public participation processes entail the management of complex and dynamic power relationships. For instance, it can happen that some stakeholders do not recognize or want to co-operate with other stakeholders. The participatory process may then at first lead to an escalation of conflict. Discussing these difficulties, openly and fairly, when they appear will help stakeholders to stay in the process, gain trust and take part in the management of conflict.

68. To reach an acceptable solution to all, organizers should ensure that all parties have an equal opportunity to express their opinions and a fair chance to assert their interests and rights. Both positive and negative impacts of alternative outcomes should be openly and transparently discussed. The process should be managed in such a way that dialogue pursues common objectives uniting the parties. This should "enable the size of the pie to be increased, rather than solely arguing how it should be divided" (ibid.). An outside facilitator may be useful to ensure fairness in the process.

69. Finally, some conflicts may not be resolved within the public participation process. They should nevertheless be identified and managed in order to allow the process to progress. Creating a climate of good faith is a true challenge if public participation is to successfully involve all stakeholders in cooperative problem solving.

About the people *taking part* in the process Who is the public?

70. As already mentioned in the Introduction, the Team defined the "public" as being a vast and heterogeneous group of people or stakeholders, organized or not, who are concerned by a specific problem or issue and who should be given the opportunity to take part in discussions and to influence and/or jointly make decisions regarding the issue at hand. When it came to defining "who is the public" in a specific participatory process, the Team agreed to use the generic term of "stakeholders".

71. In the forest sector, there are many ways to categorize stakeholders. For instance, the ToS on Social Aspects of Sustainable Forest Management identified the following two categories (ILO 1997, p. 10):

- *commodity and producer interest groups*: forest owners; forest workers; wood and forest industries; tourism and leisure industries; other industries related to forestry;
- *citizens and socio-cultural interest groups*: individuals; environmental and nature protection NGOs; subsistence & indigenous populations; farmers & rural communities; sporting & recreation associations; hunters associations.

72. The wider literature proposes various other categories, for instance, differentiating between "primary", "secondary" or "tertiary stakeholders" according to how *close* (geographic criteria) or how *salient* a forest resource or use is to them (economic or subsistence criteria). The Team found that there were no objective criteria that were generally acceptable and valid for all purposes to define *who* are so-called primary or secondary stakeholders. The definition depends very much on the context and characteristics of a public participation process. Therefore, it will be part of the public participation process to ensure that all participants recognize their various entitlements, hence rights and responsibilities, and together find solutions whose costs and benefits are shared in ways that appear equitable to all.

How to identify stakeholders?

73. In order to ensure that a public participation process is inclusive, it is necessary to have a broad view so that existing interests are identified and other potential participants are contacted. It is important not to overlook any stakeholders, *in particular* non-organized interests or those unable to make themselves known for the process. As the Team noted, specific groups such as forest workers, small forest owners, industry, small forest user groups or lower social classes tended in general to be under-represented in public participatory processes. Moreover, country experience shows that in most cases - and particularly in rural areas - women participate less. Particular attention needs to be paid to involving these groups of actors as well. Indeed, it is not possible to reach all interests (e.g. women, young people, the elderly, etc.) through the same approach so multiple methods of identifying stakeholders may be useful (see Section 5.4).

74. There are many reasons why stakeholders take part in a public participation process. They may wish to understand the process and the interests at stake; they may believe in general principles (enhanced trust, fairness, transparency, respect); and/or they may pursue economic, political, social, ecological or spiritual interests, or seek cultural identity and recognition. Not all interests are promptly expressed - some stakeholders can pursue quite personal interests using to a more or less transparent strategy. It is part of the public participation process to help participants sort out and express their interests, then to progressively set priorities within them, as well as seeking to identify common interests.

75. While making every effort to integrate potential participants into the process, it must be kept in mind that people choose to enter and stay in the process only as long as they perceive that the benefits outweigh the costs of their participation (time invested, etc.). When the selected method of public participation limits the number of participants, the question of "Who can represent whom" is often difficult to answer. To the extent possible it is best to leave the choice of representatives to the stakeholder groups themselves.

Five main reasons for lack of participation by the public

76. Experience shows that under certain circumstances public participation may fail for different reasons. The Team identified 5 possible reasons why this may be so, with different implications in each case:

- *Lack of information*

Stakeholders do not have the necessary information or knowledge to understand the issues, or how they may be affected. As a result they cannot make a judgement, or take a position.

- *Lack of interest*

Where participation does not interest stakeholders, the reason may be that other mechanisms to inform and influence outcomes exist and are seen to work satisfactorily, or that the issue at hand is not perceived as being worth the effort. In either case there seems to be no real need for participation. One should resist the temptation to jump to this conclusion too readily, however, as the reason may well be one of those below.

- *No belief in the ability to influence*

Stakeholders do not believe in their ability to influence the outcomes. This may be due to a lack of supportive democratic institutions or of a public participation culture. It can also be caused by the initiating organization's lack of credibility, suggesting that it has an image problem. Another possible reason is the actual or perceived balance of power in a participation process, such as differences in resources or organizational capacity.

- *No access to the participatory process*

Potential participants may not be forthcoming because they were not approached in an appropriate way or because their interests have not been identified or recognized. Access to venues may be restricted for some stakeholders in terms of cultural or psychological barriers. The cases collected by the Team show that women and young people are often under-represented in public participation processes. Some people may be interested, but unwilling or unable to participate as individuals, as they lack the organizational capacity or other means of presenting their views. The organizers should consider these possible limitations and make reasonable efforts to overcome them when they are encountered.

- *Tactical behaviour*

On a number of occasions it has been observed that some interested groups deliberately stay out of a participatory process because they see better opportunities to influence outcomes from the outside. Those running a process may point out such tactics to other participants as well as to the public at large, but should continue to invite such groups to participate.

Models and techniques of public participation

77. There are many *models*¹⁶ of public participation and many related *techniques* for organizing and facilitating participatory processes. In the case studies and country profiles (Annex 2 and 3), the following models of public participation were encountered (Table 4):

Table 4 - Models of public participation

Groups of interests and/or representative-oriented participation model	Broad public participation and/or consultation models	Mediation and counselling among various interests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expert committees - More or less open working groups - Multi-stakeholder based working groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising and information campaigns - Public hearings - Public consultation strategies - Formal and informal public or community meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflict negotiation and/or mediation - Citizen advisory committee or jury - Consultation bodies and user councils - Counselling

Classification inspired from Linder et al. (1992)

¹⁶ "Models" represent different institutional forms for public participation which are described by their characteristic structures and procedures (Renn, Webler and Wiedemann 1995, p. 2).

78. Selection of an appropriate public participation model and techniques depends very much on the context and characteristics of the process. The participatory process can also be more or less open depending on the stage (cf. Section 3.3.2), methods and techniques varying accordingly. The rate and importance of change in a public participation process require complex management and great flexibility. The process needs experience and skill.

79. Different models and corresponding techniques can be combined at different stages of a participation process. For instance, one might start with an open public hearing to inform the population at large of some forest policy, plan or project, then proceed to smaller expert committees or multi-stakeholder based working groups. For final decisions the process could be opened to wider consultation again.

80. The multiple techniques referred to in models above include for example involving the media, communication technologies e.g. interactive web sites (case study from France, Annex 2), collaborative mapping exercises/other participatory appraisal methods (case of crofters in United Kingdom, Annex 2), information gathering, surveys (opinion poll in Switzerland). Public events can also be organized to increase public interest in participation through exhibits, concerts, plays, etc., for example forest associations in Iceland, Annex 2. These techniques need to be creatively selected and adapted to each situation.

Evaluation of participatory processes

81. There are costs and benefits for all taking part in a participatory process and their perceived ratio determines to a large extent each stakeholder's commitment. It is therefore in everyone's interest that the process is planned and evaluated. Parameters (criteria and indicators) should be defined early in the planning stage to evaluate whether the public participation process is progressing towards the fulfilment of its objectives and thus to satisfactory results (output). It is important to involve participants in both the definition of the parameters and the evaluation of the process as this increases transparency. A third party perspective may also be advantageous.

82. In fact, evaluation should apply to the entire process: to management activities (i.e. operational, administrative activities), to invested resources (i.e. time, budget, staff, information, etc.) and to achieved results (outputs) of the process. It should take place:

1. at the beginning of the process, when it is being planned;
2. during the process, for flexibility in changing it if objectives are not being reached as planned;
3. after every step and at the end of the process to provide wider feedback, and for future public participation processes.

83. As a first step to defining suitable monitoring and evaluation parameters, the Team proposed a list of possible "measurables", which would need to be further elaborated and applied as appropriate to each public participation situation. The assessment provided the following possible evaluation/monitoring parameters under 3 headings (see Table 5):

- the people taking part in the process (*who*)
- the organization/dynamic of the process (*how*)
- the objectives of the process (*what*)

Table 5 - Monitoring parameters for the evaluation of participatory processes

WHO <i>People</i>	HOW <i>Process organization</i>	WHAT <i>Objectives fulfilment</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Audience size - Interest groups - Stakeholders - Actors/process participants - New contacts - Relationships - Actor attitude change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scope, area or other measures - Time and relative progress - Budget and % used - Level of the process - Formal /non formal - Ground rules - Feedback - Debriefing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Competency and information - Internal/external organizational change - Follow up actions (e.g. other public participation processes) - Awareness raising - Policy / management change - Improved forestry in the interest

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actors' success (capacity to influence, ownership of the process, etc.) - ... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transparency - Efficiency, effectiveness - Appropriate techniques - Media coverage - ... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of the public - Improved public commitment to forestry - ...
--	--	--

84. These parameters can be measured both quantitatively, for instance number of stakeholders, and qualitatively, e.g. stakeholders' "feel good" factor at end of the process. Evaluation may include a wide range of measures or a few, depending on scale of process and perceived need. Besides ensuring transparency and neutrality, the evaluation needs to measure parameters for which it has the resources to gather information.

Social science may be able to suggest appropriate ways to "measure" attitude and other social change.

85. Finally, one should consider the possibility of evaluating medium-term impacts and long-term outcomes of the process. Depending on the context, such evaluations might be comparative over time and place (for instance with previous policies/plans, or with policies and plans developed in other similar contexts). Indeed, because many factors outside the process influence its impact and outcome over time, evaluation of medium- and longer-term effects could be part of broader assessments (social surveys, assessments of forest policy, etc.).

86. In the time available the Team was unable to further develop the possible evaluation measures identified. The Team concluded that evaluation is an integral part of successful participatory forest management and that more case studies on evaluation would help advance this important part of the public participation process.

Specific contexts of public participation in forestry

87. This chapter looks at specific contexts in which public participation processes entail particular questions, approaches or technical considerations. The Team focused on the following specific contexts of public participation in forestry:

- public participation in public forests
- public participation and private forest ownership
- participation in the context of community based forest management in Europe (CBFM)
- participation of workers and unions in forestry
- public participation in countries in transition
- public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society

88. For each of these there is a description of what makes the context special, its particular opportunities and problems, and finally objectives and strategies to improve implementation of public participation in these situations.

Public participation in public forests

89. Many of the Team's country examples are about public participation which is not specific to ownership category (e.g. dealing with national or regional forest management plans). In this specific context we focus on public participation processes in publicly owned forests.

Context

90. In the mid-1990s, about 30% of all forest and other wooded land in the EU-15 was in public ownership; in the United States, 42% of all forested land was; and in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) 100%. As a result of privatization and restitution, however, the percentage is decreasing in some CIS countries (except for example the Russian Federation) and the former planned economies of Eastern Europe. In fact, the percentage of publicly owned forests varies greatly across Europe, from 100% in Bulgaria and 99.9% in Turkey, to 20-25% in Sweden, Spain, Norway and France, 18% in Austria and 8% in Portugal (UN-ECE/FAO 2000).

91. Publicly owned forests may be owned by the State or by other public institutions belonging to regions, departments, counties, cantons or districts, cities, municipalities, villages and communes. Varying greatly from country to country, these different government levels have different institutional frameworks within which public participation processes can develop. In a good number of countries public forestry authorities are legally required to initiate public participation at some government level (regional in Finland, Hungary, Switzerland). Parallel to this legal requirement, public forest owners can also initiate such processes voluntarily. How public participation is conducted, whether as a legal requirement or voluntarily, is generally left to the discretion of the initiator - to ensure some flexibility in the public participation process.

Constraints

92. Public forestry in Europe and in the United States is nowadays challenged by a combination of trends: constraints on economic timber production, requirements for close-to-nature forestry and globalization of wood prices, all of which are reducing

public forestry income. These trends also have an impact on public participation in public forest. The Team noted that while forest policies and laws increasingly promote public participation to satisfy growing public demand, this is often without a corresponding public budget allocation.

93. In the context of pressure towards greater efficiency in resource management, often also pressure of privatization, new public management approaches are expected to promote closer ties between public services and their users. The objective of these new approaches is to increase the public forest agencies' acceptability and efficiency.

94. The culture of some public forestry organizations, however, and the perception the public has of them, are often marked by their legacy as the "forest police", with rather bureaucratic and exclusive working methods. This legacy to some extent hinders the development and adoption of participatory management approaches by forest services. But forest agencies can work on removing those constraints and public participation provides a great opportunity for organizations to learn and change while also improving their public image.

Opportunities

95. With increasing emphasis on the social aspects of forestry, environmental values and sustainable multiple use, forestry places a special responsibility on forest managers to involve the public in public forests. Although these values and opportunities also exist on private forest land, there is a greater perceived need for public participation in public forest management as managers are acting essentially on behalf of the public as the ultimate "owner".

96. Public policies promoting public participation at various institutional levels often link it with efforts to decentralize the management of natural resources (IPF 1998 and FAO 1979). Other policy developments promoting subsidiarity in government are likewise encouraging public agencies to undertake participatory management involving not only local government but also other stakeholders.

97. Another factor encouraging the application of public participation processes in public forests is the very much greater average size of public holdings compared to private forestry, making the unit cost of public participation and any possible follow-up lower in public forests.

98. Public participation can be beneficial for achieving increased transparency and accountability of public forest agencies. When forestry services undertake public participation processes their internal organization tends to be challenged. When employees and managers increase their skills in public participation, they are likely to adapt their own organization's working methods.

99. Economic pressures on the sector can also in some instances motivate public participation processes, to the extent that they can make forestry more efficient (through improved acceptance of forestry practices and in some cases participation of the public in implementing forestry decisions). For instance, conservation in a protected area will

have a greater chance of being respected and managed in collaboration with local users if it has been established through a public participation process.

100. In practice, public agencies may have a variety of relationships with stakeholders. Some have a one-way public awareness raising relationship (one-way information flow, e.g. Portugal "To live is to share", Annex 1); some a two-way partnership (two-way exchange but among a limited number of stakeholders who commit themselves to undertaking a common project, e.g. partnerships with user groups in Belgium, Teams of Forest Guards in Portugal). Others have a public participation relationship, open in principle to all (e.g. city forest management in Finland and Flanders). Still others integrate these various approaches at different levels into one large (nation-wide) programme such as the Iceland afforestation project.

Conclusions and recommendations

101. Based on their country experience, the Team noted that the application of public participation in public forests generally satisfies all the identified purposes. Achieving public participation in public forests may arguably be more important than in private forests, since public forest managers act as "public servants". Participatory processes in these contexts can also serve as a learning experience - including better estimates of benefits and costs that public participation may entail. Such experience in the public domain may also be useful to private forest owners.

102. The management of complex and often conflicting forest-related interests will increasingly require public forest agencies to adapt their skills and methods, including their ability to handle public participation, and improve their capacity - financial, organizational and technical - to promote and effectively apply it.

103. The evaluation of public participation in the public domain should be further developed and systematically used (i.e. Section 5.5). For public forests in particular, a key requirement is the inclusion of all interests, at all institutional levels where public participation is applied.

Public participation and private forest ownership

Context

104. Almost two-thirds of the forests in Europe -- not including the countries in transition, and a little more than two-thirds in the United States are privately owned. In Central and Eastern European countries, restitution and privatization of forests are leading to an increasing share of private forest holdings. The majority of private forests in Europe are still owned, occupied and managed by families. Other defined types of forest ownership are: company forests, community and corporation forests, collectives and cooperatives, institutional forests (e.g. belonging to church trusts)

105. The size of private holdings varies from over a million hectares to less than one. The average private forest holding in Europe is 10.7 ha,¹⁷ and there are several million private owners with less than 3 ha each (UN-ECE/FAO 2000, p.7). Family ownership continues to be important in Western Europe. To these families, who have a long tradition of forest management, the forest is a source of pride and remains a significant source of income. Traditionally there has been a close inter-relation between agriculture and forestry with the farmer often

¹⁷ Some countries that provided statistics on private forest ownership to the TBFRA did not include private holdings of less than 3 ha.

being a forest owner. Changing demographic, social, cultural and economic patterns in rural areas are however leading to an increase in the number of forest owners living away from their property, as well as to fragmentation of wood lots.

106. The restitution and privatization process in the Central and Eastern European countries is rapidly leading to an increase in the number of private forest owners and some western countries with large afforestation programmes (e.g. Iceland, Ireland, etc.) are seeing a similar rise. The new owners often lack tradition and know-how in forest management, and valuable technical expertise is being lost with the restructuring of state forest services. Although there is a urgent need for technical assistance, the creation of forest owners' associations sometimes lags behind.

107. The level of organization of private forest owners varies significantly among countries. In some European countries there are strong owners' associations at various levels from local or regional to national level. There are also numbers of transnational and European organizations. Forest owners' associations represent private forest owners' interests at various policy making levels, as well as providing technical advice, offering training and being involved in research projects. They sometimes have a vital economic function in pooling resources for forest management and marketing of forest products and services.

108. The notion of private forest ownership, including the rights and obligations that derive from it, varies significantly from country to country. In some countries the public has the right of free access to all forests, including those in private ownership, while in others access is legally more restricted. Like any forest owners, private owners have to comply with legal requirements for sustainable forest management. In addition forest owners' rights may be constrained by specific requirements e.g. for protection reasons such as prevention of natural hazards in mountainous areas, fire control or biodiversity protection. In some countries and in some cases, economic losses resulting from such obligations are compensated by public funds.

Constraints and opportunities

109. The Team distinguished two kinds of public participation in private forests, namely:

- participation of the public in/concerning private forest land
- participation by private forest owners, for instance in regional planning.

110. Even though - as defined - public participation may be undertaken in all types of forest ownership, the Team considered the particular constraints and opportunities of private forest owners.

111. Many private forest owners, notably those with smallholdings, face difficulties in making use of participation. They tend to lack the resources and know-how to participate fully, let alone organize processes themselves. They can be put off if faced for instance with articulate and well organized pressure groups. As already mentioned (cf. Section 3.1), public participation in private forests cannot go ahead without the acceptance of private forest owners.

112. According to the Team's definition the public participation process can occur at all institutional levels. However the management unit level may not be the most appropriate for problems having to be addressed on a larger scale. In this regard, the Team recognized that the level of public participation should be appropriate to the context (cf. Section 3.3.2).

113. Public participation can in general offer opportunities to private forest owners through associations or large company holdings. Opportunities may include improved relations with the interested public and a better appreciation by people of the investment and challenges of long-term sustainable management. Public participation in private forests may also open new sources of public interest for forestry and offer additional income for private forest owners. Since they sometimes also receive subsidies for various forest practices, their accountability to the public may also be relevant.

114. Within the legal framework, all forest owners, be they private or public, are expected to practise sustainable forest management. In the final analysis, the decision of all owners on whether to get involved in a public participation process will depend on whether they think that the benefit exceeds the cost. Benefits and costs are not necessarily monetary, but may be intangible, such as improved local community relations. In that connection it could be argued that in public forests, the "owners" themselves are discussing what is to be done, and as taxpayers they shoulder the cost, while a private owner may face a very different cost/benefit ratio.

115. The perceived costs and benefits will inter alia depend on: the issues and objectives (problem to be solved); the location (peri-urban or remote forested rural land); the relevance (type of forest, type of enterprise, scale of production, market orientation etc.) and other economic incentives (income, jobs, taxes, etc.). The equation is in some cases modified by public funding subsidising some or all of the cost or increasing benefits. Whatever the ratio, the owner's decision on participation is voluntary, as has been stressed in the definition.

Conclusions and recommendations

116. Participation by private forest owners is clearly essential for balanced development of forest policies, programmes and legislation, and represents new opportunities to respond to and develop new social forest products and services. Further, participatory approaches open new opportunities to improve relations with the public and enhance recognition of private forest owners' investment in SFM. However, public participation among small-scale, poorly organized, or poorly represented private forest owners is likely to remain rare for the foreseeable future, as conditions are not conducive. Other forms of dialogue like working groups and various forms of partnerships may be easier to organize or be more appropriate, depending on context.

117. One of the best ways to ensure that private forest owners can articulate their positions and contribute to the broader forestry dialogue within society is through strong private forest owners' associations, with broad private forest representation, not just of large and economically viable estates. This can be promoted by enhancing their capacity to organize public participation processes themselves, as well as through other options such as partnerships, selective working groups, etc. To this end, institutional and technical support may be necessary, particularly in countries in transition where private forest ownership is new and growing.

118. With public participation in private forests, adequate information, broad involvement of all other interested groups (in particular local ones), clear and agreed ground rules, and the voluntary nature of all aspects of the process are all important to ensure a level playing field. As in the case of other stakeholders, co-operation amongst owners in the participation process is often the key to effective participation.

Participation of workers and unions in forestry¹⁸

Its long history and many facets

119. Participation is a basic requirement for workers in the forestry sector. Unions have a long tradition of developing their own models of participation. For unions, «partnership» could be a possible positive outcome of a participation process with equally distributed rights and duties for each participating person or group.

120. Unions are present at all levels of forestry work: international, national and forest management unit (FMU). For unions, participation has to be understood in different ways, as workers may be state employees, company employees, self-employed, or contract workers, with different participatory roles.

