

resent and future role of forest resources in the socio-economic development of rural areas

*Rome, 23<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> June 2011* 

#### PLENARY SESSION 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2011

## Rural Development Policies and Forestry: the point of view of centralnorth European Countries

Norbert Weber

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DRESDEN

Professor of Forest Policy and Forest Resource Economics Dresden University of Technology

nweber@forst.tu-dresden.de

### Outline

- 1. Rural areas and regional types of forestry
- 2. Differing perceptions of forests and forestry
- 3. Actual and future role of forestry in IRD programmes
- 4. Conclusions

## **Rural areas in the EU**

"The overall picture for rural areas in the EU is increasingly diverse...:

some regions are facing decline with young people leaving and land abandoned,

while others are among the most dynamic in the EU"

Agricultural Policy Perspectives Briefs No. 4, January 2011

### **Rural area classes:**

- Rural area with urban characteristics
- Diversified rural area
- Agricultural/growth area
- Agricultural /decline area
- Remote area
- traditional areas
- afforestation areas

Elands & Wiersum 2003

### **Country groups and types of forestry**



#### SOEF 2011, IIASA 2007/IEEP 2010

### **Forest issues in Northern Europe**

- Boreal forests
- Forest sector mostly privately-owned
- Well organized
- Focussed on wood production
- Strong commitment to achieving environmental objectives
- Areas of concern:
  - Eutrophication
  - Forest biodiversity



### **Forest Issues in Central-West-Europe**

- Not central to economy or society
- Strong reactions to threats to forests
- densely populated countries, forests primarily in rural and mountaineous areas
- Stable and well-resourced forest institutions (?)
- Areas of concern:
  - Eutrophication
  - fragmentation
  - Negative net entrepreneurial revenues (some)



- Negligible share of wood in total energy supply (some)
- Small share of the total workforce engaged in forest sector

#### SOEF 2011

## **Forest issues by Country Groups**

### Group I (Austria, Finland, Norway, Sweden):

- wood production as a key forest function
- forestry an important sector in the national economy
- forest areas of the countries large, both relatively and absolutely

### Group II (Belgium, the Netherlands):

- agricultural sector strong/agricultural land use dominates
- high population pressure
- forestry a marginal sector in the national economy
- forest areas small, forest properties fragmented
- other land uses dominate forest land use

### Group III (Denmark, Ireland, Switzerland, United Kingdom) Group V (France, Germany)

Kankaanpää & Carter 2004 b, modified

## **Forest issues by Country Groups (2)**

- Group III (Denmark, Ireland, Switzerland, United Kingdom)
- other forest functions than wood production also important (such as protection function in Switzerland)
- other forest products than timber (Christmas trees, foliage etc.)
- forestry of little importance in national economy
- afforestation/forest area increase envisaged
- forest areas small, relatively and in absolute terms

### • Group V (France, Germany)

- large forest areas in absolute terms, forests parcelled
- per capita forest area less than in the northern countries
- other land uses dominate forest land use
- high population pressure
- wood production as important forest function

## Regional differences: first and second most important topic when thinking about forests



## Regional comparison:

most important topics when it comes to forests (in totals and percentage)

|                                                                                  | Regiona        | comparis | on              |       |                |       |               |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-------|---------------|-------|
|                                                                                  | Eastern region |          | Southern region |       | Western region |       | Nordic region |       |
|                                                                                  | Question 4     |          | Question 4      |       | Question 4     |       | Question 4    |       |
|                                                                                  | Count          | %        | Count           | %     | Count          | %     | Count         | %     |
| Conservation, restoration<br>and protection                                      | 4              | 6,2%     | 4               | 13,8% | 7              | 18,9% | 1             | 4,8%  |
| Climate change                                                                   | 1              | 1,5%     | 3               | 10,3% | 4              | 10,8% | 2             | 9,5%  |
| Environmental issues;<br>forest health and pollution                             | 4              | 6,2%     | 1               | 3,4%  | 2              | 5,4%  | 1             | 4,8%  |
| Forest fires                                                                     |                |          | 9               | 31,0% |                |       |               |       |
| Recreation and accessibility                                                     | 11             | 16,9%    | 3               | 10,3% | 8              | 21,6% | 4             | 19,0% |
| Bio- and Landscape<br>diversity                                                  | 7              | 10,8%    | 1               | 3,4%  | 5              | 13,5% | 4             | 19,0% |
| Forest management,<br>sustainability and<br>economic use                         | 6              | 9,2%     | 5               | 17,2% | 4              | 10,8% | 4             | 19,0% |
| Deforestation,<br>overexploitation and<br>illegal activities                     | 11             | 16,9%    | 1               | 3,4%  | 2              | 5,4%  | 3             | 14,3% |
| Ecosystem services<br>(clean water & air, non-<br>timber products,<br>bioenergy) | 12             | 18,5%    |                 |       | 3              | 8,1%  | 1             | 4,8%  |
| Symbolic and aesthetic values                                                    | 6              | 9,2%     | 1               | 3,4%  | 1              | 2,7%  |               |       |
| Other                                                                            | 3              | 4,6%     | 1               | 3,4%  | 1              | 2,7%  | 1             | 4,8%  |
|                                                                                  |                |          |                 |       |                |       |               |       |

