

**Making International Forest Policies Work at National Level
- Experiences from the National Forest Programmes
(NFPs)
in
Germany and India**

By

Pradipta Halder

MSc, European Forestry (2005-07)

University of Joensuu, Finland

Supervised by

Mr. Georg Winkel and Mr. Michael Memmler

of

Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy

Albert-Ludwigs University, Freiburg, Germany

Structure of the Presentation

- Introduction – objectives of the research study, methods of information collection, framework of the report
- Overview of NFP in Germany
- Overview of NFP in India (known as National Forestry Action Programme (NFAP))
- Key findings from stakeholder consultation

Why I selected this study?

- Working on one of the most important international forest programmes at the moment
- Understanding the complexities of formulation and implementation of international forest policies at national level
- Analyzing the approaches towards the NFPs in the two countries
- Finding strengths and weaknesses of both the country initiatives

Methods of Collection of Information

- Literature review on NFPs

• Telephonic Interviews and Email Exchanges

What is an NFP?

- **It is a forest planning process** done differently in different countries but based on a common set of guiding principles.
- These principles evolved from the Rio Summit in 1992 and later they have been the main focal points of IPF/IFF Proposals for Action and currently within the framework of UNFF.
- **Basic Principles are :**
 1. Sustainability of forest development
 2. National Sovereignty and Country Leadership
 3. Partnership between all stakeholders
 4. Participation and consensus building of all interested partners
 5. Holistic and Inter-sectoral approach
 6. A long-term iterative process
 7. Capacity building of national institutions and key actors
 8. Policy and Institutional Reforms
 9. Consistency with the National Policy Framework and Global Initiatives
 10. Raising Awareness
 11. National Policy Commitment
 12. International Commitment

NFP in Germany

1999-2000: First phase of NFP

- A social dialogue process to elaborate a national forest programme (NFP) was initiated by the BML in October 1999
- Invitation for active participation was open to the stakeholders related with the forestry activities
- Several round table meetings resulted in identification of five broad areas and 148 recommendations for future action

Overview on the broad areas for future action

- **Forests and society**
- **Forests and biological diversity** –close to nature forestry programmes and safeguarding genetic diversity of forest trees and shrubs
- **Role of forests in the global carbon cycle** - Conservation of forest areas and promotion of forest expansion; silvicultural measures to increase carbon storage in forests; greater use of wood as a raw material and source of energy
- **Importance of wood as a renewable resource** - framework conditions for the sale of wood and promoting the use of wood; certification of sustainable forest management/labelling of wood
- **Contribution of forestry and forest industries to development of rural areas**

Criticisms

- **Several topics remained undealt**
- **The procedures applied met with criticism from some actors**
- **Several topics had not yet been dealt with intensely enough**
- **Defined needs for action did not include concrete timeframes and actors**

2001-2003: Second phase of NFP

- Development of **“Guide for the Organization of the National Forest Programme”** which was mainly responsible “to make the process as binding as possible”
- **Special importance on**
 - **International dimension of the NFP**
 - **Biological diversity; forest management and nature conservation**
 - **New role (s) for forest like wilderness, large area landscape design and recreational activities like leisure forestry and eco-tourism**

Development of NFP process in India

- **National Forestry Action Programme (NFAP)** started by the recommendations of the IPF/IFF proposals
- Project formulation started in 1993 and completed in 1999
- Financially supported by UNDP and technically by FAO
- The document is a comprehensive work plan for the next twenty years to achieve the sustainable development of 76.5 million ha forests and also to increase the forest cover to 33 per cent

NFAP emphasizes on.....

- **Protection of existing forest resources**
 - protection from human and cattle population
- **Improvement of forest productivity**
 - new propagation techniques, enrichment of soil, improved nursery management techniques and selection of better native tree species
- **Reduction of total demand**
 - 147 million people live in close proximity of the forests who rely on non-timber forest products for their livelihoods
- **Strengthening of policy and institutional framework**
 - coordination between the central govt., the state govt(s), research institutions
- **Expansion of forest area**
 - bringing one-third of the country area under forest cover
 - “culturable wastelands”, covering 13.94 million ha and part of the “fallow land” covering 9.89 million ha, are potential areas for afforestation

Key Findings from Stakeholder Consultation (NFP in Germany)

Points of Discussion

- Stakeholder participation
 - Conflicts
 - Cross-sectoral coordination
 - International commitment
 - Country's sovereignty
 - Capacity building of stakeholders
 - Implementation of NFP
-
- Personal Satisfaction