121. There are many examples of unions' participation in forestry:

- *Participation at the enterprise level: Collective agreements* - Collective bargaining, even in countries with relatively high wages, is a tough but daily task for union leaders and workers' representatives at the enterprise level. Collective agreements are typically found at the level of larger enterprises with long-term employees. Unions are also trying to extend the concepts of collective agreements to contract work. For example, in December 1999, following the violent storm «Lothar», unions negotiated with the German authorities to obtain hourly wages with bonuses for high quality work in order to allow workers to do their jobs carefully and precisely without compromising safety.
- *Participation at the national government level* - Unions and affiliates participate in national governmental policy-making to bring workers' rights and needs into public discussion and consideration. For instance, in Germany, such actions helped to improve the regulations for «fictitious self-employment» jobs, for people with (negligible) part-time employment, and for adequate "bad weather compensation" for workers in forestry, in agriculture and on construction sites.
- *Multinational framework agreements* - Under the terms of these agreements partner enterprises demand that suppliers ensure that their workers enjoy conditions which comply with national legislation or national agreements and have unrestricted rights to join trade unions and to engage in free collective bargaining. They demand that their suppliers respect ILO standards relating to their operations, such as Conventions 29 and 105 on abolition of forced labour, 87 and 98 on the right to organize and negotiate collective agreements, 100 and 111 on equal remuneration and non-discrimination and 138 and 182 on child labour as well as the « ILO Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Forestry Work ».
- *Participation in policy-making at international levels* - Forest workers' unions have, for example, taken part in the negotiations for different ILO Conventions, as part of the ILO's tripartite process, as well as in the UN Intergovernmental Panel/Forum on Forests, in order to promote the recognition of and codes of practice on safety and health and basic minimum standards in forestry. Unions are also influencing certification processes in order to have at least requirements of the Core ILO Conventions respected. At local levels of certification or developing certification standards, forest workers are key stakeholders and providers of information in their forest enterprise.
- *Participation with non-governmental organizations and local communities* - Unions are likewise forming alliances with international NGOs in the forestry and environment sector - notably in establishing eco-labelling guidelines, on socially and environmentally friendly forest restoration projects and energy saving devices. At local levels they are also involved in community based projects, such as afforestation projects.
- *Participation of women within the forest sector* - Women are also increasingly given attention in the forestry professions, since they have entered at all levels of forest related work, but often still remain overlooked and neglected. Their role is quite often different from that of men, and they may have different interests and issues and different ways of participating in a participatory process¹⁹. Trade unions work towards the acceptance of women as equal partners in social and economic development.

¹⁸ This special context is based on a contribution by Jill Bowling, International Federation of Building and Wood Workers (IFBWW), Geneva, Switzerland; and Marion Karmann, University of Freiburg, Germany, submitted to the ToS on Participation, March 2000.

¹⁹ *Forworknet Update: Focus on Women in Forestry*, Industrial Activities Branch, ILO -- Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee, Nov. 1999.

Why are trade unions interested in participating?

122. Core requirements for unions are safe, stable and well paid jobs for workers. To make forest jobs stable, unions have a strong interest in managing forest resources by implementing sustainable forestry (Bowling 2000). Additionally, in spite of technological progress, forestry work remains one of the most dangerous occupations in most countries. The forestry sector has more than its share of health problems. Only a few forest workers reach the normal retirement age without occupational diseases or physical deterioration. To bring safety and health into forestry work and to secure the forest resource, all expert levels should be used. This includes the manager at the political level, the union at the enterprise level and the workers themselves at the work-site.

123. Today traditional union issues have been widened to include more fields of concerns. In forestry this includes active participation in sustainable forest management (SFM). This has occurred because unions, like other stakeholders, recognize that there are no jobs in the forest and timber sector if there are no forest resources. Union leadership has recognized that full and active participation in "new issues" is closely linked to increased responsibilities, and as such it requires increased commitments. The increased commitment results not only in a more motivated staff but it also increases its knowledge and ability to engage with the other stakeholders at a community and informal level, as well as at the professional level.

Conclusions and recommendations

- The participation of forest workers and unions is essential for ensuring that the social issues of workers' health, safety and equity are included in forest management.
- Since forest workers implement forest management decisions they are in a good position to monitor sustainable practices and they should be included in this very important activity.
- Women working in forestry face special issues that are often different from those of men, and these issues need to be addressed as a priority.

Participation in the context of community based forest management in Europe²⁰

Context

What is community based forest management (CBFM)?

124. CBFM may be considered forest management by, for and with the local community (Murphree 1993). It includes, among others:

- Traditional forms of community forest management which predate current administrative boundaries, such as those in the Val di Fiemme in north east Italy (Merlo et al 1989);
- More recent self-mobilized community forestry initiatives, such as the crofting forest initiatives in the North West Highlands of Scotland (Jeanrenaud & Jeanrenaud 1997);
- Forms of collaborative forest management between communities and state administrations, such as the management of some forested *baldios* in Portugal (Brouwer1995);

²⁰ With special thanks to Sally Jeanrenaud for providing the main material to this section, adapted from Jeanrenaud, S. (forthcoming): *Community Involvement in Forest Management in Europe*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

- Commune or municipal forests, where local authorities are responsive to local needs rather than simply acting on instructions from the central government, such as some French forest communes (Zingari 1998);
- Shared ownership which is a dominant form of non-state forest property in Slovakia (Vinca ToS 2000).

Why is it a special context for public participation?

125. Discussions about public participation in forestry tend to focus on the role of *state forest administrations* in initiating, organizing and facilitating participatory processes for forest planning and management. While these experiences are useful and valid they do tend not to capture participatory processes initiated by communities themselves. Self-mobilized forms of public participation can be found in about all European countries. They have prompted public administrations to become involved in local forest planning, more as collaborators than facilitators. Participation in the context of community based forest management is special because the motive and outcome is usually to redress the existing asymmetrical patterns and relations of power between different actors in favour of marginalized rural communities.

Where is it encountered?

126. CBFM is often encountered in areas with land and resource scarcities, declining services and employment opportunities, local dissatisfaction with prevailing forest management and institutions regulating tenure and access to forest land and resources. Compared to developing country contexts, community based forest management is not widespread throughout Europe. However, there are signs of a renaissance of interest. In many European areas and in an increasing number of nations, North and South, policies and institutional mechanisms are developing to provide more active roles for local communities and indigenous peoples, to promote sustainable forest management in accordance with international standards²¹.

Who is involved?

127. Apart from local community members, a wide range of stakeholders can be involved, e.g. state forestry bodies, environmental NGOs, workers, local industries, organized groups from outside the locality (such as walking associations), etc. Community rights to participate in and benefit from forest management are based on a wide range of tenurial and organizational arrangements. In some parts of Europe, traditional rights to access to forest products – e.g. to a certain amount of wood per year – are still shared among local families (e.g. Predazzo in Italy, Patriziati in Switzerland or Affouage in France). In some areas such rights are inherited (Predazzo). In others, the rights are associated with registered private dwellings (crofter rights to common land in Scotland; commoners' rights in the New Forest in the UK (Forestry Commission 1981)). They can be open to newcomers but are associated with length of time in the locality (Comunità di Fiemme in Italy). In some of the more recent community forestry initiatives,

²¹ International forest-related policies such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Forest Management (IPF 9) and the Convention on Biological Diversity are encouraging such collaboration. The CBD Article 8j says that : "subject to its national legislation, [each party] should respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices."

the right to participate in and benefit from forest management is open to anyone from the locality or who is actively involved in affairs (Laggan in Scotland).

How does public participation in the context of CBFM work?

128. Participatory processes initiated by local communities vary enormously in content, duration and geographical area. Some traditional communities have well established democratic institutions regulating forest management and conflicts (the local democratic assemblies within the Val di Fiemme, in Italy; the Baldios in Portugal; the Verderer's Court of the New Forest; the Swedish and Finnish Forest Commons). In most cases in Europe, such community based forest management plans are agreed with and sometimes subsidized by state forest bodies. Some self-mobilized initiatives have invited participatory rural appraisal exercises to help them identify historical processes and objectives of community action (Laggan Forestry Initiative in Scotland; Drevdagen in Sweden (Halvarsson 1998)). In some areas, communities have been systematically involved in lobbying for policy change, such as the crofters in Scotland, who managed to secure changes in legislation in 1991, allowing crofters the right to plant and benefit from trees on their common land for the first time.

Opportunities, limits and recommendations

What are its potentials?

129. CBFM can make positive economic, social and ecological contributions for the sustainable management of forests in Europe. The integration of diverse benefits is often highly valued by communities. Livelihoods: From a European Union perspective, forestry is seen as an important component of development in rural areas (Cork Conference 1996). Forests supply numerous local goods and services and contribute to rural livelihoods by providing employment, income from trade in wood and non-wood products, grazing, hunting, etc. Greater community participation in forest management and local value-added processing can increase rural incomes and promote development, and community stability. Social sustainability: Local community and indigenous peoples management institutions are often highly responsive to local needs inclusive of local knowledge, aspirations and concerns, as well as cultural, spiritual and aesthetic values. They frequently have strong local leadership, with capacity to mobilize local and even international commitment. Biodiversity conservation: Many local communities and indigenous peoples have a long-term perspective of forest uses, and frequently demonstrate an interest in local ecology and landscapes, maintenance and restoration of local biodiversity and multipurpose management.

What are its limitations?

130. Concepts such as "community", "local", "indigenous" and "traditional" need to be carefully interrogated. For example, in using the term "community" it is important not to gloss over social differences (such as class, ethnicity, gender, age) which play an important role in shaping access to and benefits from forest resources, or to ignore conflicts within groups. There can be problems with a single focus on "local". Some communities, such as the Sami, may be dispersed over large areas, and use grazing areas only seasonally. Similarly, the idea of "indigenous people" may give a false impression of groups with a homogeneous, collective identity. In reality, indigenous

peoples consist of highly diverse groups, with divergent political agendas. The idea of "traditional" is also very problematic. Communities are dynamic and the concept of traditional tends to obscure the extent to which rural peoples change and adapt according to circumstances, such as the growing impact of trade, or technological innovations.

Conclusions and recommendations

- Recognize the special role and benefits of CBFM in sustainable forest management in Europe
- Support traditional forms of CBFM and new self-mobilized initiatives (through an appropriate policy framework, legislation, land tenure reforms, economic incentives, marketing, training, networking, research, etc.)
- Support best available participatory processes at local-community level

Public participation in countries in transition

General context

131. After the political and economic changes of the late 1980s, the forest sector of the former planned economies of central and eastern Europe has been substantially transformed. However, the changes that have taken place in the transition countries have not been uniform. The Team found it more useful to consider them on a country by country basis - as with other countries - but still highlighting their historically common context of institutional change. The Team's work on this particular aspect of public participation in forestry is based on country profiles and case studies from three countries: Hungary, Slovakia and the Russian Federation (Russia).

132. During the past decade, Hungary has privatized or re-privatized substantial parts of its forests (38%). Slovakia has done so for 40% of its forests so far and the process is not finished (Vinca in ToS 2000). Both countries are attempting to raise the value of their forest resources and to afforest abandoned agricultural land. Russia, on the other hand, has kept its forests under state ownership but has also developed policies aimed at sustainable forest management - including a strategy for the "sustainable development of Russian forestry".

133. The journal *Unasylva* (FAO, #179, 1994) provided a Strength-Weakness-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) type of analysis of the forestry sector in countries in transition, according to which some of the strengths and opportunities that relate most directly to public participation are:

- a strong forestry tradition, education and an extensive network of research institutes;
- inadequate capacities related to planning, forest assessment and policy analysis.

134. The types public participation objectives identified by the ToS were considered valid in general but with varying importance according to each country's specific situation. In particular, it was recognized that public participation in forestry enhances the longer-term sustainability of forest management. It helps to develop effective institutional arrangements and is conducive to a better balancing of interests, thus a more multiple use of forests, while playing an important role for the improvement of rural livelihoods.

The Hungarian context

135. In Hungary the main feature since 1992 has been the rapid restitution of substantial parts of its forests (38%) to private owners. The average size of privately owned forests is 2.6 hectares, and much of this is agricultural land being returned to forestry. Since January 1997, Hungary has had a new Forest Law, which follows very closely the spirit of the Strasbourg and Helsinki Resolutions (in particular S1, S2, H1, H2, Criteria and Indicators). The new law defines among other things the system of regional and management unit level planning, and ways and means of keeping the forestry sector transparent. The management of private and public land is administered by the same State Forest Service, and in effect management guidelines are very similar for the two types of forest properties.

136. Hungary's government, supported by COST Action E4, has carried out a country-wide survey on attitudes of forest owners to forest management - the main objective being to enhance the efficiency of the forestry sector and to plan an effective information sharing system (mainly for the numerous new private forest owners).

Limits and opportunities

137. The greatest present challenge is to involve the new private forest owners in the sustainable management of their forests. Accordingly, extension, education and awareness raising are becoming essential tasks of the State Forest Service. Hungary is developing regional forest management plans, which include public participation. There is a need to strengthen policies and institutional capacities to foster public participation ("top-down" capacity for public participation), and to enhance the organization and involvement of the users and owners in a more "bottom-up" way.

The Russian context

138. The context of Russia is special because the forest resource is so extensive that it does not have the scarcity value of forest lands in the more westerly parts of Europe: Russia holds 22 % of the world's forest area and 55% of the world's coniferous resources. Access to Russian forest resources is largely open though Article 58 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation "charges all Russian citizens to make thrifty use of natural resources and take care of their preservation" (Third Ministerial Conference, 1998, p. 203).

139. There has been no privatization of land but the Forest Service practises forest leasing the conditions for which were established by the 1997 Forest Code. Leases can run for one to 49 years and may be renewed. Any person or institution can act as a tenant. Leaseholders are considered as legal owners obtaining the rights for forest utilization. Wood lots can be leased for the following purposes: wood harvesting; gum harvesting; collection of secondary forest products; hunting; recreation and tourism; science and research.

140. In Russia, there is little tradition or institutional means for involving the population in decision making processes in natural resource management and conservation. The 1997 Forest Code has a chapter on public participation, but it is limited to fire control. The forest service includes a Conflict Management Division, a Public Relations Division and one on Indigenous Peoples' Affairs, which are open to people to express their concerns, but they are used only rarely by the public.

141. In partnership with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, including foresters, policy makers, donors, activists and representatives of international organizations, an IUCN Working Group on Community Involvement in Forest Management is developing guidelines for public consultation and decision-making processes. This project "Creating a Framework for Public Involvement in Russian Forest Management" is actually developing two sets of guidelines, one for forest managers and one for the general public. Similarly, many Russian NGOs are working to convince Russia's government to join the Aarhus Convention.²²

Limits and opportunities

142. There is little public demand for more access to forests. The public in general does not believe in its ability to influence decision-making processes. Even though public participation is written into the new Forest Code, there is a need for support to both forest agencies and the public in its implementation.

The Slovakian context

143. Slovakia has a long tradition of planned forest management. Its Forest Act of 1977 was updated after 1990 but does not define public participation. A new version of the Act is currently being discussed. The most relevant policy for public participation is a Provision of the Ministry of Agriculture on Forest Management, which includes a chapter on participation of interested parties in forest management plans. These plans, designed with respect to ownership and management, were elaborated for units with an average size of 1200 ha. Other official documents, "A Conception of Slovak Forestry up to 2005" and "Programme of

²² Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, 1998.

Forestry Development", will include chapters dealing with public participation and public relations.

144. Economic and political transformation since 1990 implies for the forest sector increased pressure from:

- new forest owners and users;
- environmental groups (mainly active through media and public campaigns - increasingly influential in Forest Management Plans);
- the wood processing lobby (increasingly organized to ban roundwood exports – and resulting in conflicts with forest enterprises).

145. In Slovakia the *shared ownership* category of land property has a dominant position among the different types of non-state ownership²³. These joint ownership communities - often with large numbers of co-owners - hold yearly meetings. Even though their decision-making rights are limited and not specified by forestry legislation, "*the owners can significantly affect the quality of forestry activities (investment in forestry, use of more ecological techniques...)*" (Vinca ToS 2000). The joint meetings are important for conflict resolution between and among owners and foresters.

146. Slovakia's Ministry of Agriculture and an agency for the afforestation of non-forested land (part of the Forest Research Institute) are drafting a governmental decree and guidelines for the participation of forest owners in the afforestation and restoration of abandoned agricultural land (2000 hectares). The programme's objectives are land conservation, rural development and alleviation of unemployment.

Limits and opportunities

147. The programme of afforestation of lands unsuitable for agricultural production is quite exclusively meant to motivate forest owners to participate, subsidies serving as the main incentive. But because of lack of funds the continuation of the programme is at present in jeopardy. Public demand seems dependent here on the economic situation of the stakeholders: if they are in need they are more likely to be interested in the project.

Conclusions and recommendations

148. While their importance varies from case to case, all the purposes of public participation, as identified by the ToS (cf. Table 1, Section 3.2.1), were considered relevant for the three countries studied. Accordingly, they may also be of relevance for other countries in transition. Further considerations and recommendations drawn from the studies are:

1. *Public demand* for public participation in forest management in Hungary and Russia is apparently not very high.
2. All actors need to enhance their *legitimacy* (forest agencies, private forest owners in Hungary, ENGOs, etc.).
3. There is a need to identify *conflicts* (among foresters and environmentalists, foresters and local users and foresters and indigenous peoples) and public participation is a good means to balance interests (viz. Hungary).
4. There is a need to *improve the provision of forest goods and benefits* in particular related to non-timber forest products, so as to enhance the interest of local communities in forest management.
5. More public involvement is needed to improve *efficiency* in forest management - for both Hungary and Slovakia the involvement of private forest owners is a key objective.

²³ In Slovakia the ownership structure is the following: the state owns 43,7% , private 11,3%, shared ownership 24,5%, Municipals is 10,2%, Church 3,3%, other 0,1%, non-state unidentified 6,9%.

6. *Transparency* and *accountability* would improve people's trust in their capacity to influence decision-making - *public demand* for public participation would increase accordingly.
7. *Awareness raising* is important for both forest agencies and the public (i.e. guidelines for implementing public participation in Russia), so are education and public relations (in Hungary and Slovakia for the forest owners in particular).
8. In Hungary, there is a need for forest owners to be recognized - their *recognition* is related to the improvement of their organizational capacity, their knowledge, etc. This may enhance their demand for public participation (objective 1). The recognition of indigenous peoples and other user groups is also an important issue in Russia.
9. Research to provide case studies on public participation processes in various countries with economies in transition would be helpful to further promote such policies and practices in their respective contexts.

Public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society

Context

149 Across Europe and the United States as a whole 70 to 80% of people live and work in sizeable towns and cities (Bramham and al. 1993, Bjornskov 1989). In many countries the percentage of the population directly employed in the primary sector (farming, fishing, mining and forestry) is already less than 5% and is still declining. As a result of their economic, political and cultural marginalization, remote rural areas of industrialized countries are still suffering from depopulation, young people in particular continuing to migrate to urban centres. These current trends in urban development strongly influence the evolution of society's interest in forests. While their knowledge about forests and forestry tends to decline, urban dwellers have an increasing direct influence on the way forests are used as well as a growing indirect impact on forest conditions (ILO 1997, p. 17) -- whether in urban, suburban or rural areas.

150. In this context, the impact of increasingly urbanized society was recognized as a major, special context for public participation in forestry. The Team identified three different situations :

1) The impact of urban society on urban and suburban forests

In modern urbanized society people appreciate having trees and woodlands close to where they live. They value forests for the diversity of settings they provide for recreation, access, exercise, and physical, mental and emotional well-being. Urban people also value forests for their landscape, and for the contribution they make to nature conservation and to biodiversity. In this context, urban and suburban forestry is growing in importance (Broadhurst in ILO 1997a).

2) The impact of urban societies on rural forests

Current changes in urban attitudes and demands toward forest and forest resources have an influence on rural areas. Growing demands for outdoor recreational, leisure and eco-tourism activities not only open up new income opportunities for rural people, but also create tensions over access to rural areas and conflicts with rural people's interests and use of forests. *On the other hand*, as city populations – and hence voter numbers – grow, they have a greater influence on policies, management and spending in rural areas than do country dwellers.

3) *The impact of urbanization on the countryside*

Several factors have favoured the expansion of cities into rural areas, including: growing urban populations, development of infrastructure, decentralization of public administration, increased services, higher quality of life, and revolution in communication technologies (Glueck in ILO 1997a). This evolution has of course considerably increased the impact of urbanization on the countryside and its forests.

151. In all three above mentioned situations, the Team pointed out that high levels of urban demand and differences between urban and rural interests and values are giving rise to increasing misunderstanding and conflict, heightened by degree of proximity and numbers.

Problems and opportunities

- *Cost/benefit imbalance*

Considering the impact of urban society on urban forests and on rural areas (first two categories), one problem appears to be a general cost/benefit imbalance. In other words, urban people's activities incur costs for the countryside which rural people cannot -- or are unwilling to -- pay for.

- *Different needs and mutual lack of understanding*

One of the main problems of modern urbanized societies lies in the mutual lack of understanding between town and country. This situation does not only refer to different interests and values of urban and rural people, it also refers to disorganized uses and impacts of urban people in rural areas. Neither town- nor country-based interests and values are adequately represented, nor is rural regulation satisfactorily monitored or implemented.

- *Special problems and opportunities of urban forests*

Cultural diversity produces different interests and values. The intensity of urban and suburban forest uses produces both high and multiple demands on the environment and requires intense scrutiny of standards. Furthermore, specific public safety issues such as drugs, crime, rubbish disposal, etc. arise in urban forests. Intensity of use can, however, provide significant numbers of volunteers and motivate community involvement in local forest management.

- *Impact of urbanization on the countryside*

Environmental impacts of urbanization on the countryside aside, one of the hallmarks of this context is an influx of wealthy people with very high expectations, often prepared to help finance improvements in their locality.

Conclusions and recommendations

152. The growing diversity of society's interests in forests means that the forest has become a social concern of great complexity. To increase mutual understanding among various urban and rural people's interests and values in forests and to avoid and/or manage conflicts in the use of forests and forest resources, public participation in forestry may offer great opportunities for both urban and rural people. By effectively participating in sustainable forest management, they also enhance their awareness of the benefits that can flow from it. In this context, all the purposes of public participation presented in Section 3.2.1 are seen to be valid, raising mutual awareness and respect seen as having the highest priority.

