



**European Cooperation
in Science and Technology
- COST -**

Brussels, 4 July 2012

Secretariat

COST 4130/12

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Subject : Memorandum of Understanding for the implementation of a European Concerted Research Action designated as COST Action FP1201: Forest Land Ownership Changes in Europe: Significance for Management And Policy (FACESMAP)

Delegations will find attached the Memorandum of Understanding for COST Action as approved by the COST Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) at its 185th meeting on 6 June 2012.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
For the implementation of a European Concerted Research Action designated as
COST Action FP1201
FOREST LAND OWNERSHIP CHANGES IN EUROPE: SIGNIFICANCE FOR
MANAGEMENT AND POLICY (FACESMAP)

The Parties to this Memorandum of Understanding, declaring their common intention to participate in the concerted Action referred to above and described in the technical Annex to the Memorandum, have reached the following understanding:

1. The Action will be carried out in accordance with the provisions of document COST 4154/11 “Rules and Procedures for Implementing COST Actions”, or in any new document amending or replacing it, the contents of which the Parties are fully aware of.
2. The main objective of the Action is to provide European scale insights into the differentiated and changing forest ownership patterns, to scrutinize their consequences and to explore new approaches for policy and forest management (see objectives).
3. The economic dimension of the activities carried out under the Action has been estimated, on the basis of information available during the planning of the Action, at EUR 96 million in 2012 prices.
4. The Memorandum of Understanding will take effect on being accepted by at least five Parties.
5. The Memorandum of Understanding will remain in force for a period of 4 years, calculated from the date of the first meeting of the Management Committee, unless the duration of the Action is modified according to the provisions of Chapter V of the document referred to in Point 1 above.

A. ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS

Forest ownership is changing across Europe. In some areas a growing number of so-called “new” forest owners hold only small parcels, have no agricultural or forestry knowledge and no capacities or interest to manage their forests, while in others new community and private owners are bringing fresh interest and new objectives to woodland management. This diversity and change creates implementation problems for forest-related policies including biodiversity conservation, timber and renewable energy supply, climate change mitigation, or recreation. The objectives of the Action are: (1) To analyse attitudes and constraints of different forest owner types in Europe and the ongoing changes (outputs: literature survey, meta-analyses and maps). (2) To explore innovative management approaches for new forest owner types (outputs: case studies, critical assessment). (3) To study effective policy instruments with a comparative analysis approach (outputs: literature survey, case studies, policy analyses). (4) To draw conclusions and recommendations for forest-related policies, forest management practice, further education and future research. The interdisciplinary work will be done in close cooperation with relevant public and private stakeholders. A COST Action is suited for the strongly needed but still lacking comprehensive European overview and analyses.

Keywords: forest ownership structure, private forest owners motives, forest-related policies, new sustainable forest management models.

B. BACKGROUND

B.1 General background

The diversity of forest ownership categories and the high numbers of individual owners are important characteristics of European forestry (MCPFE 2007). In the last two decades the diversity of ownership categories has considerably increased – mainly due to the restitution and privatization processes in Eastern Europe but also due to the establishment of new ownership categories like environmental associations and foundations. Even on national and regional level, the situation shows significant differences within Europe. While the share of private forest holdings in Austria, Denmark, France, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Slovenia exceeds 70% of the total forest area, private and public ownership in other EU member states in Eastern and Central Europe are relatively balanced with a share ranging between 30 and 70% (Angelova et al. 2009, Hirsch et al. 2007; MCPFE 2007, UNECE & FAO 2010). In the last decades, demographic and social changes led to a growing diversity of private owners' interests, values and demands towards their forests and forest management types, influencing the hierarchies of priorities regarding their management decisions (Ziegenspeck et al. 2004). Forest-related policies and management concepts often do not account for different land ownership types. They typically assume a private owner with an active management interest in their forests. In fact, however, only a part of European forests are managed by forest companies or traditional agricultural owners. This share is furthermore shrinking as the number of farms in Europe is decreasing. As a result a growing share of owners own only small parcels, have no connection to agricultural or forestry knowledge and practices, and are hardly interested in managing their property at all. This phenomenon is known as the growing share of “new”, “absentee”, “urban” or “non-traditional” forest owners (Hogl et al. 2005; Schwarzbauer et al. 2010). It is a phenomenon of Western European countries and in a particular form in many Eastern and South-Eastern European countries after the restitution of nationalised forest land to the former private owners. Besides of the phenomenon of “urban owners”, there are also other new trends in forest ownership that are not yet broadly known and reflected, whether in science or in practice: These include, for instance, the privatisation and decentralisation policies in the UK, or forest acquisitions by investment funds. The scope of the Action will cover any new ownership related developments. In sum, there is a growing but still fragmented scientific literature on forest ownership patterns in Europe, the goals and strategies of different forest ownership types and their motivations for forest management.

