

Work Group 5 meeting notes

University of Antwerp 15th June 2016

Attended by:

Debbie Bartlett	d.bartlett@gre.ac.uk
Patrick Jansen	patrick@trackstrails.nl
Ruben Laina	ruben.laina@upm.es;
Nenad Petrovic	nenadpet@tehnicom.net;
Miljenko Zupanic	zupanicm@sumins.hr;
Eulalia Gomez Martin	eugomar1990@gmail.com

Members not able to attend:

Giulio Sperandio	giulio.sperandio@crea.gov.it
Amaia Albizua	amaiaabc3@gmail.com

The agenda had been sent out with a review of the WG 5 OUTPUTS required to be completed before the end of the COST Action in October 2017, as listed below:

1. Identify governance issues related to CFM, particularly with respect to ownership and access.
2. Analyse barriers to the development of the traditional coppice business sector, particularly with respect to the current legislative context, and explore governance-related solutions to these barriers.
3. Explore lessons to be learnt from traditional community-based/cooperative (or similar) CFM governance models for present-day fragmented, small-scale forest ownership patterns.
4. Organize a conference on coppice forests ownership and governance – what can we learn for current CFM issues and small-scale forestry?

We have completed the fact sheet (Output 1) and held a conference (Output 4) so what remains is to

- Analyse barriers to coppice management and suggest ways these can be overcome (Output 2) and
- explore the relationship between coppice and small scale woodland management/forest (Output 3).

DISCUSSION: we reviewed the issues affecting/barriers to coppice adding to the list already identified in the fact sheet. It was agreed that the most appropriate way to achieve Output 2 would be to draft a review paper, possibly for publication in IRF, and to include authors from at least three different countries (thereby hitting another target of the Action). This will cover barriers and potential solutions.

Examples of common/collaborative ownership have, to date, not been available in any detail although there are thought to be some isolated examples in Germany. In this discussion it emerged that there are examples in Serbia, dating back to 1903, and historic examples in the Netherlands, although this was dissolved as a result of a law of 1886. In Spain there are areas owned by local government that could possibly be considered in this category (which needs to be clearly defined) and there have been unsuccessful attempts to bring together different landowners to collaborate.

We agreed that the governance situation of coppice is complex, consisting of a chain of linked elements and that it is unlikely that identifying and resolving any single barrier will achieve overall success. Agent Based Modelling is a commonly used technique to clarify complex 'problems' and to predict/understand the potential consequences of intervention at various points in the supply chain. It was agreed that exploring the potential of applying this method to coppice could be interesting.

AGREED ACTIONS

To move forward the group has been split as follows:

Eulalia & Rueben to look at ABM and report back on the feasibility of applying this to understand various coppice scenarios.

Miljenko & Debbie to begin drafting

PAPER A: A review of the barriers to development of small scale coppice forest management. IRF have expressed interest Aim: to submit by November

- step 1 Patrick to complete data on the Netherlands
- step 2 Debbie to integrate the list of issues from the fact sheet and today's discussion

Nedad & Patrick to begin work on the paper on various different collaborative structures to address the issue of small scale coppice ownership

PAPER B: Traditional community based Coppice Forest Management as solution for present fragmented small scale forest ownership. Target journals: Small Scale Forestry, International Journal of Commons. Aim: to submit December

We need to collaborate with another Work Group and the most appropriate would be WG 3 regarding markets. Debbie has discussed and Dave Rossney will provide information that could be used in modelling.