153. The overriding objective is to increase mutual understanding. The public participation process is seen as an essential tool to reach partners and develop participation in forestry, formally and informally. Forest managers need to improve stakeholder assessment and increase information campaigns to do this.

154. With the very large numbers of people now living in towns and cities, there is an overwhelming need to better understand what urban people need and how best to cater for them. Public participation can help solve forest management problems and realize new opportunities for better forest use.

Synthesis, conclusions and recommendations

Synthesis...

155. Since UNCED Rio (1992) -- and more recently the Third Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe (Lisbon 1998) -- the interaction between forestry and society and the concept of public participation have been recognized as important and integral parts of sustainable forest management (SFM). This evolution reflects a clear transformation of society's interests in forests and the management of forest resources.

156. For the purpose of this report, the concept of public participation in forestry has been defined as **various forms of direct public involvement where people, individually or through organized groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome** of specific forestry issues. To distinguish between public participation and other ways in which people in the forestry sector can interact with the public, the Team characterizes public participation in forestry as a process which is *inclusive* with respect to interests, *voluntary* with respect to participation, may be a *complement to legal requirements*, is *fair* and *transparent* to all participants, is based on participants *acting in good faith*, and does *not guarantee* - or predetermine - what *the outcome* will be. The intensity of public involvement varies from simple information exchange to more elaborate forms of collaborative decision-making or implementation. This definition considers public participation in forestry mainly as a tool rather than an end in itself.

157. The aim of public participation is constructive co-operation and widely acceptable results, which can be justified from different perspectives, and which commit involved parties to implementation. When related to forestry issues, *public participation* may:

- Increase public awareness of forests and forestry among the public through active collaborative learning, mutual recognition and constructive co-operation among forest related actors.
- Maximize the total benefits of forests in offering opportunities -- for society and the forest sector -- to mutually improve multiple-use forest products and services, and to define jointly how costs and benefits of forests may be equitably shared.
- Enhance the social acceptance of sustainable forest management through better informed and more widely accepted forest management outcomes.

158. Public participatory approaches offer a wide range of possible applications at all institutional and geographical levels. Depending on the situation, they may occur earlier or later -- and more or less frequently -- in the decision-making or implementation cycle. Indeed, the Team considers that there are no ideal -- or *per se* restricted -- levels (such as national, regional, forest management unit levels), stages or intensities (exchange of information, consultation, joint decision-making) of public participation in forestry. These depend on the context and the issue tackled by the participatory process.

159. Public participation is much more than a technique, it is a way of acting and working. It requires from both organizers and participants a clear understanding of what the participatory approach is about and what participation opportunities are being arranged. Public participation should be based on mutual trust, improved communication and co-operation among all people involved in the process. This requires adequate competencies and skills -- from both organizers and participants -- as well as the use of appropriate participatory models and techniques.

Conclusions...

160. Public participation -- as a process -- is part of a broader societal and institutional context. As a system, it functions in a network of complex power relationships. Whatever the many expectations one may associate with public participation, such processes also have their limits, which come from within and beyond the public participation process:

- There are limits related to the cultural or institutional - including regulative and ownership - context which may or may not be favourable to participatory approaches; whatever the context, in general public participation may be a complement to legal requirements, but cannot conflict with legal provisions, property and user rights.
- There are limits related to the issue motivating the participatory process; indeed perceived costs of participation may restrict wide participation, while representative participation entails communication related constraints.
- Finally some stakeholders may be unable to participate because of lack of information, of interest, of trust, or of access, or because they find other options to influence decisions.

161. These aspects constitute tangible limits to effective public participation, which need to be clearly recognized. In fact, they should be seen more as a challenge to create the best possible conditions for successful public participation, rather than an excuse to avoid any form of public participation.

162. In the early stages of the concept of "sustainability", particular attention was paid to what was ecologically necessary and economically feasible. More recently, the social dimension has been recognized as an integral part of the solutions to sustainable development in general, and to sustainable forest management in particular. In this context, public participation represents a potential tool to help enhance the social sustainability of forest management.

Recommendations...

163 The aim of this report is to offer guidance for decision-makers and practitioners in forestry to better understand the concept of public participation and to integrate it more fully and transparently into forest policy making and forest management strategies. To this end, the Team singled out six special contexts of public participation in forestry:

- ♦ *Public participation in public forests* is a means to improve multiple use forestry through balanced integration of the various social demands on public forests and to enhance the social acceptance of their management. It also meets society's growing concern for more transparency, accountability and efficiency in the activities of public forest authorities and services. To improve the effectiveness of public participatory approaches, the organizational and technical capacities of public forest services have to be adequately developed.
- ♦ *Participation by private forest owners* is clearly essential for balanced development of forest policies, programmes and legislation. Further, participatory approaches provide new opportunities to improve relations with the public and to enhance recognition of private forest owners' investment in SFM. It also opens new perspectives to respond to the demand for new forest products and services. To make best use of these opportunities, institutional and

technical support is necessary, particularly for small private forest owners (i.e. better organization and assertion of their interests) or in countries where private forest ownership is recent and increasing (i.e. countries in transition). Support is especially needed where private forestry issues and opportunities can go beyond management unit levels.

- ♦ *The participation of forest workers* and unions is essential for ensuring that the social issues of workers' health, safety and equity are included in forest management. Since forest workers have substantial knowledge of the forests they work in and implement forest management decisions, they should be systematically involved in both the planning and the monitoring of sustainable forest practices. Further, women working in forestry face special issues that need to be addressed as a priority.
- ♦ *Participatory processes at local community level* enable the special roles of CBFM in sustainable forest management to be recognized by many stakeholders. Effective participatory processes at local community level, traditional forms of CBFM and new self-mobilized initiatives should be supported through appropriate policy, institutional and economic frameworks.
- ♦ *Public participation in countries in transition* can contribute to involving new private forest owners in the sustainable management of their forests and raising public awareness about forestry issues in general. It can also improve the provision of multiple forest goods and benefits, including non-timber forest products, so as to enhance the interest of local communities in forest management. To this end, institutional frameworks, as well as organizational and technical capacities of the forest sector, need to be strengthened adequately.
- ♦ *Public participation in the context of an increasingly urbanized society* is a means to increase mutual understanding among various urban and rural people's interests and values in forests and to avoid and/or manage conflicts in the use of forests and forest resources. By participating effectively in sustainable forest management, both urban and rural people also enhance their awareness of the benefits that can flow from it. This implies a need for forest authorities and forest managers to develop adequate opportunities for people to be more fully involved in sustainable forest management.

164. To act effectively on the considerations outlined in this report requires coherence and a broad consensus on policy measures, programmes and investments as well as a medium- to long-term perspective. The considerations presented here on public participation demonstrate that much is to be gained from co-operation within the European region. Emphasis should be on policy, on research, and on education and training of practitioners. Further, regional institutions such as the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training should adapt their general programmes to incorporate the dimension of participation where it is relevant to their work such as in the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee's forthcoming seminars on "Women in forestry", "Forestry meets the public", "Partnerships in forestry", "Afforestation" and "Management of protected areas".

165. Finally, particular attention should be paid to the following new questions raised by the report:

- To make public participation more effective for the public and accessible for all types of forest ownership is a true challenge. Indeed, forest decision makers and

practitioners need support in considering the resources - costs, time, skills and organizational capacities - which public participation entails.

- It was outside the mandate of the team to evaluate the effectiveness of the public involvement examples presented here. However, the Team feels more work is needed in this area and for increased sharing of public participation experience in general.
- To create a climate which enables public participation processes, forestry related actors need to take into account the daily, continuous, often informal, quality of relations they establish with the multiple forest users and interest groups. Raised public awareness is altogether a condition, a part of - and a further achievement of - public participation.

166. In the modern framework of sustainable forest policies and forest management strategies, the human dimension is intrinsic to environmental and forestry issues. In this context, the Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry is convinced that public participation in forestry, as a means of communicating more directly with people, with creative and open-minded handling, has a lot to offer.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.; Clement, J. and Crowder, L.V. (1998): **Accommodating Conflicting Interests in Forestry - Concepts Emerging from Pluralism**. *Unasyuva* 49 (194), pp. 3-10.
- Arnstein, S. (1969): **A Ladder of Citizen Participation**. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. 35, pp. 216-226.
- Bowling, J. (2000): **A Worker's View of Sustainable Forestry**. In *Sustainable Forest Management*, Kluwer, Netherlands.
- Bramham, P.; Henry, I.; Mommaas, H. and van der Poel, H. (eds.) (1993): **Leisure Policies in Europe**. CAB International, Oxford, UK.
- Broadhurst, R. (1997): **People, Trees and Woods across Europe**. In *People, Forests and Sustainability, Social Elements of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe*. International Labour Office, Geneva, pp. 53-66.
- Brouwer, R. (1995): **Baldios and Common Property Resource Management in Portugal**. *Unasyuva* 46 (180), pp. 37-43
- FAO Journal **Unasyuva**, No. 179, 1994.
- Forestry Commission (1981): **Explore the New Forest**. Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London.
- Giddens, A. (1999): **Democracy**. The 1999 Reith Lecture, No. 5. London School of Economics, London.
- Glueck, P. (1997): **Sustainable Forestry in the Context of Rural Development**. In *People, Forests and Sustainability, Social Elements of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe*. International Labour Office, Geneva, pp. 79-88.
- Halvarsson, H. (1998): **Local Forest Management: Hope for the Future in our Struggle for Survival**. *Forests, Trees and People Newsletter*, No.36/37, pp. 34-40.
- ILO (1997): **People, Forests and Sustainability Social Elements of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe**. FAO/ECE/ILO Team of Specialists on Social Aspects of Sustainable Forest Management, International Labour Office, Geneva. 213 p.
- Jeanrenaud, S. and Jeanrenaud, J.-P. (1997): **Thinking Politically about Community Forestry and Biodiversity: Insider-Driven Initiatives in Scotland**. ODI Rural Development Network Paper 20c. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Johansson, O.T. (1999): **Reindeer Herding and Forestry in Northern Sweden**. Paper presented at the Indigenous Peoples' Workshop on the Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Forest Degradation, Quito, Ecuador, 7-11 January 1999.

- Kennedy, J.J.; Dombeck, M.P. and Kock, N.E. (1998): **Values, Beliefs and Management of Public Forests in the Western World at the Close of the Twentieth Century**. *Unasylva* 49 (192), pp. 16-26.
- Kooiman, J. (2000): **Social Political Governance: Overview, Reflections and Design**. Paper for the conference, Globalization and the Comprehensive Governance of Water, IUCN-CEESP, May 26, 2000.
- Linder, W.; Lanfranchi, P.; Schnyder, D. and Vater, A. (1992): **Procédures et Modèles de Participation - Propositions pour une Politique de Participation de la Confédération Selon l'art. 4 LAT**. Office Fédéral de l'Aménagement du Territoire. OCFIM, Berne. 130 pp.
- Loikkanen, T.; Simojoki, T. and Wallenius, P. (1999): **Participatory Approach to Natural Resource Management. A Guide Book**. Finnish Forest and Park Service, Metsähallitus, Suomen Graafiset Palvelut Oy LTD, Kuopio. 95 pp.
- Merlo, M.; Morandini, R.; Gabbrielli, A. and Novaco I. (1989): **Collective Forest Land Tenure and Rural Development in Italy**. FAO, Rome.
- Mühlemann P. (1997): **Participatory Forest Management**. In People, Forests and Sustainability, Social Elements of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe. International Labour Office, Geneva: pp. 99-105.
- Murphree, M.W. (1993): **Communities as Resource Management Institutions**. IIED Gatekeeper Series No. SA36, International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
- Ockerman, A. (1999): **Changing Forests, Changing Ideas: A Cultural History and Possible Futures of Forestry**. In Boreal Forests of the World IV, Integrating Cultural Values into Local and Global Forest Protection. Proceedings of the 4th Biannual Conference of the Taiga Rescue Network, October 5-10, 1998, Tartu, Estonia. Tartu: Estonian Green Movement.
- Renn, O.; Webler, T. and Wiedemann P. (1995): **Fairness and Competencies in Citizen Participation. Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse**. Technology, Risk, and Society, USA, 381 pp.
- UN-ECE/FAO (2000): **Forest Resources of Europe, CIS, North America, Australia, Japan and New Zealand (Industrialized temperate/boreal countries)**. ECE/TIM/SP/17.
- UN-ECE/FAO (1999): **Multiple Use Forestry**. Discussion Paper prepared by the FAO/ECE/ILO Team of Specialists on Multiple Use Forestry, ECE/TIM/DP/18.
- Western, D.; Wright, R. and Strum, S. (eds.) (1994): **Natural Connections, Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation**. Island Press, Washington DC.
- Zingari, P.-C. (1998): **French Forest Communes and Sustainable Development in Mountain Areas**. *Unasylva* 49(195):55-57.

ToS contributions to its 1st meeting in Eggiwil (Switzerland, November 1999) and to its 2nd meeting in Växjö (Sweden, March 2000)

Bowling, Jill and Karmann, Marion (ToS 2000): **Participation in Forestry: From the Union Point of View**, IFBWW, Geneva, Switzerland and University Freiburg, Germany, 11 pp.

Buysse, Wim (ToS 1999): **Participation in Forestry and Management of Other Natural Resources. Experiences in Flanders, Belgium**, Ministry of Flanders Administration of Environment, Nature, Land & Water Management, Division of Forests and Green Spaces, Brussels, Belgium, 24 pp.

Coleman, Evelyn; Finger, Andréa. and Kazemi, Yves. (ToS 1999): **Participatory Planning in Switzerland**, Swiss Forest Agency, OFEFP, Bern, Switzerland, 9 pp.

Boon, Tove Enggrob (ToS 1999): **State of Art on Public Participation in Danish Forestry**, Danish Forest and Landscape Research Institute, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Copenhagen, Denmark, 11 pp.

Boon, Tove Enggrob; Appelstrand, M.; Aasetre, J.; Gunnarsson, K. and Hytönen, L. (1999): **Project SNS59 Public Participation as a Means to Sustainable Forest Management - Reconceptualising Public Participation**, Lunds University Allforsk, For.& Landsc.Res. Ic. Forest Research., 5 pp.

Boon, Tove Enggrob (2000): **Five Analytical Frameworks for Analysing Public Participation**, in: Niskanen, A. and Vayrynen, J. : Regional Forest Strategies. EFI Proceedings No.32, pp. 47-62.

Foley, Noël (ToS 1999): **Participation and Partnerships in Forestry in the Republic of Ireland**, Forest Service, Department of Marine and Natural Resources, Republic of Ireland, 14 pp.

Gunnarsson, Karl S. (ToS 1999): **State of Art on Icelandic Forestry**, Iceland Forest Research, Mógilsá, 8 pp.

Hoover, Anne P. (ToS 1999): **Public Participation and Federal Land Management Agencies in the United States, A Brief Overview**, USDA Forest Service, Research & Development (SPPII), Washington, USA, 5 pp.

Jeanrenaud, Sally (ToS 1999): **Participation and Partnerships in Forestry - Why, What, Who, and How**, WWF/UICN, St-George, Switzerland, 8 pp.

Jeanrenaud, Sally (ToS 2000): **Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples: Alternative Perspectives on Participation in forest Management in Europe**, WWF/UICN, St- George, Switzerland, 26 pp.

Kolozs, László (ToS 1999): **Public Participation in Hungary**, State Forest Service, Budapest, 8 pp.

- Kopylova, Elena (ToS, 2000): **Public Participation in Russian Forest Management**, IUCN Office for CIS, Moscow, 6 pp.
- Pereira, Maria João (ToS 1999): **Dialogue in Forest Policy Revisited-or the Intrinsic Merits of Participation**, Direcção-Geral das Florestas, Lisboa, Portugal, 12 pp.
- Schlemmer, Gisbert (ToS 2000): **What is Certification ?**, IFBWW, Düsseldorf, Germany, 3 pp.
- Teixeira, João (ToS 1999): **Public Participation in Portugal**, Department of External Relation, General Direction of Forests, Lisbon, Portugal, 5 pp.
- Vinca, Robert (ToS 2000): **Public Participation in Slovakian Forestry**, Forest Research Institute, Zvolen, Slovakia, 4 pp.
- Wallenius, Pauli (ToS 1999): **Public Participation in the Finnish Forest and Park Service**, Finnish Forest and Park Service, Vantaa, Finland, 12 pp.

ANNEXES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Annex 1 - Recommended reading on public participation in forestry</u>	55
<u>Annex 2 - Case studies on national experience of public participation</u>	58
<u>2.1 User councils in state forest districts in Denmark</u>	59
<u>2.2 Strategic forest and land use planning in the Metsähallitus (Forest and Park Service) in Finland</u>	62
<u>2.3 City forest management in Hämeenlinna (Finland)</u>	67
<u>2.4 Creation of new urban forests in Flanders</u>	70
<u>2.5 Opening a public forum on the internet in France</u>	73
<u>2.6 The Icelandic Forestry Association</u>	76
<u>2.7 "To Live is to Share" (Viver é Conviver) in Portugal</u>	78
<u>2.8 Fire watchers in Portugal - Sapadores Florestais</u>	80
<u>2.9 Public participation in Russia</u>	84
<u>2.10 Afforestation of lands unsuitable for agricultural production in Slovakia</u>	86
<u>2.11 Spanish forest strategy</u>	88
<u>2.12 Crofter forestry in the North West Highlands of Scotland</u>	91
<u>2.13 Regional forest planning in Switzerland - example of the Lake District</u>	94
<u>2.14 Public participation in an increasingly urbanized society in the USA</u>	97
<u>Annex 3 - Descriptive matrix of country profiles</u>	100
<u>3.1 What is the participatory process about?</u>	100
<u>3.2 Why are people developing/ using the public participation process ?</u>	105
<u>3.3 Who is organizing and taking part in the public participation process ?</u>	106
<u>3.4 How are the public participation processes designed and implemented ?</u>	108
<u>Annex 4 - List of members of the FAO/ECE/ILO Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry</u>	111

Recommended reading on public participation in forestry²⁴

- Anonymous (1998): **The Community Woodland Handbook – A Guide for Local Groups Setting up Community Woodlands and for Organisations Seeking to Encourage Participatory Forestry**, Reforesting Scotland, 60 pp.
- Anonymous (1999): **Working with Communities, The Natural Heritage in Rural Development**, Scottish Natural Heritage, ISBN: 1-85397-298-3, 27 pp.
- Anderson, J.; Clément, J.; and Crowder, L.V. (1998): **Accommodating Conflicting Interests in Forestry – Concepts Emerging from Pluralism**, *Unasylva* 194, Vol. 49, pp. 3-10.
- Boon, T.E. and Meilby, H. (2000): **Enhancing Public Participation in State Forest Management: a User Council Survey**, *Forestry*, Vol. 73 (1), pp 153-164.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G. (1997): **Beyond Fences. Seeking Social Sustainability in Conservation**, Volume 1: A Process Companion, Volume 2: A Resource Book, IUCN (The World Conservation Union), Gland, Switzerland.
- Buchecker, M. (1999): **Die Landschaft als Lebensraum der Bewohner – Nachhaltige Landschaftsentwicklung durch Bedürfniserfüllung, Partizipation und Identifikation: Theoretische Begründung, Empirische Untersuchung und Evaluation von Methoden zur Praktischen Umsetzung**. Dissertation der Universität Bern.
- Canadian Standardization Association (1996): **A Guide to Public Involvement**, Canadian Standardization Association, 118 pp.
- Coillte Teo (1999): **Forests and People - Consultation Process: Results Coillte Teo**, Leeson Lane, Dublin 2.
- Committee of Scientists (1999): **Sustaining the People's Lands: Recommendations for Stewardship of the National Forests and Grasslands into the Next Century**, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington D.C.
- Flora, J. L. (1988): **Social Capital and Communities of Place**, *Rural Sociology*, 63 (4), pp. 481-506.
- Forestry Commission (1996): **Involving Communities in Forestry ... Through Community Participation**, Forestry Practice Guide 10, Forestry Commission, ISBN: 0-85538-271-6, 36 pp.
- Forestry Commission (1999): **Forests For People – Working With Communities in Britain, How to Get Involved**, Forest Enterprise Public Information, Forestry Commission, 10 pp.

²⁴ This list of sources is proposed by the members of the Team

- Forestry Commission (1999): **Forests for People – Working With Communities in Scotland, Our Commitment**, Forest Enterprise Public Information, Forestry Commission, 6 pp.
- Greighton, J.L. (1992): **Involving Citizens in Community Decision Making: A Guidebook**, Program for Community Problem Solving. 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20004. 227 pp.
- Institute for Participatory Management and Planning (1994): **Citizen Participation Handbook for Public Officials and Other Professionals Serving the Public**, Institute for Participatory Management and Planning, IPMP, PO Box 1937, Monterey, CA 93942-1937.
- Jackson, W.J. and Ingles, A.W. (1998): **Participatory Techniques for Community Forestry - A Field Manual**, the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Gland, Switzerland.
- Kearney and O' Connor (1993): **The Impact of Forestry on Rural Communities**, Economic and Social Research Institute, 4 Burlington Road, Dublin 4.
- Korten, D.C. (1980): **Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach**, Public Administrative Review, (Sept. -Oct), pp. 480-511.
- Knoepfel, P. (ed.) (1995): **Lösung von Umweltkonflikten durch Verhandlung - Beispiele aus dem In- und Ausland - Solutions de Conflits Environnementaux par la Négociation - Exemples Suisses et Etrangers**, Helbling & Lichenhahn, Basel und Frankfurt am Main, 324 pp.
- Linder, W.; Lanfranchi, P.; Schnyder, D. and Vater, A. (1992): **Procédures et Modèles de Participation - Propositions Pour une Politique de Participation de la Confédération selon l'Art. 4 LAT**. Office Fédéral de l'Aménagement du Territoire. OCFIM, Berne. 130 pp.
- Little, P. (1994): **The Link between Local Participation and Improved Conservation: A Review of Issues and Experiences**. In Western, D, & Wright, R.M. (eds.) (1994): **Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation**, Island Press, Washington D.C., pp.347-372.
- Nelson, N. and Wright, S. (1997): **Power and Participatory Development -Theory and Practice**, Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- Ni Dhubhainn, A. (1995): **The Impact of Forestry on Rural Communities**, Irish Forestry, Volume 1 and 2.
- Ostrom, E. (1999): **Self-Governance and Forest Resources**, Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Occasional Paper No. 20 (Feb.), Bogor, Indonesia.
- Peters, P. (1996): **Who's Local Here? The Politics of Participation in Development**. Cultural Survival Quarterly (Fall 1996).

