



COST ACTION FP1301

“Innovative management and multifunctional utilization of traditional coppice forests - an answer to future ecological, economic and social challenges in the European forestry sector (EuroCoppice)”

Minutes of the 2nd WG Meeting of the WG 5

**Greenwich University
3-5 November, 2014**

Minutes Summary

Participants:

Debbie Bartlett	Marco Conedera
Indrek Jakobson	Patrick Jansen
Julija Konstantinaviciene	Patrick Krebs
Ruben Laina	Miljenko Zupanic

WG Leader: Debbie Bartlett

Rapporteur: Debbie Bartlett

Welcome

Agenda

Debbie Bartlett presented the agenda and asks for approval. The agenda was approved without amendments.

Point 1 Work Plan

The meeting began with reconsideration of our brief from the COST Action document which gives us the following work plan:

- 1. Compiling different governance concepts related to CFM with special regard to ownership and utilization rights.*
- 2. Analysing how these traditional concepts fit into existing “modern” forest legislation and elaborate possible contradictions and conflicts.*
- 3. Developing ideas and deriving concepts to introduce traditional coppice forest governance into small scale forestry issues.*
- 4. Organize a conference on coppice forests ownership and governance – what can we learn for small scale forestry?*



Point 2 Progress to date

Although responses to the request for details for each country under the headings agreed at Florence have been received – and are informative and interesting - it is not easy to see how these can be used effectively to meet the requirements of the brief. Further it seems unlikely that the same level of detail can be obtained for all the countries involved in the action.

Marco suggested that species should be included as, for example, there is industrial chestnut in Switzerland but no longer for beech as the purpose (the 'driver') for coppicing this species has been lost. Perhaps we should be focusing on the past, present and future relating to different species.

Point 2 The November Event - do you feel that this will provide adequate material for us to start a review paper?

- 1) The seminar on Wednesday has been organised specifically to present different stakeholder's perspectives on coppice here in South East England. This will give an overview of governance and access issues and sheets will be given to all the delegates so they can record, during or after each short presentation, the situation in their country. You might think this is ambitious but - even if we only get incomplete responses - it will begin to widen out our work.

It was suggested that a reminder slide was used before and after each presentation to remind people to complete their sheets (this was made but not actually used)

- 2) My students will be asking everyone to write the key issues for the coppice industry for their country on flip charts during the breaks. The information sheet sent to all delegates asks everyone to think about this before they come (and this includes all of you!) so hopefully we will be able to expand this section as well.

Point 4 At the last meeting it was suggested that that **the next meeting** should consider Oral history, traditional knowledge and gender issues as well as define the topic of the first peer reviewed paper. How will we do this?

Marco reported that there are many oral history sources for the countryside e.g. women collecting leaf litter for animal bedding, and branches for fodder. It is likely that this is the case for other countries but how will we find time to access this and compile information? Perhaps this needs a narrower scope and we should focus on a few countries and specific contexts (chestnut in Italy, UK, Spain and England? Comments please).

Consensus that little has been done on oral history/traditional management. Switzerland – oral history written local by laws for each village mostly for fuelwood harvesting. To what extent has the traditional industry completely disappeared – here still trad chestnut but not other species. Italy (chestnut and Quercus sp; ?Robinia); France chestnut/Spain Eucalyptus (C20th onwards) chestnut (basket making). Lithuania – coppice system was and is not widely use. It is starting now to exist and slowly increase mostly in short rotation as energy wood plantations (2014 – about 2500 ha). Robinia is an invasive species but is also used in coppicing (50 ha).

The gender issue is little problematic. It was reported that there are many women in the voluntary sector and that they have a role in doing the paperwork, administration and sometimes marketing. The comment was made that paperwork is a recent phenomenon and some still work without any. (it wasn't mentioned at the meeting but is IT literacy an access and therefore a governance issue?) Risk management and insurance are recent additions to conventional paperwork such as invoicing.

Coppicing – it happened everywhere but the history of coppicing in the EU countries is very different as a function of growing conditions, local markets, history, politics and cultural background.

In some countries the coppice issue is related to the tannin production (e.g. oak coppice in NE and F, chestnut in I and CH).

It was proposed that we could list which species are used as a coppice in which country (and if possible to which extent ..). This could end up in a synoptic map and produce new information not available at the moment. The rationale for this is that tradition can only be seen in the context of the resource (although I am concerned that this would overlap with the work of other WGs)

The discussion then turned back to Governance. What does governance mean? Why is it needed? It was reported that in some countries, such as Finland the level of state control is decreasing rapidly although this was not the case in other countries. How does this relate to sustainability? This led to the question how has the political, social and economic context affected governance for the coppice sector? Patrick Jansen asked how this is possible to unravel as the Netherlands, for example, is made up of 12 previously autonomous provinces

An attempt was made to list political, social, economic and environmental factors. (This could be re-framed as a PEST analysis as so include technological factors)

Political (strategic level)	national government state forest service regional government local government subsidies freedom of movement (EU legislation)
Social (operational)	collectivisation/private/public Health and safety Insurance
Economics	markets (subsidies) Management/Supply chain costs Labour/ pensions/ sick pay/
Environmental	EPS National protection SAC/national reserves

The idea of creating a matrix based on these so that the level of influence of each (high, medium, low) could be identified for each issue and each country. Using different time periods might enable prediction of future trends. (a draft has been circulated for comment)

Change in rational of laws could be an interesting area for exploration. In the past these were related to power and WHO controlled the resource but now these relate to HOW management is carried out. Biodiversity/environmental factors increased in importance during the 1980s and now the focus is on the ecosystem service approach. It was noted that change tends to be slow in Nordic countries as there are such high areas of forest.

The wide range of definitions for SRC was discussed. In Estonia it can be 30 years while it is much shorter in some other countries.

It was suggested that an online survey could be used to follow up the green papers (the sheets delegates filled in on Wednesday) and the matrix. These might enable **dates when there was a turning point for the coppice industry in each country to be identified. It was suggested that governance might not turn out to be very important.**

Point 5 We need to develop a plan for the next 6 months and provide feedback on progress to the meeting on Wednesday

- Analyse green sheets
- Analyse flip charts
- Pilot matrix
- Plan review paper