Stakeholder Participation

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
Representatives of relevant stakeholders invited and participated	Representatives of relevant stakeholders invited and participated but	Representatives of relevant stakeholders invited and participated	Representatives of relevant stakeholders invited and participated	Representatives of relevant stakeholders invited and participated
Not all participated in the same capacity, e.g., Traffic and Building Ministry	Tourism Ministry were not present	“It was the best participation process I ever took part”	Local people were not invited and this was not possible	“Important actors for policy like Ministry for Finance took part in a very low level”

Conflicts and Conflicts Resolution

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF- Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
There were conflicts among the stakeholders regarding broad issues of forests	Conflicts regarding role of BMVEL; traditional conflicts; new conflicts like between the forest owners and the timber industry and the paper industry	Conflicts between environmental Organizations, private forest owners and state forest administration	Conflicts between biodiversity goal and economic goal	Conflicts between nature protection coalition and forestry coalition
Participants were asked to work in mixed working groups. In the 182 proposals for action, everybody can find their own interests	Independent monitoring and independent moderator were two conflict resolution mechanisms in the second phase	Conflicts are still existing and compromises are on the paper only	Conflicts are still existing	Dissentious procedure was adopted to try to solve conflicts. But conflicts are still existing

Cross-sectoral Coordination

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
All the relevant ministries were invited	All the relevant ministries were invited	All the ministries and states participated and discussed. But lack in coordination	The ministry has done its best to reach cross-sectoral organizations	BMVEL tried make these plans as intersectoral but on the other side they were very sectoral
Not all the ministries have the same capacity to join the discussions on NFP	Overlapping between BMU and BMVEL	Lot of conflicts among public stakeholders. Conflict between BMVEL and BMU was severe	But the ministry on environment did not cooperate positively	They try to coordinate with other ministries but political reality is also rivalry

International Commitment

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
International commitments were discussed like biological diversity, illegal logging, international trade and economic cooperation	All the thematic issues discussed during the round table meetings	It has not been dealt well enough at this moment	International treaties were discussed like CBD.	They tried to get together the international treaties and national interests
NFP is a bridge between international level and national level	But it is difficult to coordinate with all the issues and also implement	Environmental NGOs are very skeptical about these aspects	Top-down approaches of international treaties were also discussed	It is very difficult to judge aspects of every treaty

Country's Sovereignty

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
We take the stakeholder participation from international level, then discuss this in national level and then ask them to take it in the local level	Germany has NFP at the federal level and also small NFPs at the sixteen federal states level going on which are based on local needs	Federal states are aware of their local needs.	The essence of national NFP is not to address local needs. Local or regional NFPs should address them	NFP is much less important than other binding laws coming down to the national level. So, I do not see the danger from NFP.
NFP is truly the connecting part to the international level and to the local level.	National process has an important function to give certain guidance to the states how the NFP works	But compromises on the paper do not mean that anything change on the local level	If NFP is implemented in a bottom-up approach then the local needs would be more important than the international agreements	It is not addressing local needs due to lack of implementation at local level

Capacity building of Federal States

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
Sates have the capacity to take care of their own forest affairs	All states have quite good administrative capacity. So, they do not need help in capacity building from the federal level	Not all states have the same capacity. There have been some states like Baden-Wurttemberg who did their own forest programme	There are differences in competencies based on the forestry activities	All the states in Germany have quite good administrative capacity. So, they did not need help in capacity building from the federal level
Sometimes BMVEL takes innovative ideas from the states	But they have information gap regarding international treaties	Majority of the states will not implement the national forest programme	Capacity building can be done by BMVEL by providing information, providing coordination	They needed was information

Implementation of NFP

BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
Influence from Rio conference. Participation increased	To show to the international community that we take NFP seriously	International pressure.	IPF/IFF and UNFF proposals for action.	International pressure and demand from developing countries
182 Proposals for Action, 11 core proposals under implementation	No direct change but communication has increased	They try to some aspects but implementation is not intensive	Role of ministry has changed	Implementation of proposals
Discussion in the next round table meeting in December	In future intensity of round table meeting will decrease	Implementation at state level is not very strong	Implementation of proposals for action	Conflicts between different actors

Personal Satisfaction

1 (Very Satisfied)

6 (Not Very Satisfied)



BMVEL	BMZ	WWF-Germany	Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg	Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg
Between 2 and 3	Between 2 and 3	3	No rank	2 and 5
Satisfied with the stakeholder participation but not satisfied with the implementation	At the beginning there were lot of mistakes but all parties involved. There is a big question regarding implementation	On paper we have got a lot but it is still only on the paper and the lacks are the implementation	Comparing with other NFPs we are second best to only Finland	Satisfied with organization process but results are really lacking