[Source: ECORYS]

Regional comparison: important topics for the younger generation when it comes to forests

|                                                                                  | Regional comparison |          |                 |       |                |       |               |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-------|---------------|-------|
|                                                                                  | Easterr             | n region | Southern region |       | Western region |       | Nordic region |       |
|                                                                                  | Ques                | tion 5   | Question 5      |       | Question 5     |       | Question 5    |       |
|                                                                                  | Count               | %        | Count           | %     | Count          | %     | Count         | %     |
| Conservation, restoration<br>and protection                                      | 3                   | 5,3%     | 5               | 18,5% | 5              | 15,6% | 2             | 11,8% |
| Climate change                                                                   | 1                   | 1,8%     | 1               | 3,7%  | 3              | 9,4%  |               |       |
| Environmental issues;<br>forest health and pollution                             | 4                   | 7,0%     | 2               | 7,4%  | 6              | 18,8% | 1             | 5,9%  |
| Forest fires                                                                     | 1                   | 1,8%     | 2               | 7,4%  |                |       |               |       |
| Recreation and accessibility                                                     | 21                  | 36,8%    | 5               | 18,5% | 10             | 31,3% | 5             | 29,4% |
| Bio- and Landscape diversity                                                     | 5                   | 8,8%     | 5               | 18,5% | 5              | 15,6% | 3             | 17,6% |
| Forest management,<br>sustainability and<br>economic use                         | 6                   | 10,5%    | 1               | 3,7%  | 1              | 3,1%  | 4             | 23,5% |
| Deforestation,<br>overexploitation and<br>illegal activities                     | 3                   | 5,3%     |                 |       | 1              | 3,1%  |               |       |
| Ecosystem services<br>(clean water & air, non-<br>timber products,<br>bioenergy) | 5                   | 8,8%     | 2               | 7,4%  |                |       | 1             | 5,9%  |
| Awareness-raising                                                                |                     |          | 1               | 3,7%  |                |       |               |       |
| Symbolic and aesthetic values                                                    | 1                   | 1,8%     | 1               | 3,7%  | 1              | 3,1%  |               |       |
| Other                                                                            | 7                   | 12.3%    | 2               | 7.4%  |                |       | 1             | 5,9%  |

[Source: ECORYS]

## Regional comparison: public opinion about the importance of different forest benefits

|                                         | Regional comparison |       |            |                  |            |                |            |                     |  |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|------------|------------------|------------|----------------|------------|---------------------|--|
|                                         | Eastern region      |       | Souther    | outhern region W |            | Western region |            | Nordic region       |  |
|                                         | Question 9          |       | Question 9 |                  | Question 9 |                | Question 9 |                     |  |
|                                         | Count               | %     | Count      | %                | Count      | %              | Count      | %                   |  |
| Preserving biodiversity                 | 16                  | 20,8% | 6          | 18,2%            | 13         | 29,5%          | 6          | 23,1%               |  |
| Regulating climate                      | 9                   | 11,7% | 9          | 27,3%            | 11         | 25,0%          | 2          | 7,7%                |  |
| Providing biomass for<br>energy         | 11                  | 14,3% | 4          | 12,1%            | 3          | 6,8%           | 9          | 34,6%               |  |
| Providing wood as<br>renewable material | 14                  | 18,2% | 4          | 12, <b>1%</b>    | 2          | 4,5%           | 1          | 3 <mark>,</mark> 8% |  |
| Providing opportunities for recreation  | 23                  | 29,9% | 10         | 30,3%            | 13         | 29,5%          | 6          | 23,1%               |  |
| Other economic use                      | 2                   | 2,6%  |            |                  | 1          | 2,3%           | 2          | 7,7%                |  |
| Other                                   | 2                   | 2,6%  |            |                  | 1          | 2,3%           |            |                     |  |

