



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 – WG5 Meeting on Coppice Governance Factsheet
Vinkovci, Croatia
3 - 4 March 2016

Action participants:

Debbie Bartlett; Ruben Laina; Alicia Unrau; Miljenko Zupanic

Rapporteur: Debbie Bartlett

Agenda: produce fact sheet and consider review paper

The data collected from the case study countries, England, Croatia, Germany, Italy, Spain and Serbia had been collated and circulated to WG5 members prior to the meeting. The data was presented in columns for ease of comparison.

Each of the headings, agreed at the meeting in Madrid, was discussed and the similarities and differences between countries recorded in text format where possible to make it more readable.

While some countries have apparently robust data regarding coppice others admit the complexity of definitions, itself an interesting fact. This is further complicated by the lack of a common understanding of what constitutes coppice or, perhaps more importantly, woodland/forest actively managed as coppice.

We agree that there are research questions to be answered and that these will be refined in the closing paragraph of the fact sheet and we will look at ways of taking this forward.

Most of those involved in the COST Action are forest technologists and so may not have a clear understanding of what is actually happening on the ground (and this was confirmed at the conference in England; the data in the green sheets collected during the participatory exercise undertaken at this event has been analysed but it is difficult to see how to include this in the fact sheet). Most of the small forest areas are privately owned and, where formal governance structures exist the extent to which this is impacting on the coppice sector is not clear.

The issue of producing a review paper so that the data/information collected is not wasted was discussed and it was agreed that DB would take this forward with the International Review of Forestry in the first instance.