The COST Action shall bring this scientific knowledge together and shall connect it to practical knowledge and experiences and to policy-making. The results of this scientific work will be highly relevant for all forest-related policy fields both in the formulation on European and national levels and in the implementation on local level. There are important policy fields where the consequences of new forest ownership patterns are increasingly discussed but not yet included in the regulations: sustainable forest management (e.g. EU Forest Strategy and Timber Regulation), competitiveness and innovation (e.g. FTP), rural development (EU Rural Development Regulation), climate change and renewable energy (e.g. renewable energy targets), biodiversity conservation (e.g. Natura 2000), or water protection (EU Water Framework Directive). Also the public administration and private stakeholders which are entrusted for or affected by the policy implementation are increasingly asking for knowledge on the changing forest owners' motivations and related forest management approaches and relevant policy instruments. A better implementation of the policy goals and activities eventually supports the effective provision of many forest ecosystem services that benefit the society as a whole. The different policy fields and ecosystem services will be studied in the Action in an interdisciplinary way and cooperation with policy and practice.

B.2 Current state of knowledge

The question of forest ownership and the current changes in the ownership structure in many countries has not been studied broadly and comprehensively so far. A certain exception is the issue of small-scale forestry (IUFRO group 3.08.00). Specific studies are often local or national and hardly allow cross-national studies. Research on changing forest ownership patterns has been done mainly on local, regional or national scale, particularly in Middle, Northern and Eastern/South-Eastern European countries with few exceptions such as the work of the COST Action E3 on forest owners' attitudes (Terrasson 1998) or the study of small-scale ownership across Europe (Wiersum et al. 2005). This observation was proven by the study on Prospects for the market supply of wood and other forest products from areas with fragmented forest-ownership structures (Tender Nr. AGRI2008-EVAL11). Nation-wide permanent monitoring systems are also rare (Karppinen and Hänninen 2006; Leppänen 2010).

The existing studies often take a social science view but consequences of the changing ownership of forest ecosystem services and studies on new forest management models and forest policy design and implementation are almost lacking. In the study of owners' motives, goals and objectives, often typologies are established, however, the studies differ strongly with regard to the criteria for classification (Hogl et al. 2005). The studies often focus on the "urbanity" of new types of forest owners (Hårdter 2003), privatisation or restitution (Weiss et al. 2011; EAST), wood mobilisation (Schwarzbauer et al. 2008), cooperation of small owners (Mendes et al. 2011), innovation and entrepreneurship (Rametsteiner et al. 2005), new movements (Lawrence et al. 2010), property rights (Schmithüsen 2000; Bauer et al. 2004; Bouriaud and Schmithüsen 2005), common property (Kiessling-Näf et al. 2002; Glück 2002; Bouriaud 2007) and community ownership (Schraml, Lawrence 2009). The issue of adequate forest management approaches for different ownership types includes many aspects, from which only few have been dealt with in depth up to date. Technological issues of forest operations such as logistics are studied in detail, however, related social questions such as if forest workers and entrepreneurs will be available in future at all, are largely neglected (Bouriaud et al. 2011). Social networks are an important but not well studied aspect important for forest entrepreneurs as much as forest owners (Nybakk et al. 2009). A pending problem is the potential of forest owners' cooperatives and associations in organising forest utilisation (Mendes et al. 2011; Glück et al. 2001) and other institutional arrangements facilitating new forest management (Nichiforel and Schanz 2009). Moreover, forest management is facing novel and complex challenges facing potential goal conflicts between timber production, biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and mitigation and provision of other ecosystem services (Wolfslehner and Seidl, 2010). A very central question is which forestry approaches actually fit different ownership types, a question which is often denied and only rarely discussed (Novais and Canadas 2010; Lawrence et al. 2010). The relations between ownership structures and policy are manifold but hardly studied. One question is the role of policies aiming at a change of ownership. Specific policies supporting or indicating ownership change were analysed in post-socialist Eastern and Southeastern European countries (Lazdinis et al. 2005; Weiss et al. 2011), but also for the case of forestry decentralisation in Great Britain (Munton 2009).