- Romm, J. (1993): **Sustainable Forestry, an Adaptive Social Process**, in Aplet, G.H.; Johnson, N.; Olson, J.T. and Sample, A. (eds.) (1993): **Defining Sustainable Forestry**, the Wilderness Society, Island Press, Washington D. C., Chap. 13, pp. 280-293.
- SAEFL Swiss Agency of Environment Forests and Landscape (1996): **Handbuch / Manuel : Forstliche Planung / La Planification Forestière**, Bern.
- Shannon, M. A. and Antypas, A.R. (1997): **Open Institutions: Uncertainty and Ambiguity**, in Kohm, K.A. and Franklin, J.F. (1997): **Creating a Forestry for the 21st. Century, the Science of Ecosystem Management**, Island Press, Washington, D.C., pp. 437-445.
- Stanley, M. (1983): **The Mystery of the Commons: On the Indispensability of Civic Rhetoric**, Social Research, 50(4), pp. 851-883.
- Sutter, S. (2000): **Die Mitwirkung bei Waldentwicklungsplänen: Rechtliche Regelung und Umsetzung**, dargestellt an ausgewählten Beispielen einzelner Kantone, Diplomarbeit der Eidg. Techn. Hochschule, Zürich.
- Tanquerel, T. (1988): **La Participation de la Population à l'Aménagement du Territoire**, Collections Juridiques Romandes, Etudes Pratiques, Payot, Lausanne, 388 pp.
- Tanquerel, T. (1992): **Modalités d'Intervention du Public dans les Choix d'Aménagement - Le Point de Vue du Droit"**, in Ruegg et al., **La Négociation - son Rôle, sa Place dans l'Aménagement du Territoire et la Protection de l'Environnement**, Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes, Lausanne, pp. 59-78.
- Loikkanen T.; Simojoki, T. and Wallenius, P. (1999): **Participatory Approach to Natural Resource Management. A Guide Book**, Finnish Forest and Park Service (Original in Finnish 1997), Suomen Graafiset Palvelut Oy LTD, Kuopio.
- Warburton, D. (1998): **Participation in Conservation: Grasping the Nettle**, ECOS 19(2), British Association of Nature Conservationists, 11 pp.
- Wellman, D. J. and Terence J. T. (1990): **Public Forestry and Direct Democracy**, The Environmental Professional, No 12, pp. 76-84.
- White, S.C. (1996): **Depoliticising Development: The Uses and Abuses of Participation**, Development in Practice, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Feb. 96), pp.6-15.

Case studies on national experience of public participation

The Team of Specialists on Public Participation in Forestry gathered 14 cases studies from 12 countries. Most of these experiences are at an early stage of development. While it appears that not all cases mirror equally the different principles of the definition, they do all encompass key elements of what is intended here by publication participation at some stage in their process. The cases have been described and analysed within a structured format in order to provide a concise and comparative presentation. The format is organized as follows.

1. Situation and context	➤ Define the social / institutional / legal/ policy / organizational context of the process
2. Object	➤ Define the types of public participation processes
3. Institutional or legal framework	➤ Situate the legal, regulatory, voluntary, organizational framework
4. Institutional level	➤ Locate the PP amongst different policy/planning levels (i.e. international, national, regional or local institutional and geographic levels) and/or define the type of enterprise or owner concerned by the PP
5. Goals & objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify the relevant overarching goals & objectives of the PP such as: increased legitimacy, improved forest goods and services, etc. ➤ Specify which stakeholders have preference over one or another goal or objective and note which are common goals and objectives.
6. Initiators of the process	➤ Who has initiated the process (e.g. government, institutional agencies, citizen groups, economic groups, NGO, ...) ?
7. Characteristics of actors/participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Who are the different actors taking part in the process (e.g. commodity and producer interest groups, citizen groups, environmental NGOs, institutional actors, etc.) ? ➤ What are the characteristics and the specific interests of the participants (e.g. : gender, age, professional, socio-economic and political categories, residence, etc.)?
8. Design of the participatory process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How is the participatory process designed and implemented? ➤ Which techniques and models of participation are used (e.g. consultation, interview, workshops, conferences, open-house, informal discussions, etc.) ? ➤ When in the decision making process does the participatory process take place (e.g. : in the initial phase of the decision-making; continuing until the final decision, etc.) ? ➤ What is the degree/intensity of participation based on Arnstein's ladder: manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, citizen control. (Arnstein 1960) or information exchange, collaborative decision, co-implementation and / or co-evaluation
9. SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Propose a SWOL analysis highlighting Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Limits of the given PP. ➤ Draft some conclusions, possibly with recommendations for a way forward.

User councils in state forest districts in Denmark

Situation and context

There are 25 state forest districts in Denmark. Until 1995, public participation has been limited. Typical forms of participation have been expert-based, permanent or ad hoc advisory boards found at the national level of forest policy formulation and administration (e.g. the Forest Council). State forest planning has traditionally - but in a non-legally binding way - included hearings of major NGOs, concerned municipalities and counties. It therefore seemed like a breakthrough for participation when, in 1995, the Forest and Nature Agency introduced user councils at each of their 25 state forest districts. In total, 33 user councils were established with up to 14 members in each.

Object

Management of state forest districts. Forest planning takes place every 15 years, and the user council will also be heard then.

Institutional or legal framework

No legislative requirement for user councils. No legislative requirements for public hearings of state forest plans either.

Institutional level

State forest district level (25 in total). Across administrative county borders and encompassing several municipalities per district.

Goals & objectives

The formal goal of user councils is to enhance the involvement and influence of local users in the management and utilization of public forests. Objectives growing out of experience are: improved communication among state forest district and stakeholders and, mainly, among stakeholders, leading to improved understanding of each others' interests and of the applied solutions to satisfy conflicting interests.

Initiators of the process

The Minister of Environment and Energy initiated the process, implemented by the Forest and Nature Agency, in 1995.

Characteristics of actors/participants

The aim was to involve the «common citizen». However, for practical reasons, the user councils ended up as a mix of environmental NGOs (Danish Nature Conservation Society, Outdoor Council, Danish Federation of Sports), county officials, municipal politicians and – in some councils – representatives from defence, agricultural, hunting and tourist organizations. All members should have local affiliation.

The average age of all council members is 54, 17 % are women, 87 % live within the state forest district, 51 % are public employees, 34% are private employees or have own business, whereas 15 % are retired or unemployed (Skovøg Naturstyrelsen 1998; Boon & Meilby 2000).

Design of the participatory process

Initially, each user council should meet at least once a year. Since 1998 there is a minimum of two meetings per year. In practice, some districts held only the required meetings, whereas others held up to 4 meetings per year.

Apparently, no particular techniques were applied at the meetings in order to stimulate participation, besides excursions and common debate on topics laid out by the forest district supervisor.

The user councils have no formal decision power. Also, it is up to the forest supervisor whether he/she involves the user council before or after a decision has been taken. As such the user councils can be placed at several places on Arnstein's ladder, from manipulation and informing to consultation and, eventually, partnership, depending on the forest supervisor's attitude towards the council (Boon & Meilby 2000).

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: User councils facilitate communication and increased understanding of actions and motivations among different stakeholders and state forest district.

Weaknesses: Municipal politicians (e.g.) are potentially strong sources of improved co-operation between public authorities and between state forest district and local society/individual citizens. However, user councils cover too big areas to be really local, whereby the advantages of local networking are partly lost.

Opportunities: Improved dialogue with municipalities and, in rural districts, with farmers' organizations, is an opportunity which could facilitate implementation of afforestation and nature restoration projects, following the Danish ambition to double the forest area within a tree generation.

Limits: The success of the user council in terms of members feeling they make a difference depends largely on the forest supervisor facilitating communication, transparency and accountability. The major threats could be considered: (1) forest supervisors being unwilling to manage the user council; (2) that the current composition of members fail to represent the forest users; (3) lack of interest among citizens in participating.

Sources

Boon, T.E & H. Meilby 2000. Enhancing public participation in state forest management: a user council survey. *Forestry* 73: 155-164.

Skovøg Naturstyrelsen 1998. *Evaluering af brugerråd. Opgørelse af spørgeskema.* [Evaluation of user councils. Statements on survey]. Skovøg Naturstyrelsen, Driftsplankontoret, Copenhagen. 16 pp.

Contact

Tove Enggrob Boon
Danish Centre for Forest, Landscape and Planning
Hørsholm Kongevej 11
DK - 2970 HØRSBOLM
E-mail: teb@fsl.dk

Strategic forest and land use planning in the Metsähallitus (Forest and Park Service) in Finland

Situation and context

The Metsähallitus FPS (Forest Park Service) started to develop PP in the beginning of 1990s. The reason for this process came from FPS itself or a few employees working in FPS. The first goal was to handle those many conflicts happening all the time on FPS land. During the development process there became many other goals also for PP so in Finland we didn't have any laws saying that PP should be undertaken. Community planning had been done in several case studies from the beginning of 1980s and also Road Administration had made road planning processes with PP. Also some national work groups set by government had made papers about participatory planning but also those had not led to any practices.

Object

Regional natural resources (RNR) plans are proactive forest and land management plans, there are no special conflicts or reasons for PP, just the principles for open and co-operative ways of working.

Institutional or legal framework

PP is a voluntary process based on FPS's understanding that community and entire national and international development is going in that direction and that we should start it especially on FPS land. There were no laws to obligate the use of public participation in Finland at that time when first large processes were started.

Later on new laws have led planning processes at least in some cases toward PP. Those are new Community law, 1999, Land use and construction law, 2000 and Forest law, 1997, which all give new direction to PP.

Public participation has become a central approach in practising sustainable forestry by Metsähallitus - Forest and Park Service (FPS) during last five years. The FPS has set the goal that during 1996 public participation will be applied in all main planning processes and all employees have learned the basic principles and methods of public participation.

Public participation in the FPS is defined as open, interactive and people oriented everyday management and planning philosophy. It offers fair and equal opportunities for those perceived as being affected by decisions to be involved and to have an effect on planning and decision making, as well as in implementing and reviewing plans. In the FPS public participation means at least informing, gathering value based and geographic input and talking with public and the various stakeholders; occasionally negotiating or even seeking a consensus in decisions. Recently, special emphasis is placed on internal participation. The agency defined in the beginning of development process the following PP goals; 1. PP will be applied in all major planning processes, 2. All employees will learn what PP is

about, and 3. Most managers and planners will learn the basic principles and methods of PP

Institutional level

Regional planning is implemented at regional level and we can say that it is also implemented at an organizational level. FPS runs the process and makes final decisions, implements the plan and will arrange that co-operation continues also in the future when plans are evaluated together with stakeholders and the public.

Goals & objectives

The main goal of PP in RNR planning process is to generate a widely acceptable land-use plan where the national goals set for the agency and the goals and objectives of the operating environment will be balanced. Other planning goals include:

1. Gaining information on the various stakeholders and developing good working relations with them;
2. Activating individuals and interest groups to participate in the planning process;
3. Learning collaboratively about the goals and objectives of all stakeholders toward the use of state forest;
4. Gaining understanding on the major issues and concerns related to the natural resources and their management in the region;
5. Informing the public about the FPS and the services and opportunities made available for them by the agency;
6. Utilizing local knowledge, and
7. Integrating public participation into agency's everyday way of doing business in the region.

Initiators of the process

FPS initiated the process and tried to involve as many as possible (interest groups and individuals).

Characteristics of actors/participants

400 interest groups were invited to the process, about 150 participated at the first meetings where working groups were established. One of the main goals was that working groups would represent different viewpoints and also areas in the process and that those interest groups which didn't have a representative in a working group would accept it.

There were representatives from: communities, cities, institutional actors like forest centres, environmental centres, army, citizen groups from villages, fishers, hunters, hikers, local environmental associations, bird specialists, producer groups, entrepreneurs like tourist business, machine business, workers' groups, schools, universities, reindeer owners etc.

Background information was not collected but we can say that most of group representatives were men (women only 20-25 %), middle aged (very few young people) and maybe also more highly educated than average Finnish people.

Amongst the broader public the share of women was only 15 % and also there were very few young people.

Design of the participatory process

The PP process was at first designed by few FPS public participation specialists. Then in the first starting meetings the process was presented, discussed and changed if needed. After every meeting participants and organizers evaluate the process and propose ways to modify it accordingly.

Both public and interest groups were involved from the very beginning of the process. Several different techniques were used, so that people would have some possibility to participate. In the beginning of the process there were the following methods: (1) four open houses; (2) six information access points at the agency's customer service offices; (3) twelve public meetings; (4) several written comments opportunities (5) comment opportunity via paid phone and (6) employees personally made contacts with individuals and delivered brochures and participation feedback forms. There were several announcements in the media, news and articles dealing with the process and possibility to participate. For the planning process it was written brochures and other material telling with simple words what it was all about and how every one is able to participate and affect the plan.

Working groups met in all important decision making points of the process, so that they could handle issues and make their decision how things should be going on (in average there were 6-8 meetings/group). The final draft was presented to groups and public in the meetings and feedback out of that was collected and used in order to finalize the plan.

FPS public participation means informing, gathering value based and geographically situated inputs, it implies talking with the public and various stakeholders. It means also in working groups negotiating and sometimes even seeking consensus in decision-making.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

For the public the new planning approach meant, above all, overcoming their images of an intensive government bureaucracy, although some questioned the effectiveness of their participation. However, according to PhD work (draft) of Pauli Wallenius, 10-20 % of the ideas from individuals could not be integrated in the final plan. That is because strategic plan produces solutions on large main lines and individuals bring usually very detailed information into the process.

Regarding the local employees some apprehended that public comments would deal with two main issues, namely 1. Demands to expand nature protection in old growth forests and 2. Criticism on the agency's former forest management practices. Also it was believed that the media would cause the image and credibility of the agency to get even worse in the public eyes than they were before PP. But as it turned out nature protection proved to generate much less public input than initially thought. In their comments, people generally focused on local issues relating to their living conditions, employment opportunities, outdoor activities or forestry practices. Forest recreation including outdoor recreation, fishing, hunting and berry picking generated overwhelmingly the most comments and the state forests were seen for the major part as properly managed. Moreover, almost all of the outputs of the media were extremely positive and supported strongly the open participatory management approach being implemented in the RNR planning process. This is an example of PP at strategic level, for land use planning, with very careful preparation and implementation of public involvement during the process.

Strength: PP was very positive experience for both employees and participants. It is a fruitful way of collaborating and co-operating both within FPS, with the public and among the interest groups. FPS set enough people, money and time to run this process well. Participants got more information and understanding how things are really working today and opinions are better founded.

Weaknesses: Many employees feel PP means extra work. It needs also some costs. It needs new attitude and in some cases new skills to co-operate with people. The citizens don't have very strong interest in strategic level planning because their comments deal very often with local details, which can be taken into account in everyday work but not so much in regional plan. Arrangers get frustrated when people are not interested or do not participate.

Opportunities: The PP process will be very good start for long lasting co-operation between participants. It also enhances the understanding for different opinions and for others' goals. People are more comfortable when contacting FPS employees and it is easier for all to work together. FPS employees feel that PP is really the way of working from now on.

Limits: PP needs time and some money, it requires skills to co-operate and work with people. After first large planning process there will be a need to keep interest up for continuing work in lower level processes. Otherwise, the process may very easily collapse.

Contact

Paul Wallenius
Finnish Forest and Park Service
PL 94
FIN - 01301 VANTAA
E-mail: pauli.wallenius@metsa.fi

City forest management in Hämeenlinna (Finland)

Situation and context

In Hämeenlinna it was found along the new management development process in the beginning of 1990s that citizen co-operation and participatory partnership will be the way to work in city planning for the good of citizens. The City studied also some examples from abroad and was later on very eagerly developing international co-operation in planning. In 1998, the Hämeenlinna Office of Natural Resources carried out two plans for town parks and forests in co-operation with the public. The first plan, Park Programme 2010, was a strategy plan for all town parks. The other plan was an area plan for the Aulanko region

Object

The planning process is proactive city planning method, which means in Hämeenlinna also the planning of quite large green land and forestry areas.

Institutional or legal framework

Actually no laws said that this kind of management should be implemented. Public participation methods are voluntary but well recognized, city employees say at the moment that it is the only way of working in modern world. The whole city has accepted participation and partnership co-operation as the way of working. Employees have been educated and trained for this method.

Institutional level

PP should be indicated as local and also institutional planning form. City is arranging participation and planning - city level Service Charter.

Goals & objectives

Goals are to make city and its surrounding better and improve goods and services wanted and found in city owned area. Goal is also to get citizens to take more responsibility about city development and environment which means that citizens become more responsible for taking care of common living conditions themselves.

Initiators of the process

The city initiates the process regularly, but also citizens can bring up needs for some new processes and planning.

Characteristics of actors/participants

There were representatives of residents' associations, schools, parents' groups, sports clubs, nature conservation associations, travelling business, and both regional and town administrations, such as health administration, police and also churches. Women have been highly present.

Design of the participatory process

Both plans were made in co-operation with residents of Hämeenlinna and other interest groups. Planning started with an open public meeting, which was advertised in the local newspaper and radio. In the meeting people had the opportunity to tell their thoughts about the parks and forests in Hämeenlinna. They could also sign up for a planning group. The planning group mailing list consisted of 70 names altogether (i.e. list of representatives in the above section). The planning group assembled seven times, three of which were meetings on location, i.e. in the forests. Usually there were about 15-25 people in the meetings. All the meetings were documented and the documents sent to all the 70 people on the planning group list.

The participatory process is an ongoing system that affects decisions in principle all the time and that requires also constant feedback. The public's inputs are analysed largely at least three times a year and answered in seven days (a city level Service Charter institutionalizes these practices).

Techniques used are feedback cards got from every city office and in mail, feedback phone, open meetings for general development plans and local development questions and questionnaires sent to every household.

On Arnstein's ladder the type of PP presented is information, partnership and in many local processes delegated power and even citizen control, especially when guarantee has been given to reach goals set together.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

This Hämeenlinna case study is a good example about PP in urban forestry, it illustrates active and goal oriented PP implemented by city employees and decision-makers.

Strength: Citizens gain an improved environment to live in and will be more responsible about city areas. Employees of the city have been forced to learn more and develop their skills to better fulfil new demands.

Weaknesses: PP requires a lot of time and some more money, it needs good skills to co-operate, to negotiate and to find compromises.

Opportunities: PP has been effective to reach the citizens (throughout the concerned areas).

Limits: Money may be a constraint in some cases, so is time and maybe in some cases opposite demands.

Contact

Paul Wallenius
Finnish Forest and Park Service
PL 94
FIN - 01301 VANTAA
E-mail: pauli.wallenius@metsa.fi

Creation of new urban forests in Flanders

Situation and context

The importance of green areas for the liveability of suburban areas is recognized today locally as well as internationally. These areas form a structural part of towns, improve the integration of a natural structure in an urbanized region and improve the quality of our environment. Because of this, the Flemish government is planning the realization of recreational urban forests in sparsely forested urban regions.

In spite of the systematic approach and the social relevance of these projects, the effective realization is in many cases a problem. Often, such projects can not be realized because of the pressure coming from the economic sectors (speculation, agricultural lobbying groups, ...). Besides, most of the target groups are not able to make their needs for recreational forests explicit. Especially for the large-scale urban forest projects, well organized communication and participation are very important. For this purpose, a scientific methodology and participation model for the localization and design of new urban forests has been worked out.

Object

- Motivate people to plant trees at national level
- Manage various afforestation and revegetation programmes
- Inform, collect and publish data on the afforestation work
- Consult people in local societies professionally

Institutional or legal framework

- Based on art. 6bis of the forest decree
- Based on the principles of sustainable environmental planning and the goal of 10.000 ha afforestation, mentioned in the Flemish environmental plan
- Non-formal

Institutional level

Regional (Flemish government), local (provinces and municipalities are involved in the planning process)

Goals & objectives

- Effective realization of recreational urban forests (200 - 300ha) in sparsely forested regions,
- Relieve pressure on vulnerable forests,
- «Responsabilisation» of local governments,
- Participation of the different target groups during the planning process,
- Improvement of the liveability of the urban regions,
- Maximal functionality of the new urban forest (thanks to the participation model),

- Improvement of the landscape, ...

Initiators of the process

The Flemish Government initiates this process but involves the local governments and creates a shared responsibility with them. Once the perimeter is located, the active participation with the different target groups starts. The social relevance, recreational function and sustainability of the new planted urban forest is maximized when the local governments and target groups can participate in the process.

Characteristics of actors/participants

There are two categories of actors:

- The local governments
- The different local target groups (youth movements, local organizations and committees, agricultural organizations, ...)

The participation is situated on the level of organizations, movements, During the localization study there is some participation of the different actors through a steering board. Meanwhile, the communication with the target groups starts, but they don't participate actively in this preparatory scientific phase. When the scientific method has resulted in a perimeter for afforestation, the target groups are consulted and stimulated to participate in working out the design plan and, at the end, in helping to realize the plantation.

Design of the participatory process

First a localization study is worked out, based on a scientific method. This method is divided into three different phases:

1. Exclusion of areas which are not suitable for the realization of an urban forest (industry zones, built-up areas, ..),
2. Ranking of the different locations, based on several groups of criteria (recreational, structural en ecological),
3. Feasibility study of the best locations (expansion of industry, liveability of agricultural zones, ...).

During this process, the different sectors are already participating through their administrations in the steering board. Communication about the project is also started.