[Source: ECORYS]

### Variety of national forestry measures in RDP

#### Most Member States

- outlined the role of forestry as a multi-functional activity in their national Rural Development Programmes (RDPs), and
- placed substantial responsibility on forestry to deliver a number of public goods.
- Some Member States, such as France and Germany, specify the importance of forestry in helping to address climate change.
- Forestry measured included in all programmes, except those of Malta and Ireland

## Perceptions mirrored in national forestry measures in RDPs

| Forestry Measure                                    | Member states    |  |  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Processing and marketing of forestry products       | Finland, France  |  |  |
| Forests as ecological corridors                     | Netherlands      |  |  |
| Urban forests (creating urban green space networks) | Netherlands      |  |  |
| Forests and sustainable water management policy     | Netherlands      |  |  |
| Enhancement and expansion of native woodland        | Ireland          |  |  |
| Support for agro-forestry                           | Finland          |  |  |
| Wood as an energy source                            | Finland, Germany |  |  |
| Sustainability and biodiversity guidelines          | Ireland          |  |  |

### The role of forestry in IRD programmes

- Policy integration is a challenge for forestry (rural governance, new rural paradigm, neo-endogenous rural development, integrated rural development)
- Until today forestry plays a minor role in IRD
  - Sectors tend to avoid being coordinated by sector-external entities and programmes
  - Forestry lacks the ability, resources, institutional preconditions for cooperation
  - refusal among forestry actors (agricultural bias)

## The role of forestry in IRD programmes (2)



- participation of forestry is a question of willingness, ability, opportunities
- Are there specific factors of success for participation of forestry in IRD programs?

Giessen & Krott 2008; Ortner 2008

## Factors of success for participation of forestry in IRD

- 1. Resources
- 2. Dedicated promotors
- 3. Problem pressure *and* willingness to find solutions
- 4. Win-win-situations
- 5. Allies
- 6. Strong advocates
- 7. Active management of the "project foreign policy"
- 8. Competency in processes, give-and-take, ability to learn
- 9. Connectivity

### **Future potential of forestry and FBIs**

- important role in rural economies
- strong potential to contribute to a sustainable future of Europe, for instance in the following fields:
  - Recreation and tourism;
  - Nature protection, biodiversity conservation and landscape amenities;
  - Protective functions such as against natural hazards;
  - Bio-energy production
  - climate change mitigation
  - Bio-based products, including food, fibres, chemicals and wood construction



## **Conclusions (1)**

- Fundamental differences in forest resources, ownership, role of forests, their societal perception and the institutional set-up in the countries in this group (e.g. Netherlands, Finland)
- Forestry measures in IRD underfunded for a long time, bureaucratic procedures - positive tendency now
- forestry participation in IRD is promising and challenging at the same time



## **Conclusions (2)**

- Key issues for forestry in rural areas in Central-North European countries
  - production and competitiveness vs. amenity
  - bio-based energy and sustainability
  - integration vs. segregation/wilderness
  - rural identity, urban-rural interface, "rural islands"
  - natural desasters







### *Rome, 23<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> June 2011*

Present and future role of forest resources in the socio-economic development of rural areas





esent and future role of forest resources in the socio-economic development of rural areas

*Rome, 23<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> June 2011* 

# Rural area classes and predominant value orientation

| Rural areas                           | Predominant value orientation                                                      |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rural area with urban characteristics | Urban based values                                                                 |
| Diversified area                      | Combination of urban and rural based values                                        |
| Agricultural/growth area              | Traditional rural based values<br>emphasizing agricultural production<br>processes |
| Agricultural/decline area             | Traditional rural based values<br>emphasizing agricultural production<br>processes |
| Remote area                           | Increasing flux of urban based values due to impact of migrants and tourists       |

Elands & Wiersum 2003