Another issue is what new ownership structures (increasing fragmentation and new types of owners) mean for the fulfilment of policy goals. This question is strongly discussed with regard to the future supply with raw materials from forests for forest industry and energy production, but there are also implications for biodiversity conservation and other ecosystem services (Paavola et al. 2009; Agrawal et al. 2010). What is only rarely discussed is that the changes may hinder certain policy goals, but that they also offer new opportunities for policy implementation. Respective policy instruments and strategies, however, are mostly lacking. Relevant policy instruments are grants for private, common and cooperative woodland management (Lawrence et al. 2010; Rametsteiner et al. 2005) and advisory services (Schraml 2006), and a mix of instruments (van Gossum et al. 2008). Concluding from the EC study on fragmented forest-ownership (Tender Nr. AGRI2008-EVAL11), more knowledge on possible approaches to reach different types of owners, successful examples from practice and the hindrances is urgently needed (Schwarzbauer et al.), and not only with regard to timber supply.

B.3 Reasons for the Action

The Action aims to address European scale policy needs and needs from practice as well as to advance scientific knowledge. The advantages of the COST framework allow to achieve the following objectives: to collect and map the state-of-knowledge, including grey and national language literature; to do comparative analyses by using existing knowledge but to bring single results together in a comparative view; to generate new insights and new research questions through interdisciplinary sessions; and to challenge research approaches and policy solutions by bringing together scientists and policy-makers. The COST framework allows for such activities in a comprehensive way on national-regional and European levels.

B.4 Complementarity with other research programmes

An analysis of the larger recent European research projects in the Framework Programme, ERA-net and COST reveals that they hardly tackle the question of ownership. The in COST Action should therefore provide a valuable additional input to many European or national projects.

C. OBJECTIVES AND BENEFITS

C.1 Aim

The main objective of the Action is to provide European scale insights into the differentiated and changing forest ownership patterns, to scrutinize their consequences and to explore new approaches for policy and forest management.

C.2 Objectives

The COST Action has the following four specific objectives: (1) To analyse the attitudes and constraints of different forest owner types in Europe and to map in qualitative and quantitative terms the ongoing changes of forest ownership. (2) To explore innovative management approaches for the properties of new forest owner types with respect to the provision of goods and services and under the constraint of relevant socio-economic frame conditions. (3) To study the impacts of governance approaches and policy instruments on the development of ownership structures, and to assess the consequences of new ownership patterns on forest-related policy goals (sustainable forest management, multifunctionality, recreation, nature conservation, climate change, renewable energy, innovation and rural development). (4) To draw conclusions and recommendations from the synthesized knowledge for forest-related policies, forest management practice, education and research.

C.3 How networking within the Action will yield the objectives?

Literature review: The networking in the Action will be needed for completing the European scale literature review in order to include national level and national language literature (particularly for objectives 1 and 3). From this databases will be established and the meta-analyses carried out.

Small task groups will do the compilation, mapping and cross-country comparisons. Case studies and interviews: The Action network will be used for collecting relevant and systematically selected case studies from the participating countries and will carry out expert assessments and interviews (partic. for objectives 2 and 3). Local excursions and workshops: The country participants will (co-)organise the interdisciplinary excursions and workshop discussions with the policy-makers and stakeholders on national-regional level (partic. for objectives 2 and 3). Synthesizing: The network will contribute to the interdisciplinary focus group discussions with the policy-makers and stakeholders on European level, to the synthesis and concluding work, to the topical articles which will be conducted by task groups from the Action, and to the final publications and conference (objective 4).

