

# WP 6: Requirements of the stakeholders and societal demands

WP leader: Camilla Widmark

Department of Forest Economics, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Camilla.Widmark@slu.se

**Overall purpose** 

- Display and compare policy in the CSRs.
- Provide an in-depth stakeholder analysis including multiple use of forests.
- Display a common understanding of the values of forest management and the value of forest ecosystem services (FES) among stakeholders.
- Qualify and quantify current and future wood utilisation pathways.
- Develop an algorithm to forecast wood quality and timber assortments from silviculture management concepts.
- Future scenarios for improving FES provision and forest wood value chain.
- Synthesis and recommend best practices to reach a common understanding on forest management concepts, FES and their values between different stakeholders, based upon above mentioned targets.

## Task 6.1 – Policy analysis

Policy analysis include analysing forest-relevant policies and the results show that forest-related policies differ between the CSRs combining soft and hard policy and that policy are coherent across forest and climate in general.

	Catalonia (ES)	Estonia	Grisons (CH)	Hesse and Thuringia (DE)
Policy instruments Hard/Soft	Combination of <b>H/S</b> instruments	Combination of <b>H/S</b> instruments	Combination of <b>H/S</b> instruments	Combination of <b>H/S</b> instruments
	Hard in FO,CC,BIO Sanctions, Financial mechanism Soft in EN, BEC Strategies	Hard in FO,EN,BIO Sanctions, Licences Soft in BEC, CC License, subsidy without sanctions	<ul> <li>Hard in FO Sanction</li> <li>Soft in EN, BEC, BIO, CC Obligations but no sanctions</li> </ul>	Hard in FO Sanctions, Fines, Monitoring and enforcement systems <b>Soft</b> in CC, EN, BIO Obligations with controls

## Task 6.3 – public and FES

In this task, a survey to public was circulated. A total of 4000 responses was collected. The results shows that the most important FES to public are overall clean air and water followed by carbon storage.

Among the least important hunting, berry–picking and culture values are noted.

## Task 6.4 – forest utilization pathways

Policy coherence	High across	High across	High across & BIO/EN	High across
$\operatorname{High}/\operatorname{Low}$	FO/CC/BIO	FO/CC	CC/FO	FO/CC
	Low across EN/BEC	Low across EN/BEC/BIO	Low across BIO/EN	Low across BIO/EN

Note: BIO=Biodiversity, BEC=Bioeconomy, CC=Climate, EN=Energy, FO=Forest

In this task, data on forest and the forest wood value chain was collected. The purpose was to understand the properties of the wood value chain in each of the CSRs.

### Task 6.2 – forest stakeholders

In the stakeholder analysis, key stakeholders in the CSRs were interviewed to understand their preferences connected to FES. Among the results, the supporting services (e.g., air and water, soil and nutrients) were among the most important.

Grazing and fuelwood together with berries and mushrooms were of least importance.



### Task 6.5 – possible future of forest and wood value chain

In order to understand what future challenges forest and forest wood value chain stakeholders may face, four scenarios was developed. The theoretical framework of PESTEL was used – a way to reveal what factors affect stakeholders.



■ Not important ■ Rather important ■ Very important

#### **CONTACT INFO:**

www.oneforest.eu // info@oneforest.eu // Twitter @Oneforest\_H2020 // LinkedIn @one-forest-h2020



#### \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement Nº 101000406.

institutions Preliminary results

#### Task 6.6 – Best practice

In this task, the results of ONEforest come together in a guide to stakeholders and policy makers on the future of forest ecosystem services, forest management and the forest wood value chain. The aim is to reflect on the knowledge developed during the project to be useful for local, national and EU policymakers.