Secondly, after having located the best perimeter for the realization of the urban forest, the different target groups are involved in working out the design plan.

Thirdly the plantation starts with help of the local citizens, schools, youth movements, ...

The result must be an urban forest that is integrated as optimally as possible in the local social, ecological and economic web.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: Local support from organized and non-organized groups is obtained for the creation of new forest. Little or no resistance in the project areas from organizations who are against the general idea of forest expansion speculation, agricultural lobbying groups, ...

A lot of resistance or problems are avoided by informal meetings, there is no strict formal procedure that has to be followed, local differences can be taken into account

Weaknesses: Time and energy consuming, some rather obvious conclusions have to be obtained through extensive studies before the partners are convinced

Opportunities: Forest expansion comes on the political agenda and into the media

Limits: Since the process takes some time, it is not clear from the start what are the consequences for individual landowners in the project area

Contact

Wim Buysse

Administration of Environment, Nature, Land & Water, Division of Forests & Green Spaces

Koning Albert II-laan 20, Box 8

B - 1000 BRUSSELS

E-Mail: wim.buysse@lin.vlaanderen.be

Opening a public forum on the internet in France

Situation and context

The forest "officials" are often considered as deciding without taking account of the opinion of civil society. The ministry just achieved its computer and network equipment. At the same time, we concluded the institutional process leading to the formulation of a document entitled «The French Forestry Strategy». A test has been decided, not only to post information on a website, but in addition to open broadly this site to anyone keen to send a comment on this topic.

Object

Initiate an open and transparent dialogue with the civil society. Disseminate information, but also pick up comments, criticisms or suggestions.

Institutional or legal framework

Ministry website

Institutional level

We used the site already open, to create a forum dedicated to forests. The level was therefore the national level

Goals & objectives

Improve information, and beyond, awareness about forests and forestry in the civil society, and at the same time, better understand the civil society, its key points and hopes about forest and forestry. In a way, initiate a dialogue.

Initiators of the process

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (Deputy Directorate for forests)

Characteristics of actors/participants

The forum was intended to be wide open and transparent. It must be recalled that internet is not very well developed in France, compared to our European partners. It is a limitation for audience and access. We have done an analysis about people involved. Very fast, ecologists and "eco-warriors" tried to overflow the site (45% of the messages). The professionals (26%), the users, as hunters (4 %), students and people from university (2,3%) anonymous (8%), unions (3,7 %), officials (1,3 %), "moderator" and leaders for the site (10 %).

Design of the participatory process

That kind of process is very open and free, and make difficult therapy, placation or manipulation (in Arnstein's terms). The reverse deserves a comment: due to a strong mobilization of environmentalists and eco-warriors, it does not seem significant to use the result as an average representative of opinions. As examples, between 25 October 1999 and 10 January 2000, the matters raised were:

- Christmas trees and sustainable management (27 messages)
- TV programme for broad public (22 messages)
- Forest exploitation and forest management (22 messages)
- Fontainebleau forest (18 messages)
- The management of public forests (16 messages)
- Rights and duties of users (16 messages)
- Wind-blow - just begun (12 messages)
- Stop the logging (12 messages)
- ONF (National Forest Agency) management (11 messages)
- Free access (11 messages)
- Game and forest (10 messages)
- State forest as private properties (9 messages)
- Timber as raw material for future
- Forests and jobs

We can see the broadness of the topics, although the initial text was based on the forestry strategy draft. After the exceptional wind-blow, the Forest Agency was overloaded, and it seemed difficult to add any burden. One adviser out of the directorate has been put in charge of pursuing the dialogue. But we have not been able to achieve any analysis of this recent period.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: it allows a broad and open participation, is cost effective in relation to the potential broadness of the process, ability of updating the information, or adapting it to the evolving priorities, real dialogue, in real time (and in front of all).

Weaknesses: only open to people connected to the Web and used to surfing, may miss important partners regardless of the fact that they should have a role to play. It may lead to misunderstanding if a group over-use or over-load the system (e.g. to hinder the leading organization).

Opportunities: a good and cheap enough way of disseminating information. Despite the delay of the equipment and connecting in France, it is a powerful tool for spreading information and collecting feedback from various people or groups you have no chance to contact in another way.

Limits: may miss some important partner, may lead to overestimate a well-organized or very active "noisy" group, it should therefore not to be used for a statistical survey.

Such PP process requires a very tight follow up, by a qualified team able to post required information, answer to question or argue in the debate.

Source

Roger-Veyer Catherine (2000): *Forum quelle forêt pour demain ? Situation au 10 Janvier 2000*. DERF, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche, Paris.

Contact

Bernard Chevalier
Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche, DERF
78, rue de Varenne
75349 PARIS 07 SP
E-mail: Bernard.chevalier@agriculture.gouv.fr

The Icelandic Forestry Association

Situation and context

The Icelandic Forestry Association is an umbrella organization, an alliance of 57 nation-wide district societies with approximately 7000 members or 2,5% of the total population in Iceland.

Object

- Motivate people to plant trees at national level
- Manage various afforestation and revegetation programmes
- Inform, collect and publish data on the afforestation work
- Consult people in local societies professionally

Institutional or legal framework

- The Icelandic Forestry Association (IFA) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization, which was founded in 1930.
- The organization's activities are financed with various trust funds, private sponsorships, governmental support, members fees etc.
- Everybody is welcome to join the association's societies.

Institutional level

- Regional level; individual members of the local forest societies elect boards in their societies' annual meetings.
- National level; representatives from the forest societies gather in IFA annual meeting and elect the board of the association.

Goals & objectives

- To enhance the practice of forestry
- To foster forest culture
- To give and obtain information
- To recognize forestry

Initiators of the process

The initiators of the activities of the IFS are the individual members of the local forest societies, as such the process is bottom-up.

Characteristics of actors/participants

- Members of the forest societies cross professional, economic and political levels.
- Members have in common to be 30 + in age, and many have some kind of access to land (owners of summerhouses or farmsteads, local societies have access to land through municipalities).
- Members are situated in all parts of the country.

Design of the participatory process

- Models of participation; organized meetings, courses, conferences, open-houses, etc., open both for members and others.
- The IFA publishes various magazines and booklets on the subject.
- The IFA manages nation-wide afforestation and revegetation programmes.
- The participatory process is continuous through each forest society, up to national representative meetings, and the association's annual meeting where the board of the IFA is elected.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: intensive, direct participation of individual members in the 57 forest societies distributed all over the country.

Weaknesses: lack of resources for implementation of projects.

Opportunities: for people interested, tasks are plenty in a country fighting erosion and lacking forests.

Limits: the existence of IFA is threatened if it is not able to keep the general interest and awareness concerning deforestation and soil erosion problems alive.

The Icelandic case study relates well to the Team's working definition of PP. The case shows that the IFA process is voluntary and bottom-up.

Contact

Karl S. Gunnarsson
Iceland Forest Research Mogilsa
Mogilsa
IS - 116 REYKJAVIK
E-mail: karlsgrsr@simnet.is

"To Live is to Share" (Viver é Conviver) in Portugal

Situation and context

During 1998 more than 100.000 ha of forest were burned as a result of 30.000 forest fires, occurring mainly during summer. In Portugal, fire is a constant threat to forest land and seriously undermines the profitability of forestry. The situation is particularly serious compared with the other southern European countries.

A work undertaken by the Forest Fire Investigation Brigades (BIFF) identified the main causes of forest fire, which are: 56% of human origin, out of which 29% of involuntary origin, less than 2% of natural origin and 42% of unknown origin. This investigation leads to the idea that forest fire's causes are mainly of socio-cultural nature, for at least 29% of fires started as a consequence of human negligence. This negligence is a direct consequence of an inappropriate relationship of citizens with the forest.

Object

«To live is to share» is a project, addressing several target groups, that provides the framework within which information about the values of forests - aiming at changing attitudes towards forests and leading to a consistent decrease of human origin fires - should be given.

Institutional or legal framework

Voluntary.

Institutional level

Specific projects/actions in the campaign will emerge «bottom-up» from local communities and local actors.

Goals & objectives.

The campaign spirit is to apply in relationships with forests, human and social concerns and principles, such as: trust, reciprocity, joy, integrity, identity, security, well-being and respect for the uniqueness of life in general. The campaign aims at the development of a positive attitude towards living with the forest instead of forbidding any practice.

Initiators of the process

The project has been commissioned by the Government/National Forest Authority to the Aveiro University, which produced a manual to be used as a basis for the launching of actions aimed to improve sensitivity towards this matter.

Characteristics of actors/participants

The main agents identified in the BIFF investigation were: shepherds; land-owners; citizens in leisure activities; operators of machinery (agriculture/forest); the municipality when developing activities such as: burned-over land, gathering of

garbage scattered in nature. These constitute target groups to be reached through environmental awareness-raising actions.

Design of the participatory process

Several actions launching the project were developed in order to reach the main actors/target groups. The methodology has been adopted, since the beginning, by municipalities, schools, professional associations and some environmental NGOs.

The manual providing guidance is designed so that interested actors for such actions are able to use it by themselves.

Although the government is willing to support some of the actions, either financially or with human resources, the main objective is that actors and stakeholders proactively take care of such actions.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

The "To Live is to Share" project is a voluntary process, it involves target groups, gives information, is based, inter alia, on reciprocity and aims at a decrease of human-origin forest fires.

Strengths: the willingness to change the current situation, that is, to decrease the number of fires having human origin.

Weaknesses: the difficulties to reach some of the identified target groups and to make them realize the absolute need to change certain practices that may constitute fire causes.

Opportunities: to develop a positive attitude towards forests and to get our message about forest values across.

Limits: not only time and resources, but also the recognition that fire constitutes an intrinsic characteristic of our ecosystems, therefore impossible to eradicate.

Since the very beginning of the project, the need to urgently promote a public debate about the attitude of the media towards forest fires was recognized. This still constitutes a recommendation.

Contact

João de Sousa Teixeira
Ministerio de Agricultura,
Direcção-Geral das Florestas
Av. João Crisóstomo, 26-28
P - 1069-040 LISBOA
E-mail: joao.teixeira@dgf.min-agricultura.pt

Fire watchers in Portugal - Sapadores Florestais

Situation and context

In Portugal, fire is a constant threat to forests in summertime. The frequency of the phenomenon, and the vast areas affected every year, constitute a serious obstacle for investment in forestry and in forest management. Forests of maritime pine, over a million hectares, are the main forest areas affected, but when the fire is severe, huge areas of other forest and wooded land, or agricultural land are also damaged. In terms of European classification 1,114 thousand hectares are classified as «high danger». The causes of this catastrophe are the same all around the Mediterranean Sea, and basically beyond the scope of forest policy: emigration and «human desertification», general collapse of traditional agricultural practices, agricultural and forest activities which are no longer complementary of each other in rural areas; other cases relate to urban pressure, chaotic development of seaside real estate projects. The final result is a rift between population and forest, in the sense that population delegates the fighting of the fire to professional firemen, or the civil protection, and, quite contrary to past practices, does not engage in prevention activities any more.

Apart from being a constant feature in television news each summer evening as well as a subject of political debate and of questioning of the government performance, forest fire has become an important issue in policy discussion because of its impact: it seriously undermines the profitability of any investment in forests, and the actual risk premium is evaluated around 4%. The fact that almost 90% of forests are privately owned with 84% of holdings under 3 ha also makes it harder for forest owners to effectively commit to fire prevention.

After years of government action and investment focusing on fire fighting, the view has now taken hold that a serious attitude and a comprehensive programme to prevent forest fires are needed. These have been included in the Portuguese new Forest Law (1996).

Object

- The Forest Law (Lei de Bases da Política Florestal) (1996) establishes as a priority action the creation of Teams of Fire Watchers (Sapadores Florestais) [art.31 §c)]. Besides, art.10, n.2 §d) e) and f) and art.21§c) also deal with regulatory and incentive action to enhance prevention of fire and involve local communities.
- The National Plan for the Sustainable Development of Forests in Portugal (Plano de Desenvolvimento Sustentável da Floresta Portuguesa, 1998) aims to reduce the forest land burned by 20% between 1998-2003 and by 50% in years 2003-2008. The Plan mentions the support to private owners' associations in the creation and maintenance of structures for the prevention and combat against forest fires, namely the FIRE watchers. (Objective 1.2.1.)
- This proactive approach has in fact been initiated with the Decree 179/99 establishing the rules for the implementation of Teams of fire watchers, and conditions for institutional and financial support from the government. These incentives will enable the private forest

sector to strengthen existing public structures (established in 1992 for public lands), and will lead to a shared responsibility for the implementation of the Forest Law.

Institutional or legal framework

- Private owners, their associations and bodies governing forest on common land («baldios», considered social productive sector under Portuguese law), which have as one of their objectives the management of forest areas, may apply, on a voluntary basis, to have one or more teams of fire watchers certified. The teams need to have at least 5 members and receive support towards a programme of professional training for the members, as well as for equipment and funding.
- Public entities may also apply, on a voluntary basis.

Institutional level

Interventions of the teams are geographically restricted and basically local. Accreditation is the responsibility of the regional agricultural services while the planning and co-ordination of the programme's coverage is ensured by the National Forest Authority. The process of consultation that led to the Decree 179/99 was of national level.

Goals & objectives

The scheme is expected to:

- Improve production of forest goods and services, namely by increasing overall productivity of forest land (reducing threats and risk-preventive forest practices, use of prescribed fire, infrastructure maintenance). In the long run, rising awareness among the population should encourage «sound» practices in the use of fire.
- Establish a fair sharing of costs and benefits between the private and the public sector (candidates to have a team certified must be able to support 25% of annual recurrent variable cost; investment costs are supported by public funds as well as the remaining 75% of the annual costs for salaries and insurance).
- By means of technical and financial support act as employment and resources leverage to local associations of private owners that are committed to the sustainable management of forest areas.
- Simultaneously act as empowerment of stakeholders (private owners, their associations and local communities) and improve their involvement in decision making at all levels.
- Pool means and resources that are specific to each of the parties involved, in order to reaching a common goal of fire prevention and conservation of forest areas (See description of partnership).

Initiators of the process

The process has been initiated by society, with the approval in parliament of the Forest Law, following a proposition by the Government. Subsequently, the Forest Authority and the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Home Affairs jointly undertook the consultation and regulatory process that lead to the Decree 179/99.

Characteristics of actors/participants

- Candidates applying for the teams receive a 110-hour training that will be certified as a professional qualification. As this training also includes practical units on forest operations and general forest knowledge, this action may enhance their potential for employment in the future.
- Private owners' associations, as well as community-based associations, will benefit from establishing a reputation and credibility, both locally and at higher level. This may apply to government also if the funding is steadily available and quantitative targets of the programme are reached year after year.

Design of the participatory process

This process of promoting the direct involvement of the public in fire prevention as a specific programme is a true partnership in the sense that none of the parties, neither the Government, nor the forest owners, nor their associations has the means to individually implement this programme. The Government lacks human resources and local knowledge; private owners and associations lack the financial means. This process of co-implementation is voluntary.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strengths: The project addresses mainly special stakeholders, private owners and their associations, but local communities also own considerable portions of forest land in many regions where fire hazard is important. The bodies governing these forests on common land (Conselhos Directivos dos baldios) are local elected citizens, most certainly not all private forest owners. In fact one of the strengths of this project is the real involvement of local communities as common land forests account for a reasonable share of teams already in the field [9 teams in a total number of 33 teams (1999) and 21 in a total of 65 (2000)].

Weaknesses: Abandoned agricultural land is not a target for these teams, but many fires are set on such land by shepherds to improve pasture productivity. As the statistics also show, half of the area burned each year is shrubland and other non-forest vegetation with conservation value for biodiversity. Even lands that are not valuable as such give rise to fire-externalities affecting forest stands. It is thus imperative to deal with the technical and social complexity of the fires in forests and outside. The current scheme only addresses part of the problem.

Opportunities: To effectively control fire propagation on forest stands will give rise to enhanced profitability, which may increase overall interest for traditional investment OR protection investment by investors and the population in general. Training of the team members and the implementation of management plans for the forest areas covered by the project will enhance local capacity for forest management in general.

Limits: Liquidity and credit problems of the private owners and their associations to cover their share of annual costs; the project is budget-dependent and the

balancing of public expenditure between prevention and fire suppression is always subject to change depending on political will.

The special project presented here lacks a participatory feedback mechanism of evaluation and revision to suit all qualifications of the team's working definition of PP. At this stage the parties can only «veto» the project: private parties by not applying to have new teams certified; public party by «freezing» the financial means necessary to its development

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank following persons for their valuable comments and help: Ms. Manuela Pedroso, Ms. Teresa Alves da Silva, Mr. Pinho de Almeida and Mr. Peter Poschen. Determinant were the incentives of the Mr. Carlos Morais (Director-General of Forests in Portugal) and Mr. Miles Wenner (Chairman of the ToS on Participation).

Contact

Maria João Pereira
Ministerio de Agricultura,
Direcção-Geral das Florestas
Av. João Crisóstomo, 26-28
P - 1060-049 LISBOA
E-mail: mariamoura@mail.telepac.pt or mjapereira@dgf.min-agricultura.pt

Public participation in Russia

Situation and context

Social: under the technocratic management model of the Soviet period, the public never had a real opportunity to participate in the decision-making process.

Institutional/organizational: although PR departments have been set in some of the Russian agencies, the expertise in multi-stakeholder consultation is often lacking.

Legal: the Constitution of the Russian Federation guarantees rights on public access to information and there is a law on information disclosure. However, there is practically no normative basis or administrative experience for public involvement in forest management decision making.

Object

The key objectives of the IUCN project on Public Involvement are to influence environmental policy makers in Russia by:

- 1) working out recommendations on legislation as well as by producing guidelines for public involvement in the decision-making process;
- 2) building a coalition of stakeholders empowered to implement those guidelines and recommendations;
- 3) Facilitating the Aarhus Convention on the Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (ECE, 1998).

Institutional or legal framework

Voluntary

Institutional level

- National
- Regional
- Local

Goals & objectives

- Recognition of forestry, raising respect and fostering the «forest culture»,
- Practising effective communication to prevent misunderstandings and to enhance openness, good will, positive attitudes, and decision transparency,
- Developing a framework for the increased participatory forest management and awareness about forests, forest conservation, and the use of forest products/services,
- Enhancing information sharing and public efficiency,
- Conflict management instead of ultimatums and forbidding policy,
- Arriving at practical understanding of «how to» manage the forests (diminishing the number of human-caused forest fires).

Initiators of the process

IUCN Office for CIS countries.

Characteristics of actors/participants

The project was designed to be transparent and open to the wide audience. Thus, the Federal Government, the Federal Forest Service, the universities, environmental NGOs are involved as well as most of the levels of regional forest administration.

Design of the participatory process

Design and implementation:

- Interests and demands are discovered and registered,
- Certain rules are set up along with the work plan,
- Collecting of the information,
- Conducting the research,
- Ensuring feedback,

Used techniques: informal discussions, workshops, interviews, round tables, seminars, consultations, conferences, mass media presentations.

The participatory process takes place continuously until the final decision is taken.

The degree of participation: informing, consultation, and partnership.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strengths: common understanding that partnership is the most effective way of working.

Weaknesses: the PP process may not be able to resolve all conflicts.

Opportunities: the project gives a great start, becoming the first step of success.

Limits: difficulties to reach and involve the non-organized sectors of society; lack of competency.

Contact

Elena Kopylova
IUCN Office for CIS
17, Martial Vasilevsky Str.
RU - MOSCOW 123182
E-mail: keb_iucn@aport.ru

Afforestation of lands unsuitable for agricultural production in Slovakia

Situation and context

Optimizing the use of forest land resources is a permanent problem. Land conservation also due to globalization of environment conservation is addressed in the Programme of non-forest lands afforestation. A decrease in agricultural production causes many hectares of agricultural land to be unmanaged. These unused surfaces - «white plots» - are already partly covered by trees, while still being accounted as "agricultural land". In the context of re-privatization these kinds of land are now mainly owned by communities (shared ownership is traditional in Slovakia). These communities manage both agricultural and forest lands. The Programme is aimed at convincing owners of the social and ecological benefits they would gain from transferring unused land into forests.

Object

- government decree
- programme guidelines

Institutional or legal framework

Government decree is a regulatory document for state administrative authorities. Involvement of owners has voluntary character, supported by subsidies.

Institutional level

National level (Slovak Government and Ministry of Agriculture), regional level (special agency for implementing the Programme at the Forest Research Institute and regional authorities) and local level (land owners).

Goals & objectives

- transfer 2000 ha per year of agricultural land into forest land - 1500 ha already covered by trees, 500 ha afforested
- increase ecological stability of the landscape and more efficient use of land
- involve owners into the Programme - use appropriate instruments of the Programme presentation and financial support
- social goal : through afforestation decrease rural unemployment

Initiators of the process

Slovak government together with Ministry of Agriculture. Agency established at Forest Research Institute is responsible for contacting the owners and securing organizational tasks.

Characteristics of actors/participants

There are two levels of actors :

1. Ministry of Agricultural, Agency for non-forest lands afforestation, state authorities
2. Target group : land owners

Design of the participatory process

Process of implementing the Programme is realized in following steps:

1. Work out the scientific study to identify the lands unsuitable for agricultural production
 2. Prepare institutional and organizational framework of the programme
 3. Establish the special agency
- Steps 1,2,3 were achieved as an initial, preparatory phase of the programme.
4. Propagation of the programme among the target groups - announcements through the media (professional forestry and agriculture magazines, daily press), meetings of Agency employees with land owners and users
 5. Consultations and interviews on particular projects
 6. Securing the financial subsidies and project implementation.

Steps 4,5,6 can be considered as public participation process. As for techniques and models - consultations, interviews are used and provided by Agency. The Agency also provides assistance with project documentation. The degree of PP is consultation, respectively partnership.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: high level of the Programme from organizational and scientific point of view, high owners interest

Weaknesses: low propagation of the Programme importance among broader public and propagation of the Programme among the owners mainly at the level of the subsidies criteria, absence of other motivation

Limits: there are problems with ownership identification, due to reprivatization; limited financial capacity (this limitation is so important and actual, that the Agency at present has no funds for further implementation and the Programme is presently stopped).