C.4 Potential impact of the Action

Scientific: The scientific advancements are expected through i) documenting the state-of-the-art in theoretical and methodological approaches, incl. grey literature; ii) carrying out comparative studies using existing knowledge from national studies as well as case studies; iii) collecting a Pan-European database and map of forest ownership; and iv) in a new inter- and transdisciplinary work method. The Action also aims at capacity building, particular for Eastern and South-Eastern European partners. The Action shall also trigger new and highly relevant research topics in the field of forest management and policy. Practical: The practical added-value will be provided by a) the excursions and workshop discussions with researchers from different fields as well as the affected policy-makers and stakeholders; b) the work on different scales (national-regional and European); and c) the various targeted dissemination activities in the course of the Action.

Technical benefits will be new and more effective and efficient forest management models for new forest ownership types, including silvicultural techniques, organisational, planning and communication methods as well as business and timber selling models. The Action shall carve out education and training needs for different kind of forest owners. It aims at the further development of instruments for addressing the very heterogeneous target groups in the work of the authorities and extension services. In the field of policy, the Action shall develop and improve tools for reaching new forest owner types in policy implementation (forestry, biodiversity conservation such as Natura 2000, climate change, renewable energy, innovation and rural development), forest extension work and public relations. It shall develop new models and working methods for forest owners organisations, new services offers in forest management for new owner types. Results may feed into the Rural Development Policy of the new planning period 2014+ through case study analyses and derived conclusions. For society, the Action contributes to awareness-raising for the role of forest owners in shaping the landscape, in the provision of products and services, and in contributing to rural development. It will generate advanced concepts for the provision of ecosystem services such as recreation, biodiversity conservation, renewable energy, etc. In economic terms, the Action will develop business models and tools for the steady and sustainable procurement of wood for forest-based industries and the bio-energy sector; new models for innovative management and income diversification from forest resources in rural areas. It will provide best practices of logistics and business communication in forestry-wood value chains and the technical and marketing cooperation in forest cooperatives and associations.

C.5 Target groups/end users

The outputs are addressed to scientific and applying user groups: - Reports, journal articles, books, STSM and Summer Schools are addressed to the scientific community, young researchers and higher education. - Workshops, excursions, conferences, case study collections and practical journal articles address practice and policy-makers. The results will specifically address public administration at European, national and local levels, extensions services, interest groups, forest owners' organisations, etc. There is a particular relevance for traditional and new small private owners as well as for joint ownership and community owners.

The following practice target groups contributed strongly to the development of the Action: forest owners and industry interest groups (CEPF, FTP, ENFE), environmental groups (WWF, IEEP, Wildland Resources), international organisations (UNECE, FAO). Many insights from collaboration projects and conferences with the various DGs in the European Commission and national governments are taken up in the proposal.

D. SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMME

D.1 Scientific focus

The research questions are the following:

Changing forest ownership types and forest owners' motives (obj. 1) - In which way and how fast are forest ownership types changing in Europe? - What goals do the different types of forest owners have for their forests? - What attitudes and motivations do forest owners have regarding the management of their forest? - What are the constraints, including ecological, technical, legal, social and economic factors?

New forest management approaches (obj. 2) - How adequate are existing forest management approaches and concepts for different ownership types? - What are the consequences of the changing pattern for forest management and for the provision of forest ecosystem functions and services? - Which new forest management approaches and concepts and techniques are needed for the different ownership types? - What is the awareness and access of new owners to information, advice and support, and how could this be improved? - What is the role of forest owners cooperatives and associations in the support of the forest management and in regard to different owner types?

Implications and needs for forest-related policies (obj. 3) - How do policies influence the forest ownership patterns in Europe (restitution, promotion of associations, decentralization, restrictions for the trade of forest land, etc.)? - How do different types of owners perceive, contribute to and benefit from forest policy? - What consequences do changing forest ownership patterns have for the fulfilment of national and European policy goals? - Which policy instruments and organisational concepts do exist in order to reach different ownership types, what are the experiences in practice, and what is hampering their development and application? - What are the factors for innovation processes with a view to sustainable forest management and rural development, including the role of public and private actors, cooperation, social networks, policy instruments, etc.

Synthesis and conclusions (obj. 4) - What is the most useful way to classify ownership types? - What are the implications of ownership change for policy goals and implementation, in particular for choice of policy instrument and provision of advice and support? - In which way do forest-related policies need to consider different forest ownership structures? - What learning opportunities are available in policy processes, to enable adaptation to on-going ownership changes? - What can be recommended for the affected policies, for practical forest management, and for forestry research? What to recommend to different user groups, including forest owners and their organisations, industry and environmental interest groups, local, national and European level policy-makers and public administration?