Key Findings from Stakeholder Consultation (NFP in India)

Points of discussion

- Stakeholder participation in policy formulation
- Cross-sectoral coordination
- Country's sovereignty to formulate own policy
- Review of existing policies
- Implementation of NFP

Stakeholder Participation in Policy Formulation

WWF – India	Planning Commission	FAO – Asia & Pacific
<p>There was no wide stakeholder consultation in the process</p>	<p>Stake holder participation is adequate and the level has increased from the past. Two recent examples are – National Environmental Policy and Tribal Bill. These two important policy documents are still open due much public debate. The National Board for Wildlife, National Afforestation and Ecodevelopment Board and Societies/ Governing bodies of IIFM, ICFRE, WII etc have ample representation of Civil Society</p>	<p>The ultimate goals of achieving participatory and multi-stakeholder procedures into policy revision and implementation have not been captured in the process</p>

Review of existing policies

WWF – India	Planning Commission	FAO – Asia & Pacific
This process is grossly inadequate	Review of existing policies are done adequately. For example, recommendations of the Tiger Task Force are to be implemented very soon; the forest cover is also increasing and this is due to sound policy	Referring to the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action, which represent a set of holistic approaches, with a built in mechanism for review and revision of the existing policies, to be followed up with field implementation, India is nowhere near that

Cross-sectoral coordination

WWF – India	Planning Commission	FAO – Asia & Pacific
Cross –sectoral coordination is lacking and not other ministries are involved actively	Basically linked to cross-sectoral rural development domain. Thus while Rural Development programmes have a strong natural resource component	Not much progressed has been achieved in this area because of centralization and ownership issue. Infact, FAO conducted a South Asian Sub-regional Workshop on “Implementation of National Forest Programmes: Strategies and New Directions”, March 10-12, 2004 where these issues were discussed first time. Although most of the representatives were forestry personnel

Country's sovereignty to formulate own policy

WWF – India	Planning Commission	FAO – Asia & Pacific
This is not a danger area at this moment	We may not need to follow a tailor-made model of NFP. We can manage our affairs and we do not have to toe the lines dictated by anybody	The role of FAO is a facilitator and it encourages countries to formulate own policy instruments based on their needs.

Implementation of NFP

WWF – India	Planning Commission	FAO – Asia & Pacific
<p>NFAP exists but remain as a guideline to the forestry sector in India and detailed actions expected of them is grossly inadequate</p>	<p>There are examples that the NFP elements are being implemented like stakeholder participation in policy formulation, review of existing polices. At this time lot of projects are going on in the country of which many are funded by the external funding agencies</p>	<p>The NFAP evolved from the TFAP. The TFAP has been abandoned for various reasons. The NFAP will only become a piece of paper if the donors are not going to fund the projects identified in there. The donors are seeking the nfp process before they want to pick up activities which they can support</p>

But Hope Floats Because.....

- **Recent developments in the activities regarding NFP**
 - **Increased cooperation from international communities**
 - **Political will to make the process more democratic**
 - **Increasing awareness among public**
 - **Private organizations' interests**
 - **Strong infrastructure in forestry education and research**
-

Personal Benefits from the Applied Period

- Understanding of how international policy works at national level
- Getting into touch with different actors and personal contact building
- Getting familiar with telephonic interview techniques
- Setting up a platform for future research areas
- A brief overview of management of broadleaf trees in Germany through excursions with the Institute For Forest Growth at different sites
- Experiencing the natural beauties of Black Forest and Swabian Alps
- Getting familiar with the German society and culture

Sincere Thanks to

- Prof. Spiecker for arranging the applied period study
- Mr. Winkel for his role as a supervisor
- Mr. Memmler for his help during the whole study period as Co-Supervisor and specially technical help for telephonic interviews
- Mr. Schraml for his personal advice and suggestions for the study
-
- Mr. Kahle and Mr. Joachim for their personal attachments during the study visits
- Ms. Stadler for arranging our accommodation
- All other members from the Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy and the Institute for Forest Growth

Thank You

Telephonic Interviews and Email Exchanges

Telephonic Interviews

- **BMVEL** (Federal Ministry for Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture)
- **BMZ** (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
- **Institute for Economics, Federal Research Centre for Forestry, Hamburg**
- **WWF, Germany**
- **Institute of Forest and Environmental Policy, Freiburg**

Email Exchanges

- **WWF-India**
- **Planning Commission, India**
- **FAO, Asia-Pacific**

[Back](#)