Opportunities: use of EU funds - SAPARD programme, lay a greater emphasis on developing the Programme at local levels.

Contact

Robert Vinca
Forest Research Institute
T.G. Masaryka 22
960 92 Zvolen, Slovakia
E-mail: vinca@fris.sk

Spanish forest strategy

Situation and context

The forestry sector in Spain required some new guidelines because:

- The Law of Forests in force was promulgated in 1957, when the autonomous regions did not even exist, there was then a centralist power.
- Very absolutist State during a long period.
- Owners were structured into organizations during the last quarter of century.
- Great lack of coordination among autonomies
- Never talked about sustainability before.

Object

To develop the Spanish Forestry Strategy, taking into account the general demand for ecological, social and economical forest functions, based on a consensus among all the parties.

Institutional or legal framework

As its name indicates it is a strategy, this means it is an organizational framework

Institutional level

At institutional level, the Spanish Forestry Strategy involves the national administration, the autonomies, local authorities and public and research institutions as much as citizen groups.

Goals & objectives

The main objectives relate to three different issues: ecological, social and economic.

Ecological objectives:

- To regulate water cycles
- To diminish erosion and desertification processes
- To regulate gas cycles
- To save forest biodiversity
- To preserve landscapes

Social objectives:

- To settle population on those disfavoured regions
- To enhance recreational and leisure use
- To develop cultural and educational use
- To generate jobs in the forestry sector and other related sectors
- To promote direct and indirect economical activities in disfavoured areas
- To improve the rural environment

Economic objectives:

- To produce goods (firewood, timber, cork, resin, grazing land, fruits, fungi..)
- To strive at the sustainable management of forests.
- To contribute to the supply of raw materials for the industrial sector
- To generate incomes for the owners of forest land

Initiators of the process

The Ministry of Environment of Spain initiated the process, but it involved other local governments and other social partners.

Characteristics of actors/participants

The first Spanish Forestry Strategy draft was sent to some 100 representatives of different social groups and strata, which were linked for previous contacts to the Administration. Therefore, it was not a «selection», but an opening up to all who were potentially interested, including: ecologists, trade unions, forest owners, research institutes, universities, agrarian organizations, other administrations (Ministries of Culture, Industry, Agriculture, Interior Affairs, Labour, National Employment Agency, Treasury, Local Administrations, Autonomous Forestry Administration, Communal Forest representatives, National Heritage, etc), seed producers, hunting and fishing associations, professional associations: engineers, employers' associations, private and public forest enterprises.

Design of the participatory process

July 97: Assessment of Forestry in Spain draft by a Ministry of Environment Team

End of 97: Joint meeting among Forestry General Directors of the Autonomies and the National Administration Group. In this meeting was founded the National Commission on Nature Protection, the following decisions were made:

1. National Forestry Programme (demanded by IPF) must be made in two stages due to the deep reform needed (first by giving the guidelines for the Strategy and afterwards adopting some new legal bases)
2. Decisions must be made by consensus with a broad participation of all the stakeholders

Mid 98: First National Forestry Strategy Draft submitted to some 100 actors among various stakeholders, who were then organized into four different groups: administrative bodies; forest national administration officials; forest economic sector (forest owners, industries); other stakeholders.

From them, 94 recommendations were received.

September 98: 2nd draft adding the 94 recommendations. Nine thematic working groups were set up in order to bring nearer positions on the following issues:

- Role of the forest rangers
- Taxes
- Private owners

- Public Utility Forest Catalogue
- Social-recreational use
- Biomass generation
- Research
- Forestry industries and certification
- Rural development

During six weeks some 40 bilateral meetings took place

February 99: Draft agreed by the National Commission on Nature Protection

June 99: Last draft sent to all the participants in the process to be signed down.

July 99: Sectoral Conference on Environment (Minister and Autonomous Governments) gives the approval to the document.

Last quarter 99: Final edition with regard to its publication.

January 2000: Public presentation of Spanish Forestry Strategy.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: People feel that the Spanish Forestry Strategy is something of their own. Management plans will be easier to be made since people know the framework. Everyone knows about others' difficulties.

Weaknesses: Slower process. Difficulty of drafting. Decisions taken by policy makers must take into account the actors' suggestions or demands. Difficulty to renew a sector with high economic and cross-sectoral co-relations and with a complex legal network.

Opportunities: Participation is a good tool for other big national or regional processes. New processes have taken place around the Spanish Forest Strategy

Limits: Consensus among very different initial positions weakens the final text.

Contact

Ana Belén Noriega
Ministerio de Medio ambiente
Subdirección de Política Forestal
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
E - 28005 MADRID
E-mail: ana.noriega@gvsf.mma.es

Crofter forestry in the North West Highlands of Scotland

Situation and context

Scottish crofters have been managing small areas of woodland to provide a range of benefits including a source of fuelwood and shelter for animals for many generations. However, **crofters had no legal right to establish or manage trees and woodlands on their village common grazing lands**, which together make up 800,000 hectares, 20% of the land area in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. Any trees would, in law, belong to the landowner, regardless of who planted them.

Crofting is a form of land tenancy unique to the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. It gives an individual heritable rights to dwell on and manage a small area of land, called a croft, which is often under 10 ha. Crofters also have a legal share in an area of common land, called the common grazings, which is managed by an elected grazing committee. Typically about 15-20 crofters share an area of common grazings, on average about 400-500 ha. There are about 1,000 common grazings across Scotland. The tenure arrangement defines a relationship between the crofter (tenant) and landlord, in which both have rights and responsibilities towards each other and over the land.

Object

The object of the public participation process was to:

- change existing forest policy and legislation to allow crofters to benefit from trees on common land
- promote specific forest projects (to establish locally managed crofter forestry schemes; provide local employment and training; diversify land use away from subsidized sheep farming; restore native woodlands of ecological significance; benefit from woodland grants and subsidies)

Institutional or legal framework

The overall system of crofting in Scotland is governed by legislation known as Crofting Acts, and the system is regulated by the Crofters Commission, a government body based in Inverness. The legal arrangements between crofter and landlord were originally enshrined in the 1886 Crofting Act. Legal rights of crofters on common grazing only extended to the rights to graze livestock and make improvements to land to aid animal husbandry, such as drainage, fencing or reseedling. These rights did not include the right to manage any existing woodland, nor ownership of any trees.

Institutional level

There have been three levels of community-based participation:

1. **At a regional level**, local crofter unions from North West Scotland joined together to form the new Scottish Crofters Union in 1985. This helped build consensus between different bodies including government agencies, environmental NGOs, landowners, the Crofters Commission and local communities.

2. **At a national level**, by acting together, the crofters effectively lobbied the government to change existing legislation in 1991
3. **At a local level**, various participatory forest appraisals (PFA) were conducted in a number of crofting communities in 1994, to enable local people to assess their own situation and identify how crofter forestry might benefit them.

Goals & objectives

At a national level, the objective of PP was to:

- Change the legislation to allow the crofting communities to make use of the common grazings for forestry purposes
- Make grazing committees eligible for woodland management and afforestation grants.

At a local level, the objective of PP was to enable local individuals and groups to:

- Identify the potential of forestry as a land use with environmental, social and economic benefits
- Analyse their own natural resource patterns and problems
- Analyse land ownership patterns
- Identify and appreciate differences of opinion in a neutral but structured forum
- Share ideas and understanding about forestry, ideas and priorities
- Provide a basis for planning
- Engage with a wide cross-section of people and agencies in the locality

Initiators of the process

Crofters and community leaders, in partnership with other organizations

Characteristics of actors/participants

At a local level, the participants in one forestry programme (Borve Township) consisted of :

- Borve and Annishadder Grazing Committee. Responsible for initiating programme and liaising with other crofters in the Township
- Scottish Rural Development Forestry Programme (SRDFP). An NGO specialising in PRA facilitation
- Forestry Commission. Provided grants and approved final planting plan
- Scottish National Heritage. Produced audit on conservation values of area and forest plan
- Scottish Crofters Union. Provided advice on getting started, who to contact, etc.
- Scottish Agricultural College. Provided advice on planting and maintenance
- Individuals with specialized knowledge and skills.

Design of the participatory process

At a local level, the PP consisted of

- Structured PRA meetings
- Informal discussions
- Semi-structured interviews
- Participatory production of diagrams, maps and other visual materials
- Submission of forest plans for comment

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: The SCU helped bring about new legislation: The Crofter Forestry (Scotland) Act 1991, allows crofters the right to manage existing woodlands and create new ones on their common grazing, and to benefit from woodland grants for the first time. Since 1991, 85 new crofter forestry schemes have been initiated, providing a range of economic, social and ecological benefits

Weaknesses: The legislation fell short of actually granting ownership of the trees to crofters, and consequently they often have to enter into complicated agreements with landlords to safeguard the crofters' use of the trees. One of the bills before the new Scottish Parliament (formed in 1999) is a Land Reform Bill which will address the question of who actually owns the trees planted by crofters on their croft lands.

Opportunities: The success of community-initiated participation inspires other community groups in Scotland to undertake similar activities for local benefits.

Limits: Afforestation and woodland management provide only limited sustainable livelihood benefits for crofters.

This case study was adapted from

Haggith, M. & Ritchie, B (2000): **Crofter forestry**. A case study prepared for an European Profile of Community Involvement in Forest Management (forthcoming: IUCN)

Inglis, A.S. & Guy, S. (1996/7): **Rural development forestry in Scotland: The struggle to bring international principles and best practices to the last bastion of British colonial forestry**. ODI Rural Development Forestry Network Paper 20 b. Overseas Development Administration, London.

Rural Development Forestry Programme (1994): **Borve. Crofting and Forestry - A Case Study**. Reforesting Scotland, Edinburgh.

Contact

Sally Jeanrenaud
Chalet le Mazot
CH - 1261 St. GEORGE
E-mail: s.jeanrenaud@span.ch

Regional forest planning in Switzerland - example of the Lake District

Situation and context

The 1981 forest management plans of the public and private forest owners in the Lake District of Fribourg had to be revised, and this under the new forest law of Switzerland.

Object

The project's aims were the following:

- guarantee the public interests
- sensitize the population to the complex system «forest»
- the Public realizes its joint responsibility
- create a forest lobby among the population
- from the beginning reaching consensus was the objective.

Institutional or legal framework

According to Article 18 of the Ordinance on Forests (1992) «when planning goes beyond the scope of a single enterprise, the cantons shall ensure that the public (a) is informed about the objectives and the course of the planning process; (b) can be associated in an adequate way; (c) has access to the information".

Institutional level

Two levels of planning:

- on regional level, planning with public participation
- on the level of single enterprise, the regional forest management planning has to be respected.

Goals & objectives

PP was used as a management instrument. Goals:

- increase harvesting (reach the whole wood-chain up to architects)
- increase contact with schools. Involve teachers
- increase natural protection (tending a natural forest, habitats, reserves,...)
- solutions to the wood/wildlife problem
- improve infrastructure
- improve recreational aspects (picnic places, security, guides, ..)
- improve the situation of private owners (structures, providing instruments, collaboration).

Initiators of the process

The forest engineer of the forestry district initiated the PP

Characteristics of actors/participants

The public at large was not asked to participate. The idea was to ask representatives of NGOs, private forest owners, etc. and that these persons would also have private opinions like anyone of the broader public. The actors were members of the Cantonal Forestry Office and Communal Forestry Service, the project engineer (leader), the moderator, the media, NGOs (sports, WWF, ornithologists, nature protection, etc.). The forest engineer and also the project engineer were both women, who wanted active participation.

Design of the participatory process

Conception of the plan: 17 months (from Dec. 1993 to April 1995).

Active public participation (14 months from March 1995 to May 1996): There was no existing platform in the Lake District to reach the public. Every possible actor as defined above was invited (associations, officials, politicians, municipalities, owners). At a first meeting the duties and competencies of all actors were fixed, clarifying what was expected from their active participation. The public was informed that all results had to be integrated in the regional forest management planning and that the further integration of the results had to be made in a transparent way. From the beginning an external moderator was involved. Animation, moderation forms and methods were an important part in this creative process (they started by playing how Indians would see the Lake District). The media accompanied the whole process. Afterwards they organized an afternoon to formulate thesis, then with delegates they formulated the aims and the measures. In the end a meeting was organized to present the results to all participants.

Official ratification: 26 months

Realization of the project: 14 years (from 1996 to 2010)

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

Strength: With this method you only can win. The conflict potential of any actor was shown with this mode. The official (Forestry service) and population learned a lot. To ask professional support (project engineer, moderator) was very important for the success. The two women really wanted (is that gender specific?) active participation, they gave just guidelines and were open to every possible outcome.

Weaknesses: The project has to be realized – otherwise there will be frustration. The forms of animation and moderation have to be chosen carefully.

Opportunities: The participation goes on, it does not end when planning is over. Now a platform of all interested groups on the forest is existing. Continued success stories include a new wood for a children's playground.

Limits: The participants and initiators wanted to meet on a yearly basis – but the last time they didn't.

Contact

Claire-Lise Suter Thalmann
Swiss Forest Agency, OFEFP
CH - 3003 BERN
E-mail: claire-lise.suter@buwal.admin.ch

Public participation in an increasingly urbanized society in the USA

Situation and context

Due to technological innovation and associated economic prosperity, urban people are choosing more and more to live in rural areas, bringing with them their expectations for urban amenities and conveniences. The presence of people with a different rural lifestyle has created conflicts with long-time residents, and increased development of rural landscapes in new ways. Local institutions, traditionally dominated by farmers and foresters, are being infiltrated by new residents, who bring with them new ideas about how land should be used and managed. Since land use in the US is controlled primarily at the local level, new rural residents are having a profound effect on the size, distribution, and quality of forest land. Some of these effects, both direct and indirect, result in greater protection of forests, while others result in loss of forest land, or deterioration of ecological conditions. Local planning efforts and revision of local land laws/controls are being effected by the presence of new constituencies in rural places. «Slow Growth Initiatives» are becoming increasingly popular throughout the US. This is a direct result of participation of new rural residents in local politics and planning. New rural residents are influencing public lands through participation in forest planning and other customer evaluation processes. As a result, more sophisticated facilities are available for recreationists, and less resource extraction is taking place.

Object

Public involvement in the development of a forest plan for a National Forest in an urbanising area.

Institutional or legal framework

- National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and regulations require public involvement in planning.
- NFMA currently being revised and will include greater collaboration with local planning efforts.
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires analyses of environmental and social impacts of plan.
- Coordinate with state, regional, and county planning efforts.
- Work with and develop partnerships with private organizations representing different interests.

Institutional level

Forest plans typically developed at a National Forest-landscape scale or county scale. Those potentially involved in public participation related to forest planning include all communities of interest and communities of place, and the general public at large. Communities of interest may include: national environmental groups, natural resource-based industries (i.e. timber, mining, recreation), etc.

Communities of place may include: local communities and their governments, local land-based organizations i.e. Mammoth Mountain Preservation Group, etc.

Goals & objectives

- allows effective implementation of plan
- process builds trust among diverse parties
- reduces potential for litigation against the plan
- increases communication among parties
- increases ownership and support for plan
- ensures plan is representative of diverse concerns and needs of multiple interests
- enables mutual learning among all parties

Initiators of the process

Federal government initiates the planning process every ten years. However, if the NFMA regulation is revised as planned, plans will become «living documents» where planning will be an ongoing, adaptive process.

Characteristics of actors/participants

There are multiple actors, as explained above. Characteristics depend on whether the actors fit the community of place or interest description. If they do not, they may simply be a visitor or citizen with no particular affiliation or interest beyond that.

Design of the participatory process

Public participation in forest planning may take any form (consultation, interview, open house etc.), and is usually designed and implemented by an interdisciplinary planning team on the National Forest in question. Money and level of creativity tend to be the major limiting factors. In planning, public participation may occur through the planning process in all phases. However, only the government or deciding official, which usually is the Forest Supervisor, may give his or her final approval of the plan. In the past, the degree of participation based on Arnstein's ladder ranged in the informing, consultation, placation stages. Currently, the Forest Service is doing more partnerships, and delegating power; I would say we will never be in the citizen control phase.

SWOL analysis & recommendations for actions

- Continue to move towards delegated power.
- Implement revised planning regulation.
- Conduct a workforce analysis and increase expertise and training where needed to improve skills needed to do better public involvement.

Contact

Anne Hoover
USDA Forest Service
Research & Development (RVUR)
201 14th St. S.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20024, USA
E-mail: ahoover@fs.fed.us

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

To concretise the concept of public participation such as defined in this report, the Team members have been invited to produce country profiles on national experiences in implementation of public participation in forestry. To achieve this work, the Team applied a descriptive framework for presenting the information from the profiles along questions related to:

- *What* is the object of public participation (specific plan, programme, etc.)?
- *Why* is the public participation process developed (objectives)?
- *Who* is initiating and taking part in the process?
- *How* is the public participation process developed and implemented?

This material formed the basis for the TOS's work. The matrix proposes a way of organizing the information comparatively, indicating the situation of public participation in the various countries discussed by the Team. This information should, however, be considered as neither exhaustive nor fixed in time.

What is the participatory process about?

Country	Object of PP	Institutional origin and context of PP	Level of PP & institutional framework
B	1. Long term forest policy planning at regional/local level. 2. Specific problems/issues e.g.: a) Forest grouping of private forest owners; b) "Play forests": recreational activities from youth groups in forests; c) Development of standard for SFM d) Creation of new forest zones in urban areas; e) Recognition/regulation for forest contractors and roundwood merchants.	1. Government of Flanders Act on Forest (1990, last amended 1999), requires local forest manager to consult population when drafting forest management plans. 2. Resolution of specific problems and issues related to forests and forestry	1. Planning at regional/local level. 2. The level depends on the situation and problem to be solved: a) Voluntary pilot projects at local level/planning and policy at regional level (amendment of forest legislation 1999). b) Voluntary problem solving at local level (if necessary legal) / memorandum of understanding at regional level. c) Open. d) Planning at regional level, discussions at local level. e) Negotiations at regional level
CH	– Long-term forest management planning above forest ownership limits (Regional Management Plan).	– New Forest Law 1992 (art. 18.3 of Forest Implementation Order) obliges cantons to organise PP while elaborating long-term forest management planning above forest ownership limits.	– Planning at regional level (above forest ownership). – Cantonal forest services are responsible for the implementation of participatory processes (for defining size of the region, methods of work, participatory models, etc.). – PP is considered a "non-contentious administrative procedure" (participation at an early stage of decision making).

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Object of PP	Institutional origin and context of PP	Level of PP & institutional framework
DK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest council and other expert advisory boards, e.g. Appropriation Committee for Product Development (Forest Fund) - Ad hoc committees for e.g. sustainable forest management strategy, biodiversity strategy... - Other nature protection-related multi-stakeholders based groups - User councils - Ad hoc councils at local afforestation projects - Open house arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Related to policy making and administration of the Forest Act, Nature Conservation Act etc. - Legally established or voluntary - Governmental policy since 1995 - Voluntary initiative by state - forest supervisor - Private & public forests, voluntary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National level - Regional or national level - Regional/local level - Local level
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Forest Strategy - National and Regional Forest - Advisory Councils (from the Autonomous Regions) - Councils of nature and protected areas - National and Regional forest products councils - Forest Defence Associations (fire protection) 	<p>Spanish forestry is regulated by a law adopted in 1957 but has updated its forest policy in order to meet international requirements and changes in public demand with a national forest strategy (adopted in Jan 2000 after a public participation process lasting several years)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and regional (autonomous) - Local
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term forest management and advice to the Minister about policies: Commission Nationale de la Forêt et des Produits Forestiers, chaired by the Minister - Long-term regional forest management planning prepared by the Commissions on Forests and Forest Products. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Code - Forest Code 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At national level, discussion on national policies, consultative body with broad participation - Planning at regional level. - Regional orientations are produced by the regional forest service. They are then submitted to the Commission, which is a consultative body. At the end, the plan has to be approved by the Minister, through the political regional assembly.