D.2 Scientific work plan methods and means

The following tasks will be carried out:

Changing forest ownership types and forest owners' motives (obj. 1) (1) Literature review on (i) the research approaches, theoretical concepts and typologies that are applied and (ii) existing empirical evidence. In addition to articles in international journals and books, special attention is given to unpublished or national language literature (incl. so-called "grey literature").

From theories and existing empirical knowledge, hypotheses will be drawn to be scrutinized in the following work steps. (2) Compilation and analysis of data on changes in forest ownership in terms of structural pre-conditions for forest management (e.g. property rights, fragmentation, management capacities, integration in agriculture/forestry, role of forests for the owners' livelihood) and respective trends. (3) Compilation and analysis of data on changes in forest owners' attitudes, interest, motives and their forest management practices across Europe. (4) Meta-analysis of statistical empirical findings if data quality allows. (5) Produce a map of ownership types distribution across Europe, including their attitudes and motivations, underlying legislation and property rights, and trends of change. (6) Comparative analysis and synthesis information on the results and their implications for management practices and policy fields.

New forest management approaches (obj. 2) (1) Literature review and screening of ongoing projects on forest management approaches and concepts adequate for different ownership types. (2) Screening of innovative forest management approaches and concepts adequate for different ownership types in practice (collection of case studies and examples, practical experiences, and relevant initiatives across Europe). (3) Study of new silvicultural and technological methods, institutional and organisational arrangements, planning and communication approaches, and new business models adapted to the new types of forest owners. (4) Theoretical and empirical analysis of consequences for the provision of various forest ecosystem services. (5) Comparative assessment of innovative solutions and of gaps and needs for policy and research: Collect, describe and analyse examples for practical solutions; derive new forest management approaches and concepts and techniques for different ownership types.

Implications and needs for forest-related policies (obj. 3) (1) Initial stakeholder workshop for collecting practical views and experiences. (2) Literature survey of scientific studies on changing property rights and of policies reacting to changing forest ownership patterns and addressing new forest ownership types, including advisory services, financial support, regulatory changes, initiating and supporting forest owners organisations, public relations, etc. (3) Screening of European case studies and examples, practical experiences, and relevant initiatives related to forest owners organisations, forest extension service and other advisory activities, adapting policies to ownership types, public relations.

- (4) Comparative assessment of innovative approaches, policy instruments and organisational concepts to reach different ownership types; assessment of the potential of different institutional arrangements: state, market, common property regimes; assessment of consequences for the fulfilment of national and European policy goals, sustainable forest management and sustainable rural development; innovation processes; assessment of gaps and needs for policy development.
- (5) Concluding analysis and synthesis on policies addressing new forest ownership types and analysis of factors explaining success and failure of applied policy means and forest owner associations and cooperatives.

Synthesis and conclusions (obj. 4) (1) Synthesized knowledge and recommendations for forest-related policies, forest management practice, and research from theoretical and empirical analyses in country reports and working groups. (2) Assessment of innovative solutions and gaps and needs from theoretical and empirical analyses in country reports and working groups. (3) Concluding stakeholder workshop for discussing the results, conclusions and recommendations. (4) Conclusions and recommendations from analysis and stakeholder discussions at excursions, workshops and consultations. They will address public administration at European, national and local levels, extensions services, interest groups, forest owners' organisations, etc.

Deliverables:

(1) Obj. 1: Overview articles on research approaches, typologies and motives; a database, meta-analysis and map of European forest ownership, property rights and forest owners' attitudes towards their forests. (2) Obj. 2: Critical assessment of management models, including silvicultural, organisational, planning, communication, business and marketing concepts; comparative articles on innovative approaches; case studies. (3) Obj. 3: Literature survey; case studies; comparative articles on governance models, policy instruments, stakeholder perceptions, and policy impacts. (4) Obj. 4: Stakeholder workshops; synthesis articles; final conference and book publication/or special issues of international peer-reviewed journals; proposals for refined data collection guidelines with international organisations; proposals for action with policy-makers and interest groups.

