

Inter-sectoral coordination in European forest governance

Evelien Verbij
Forest and Nature Policy Group
Supervisors: Prof. Dr. H. Schanz and Dr. E. Turnhout



Foretaste...

“I think forest policy does not really exist, most things effecting forestry are horizontal problems which come from other sectors. So, I am always very amused when I hear the debate of the MCPFE and somewhere else: forestry has to open up and so on... we always were ... So, that's the typical thinking of civil servants” (*Austrian Forest Owners Association*)



Assumptions behind inter-sectoral coordination:

- “sectors are objectively given structures”
- “and coordination takes place between sectors”
- “and this is something special, requiring special coordination instruments”

Sources: e.g. de Montalembert 1992, 1995; Schmithüsen et al. 2001; 2003; Hogl 2001; UNCED 1992; IPF/IFF 1996; FAO 1996; EC 1999; MCPFE 2003)



BUT:

- Conceptualization of ‘forest sector’?
- Does coordination take place between sectors?
- And is an NFP an example of such a ‘special instrument’?

Starting point of my study is integral understanding:

SECTORIZATION



Conceptualization of sectorization (1)

<i>Challenges</i>	<i>Expressed in</i>	<i>Continuously</i>
Internal events		Setting
External events		 Adapting Maintaining
Restructuring	Sector boundaries	Stabilizing

Conceptualization of sectorization (2):

- Organizational - actors and relationships
- Behavioural - identity and relevance
- Linguistically – framing motive

- Actor-oriented perspective: different perceptions on 'sector boundaries'

Austria



- “The most important criteria to be part of the forest sector is that you are within the family”
- “Forestry economics makes the forest sector to be the forest sector”
- “Thinking besides traditional ways is growing because of low income...”
- “Forest policy very small ... some people even say that if the international task wouldn't have come, it would be very hard to still have a forest section in the Ministry”

Example: Austrian Wald Dialog

- “I think the core part of the Wald Dialog is to fulfill the requirements of the MCPFE”
- “I think, the end justifies the means. If we really want to come up with an European forest policy ... and if we really can only reach that over a Wald Dialog, than we have to do it ... you always have to tell yourself that this is for a higher aim ...”
- “Our part in the Wald Dialog is that we must prevent that the forests in Austria can not be used any more ...”
- “For the professionals in the sector it is another game with the same cards...”
- “The Wald Dialog is more a conversation platform ...”
- “Wald Dialog is a nice thing but we are most involved as owners ... a user comes in the weekend, but we have to live of it”
- “I think in the end some are more equal than others and this is like here: forest sector and outsiders”

Example: Nature for People, People for Nature

(NvM)

- “The Netherlands has no long term forest policy ... we have NvM of our friends of LNV and that document has only one line that refers to forestry: maintaining and facilitating current level of timber harvesting”
- “NvM is an integrated plan ... but we also need a sectoral plan to give directions for the forestry sector, to know what they can expect from the government ... well, and LNV does not want that, and surprising, also the forest organizations don't want that ... and that partly comes from the fact that people working with the Ministry no longer are specialists, I don't even talk about wood, but forests is also getting difficult because it is all about nature”
- “Netherlands has no NFP, although LNV will say that we do have one within NvM, but if they (sector) would say that there is no NFP than they have the opportunity to jointly set up an NFP and ask for administrative commitment ... so whether we have an NFP or not to a large extend depends on the activities of the sector self”
- “Basically, there is still some attention for forests, less than there used to be, but the spirit still is present within NvM. And the major added value of NvM is a clear distinction between the responsibilities of the government and of the responsibilities of the sector”



Analyses Netherlands:

- *Organizational*: a small hard core group of individuals based on a high level of familiarity BUT dynamics!
- *Behavioural*: search for recognition for their shared identity based on 'wood production' BUT dynamics!
- *Linguistically*: from 'forestry', to 'forest management', to 'site-management'
- **SO**: is there still a forest sector??



Comparison: what is meant by 'forest sector'?

- Shift **in time** in how forest sectors are constructed
- Forest sectors **differ in different countries**
- **Diversity within countries** in constructing sectors

As a result: delineation of 'forest sector' is **problematic** and depends on **context**



And what about 'coordination between sectors'?

Conceptualization of 'forest sector' determines expectations towards coordination between 'sectors'

Depending on context of subregion, country, region:

- Who are in or out and how are they related?
- What is their shared identity and how is this identity expressed?
 - How to linguistically make sense within broader society?



To conclude

- Inter-sectoral coordination part of a broader sectorization process
- Coordination increasingly important as part of general governance trend towards integration
- People will always need boundaries – fundamental fact of life – should remain reflexive on these boundaries!!!

Questions?

© Wageningen UR