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Object of PP	Institutional origin and context of PP	Level of PP & institutional framework
FIN	<p>1. Finnish Forest and Park Service planning (FPS) :</p> <p>a) Regional Natural Resources Planning above forest ownership (7 RNRP);</p> <p>b) Landscape Ecological Planning (78 LEP);</p> <p>c) Real estate planning for the use of state owned shores and other built-up areas;</p> <p>d) Nature protection and recreation planning;</p> <p>e) Every day planning at the stand level.</p> <p>2. Other PP processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Forestry Programme (NFP) and Regional Forestry Target Programmes (13 RFTP) - City and community land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finnish FPS has been implementing PP for about 5 years in all parts of the planning system and at different planning levels (voluntary decision). - Since 1997 new Forest Law requires public participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at all levels (national, regional, local). Each planning level has its own participatory process. - FPS is responsible for the implementation of participatory processes (methods of work, participatory models, etc.).
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term Regional Forest Management Planning (170 RFMP). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important transformation of the forest sector (change of the political and economic regime). - New Forest Law (1996). - Country wide public participation through regional planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at regional level (above forest ownership). - State Forest Service is responsible for the implementation of participatory processes.
IC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public participation applies to the planning of afforestation programmes in the context of forest management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The State supports afforestation projects to increase forest cover (from 1.4% today to 10% by the year 2100). - In fact, all actors promoting forestry, the State Forest Service (the most powerful actor), the Owner Association, the Voluntary Association and individual afforestation projects, play a role in educating people in forestry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public participation applies to afforestation programmes and projects (farm-forestry)

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Object of PP	Institutional origin and context of PP	Level of PP & institutional framework
IRL	<p>1. National level e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strategic Plan for Forestry until Year 2030 (established in 1996); - environmental consultation; - environmental impact assessment for afforestation areas greater than 70 ha. <p>2. Local level e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - partnership with local groups for the provision of local amenities (Coillte Teo); <p>3. Individual forestry operation e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - distribution of subsidies to forest owners e.g. afforestation, amenities and recreational developments. - participation inside the forest service (FS) and between the FS and other stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For 20 years great afforestation projects have involved major changes in the landscape (management system: high forests, clear-fell and re-stock) - The forest agency uses subsidies to voluntarily bring forest owners to consider amenity and wildlife functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning at national, regional and local levels (strategic and operational)
P	<p>1. Long-term regional forest management planning.</p> <p>2. Specific projects/issues e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - environmental education at school (e.g. project "Forest in Motion"); - prevention of forest fires through specific projects (e.g. "To live is to share") 	<p>1 New National Forest Act (1996) requires participatory forest planning at regional levels.</p> <p>2 Resolution of specific problems and issues related to forests and forestry.</p>	<p>1. Planning at regional level. National forest services is responsible for the implementation of participatory processes.</p> <p>2. Forest fire prevention at regional and local levels through public and private partnership</p>
RUS	<p>- Presently the Russian Federation allows access to information but needs to strengthen its capacity for practising public participation. In partnership with governmental and non-governmental actors IUCN promotes the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Creating a Framework for Public Involvement in Russian Forest Management" (1999) - "Working Together" _ awareness raising programme on forest issues with the Federal Forest Service of Russia - Training courses for foresters on "How to work with public and mass media" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Code 1997 "Participation of Public Associations in Fire Protection" (Art. 96) - "Statement on providing citizens and legal entities with information about forest fund being federal property" (adopted by the Forest Service in Oct. 1997) - Concept - Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management in the Russian Federation (1998) - Forest Code of Khabarovsk Kray (Far East Russia) includes chapters on public involvement and ecological expertise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National - Regional (state) - At local level there is also some control of forest use
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Management Plans - Afforestation of abandoned agricultural land – governmental decree and programme guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of Ministry of Agriculture on Forest Management includes chapter on participation in FMP preparation (new forest act is presently being prepared) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FMU level - National, regional, local

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Object of PP	Institutional origin and context of PP	Level of PP & institutional framework
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation of grants for forestry developments; - Management of specific problems and conflicts; - Creation and management of community woodlands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General afforestation policy aims to increase forest cover. - Most forestry development projects are funded by grants, whose distribution requires public consultation. - Cases of public discontent and willingness to take forest management in their own hands. - Creation and management of community woodlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation of forestry grants requires local consultation (e.g. publication in newspaper). - Local conflict resolution processes. - Local level.
USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National strategic plan, regional and land unit plans and other land management activities fully informed and supported by the public. - Land management agencies' products and services potentially accessible to all members of the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public participation is required by NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act and SEPA (individual states have state environmental policy acts) for all proposed major federal (or state for SEPA) actions. - NFMA (1976) National Forest Management Act requires public participation in the development of forest plans. - Constant litigation in the courts by interest groups has encouraged land management agencies to increase public participation to reduce potential for future litigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National level (national policies and plans) - Federal land unit level (i.e. National Forest, National Park, National Wildlife Refuge etc.) - State level (state forests and parks) - Local level (county parks)
CEPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest management plans at FMUL - Participation in subregional and national planning as well as policy making, i.e. Pan-European Process - Involvement in certification processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observer and co-decider in various policy and planning processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At FMUL, national, regional levels, only starting at global level (IFF) and regional level
IFBW W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies regarding health, safety and security of jobs, as well as environmental issues. - Growing political involvement based on the awareness that "sustainable forestry implies sustainable jobs" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The International Federation of Building and Wood Workers federates about 300 unions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At all levels, international, regional and national, the difficulty being to reach lower levels of workers' organizations

Why are people developing/ using the public participation process ?

Country	Objectives	Functions
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased acceptance - Conflict management / sensitization - More sustainable use of forest land/ressources - Improved recognition of some forest users (forest/wood workers, youth etc.) - Improved cost/benefit sharing (through partnerships) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is SFM on forest stand level - New urban forests - Improved safety and benefits for forest workers
CH	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Democracy legitimacy 2. Legal protection 3. Increase plan's efficiency and efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depending on the perspectives: population/administration: - For the population: functions of <i>emancipation</i> (raised awareness, responsibility & rights, collaborative learning; transparency, accountability) - For the administration: functions of <i>efficiency</i> (legitimacy, loyalty, anticipation, canalization, access to information)
DK	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Influence (participants) 2. Reach legitimate solutions for efficient implementation of policies 3. Governmental ambition to fulfil international obligations (initiating user councils) 	
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the new forest strategy : "people feel forests as something of their own" – «Management plans will be easier since people know the framework" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecological objectives (water, erosion, atmospheric, biodiversity, landscape) - Social objectives (settle population in poorer areas, rural development, employment, recreation, culture, etc.) - Economic objectives (production of goods, timber for the industrial sector, generation of income)
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decrease conflict among agencies and between other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase transparency of processes, and acceptability by the owners/managers or users of forests
FIN	<p>Depending on the planning level: Raising the legitimacy of the Forest Service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Listen to owners and citizens" - Mobilize additional funding - Outreach to other sectors
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Democracy legitimacy - Increased acceptance - Increased awareness - Conflict management - Raised efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the context of privatization, contacts with the numerous new forest private forest owners are a priority for the Forest Service. - Forest settlement (at present management groups are unclear yet on 10% of the forested area)
IC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Afforestation of the country from less than 1% to ~30 % 	
IRL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Democracy legitimacy - Legal protection - Increase plan's efficiency and efficacy - Increase Skills 	
P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sensitize the public to forest fire problems - "Bring citizens to the forest and the forest to the cities" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involve/ commit the private sector
RUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising - Involve the public - Increase transparency and efficiency of the forestry sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involve the media and many sectors of society, NGOs and public associations - Increase expertise in public participation - Promote legal and administrative reforms supportive of

Country	Objectives	Functions
		PP
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Valuing various parties' interests - Conflict management - Raise public acceptance of FMP - Optimize the use of forest land resources, land conservation, rural development 	
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance legitimacy of public funding - Decrease local conflicts 	
USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase public ownership of public land management decisions - Meet requirements of the law - Conflict management - Enhance mutual learning - Promote participatory democracy processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce costs and time losses due to legal challenges - Create more effective forest management practices

CEPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create & improve sensitivity/ understanding for private forest management - Communicate the value & responsibility of private ownership & property (generation to generation aspect) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add practical expertise - Consideration of local peculiarities & traditional knowledge
IFBW W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance visibility and influence of workers in policy making and management of forests at all levels - Wages e.g. negotiation of collective agreement - Ensure sustainable practice 	

Who is organizing and taking part in the public participation process ?

Country	Initiators	Participants
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest service + province - Forest service + umbrella organization (youth) - Forest service / WWF / private owners associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest owners/municipalities/NGOs - Youth organizations - Others
CH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cantonal Forest Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest owners (public & private) - Social interest groups for regional forests - Regional population
DK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of the Environment for the Forest Council and the advisory groups - Forest User Councils – governmental decision to have them in all state forest districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major NGOs, representatives of public authorities - Up to 14 representatives for each User Council, including municipalities, major interest organizations, some councils also have members elected at public meetings
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Ministry of Environment initiated the national forest strategy 	100 representatives from : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local government and partners - ecologists - unions - forest owners - research institutes and universities
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service at national level: advice on preparing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commissions on Forests and Forest Products - including

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Initiators	Participants
	<p>laws and regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service (write the first draft of a regional orientation plan) 	<p>other ministries and professional agencies, private owners, users (hunters, young people, unions, consumers and NGOs.</p>
FIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depending on the level and stage (when) of planning - sometimes fully open: "participants could be anyone from anywhere".
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest owners, representatives of various Chambers (agriculture, commerce), NGOs - wildlife, but no representatives of industry - difficulty for stakeholders to get organized.
IC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Forest Associations (governmental and non-governmental) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7000 members (individuals and/or groups?) - 57 grassroots associations (with municipal involvement - governmental and non-governmental)
IRL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest service - Forest owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Everyone who is interested
P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest owners, «baldios» (local community owned forests), forest industries, hunters, etc.
RU	<p>IUCN in partnership with Forest Service policy makers and practitioners, NGOs, donors, representatives of international organizations and the public</p>	
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State Forest Authority for the Forest Management Plan - For the afforestation programme Ministry of Agriculture, Agency for Non-Forest Land Afforestation, other state authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest users and owners, certified forest owners, representatives of state forest authority, of enterprises, of nature protection organizations, of municipalities and others. - Land owners, state authorities
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Forest Service handles the grant applications, is "the broker" between parties - but may not be the initiator for building partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any interested person or group.
USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Service and other public land agencies at different government levels - Regional/local councils and groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to all members of the public
CEPF	<p>On European level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEPF as the umbrella organization - delegates from different national associations - alliances with other interest groups (farmers, hunters, ...) <p>On global level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alliance with non-European forest owner associations (e.g. North America) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Various forest owners, including family owners, large and small owners, enterprises, institutions industries, etc.
IFBWW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depends on the level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IFBWW Nordic Federation of Building and Woodworkers, European Federation of Building and Woodworkers and national union affiliates in all continents - All unionized building and wood workers, be they farmers, employees of the private or the public sector, ... women often overlooked.

How are the public participation processes designed and implemented ?

Country	Models	Technical approach	Degree
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue or conflict based negotiation of contracts - memorandum of understanding - sometimes leading to changes in the law - Awareness-raising campaigns - Formal counselling - Mediation in conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project by project approach : Pilot project (co-ordinator / steering board) - (support demarcation of zones / sensitization) - Formal & informal meetings / public consultation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working with the most concerned stakeholders (youth organizations, trade unions, environmental organizations, industry, local governmental agencies- provinces- municipalities)
CH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation strategies – non-contentious types of procedure - Depending on the cantons the PP may use representative-oriented models: expert committees, working groups, planning cells, - Or broad PP models 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The law gives no formal requirement about how to implement participation. The cantons are free to choose methods of PP, they may organize working groups (workshops), public meetings, letter inquiries, exhibits, etc. However, the cantonal forestry agencies are formally required to respond to the public's suggestions / comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the stages in the PP more or less open
DK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey type of consultation - Expert committees at national level - User councils at local levels - Ad hoc councils at local afforestation project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory boards at national level - Regular meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rather exclusive participation for organized interest groups - Without formal decision making authority
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation - Consensus building towards co-decision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint multi-stakeholder based meetings - Working groups on specific teams - National Forest Strategy - three drafts over three years communicated to identified stakeholders representatives (100 actors) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 invited representatives
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation body for orienting forest management at national and regional level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and Regional Commissions involving various governmental and non-governmental actors - meeting once a year and members changed every 5 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusive for organized stakeholder groups
FIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainly consultation for planning procedures at different levels (non-contentious) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methods very varied - learning from USA experiences – including workshops, public information, telephone lines, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More or less open, depending on the level and stage or moment in the decision-making process - sometimes fully open
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation in regional forest plans - Awareness raising and technical support to small private forest owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formal & informal meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Top-down kind of participation".
IC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Owners' Association (1997) - National Forest Association (1930) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular meetings - cultural events of grassroots associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Owners' Association (1997): open to forest owners for promoting afforestation National Forest Association (1930) promoting a "forest culture" (education)
IRL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultative for planning and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaborating guidelines or codes of practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working with the main

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

Country	Models	Technical approach	Degree
	<p>control purposes (i.e. afforestation projects > 70 ha. with EIS) for developing National Forestry Standard (Code of Best Forest Practice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At local levels information sharing and awareness raising - Audits for felling licences and grant aided projects. Appeal mechanism for applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples where the state forestry agency has devolved control and management to local communities (for small scale recreation and leisure projects). Recent development of water catchment management groups (with NGOs and GOs.) - For developing National Forestry Standards (SFM), establishment of steering committees of invited groups - National Council for Forest Research and Development, including NGO representing farmers - Forestry cooperatives and improved contacts with farmers (Rural Environmental Protection Scheme) 	<p>stakeholders, forest owners, farmers, and local communities</p>
P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory planning (regional level) - Information and awareness-raising campaigns for forest fire prevention campaigns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional level workshops and then, - Public consultation with draft plan deposited in the townhouse at municipal levels - The forest service supports the establishment of local groups (fire watchers) - Several private sector-led initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple actors involved at different levels, aimed at the general public and often schools... - Involvement of the private sector
RUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Production of guidelines for PP for foresters and the public - Awareness raising campaigns (media, etc.) - Training of foresters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Informal discussions, workshops, interviews, round-tables, seminars, consultations, conferences, mass-media presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiple actors involved in: information sharing, consultations/partnerships
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings with representatives of interest groups - Several drafts of FMP considered - For the afforestation programme consultations, interviews with land owners, documentation dissemination 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consulting with involved parties - Mainly partnership with land owners
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation: grant applications are handled by the Forest Service and are open to public scrutiny - Community-based management in some cases (Laggan and crofters cases). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grant applications are published in a local paper - anyone has the right to comment. - If objections are received by public agencies or statutory consultation then the applicant can either withdraw his/her application or ask that a regional advisory panel of land use and other interested parties advise the forestry commission on what should be done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open
USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation - Public meetings - Collaborative approaches - Recent efforts provide new PP opportunities such as: focus groups, public issue tracking, monitoring by citizens, open-houses, and development of ongoing informal contacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The public is notified of a proposed plan or action, and can participate in the issue identification stage of the NEPA environmental impact analysis and potentially at multiple stages of the planning process. - FS agency produced manuals and handbooks for employees to implement NEPA and NFMA - includes section on PP - Training for employees on collaboration techniques currently being developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sincere effort is made to ensure that PP is accessible to all.

Descriptive matrix of country profiles

CEPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attending policy making fora - Counselling for private forest owners associations in the different countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising (technical support) and increasing the recognition of private forest owners in public policy making 	
IFBW W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Counselling, negotiations on collective agreements, information exchange, training and education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using multiple communication technologies, including media, attending policy making fora 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation means different things at different levels - for different peoples with different demands

List of members of the FAO/ECE/ILO Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry

Chairman

Miles Wenner (United Kingdom)
Forest Enterprise
55 Moffat Road
UK - DUMFRIES DG1 1NPUK
Tel. +44 1387 272 454
Fax. +44 1387 251 491
E-mail: miles.wenner@forestry.gov.uk

Coordinators

Yves Kazemi & Andréa Finger (Switzerland)
Forest & Society
Chemin de Colombaires 24
CH - 1096 CULLY
Tel./Fax. +41 21 799 52 30
E-mail: ykazemi@vtx.ch and finger@isp.fr

Secretariat

Peter Poschen (ILO)
International Labour Office
4, Route des Morillons
CH - 1211 GENEVE 22
Tel. +41 22 799 61 88
Fax. +41 22 799 79 67
E-mail: poschen@ilo.org

Belgium

Wim Buysse
Ministry of Flanders
Administration of Environment, Nature, Land
& Water
Division of Forests & Green Spaces
Koning Albert II-laan 20, Box 8
B - 1000 BRUSSELS
Tel. + 32 2 553 81 21
Fax. + 32 2 553 81 05
E-Mail: wim.buysse@lin.vlaanderen.be

Denmark

Tove Enggrob Boon
Danish Centre for Forest, Landscape and
Planning
Hørsholm Kongevej 11
DK - 2970 HØRSHOLM
Tel. +45 45 76 32 00
Fax. +45 45 76 32 33
E-mail: teb@fsl.dk

Finland

Paul Wallenius
Finnish Forest and Park Service
PL 94
FIN - 01301 VANTAA
Tel. +358 205 64 44 75
Fax. +358 205 64 45 00
E-mail: pauli.wallenius@metsa.fi

France

Bernard Chevalier
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche,
DERF
78, rue de Varenne
75349 PARIS 07 SP
Tel. +33 1 49 55 57 89
Fax. +33 1 49 55 51 12
E-mail: Bernard.chevalier@agriculture.gouv.fr

Hungary

László Kolozs
State Forest Service
P.O. Box 10, Széchenyi utca 14
H - 1054 BUDAPEST
Tel. +36 1 374 3220
Fax. +36 1 312 6112
E-mail: kolozs.laszlo@aeszh.hu

Iceland

Karl S. Gunnarsson
Iceland Forest Research Mogilsa
Mogilsa
IS - 116 REYKJAVIK
Tel. +354 515 45 00
Fax. +354 515 45 01
E-mail: karlsgsr@simnet.is

Ireland

Noel Foley
Irish Forest Service
Dept. of the Marine and Natural Resources
Oliver Plunkett Road
Letterkenny,
IRL - Co. DONEGAL
Tel. +353 74 21 848
Fax. +353 74 22 791
E-mail: - -

Portugal

João de Sousa Teixeira
Direcção-Geral das Florestas
Av. João Crisóstomo, 26-28
P - 1069-040 LISBOA
Tel. +351 21 312 48 03
Fax. +351 1 312 49 96
E-mail: joao.teixeira@dgf.min-agricultura.pt

Maria João Pereira

Ministerio de Agricultura,
Direcção-Geral das Florestas
Av. João Crisóstomo, 26-28
P - 1060-049 LISBOA
Tel. +351 1 312 48 00
Fax. +351 1 312 49 96
E-mail: mariamoura@mail.telepac.pt or
mjapereira@dgf.min-agricultura.pt

Russian Federation

Elena Kopylova
IUCN Office for CIS
17, Martial Vasilevsky Str.
RU - MOSCOW 123182
Tel. +7 095 190 46 55 / 7 095 190 70 77
Fax. +7 095 490 58 18
E-mail: keb_iucn@aport.ru

Slovakia

Robert Vinca (*written contribution*)
Forest Research Institute
T.G. Masaryka 22
960 92 Zvolen, Slovakia
Tel. +421 855 531 43 03
Fax. +421 855 532 18 83
E-mail: vinca@fris.sk

Spain

Ana Belén Noriega
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Subdirección de Política Forestal
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
E - 28005 MADRID
Tel. +34 91 597 56 00
Fax. +34 91 597 55 65
E-mail: ana.noriega@gvsf.mma.es

Sweden

Sven Sjunnesson
Committee on International Forest Issues
Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture &
Forestry
PI 1039 B
S - 28060 BROBY
Tel. +46 44 405 85
Fax. +46 44 405 87
E-mail: sven.sjunnesson@telia.com

Switzerland

Evelyn Coleman-Brantsche (*1st meeting*)
Swiss Forest Agency, OFEFP
3003 Bern, Switzerland
Tel. +41 31 324 76 89
Fax. +41 31 324 78 66
E-mail: evelyn.coleman@buwal.admin.ch

Claire-Lise Suter Thalmann (*2nd meeting*)
Swiss Forest Agency, OFEFP
CH - 3003 BERN
Tel. +41 31 324 78 58
Fax. +41 31 324 78 66
E-mail: claire-lise.suter@buwal.admin.ch

United States of America

Anne Hoover
USDA Forest Service
Research & Development (RVUR)
201 14th St. S.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20024, USA
Tel. +1 202 205 0899
Fax. +1 202 205 10 87
E-mail: ahoover@fs.fed.us

CEPF

Natalie Hufnagl
Confederation of European Forest Owners
Rue du Luxembourg 47-51
B - 1000 BRUSSELS
Tel. +32 2 219 0231
Fax. +32 2 219 2191
E-mail: cepf@planetinternet.be

IFBWW

Jill Bowling (*1st meeting*)
International Federation of Building and Wood
Workers
54, Route des Acacias
P.O. Box 1412
1227 Carouge, Switzerland
Tel. +41 22 827 37 76
Fax. +41 22 827 37 70
E-mail: jill@ifbww.org

Mr. Gisbert Schlemmer (*written contribution*)
IG Metall Germany,
International affairs
Wood and Plastics Branch
Sonnenstraße 10
40227 Düsseldorf, Germany
Tel. +49 211 770 3211 and 12
Fax. +49 211 770 32 75
E-mail: g.schlemmer@ghk.de

WWF/IUCN

Sally Jeanrenaud
Chalet le Mazot
CH - 1261 St. GEORGE
Tel. +41 22 368 20 72
E-mail: s.jeanrenaud@span.ch

Sectoral working papers

	Year	Reference
New Technology in Banking and Insurance: Relative Provisions and Collective Agreements (Edith Epstein)	1985	SAP 4.1/WP.1
The Socio-Economic Implications of Structural Changes in Plantations in Asian Countries (K.N. Sircar, J.P. Sajhau, A. Navamukundan, R. Sukarja) ²⁵	1985	SAP 2.1/WP.2
The Socio-Economic Implications of Structural Changes in Plantations in African Countries (J.A. Lugogo, L.A. Msambichaka and M.S.D. Bagachwa, J.A. Dadson, K. Tano)	1986	SAP 2.2/WP.3
Las implicaciones socioeconómicas de los cambios estructurales en las plantaciones de países de América latina y del Caribe (E. Torres-Rivas, M. Chiriboga, T.F. Clarke)	1986	SAP 2.3/WP.4
The Formulation and Implementation of Housing Policy in Sri Lanka: The origin and implications of the "Million Houses Programme" (Marni Pigott)	1986	SAP 2.4/WP.5
Labour and Social Effects of Restructuring in the Iron and Steel Industry (Oleg Stepanov)	1986	SAP 1.1/WP.6
The Teller and the Terminal: The Effects of Computerisation on the Work and on the Employment of Bank Tellers (Michael Bell)	1988	SAP 4.2/WP.7
Social and Economic Effects of El Cerrejon Coal Project in Colombia (James Jonish)	1987	SAP 2.5/WP.8