Possible problems and innovative aspects:

A particular problem to overcome is the very limited availability of data. The Action will not only collect “grey literature” and national language knowledge but shall also propose common approaches for regular data collection and reporting from national level to international bodies. The innovative aspects of this Action lie in i) the European scope, ii) the interdisciplinary approach, and iii) the strong cooperation with practice and policy partners: i. The topic of changing forest ownership patterns has been studied in a number of countries and certain European regions but has not been dealt with so far on European level. A comparison across European regions will be possible, including in particular the ESEE countries. ii. The COST Action applies a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach to study the problem of changing forest ownership. So far, the changing ownership structure has been studied mainly from a sociological perspective, but the consequences for practical forest management and forest-related policies have not yet been addressed. It can be expected that the results of the Action will call for tremendous changes in forest-related policies and forest management. Part of the aims of the Action is to show gaps and needs in actual policies and to collect, describe and analyse examples for practical solutions. iii. The Action shall be carried out in close cooperation with stakeholders from practice and policy who have already indicated their interest and willingness to collaborate. This ensures the maximum problem-oriented approach as well as a strong dissemination of the Action results to practice and policy.

E. ORGANISATION

E.1 Coordination and organisation

The Management Committee (MC) and a Steering Group (SG) coordinate the work in the Action. The MC meets twice a year at the WG meetings. The operational management will be carried out by the SG which is comprised of the Action Chair, Vice-Chair and Working Group leaders. It is elected by the MC and meets at least twice a year at the working group meetings.

Additional meetings are held to prepare the Action activities, monitor progress, initiate cooperative programmes and seminars, facilitate short term scientific missions, and to co-ordinate exchange with interested parties outside the Action. The SG is also responsible for monitoring and evaluating the progress of work in the Action. Besides of the strategic management of the Action, the SG is particularly responsible for the synthesising and concluding work. In the Action, a specific role is foreseen for the Vice-Chair of the Action who will be responsible for the coordination of the work across disciplines and with the stakeholders, a function which is particularly relevant for the further specification of objectives and the work structure at the beginning of the Action, and for the synthesizing and dissemination work at the end of the Action. The four years Action will be carried out in three phases with the following specific activities: Phase 1 : Literature reviews, structural data. Outputs: Website, country reports, opening stakeholder workshop (milestone 1). Phase 2 : Case study collection, regional stakeholder workshops, STSM, training school, analysis work. Outputs: WG, sub-group and task force reports, journal articles (milestone 2). Phase 3 : Synthesis and conclusions work, cross-WG analysis, conclusions workshop(s) with stakeholder participation. Outputs: Final conference, journal articles, special issues and/or final book publication, map and database (milestone 3).

The work flow is structured by the WG meetings which are used to set goals, coordinate the work, present findings and discuss conclusions. In addition to the WG meetings, two stakeholder workshops will be organised at the beginning and the end of the Action for the exchange between the scientific community and the practice. The WG meetings will also be used for stakeholder interaction on regional level which gives the opportunity to understand the specific problem situations in the different European regions. For this purpose, the WG meetings will be held in the different European regions (Northern, Atlantic, Mediterranean, Central, and Eastern Europe). They will be organised by local hosts from the countries where the meetings take place. They will include a local excursion to a field site and a panel discussion with all relevant policy-makers and stakeholders. Furthermore, stakeholders from other countries in the region or regional representatives will be invited.

The country participants' work is coordinated on country level by the MC members, and across countries by the WG leaders. Furthermore, the work is guided by joint Action guidelines for data collection, the organisation of WG meetings, and all joint activities. An Action website will play a central role in the intro-Action coordination as well as for the external dissemination. It will be established and constantly maintained by the Chair.

A specific new transdisciplinary research method will be employed which uses the regional WG meetings for participatory research. The method includes excursions and focus group discussions, standard features of many conferences, but methodically used for our research. The tasks will include i) assessing the regional-specific problem situations, ii) gaining knowledge about applied forest management approaches, iii) collecting experiences from practice regarding policy implementation and the application of tools to reach different forest owner groups, iv) facilitating focus group discussions between the interdisciplinary research group and the representatives from practice, and v) jointly developing new solutions. The systematic use of the expertise of the international research group, the hands-on experiences of the practice representatives, as well as the direct interaction between the two groups will allow a robust assessment of the problem situations and to generate innovative solution approaches. The method uses insights from empirical social science research, action research and participatory rural appraisal methods.

E.2 Working Groups

The Action will consist of three Working Groups (WG): Forest ownership types and motives (obj. 1); New forest management approaches (obj. 2); Forest owner related policies (obj. 3). A set of cross-WG activities will make sure to arrive at joint results and conclusions (obj. 4). The work within the WGs is coordinated by a WG Leader who will be part of the Steering Group. To initiate momentum and ensure exchange, WGs shall meet twice a year. WG meetings use various formats in order to exchange experiences, plan and implement the work, including: plenary meetings, WG and sub-group sessions, excursions, stakeholder workshops, etc. The work within the WGs is structured by use of common data collection guidelines (e.g. for initial country reports), self-organising sub-groups, and other tools. Findings are presented at the internal WG meetings as well as public seminars. They are published in WG reports, books and articles.

All WGs participate in the generic Action activities, namely the STSM, training school, website and other dissemination tools, the initial and concluding stakeholder workshops, final conference and publications, etc. Depending on the number and disciplinary background of participants there might be the need to have four working groups instead of three. Due to the highly inter-related sub-objectives, WGs are to be closely co-ordinated. Cross-WG task forces will be initiated. All-WG plenary meetings, joint workshops and excursions will cater to the need for bridging work, particularly in the starting and concluding phases but also throughout the Action lifetime. The Cross-WG task forces report to the SC. In the coordination of the WGs, the Chair will be assisted by the Vice-Chair who is particularly responsible for the inter- and transdisciplinary work in the Action.

E.3 Liaison and interaction with other research programmes

Many participants of the Action have a rich experience in and are currently working in international projects and networks (FP7, COST, EFI, IUFRO, etc.). The Action will utilise this wealth of already existing networks, and use the interactions to currently running projects, such as in FP7. The intention is to have information events, workshops or seminars with the following FP7 projects: ARANGE, VOLANTE, FLEXWOOD, NEWFOREX, INTEGRAL, and the ERA-net Biodiversa project BeFoFu. The collaboration may lead to joint or coordinated research work or publications. Furthermore, contacts may be established to European or national projects that are expected to be upcoming in the fields of non-wood forest products, bio-energy, wood mobilisation, integrated biodiversity conservation or climate change mitigation.

E.4 Gender balance and involvement of early-stage researchers

The Action will follow an explicit diversity, equality and capacity building policy which consists of specific aims and the implementation of which will – among others – be ensured through the specific role of a SG member. The Vice-Chair of the Action will be responsible for the management of the interdisciplinary collaboration, the stakeholder involvement, the diversity policy, capacity building as well as quality assurance. The Action will have an STSM programme and will organise a training school with the specific view to support early-stage researchers.

F. TIMETABLE

Table 1. FACEMAP - Timetable

Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
TASKS																
<i>Literature Review</i>	X	X	X	X												
<i>Case Studies</i>	X	X	X	X												
<i>Analysis</i>					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
<i>Dissemination</i>													X	X	X	X
ACTIVITIES																
<i>MC Meetings</i>		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
<i>WG Meetings</i>		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
<i>European Level Stakeholder Workshop</i>			X												X	
<i>Regional Stakeholder Workshop</i>				X		X		X		X		X				
<i>STSM</i>				X				X				X				
<i>Training School</i>							X									
<i>Final Conference</i>																X
DELIVERABLES																
<i>Website</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Country Reports</i>				X												
<i>Journal Articles</i>					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Final Publication</i>																X
<i>Map and Database</i>														X		
Milestones				1								2				3

G. ECONOMIC DIMENSION

The following COST countries have actively participated in the preparation of the Action or otherwise indicated their interest: AT, BA, BG, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IT, LT, LV, MK, NO, PT, RO, RS, SE, SI, SK, UK. On the basis of national estimates, the economic dimension of the activities to be carried out under the Action has been estimated at 96 Million € for the total duration of the Action. This estimate is valid under the assumption that all the countries mentioned above but no other countries will participate in the Action. Any departure from this will change the total cost accordingly.