²⁵ Out of print

Income of Workers in the Hotel, Catering and Tourism Sector (A. Faymann)	1987	SAP 6.1/WP.9
Social and Labour Effects of Computer-Aided Design and Computer-Aided Manufacturing (CAD/CAM), (Karl-H. Ebel and Erhard Ulrich)	1987	SAP 1.2/WP.10
La participation des femmes aux coopératives (D. Mavrogiannis)	1987	SAP 5.1/WP.11
La mobilisation de l'épargne rurale par les institutions de type coopératif et son impact sur le développement local dans sept pays africains - synthèse de sept études de cas : Burkina Faso, Cameroun, Egypte, Nigeria, Rwanda, Togo, Zimbabwe (Gilbert Renard)	1987	SAP 5.2/WP.12
Rural Savings Mobilisation by Co-operative Institutions and its Impact on Local Development in Seven African Countries - Synthesis of Seven Case Studies: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Egypt, Nigeria, Rwanda, Togo, Zimbabwe (Gilbert Renard)	1988	SAP 5.2/WP.12
Coopératives à buts multiples dans les régions rurales des pays en développement (Albert Benjacov) ²⁴	1987	SAP 5.3/WP.13
Social and Economic Conditions in Plantation Agriculture in Kenya - Proceedings of a Tripartite Workshop organised by the International Labour Office at Egerton University College, Njoro, Kenya, 4 - 8 May 1987 (J.P. Sajhau)	1988	SAP 2.6/WP.14
Productivity and its Impact on Employment and on the Working and Living Conditions of Iron and Steel Workers (Oleg Stepanov)	1988	SAP 1.3/WP.15
Social and Economic Implications of Tea Processing - The Experiences of India and Kenya (B. Sivaram and G.A. Orao Obura)	1989	SAP 2.7/WP.16

Economic and Social Implications of Sugar Cane Processing in Developing Countries (T. Hannah, International Sugar Organization)	1989	SAP 2.8/WP.17
Social and Labour Consequences of Economic and Technological Change in Civil Aviation (A. Gil)	1989	SAP 2.9/WP.18
Les implications socio-économiques de la transformation primaire du coton en Afrique francophone (M. de Sahb)	1989	SAP 2.10/WP.19
Socio-economic Implications of Primary Processing of Plantation Crops in Malaysia. Rubber and Palm-oil (M. N. Navamukundan)	1989	SAP 2.11/WP.20
Production, Employment and Wages in the Coffee Processing Sector of Brazil (G. Maia Gomes)	1989	SAP 2.12/WP.21
Social and Labour Aspects of Urban Passenger Transport in Selected African Countries (A. Gil)	1989	SAP 2.13/WP.22
Petroleum Training in Algeria and Nigeria (J. McLin)	1989	SAP 2.14/WP.23
Training and Technological Development in the Petroleum Sector: The cases of Norway and Brazil (Jan Erik Karlsen and Henrique Rattner)	1989	SAP 2.15/WP.24
Les coopératives et l'auto-assistance mutuelle face à la pauvreté urbaine dans les pays en développement (C. Jacquier)	1989	SAP 5.4/WP.25
Female Participation in the Construction Industry (J. Wells)	1990	SAP 2.16/WP.26

The Social Protection of Artists and Performers: The Situation in Selected Industrialised Countries (Jean-Pierre Dumont, Annie-Paule Gollot and Francis Kessler)	1990	SAP 4.3/WP.27
La protection sociale des artistes: la situation dans quelques pays industriels (Jean-Pierre Dumont, Annie-Paule Gollot et Francis Kessler)	1990	SAP 4.3/WP.27
Technological Change in the Iron and Steel Industry and its Effect on Employment and Training (S. Moinov)	1990	SAP 2.17/WP.28
Workers' Housing Co-operatives in Turkey: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Movement (A. S. Ozüekren)	1990	SAP 2.18/WP.29
Socio-Economic Conditions in Plantations in India. Proceedings of a National Tripartite Workshop (International Labour Office)	1990	SAP 2.19/WP.30
L'emploi dans l'industrie pétrolière (Inès Lemarie et Christophe Barret)	1990	SAP 2.20/WP.31
Les tendances de l'emploi, de la production et du commerce dans la filière textile: situation actuelle et perspectives (Marcel de Sahb)	1990	SAP 2.21/WP.32
The Role of Petroleum Industries in Promoting National Development Report of a Latin American Regional Symposium (Laura Randall)	1990	SAP 2.22/WP.33
The Internationalisation of Print: Trends, Socioeconomic Impact and Policy (Richard McArthur)	1990	SAP 2.23/WP.34
The Problems of Women Teachers in Technical and Vocational Education in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia: an Exploratory Report (Kathleen Lynch)	1990	SAP 4.4/WP.35

Safety and Health Problems in Small and Medium Scale Textile Enterprises in Five Developing Countries (L. Li)	1990	SAP 2.24/WP.36
The Status of Women Teachers in Southern Africa (Catherine Gaynor)	1990	SAP 4.5/WP.37
Socio-Economic Conditions in Plantations in Tanzania: Proceedings of a National Tripartite Workshop organised by the International Labour Office at Morogoro, 23-27 April 1990 (Edited by J.P. Sajhau)	1990	SAP 2.25/WP.38
Adjustment and Restructuring in Plantations: The Case of Sugar-cane in Mauritius and Negros Occidental (Philippines) (J.M. Paturau (Mauritius) and T.S. Untalan (Negros Occidental))	1990	SAP 2.26/WP.39
The communication of phonograms to the public: Remuneration of performers and producers (Pierre Chesnais)	1991	SAP 4.6/WP.40
Iron and Steel Producers: Fourteen of the Smaller Players (Stephan Moinov)	1991	SAP 2.27/WP.41
Professional and Managerial Staff: Their Place in the Labour Relations System of Canada and the United States (Michael Bendel)	1999	SAP 4.7/WP.42
Producers' Small Scale Industrial Co-operatives Some Case Studies from Developing Countries (Malcolm Harper)	1991	SAP 5.5/WP.43
La condition de l'artiste (André Nayer and Suzanne Capiiau)	1991	SAP 4.8/WP.44

Gestion des ressources humaines dans le secteur public: Réflexion méthodologique à partir de l'étude de quelques projets de coopération technique conduits par le Bureau international du Travail (Joël Cauden et José Trouvé)	1991	SAP 4.9/WP.45
Labour Market Flexibility: The Challenge Facing Senior Medical Officers in New Zealand (Ian Powell)	1991	SAP 4.10/WP.46
Crise et assainissement des services publics africains. Le cas des services de fourniture d'eau et d'électricité et des transports au Cameroun, Niger et Sénégal (Patrick Plane)	1991	SAP 4.11/WP.47
Manpower Aspects of Restructuring Railways in Developing Countries: A synthesis of six country case studies (A. Silverleaf)	1991	SAP 2.28/WP.48
Negotiating technological and structural change in Australia Post (R. Lansbury)	1992	SAP 4.12/WP.49
Women in scientific research in Australia: A case study (C. Macpherson)	1992	SAP 4.13/WP.50
Global information processing: The emergence of software services and data entry jobs in selected developing countries (S. Mitter and R. Pearson)	1992	SAP 4.14/WP.51
The construction industry in Brazil: Surviving the transition to a more competitive market (H. Zylberstajn)	1992	SAP 2.29/WP.52
Human resource management issues in developing country public enterprises (petroleum/chemical sectors) (D.G.M. Cheshire)	1992	SAP 2.30/WP.53

The restructuring of the Japanese National Railways: Effects on labour and management (S. Watanabe)	1992	SAP 2.31/WP.54
El sector bancario argentino: El impacto de los cambios tecnologicos y estructurales sobre el trabajo y el empleo (J.C. Neffa)	1993	SAP 4.15/WP.55
An industry steels itself for change (S. Moinov)	1993	SAP 2.32/WP.56
Un atout pour la santé: La rémunération du personnel infirmier (A. Brihaye)	1993	SAP 4.16/WP.57
Les conditions d'emploi des travailleurs des plantations: Compte-rendu d'un atelier tripartite national (P. Egger)	1993	SAP 2.33/WP.58
Ajustement structurel, politiques agricoles et efforts d'adaptations paysannes en Côte d'Ivoire (M. Allechi, Y. Affou, D. Ngaresseum)	1993	SAP 2.34/WP.59
White-collar unionism in selected European countries: Issues and prospects (E. Kassalow)	1993	SAP 4.17/WP.60
Les enjeux des services bancaires: hommes, techniques et marchés (J. D'Alançon)	1993	SAP 4.18/WP.61
Occupational Safety and Health in the Food and Drink Industries (Shizue Tomoda)	1993	SAP 2.35/WP.62
Employed or Self-Employed? Contract Labour in the British Construction Industry (Julian Birch)	1993	SAP 2.36/WP.63
The effects of technological and structural changes on employment in major Irish banks (Noelle Donnelly)	1993	SAP 4.19/WP.64

La banque française en mutation: marché, profession, organisation, culture (E. Blaustein, M. Dressen)	1993	SAP 4.20/WP.65
Nurses' pay: A vital factor in health care (A. Brihaye)	1993	SAP 4.21/WP.66
Part-time and temporary employees in the Public Service in Japan (Seiichiro Hayakawa)	1993	SAP 4.22/WP.67
La situación de las mujeres docentes en centroamérica: Hacia la igualdad de oportunidades y de trato (Mafalda Sibille Martina)	1994	SAP 4.23/WP.68
Por la remuneración equitativa del personal de enfermería (A. Brihaye)	1994	SAP 4.24/WP.69
Privatization of public services and public utilities (C. Oestmann)	1994	SAP 4.25/WP.70
Les droits syndicaux des cadres: Une perspective internationale (Claire Dupont-Sakharov et Laure Frexinós)	1995	SAP 4.26/WP.71
Consequences for Management and Personnel of the Reorganization of Railways in the Russian Federation - 1990-1992 (Irene Valkova)	1994	SAP 2.37/WP.72
Trends and Perspectives in the Nursing Profession (Christine Hancock, James Buchan, Phil Gray; Cécile Fontaine; Sholom Glouberman; Tom Keighley)	1995	SAP 4.27/WP.73
Trade union rights of managerial staff: An international perspective (Claire Dupont-Sakharov and Laure Frexinós)	1995	SAP 4.28/WP.74

Los derechos sindicales del personal dirigente: una perspectiva internacional (Claire Dupont-Sakharov and Laure Frexinos)	1995	SAP 4.29/WP.75
Productivity, employment and industrial relations in coal mines Two case studies from the Czech Republic and the Russian Federation (Edited by Norman S. Jennings)	1994	SAP 2.38/WP.76
Productivity, employment and industrial relations in coal mines Three case studies from China, India and Zimbabwe (Edited by Norman S. Jennings)	1994	SAP 2.39/WP.77
Productivity, employment and industrial relations in coal mines Three case studies from Australia, United Kingdom, United States (Edited by Norman S. Jennings)	1994	SAP 2.40/WP.78
Atmospheric pollution control: How much of a threat to coal? (Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen)	1994	SAP 2.41/WP.79
Job satisfaction and decentralization: The effects of systemic change on Swedish comprehensive school teachers from 1988 to 1993 (Roger Ellmin)	1995	SAP 4.30/WP.80
Contract labour in Malaysian plantation, construction and sawmilling industries: A survey report (Lee Kiong Hock and A. Sivananthiran)	1995	SAP 2.42/WP.81
Sectoral trends in world employment (Jaroslaw Wieczorek)	1995	SAP 2.43/WP.82
Les femmes enseignantes dans l'enseignement technique et professionnel au Bénin, en Côte d'Ivoire, au Mali, au Sénégal: Une étude comparative (Soledad Perez)	1995	SAP 4.31/WP.83

Occupational stress and burn-out of teachers: A review (Tom Cox and Amanda Griffiths)	1995	SAP 4.32/WP.84
Gender and employment on sugar cane plantations in Tanzania (Marjorie Mbilinyi with Ave Maria Semakafu)	1995	SAP 2.44/WP.85
Various forms of employment in the food and drink industries (Shizue Tomoda)	1995	SAP 2.45/WP.86
L'ajustement dans le secteur public et la gestion des ressources humaines: le cas du Sénégal (Abdoul Aziz Tall)	1995	SAP 4.33/WP.87
Privatization in Mauritius: Semi-privatization, Counter-privatization and Closure (P. Ujoodha)	1995	SAP 4.34/WP.88
L'ajustement structurel dans le secteur public et la gestion des ressources humaines: Le cas du Mali (Mohamed Moustapha Sissoko)	1995	SAP 4.35/WP.89
Document d'orientation sur les politiques de privatisation du secteur public (Alain Adérito Sanches)	1995	SAP 4.36/WP.90
Women workers in manufacturing, 1971-91 (Shizue Tomoda)	1995	SAP 2.46/WP.91
Adjustment in the public sector and management of human resources in Mauritius (Raj Mudhoo)	1995	SAP 4.37/WP.92
Privatization in the iron and steel industry (Stephan Moinov)	1995	SAP 2.47/WP.93
Privatization and human resource issues in the Caribbean sugar industry (Clive Y. Thomas)	1995	SAP 2.48/WP.94

Foreign labour in the Malaysian construction industry (A.-R. Abdul-Aziz)	1995	SAP 2.49/WP.95
Recherche de la productivité et rentabilité dans le secteur bancaire: théorie, pratiques et conséquences sur la gestion des ressources humaines (Edgar Blaustein et Marnix Dressen)	1995	SAP 4.38/WP.96
Proceso de privatización en Argentina y Brasil: Consecuencias en materia de mercado de trabajo y desempeño empresarial Practicas utilizadas para el ajuste de personal (Enrique Saravia)	1995	SAP 2.50/WP.97
Deregulation of road freight transport: Labour implications (Yukari Suzuki)	1996	SAP 2.51/WP.98
Improving working conditions and increasing profits in forestry (Kiki Johansson and Bernt Strehlke)	1996	SAP 2.52/WP.99
ILO industrial committees and sectoral activities: An institutional history (Edward Weisband)	1996	SAP 2.53/WP.100
Productivity improvement and labour relations in the tea industry in South Asia (B. Sivaram)	1996	SAP 2.54/WP.101
Egalité des chances entre les hommes et les femmes des catégories cadres et professionnelles (J. Laufer)	1996	SAP 4.39/WP.102
Health care personnel in Central and Eastern Europe (J. Healy/C. Humphries)	1996	SAP 4.40/WP.103
Safety and health of meat, poultry and fish processing workers (S. Tomoda)	1996	SAP 2.55/WP.104

Labour migration in the construction industry in Latin America and the Caribbean (Edmundo Werna)	1996	SAP 2.56/WP.105
Foreign construction workers in Singapore (George Ofori)	1996	SAP 2.57/WP.106
Ethique des affaires dans les industries THC (textile, habillement, chaussures): Les codes de conduite (J.P. Sajhau)	1997	SAP 2.58/WP.107
Health care personnel in Central and Eastern Europe (Russian version) (J. Healy/C. Humphries)	1997	SAP 4.41/WP.108
Responsible Care and related voluntary initiatives to improve enterprise performance on health, safety and environment in the chemical industry (Kevin Munn)	1997	SAP 2.59/WP.109
Business ethics in the textile, clothing and footwear (TCF) industries: Codes of Conduct (J.P. Sajhau)	1997	SAP 2.60/WP.110
Trayectoria de modernización y calificación en la industria siderúrgica: Perspectivas para el siglo 21 - Estudio de caso de una planta en México (Andrés Hernández, Anselmo García y Leonard Mertens)	1997	SAP 2.61/WP.111
Steel in the new millennium: Nine case studies (Edited by Norman S. Jennings)	1997	SAP 2.62/WP.112
People, forest and sustainability: Social elements of sustainable forest management in Europe (Proceedings)	1997	SAP 2.63/WP.113
Strategies to reach the top for women in management: Perspectives from ASEAN (Sieh Lee Mei Ling)	1997	SAP 4.42/WP.114

The impact of climate change policies on employment in the coalmining industry (Cain Polidano)	1997	SAP 2.64/WP.115
Breaking through the glass ceiling: Women in management in Poland (Anna Fotyga) (forthcoming)	1998	SAP 4.43/WP.116
Rompiendo el techo de cristal: Las mujeres en el management en Argentina (A.M. Mass, M.A. Saez, S. García y L. Cukierman)	1999	SAP 4.44/WP.117
Breaking through the glass ceiling: Women in management in Argentina (A.M. Mass, M.A. Saez, S. García and L. Cukierman) (forthcoming)	2000	SAP 4.45/WP.118
Environmental protection and its employment effects on miners in small and artisanal mines in Zimbabwe (Marilyn Carr, David Laurence and Richard Svotwa)	1998	SAP 2.65/WP.119
The impact of globalization on the construction industry Activities of contractors and workers across borders (Ryo Kawano)	1998	SAP 2.66/WP.120
The machinery, electrical and electronic industries in numbers (Maryke Dessing and Olivier Mutter)	1998	SAP 2.67/WP.121
The Dutch flower sector: Structure, trends and employment (Paul Elshof)	1998	SAP 2.68/WP.122
Indigenous peoples and oil development: reconciling conflicting interests (Manuela Tomei)	1998	SAP 2.69/WP.123

Current trends in the flexible organization of working time in Germany: A survey of recent internal agreements in the engineering industry (Christiane Lindecke and Steffen Lehndorff)	1998	SAP 2.70/WP.124
Survival of the flexible in the global economy: Employment security and shopfloor re-organization in two Massachusetts metalworking firms (Bob Farrant)	1998	SAP 2.71/WP.125
The impact of flexible labour market arrangements in the Australian metals and engineering industries (J. Buchanan)	1998	SAP 2.72/WP.126
Employment and industrial relations issues in the cigarette manufacturing industry (Miriam Szapiro)	1998	SAP 2.73/WP.127
Agrarian transition in Viet Nam (Vali Jamal and Karel Jansen)	1999	SAP 2.74/WP.128
Employment and working conditions in the Colombian flower industry (Stefano Farné)	1999	SAP 2.75/WP.129
Small-scale gold mining: Examples from Bolivia, Philippines & Zimbabwe (Edited by Norman S. Jennings)	1999	SAP 2.76/WP.130
Estudio sobre reestructuración portuaria - impacto social Puerto de Buenos Aires (Argentina) (Martín Sgut)	1999	SAP 3.1/WP.131
Estudio sobre reestructuración portuaria - impacto social Puerto de Valparaíso (Chile) (Rodrigo García Bernal)	1999	SAP 3.2/WP.132
Estudio sobre reestructuración portuaria - impacto social Puerto de Buenaventura (Colombia) (Gerardo Solano Gomez y Nazly Fontalvo de Zapata)	1999	SAP 3.3/WP.133
Estudio sobre reestructuración portuaria - impacto social Puerto del Callao (Perú) (Manuel Mogollón Venegas)	1999	SAP 3.4/WP.134

Estudio sobre reestructuración portuaria - impacto social Puerto de Veracruz (México) (Jaime R. Sanchez Diéz)	1999	SAP 3.5/WP.135
L'industrie du textile-habillement en Tunisie: Les besoins des chefs d'entreprise et les conditions de travail des femmes dans les PME (Riad Meddeb)	1999	SAP 2.77/WP.136
Child labour in small-scale mining: Examples from Niger, Peru and the Philippines (Edited by Norman Jennings)	1999	SAP 2.78/WP.137
Employment and working conditions in the Ecuadorian flower industry (Zonia Palán & Carlos Palán)	1999	SAP 2.79/WP.138
The world cut flower industry:Trends and prospects (Gijsbert van Liemt)	1999	SAP 2.80/WP.139
Le travail des enfants dans les petites exploitations minières du Niger: cas des sites de natron, de sel, de gypse et d'orpaillage (Soumaïla Alfa)	1999	SAP 2.81/WP.140
Trabajo infantil en el centro minero artesanal de Mollehuaca - Huanuhuanu - Arequipa - Perú (Zoila Martínez Castilla)	1999	SAP 2.82/WP.141
Estudio monográfico sobre la explotación minera pequeña - Ejemplo de San Simón (Bolivia) (Thomas Hentschel, Diógenes Roque y Evelyn Taucer)	1999	SAP 2.83/WP.142
Structural adjustment and agriculture in Guyana: From crisis to recovery (John Loxley and Vali Jamal)	1999	SAP 2.84/WP.143
Statistics on public sector employment: Methodology, structures and trends (Messaoud Hammouya)	1999	SAP 4.46/WP.144
Statistiques de l'emploi das le secteur public: Méthodologie, structures et tendances (Messaoud Hammouya)	1999	SAP 4.47/WP.145

Actors and the international audiovisual production industries (International Federation of Actors - FIA)	2000	SAP 4.48/WP.146
Risks and dangers in small-scale fisheries: An overview (Menakhem Ben-Yami)	1999	SAP 3.6/WP.147
Impact of the flower industry in Uganda (Patrick K. Asea and Darlison Kaija)	2000	WP.148
Structural adjustment and agriculture in Uganda (John K. Baffoe)	2000	WP.149
Homeworkers: Towards improving their working conditions in the textile, clothing and footwear industries (Catherine Barme)	2000	WP.150
Trends in feminization of the teaching profession in OECD countries 1980-1995 (Cathy Wylie)	2000	WP.151
The cut-flower industry in Tanzania (Haji Hatibu Haji Semboja, Rhoda Mbelwa and Charles Bonaventure)	2000	WP.152
Competition policy and international labour and social relations (postal and telecommunications services, water, gas, electricity) (Claude Duchemin)	2000	WP.153
Politique de la concurrence et relations sociales internationales (postes, télécommunications, eau, gaz, électricité) (Claude Duchemin)	2000	WP.154
Approaches to labour inspection in forestry - problems and solutions	2000	WP.155

The Warp and the Web Organised production and unorganised producers in the informal food processing industry: Case studies of bakeries, savouries establishments and fish processing in the city of Mumbai (Bombay) (Ritu Dewan)	2000	WP.156
Employment and poverty in Sri Lanka: Long-term perspectives (Vali Jamal)	2000	WP.157
Recruitment of educational personnel (Wouter Brandt and Rita Rymenans)	2000	WP.158
L'industrie du textile-habillement au Maroc: Les besoins des chefs d'entreprise et les conditions de travail des femmes dans les PME (Riad Meddeb)	2000	WP.159
L'évolution de la condition des personnels enseignants de l'enseignement supérieur (Thierry Chevaillier)	2000	WP.160
The changing conditions of higher education teaching (Thierry Chevaillier)	2000	WP.161
Working time arrangements in the Australian mining industry: Trends and implications with particular reference to occupational health and safety (Kathryn Heiler, Richard Pickersgill, Chris Briggs)	2000	WP.162
Public participation in forestry in Europe and North America: Report of the Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry	2000	WP.163