H. DISSEMINATION PLAN

H.1 Who?

The most important target groups are: - EU level and national level policy-makers within forestry but also in other forest-related policy fields such as industry, innovation, entrepreneurship, biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, tourism, non-wood products, energy, etc. - non-governmental interest groups and associations in the following fields: forestry industry, biodiversity conservation, tourism, non-wood products, energy, etc. - public and private, large and small as well as common and community land owners and their organisations, - other relevant actors in forestry such as consultants, extension services, etc. - researchers and research organisations as well as education and training institutions such as universities, public and private research institutes, training schools, etc.

H.2 What?

Besides of the regular work meetings, STSM and training school, a range of communication channels will be utilised for internal and external communication. A website will provide for steady exchange among participants (intra-net) and disseminate the Action's results (internet). External communication will address scientific and practice audiences and will use the adequate print media but will take place also in course of the work meetings, excursions and workshops. For particular interaction, the following means will be set up to address policy-makers and stakeholders: - Informal briefings for European Commission officials and other key stakeholders in Brussels will be held at mid-term and towards the end of the project. These briefings will provide an update on the Action, draw attention to policy relevant findings and emerging topics.

The newly established EFI ThinkForest - a European high-level forum on the future of forests - may serve as forum for these activities to connect with EC, Forest Europe, FAO, UNECE incl. contributions to their resource reports (EUROSTAT, Pan-European SFM Criteria & Indicators, Forest Resource Assessment –FRA). - Formal interaction with Technology Platforms and other relevant bodies: Special attention will be given to presentations at existing European and international platforms such as the Forest-Based Sector Technology Platform to secure compliance with SRAs and other relevant strategic guidance. - Policy Briefs: Policy Briefs will be designed to translate scientific information into non-technical and practical language (science-policy and science-practice transfer). - Stakeholder interaction: (i) initial stakeholder workshop for collecting practical views and experiences; (ii) excursions and workshops in different European regions; (iii) concluding stakeholder workshop for discussing the results; final conference and publications; conclusions and recommendations. - ‘Twinning’ approach: each MC member takes responsibility for national and regional dissemination activities of the Action in their countries (also in terms of native languages) and proves to interact with relevant policy makers and stakeholder organisations in his/her country. The Action can highly benefit from experiences of experts from forest administration and forest associations. Thus, stakeholder workshops will be co-organised with international organisations and stakeholder groups at the beginning and the end of the Action. A final scientific conference will address the scientific community and key stakeholders. Concerning publications, there will be a mix of approaches. Formal outputs will be (i) a literature review on research approaches and forest owners’ typologies across Europe, incl. “grey literature”; comparative analysis of forest owners’ interests and motives and trends in the changes of forest ownership, and (ii) a literature review, screening and comparative assessment of ongoing projects and innovative forest management approaches for different ownership types across Europe. In the wake of the Action, more publications are encouraged as outcome of bi- and multilateral international scientific teams. The final conference is to foster scientific exchange on the topic but also engage young and early-stage researcher’s in discourse and publication processes. To improve the visibility of the Action, suitable printed media will be identified to publish articles about the Action and its results. This will include also articles in local and professional media.

These targeted contributions will be accompanied by regular press and news releases to disseminate newsworthy events or results to be distributed through existing contact networks and distribution lists of the partner institutions. Inter alia, EFI will use its network to more than 700 journalists to disseminate press releases on key messages and project breakthroughs in regular terms. This will also be linked to the use of social media (Facebook, Twitter) to inform new audiences about the progress made in the Action.

H.3 How?

The Action builds on a network that is rich in experience on knowledge transfer, education, and with a huge portfolio of dissemination means. Dissemination activities will be integral elements of the project management, and will be supported by a dissemination plan which is established by the SG and updated regularly according to the demands of the Action, the involved stakeholders, and the opportunities presented by the participants. The scientific results must be presented in user-group specific formats and styles in order to achieve high visibility and impact. The Chair will hold the overall responsibility for a coherent implementation of the dissemination plan. Besides more specific task as indicated in the workplan, partners are responsible for national activities and translation tasks both in native languages and special focus on translational work of scientific results to be applicable for policy- and decision-makers. Finally, the website will be maintained at least 3 years after the end of the Action.