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SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Follow-up to the recommendations of the fifteenth session of the Committee

1. The Committee noted document FO:SCM/94/2 summarizing the actions taken by FAO in response to the recommendations addressed to it by the fifteenth session. Regarding the recommendation that the Committee's Rules of Procedure be amended so as to allow the election of officers to take place at the beginning instead of at the end of sessions, the Committee was informed of the conformity of the proposed amendment with the Organization's basic texts and the practical implications of its adoption. After recalling the reasons for its request, it confirmed its intention and recommended that FAO proceed with the amendment of its Rules of Procedure so that the election of officers may take place at the beginning of the session (para. 10).

Mediterranean Forest Action Programme

2. The Committee confirmed its full support for the Programme. It recommended that States and inter-governmental and community organizations, including funding agencies, express their commitment to the Programme within the allotted time in view of the urgent situation facing all Mediterranean forests (para. 12).

Activities of the research networks

3. Forest fire management

The Committee recommended that the network continue its efforts in line with the scheduled programmes (para. 24).

4. Selection of multi-purpose species

In view of the coordinator's wish to be relieved of his duties, the Committee recommended that the Secretariat propose a new coordinator, without delay, to be appointed in consultation with Tunisia's national coordinator, the officers of the Committee, and the institutions and other countries concerned (para. 28).

5. Silviculture of species: Cedrus sp.

The Committee recommended that the network's programme be pursued as it had been described, including the preparation, then publication, of the monograph on cedar. It expressed the wish that the possibility be looked into of orienting the programme towards a review of ways and means of conducting comparative trials on natural and artificial cedar stand management methods (para. 33).

6. Selection of stands of Mediterranean conifers for the production of seed to be used in reforestation programmes

The Committee confirmed its interest in this theme and stressed the need for the rapid establishment of a genuine programme. It recommended that network members who had not already done so complete the questionnaire drawn up by the coordinator, so that the final list of seed stands may be completed (para. 39).

7. Silviculture of species: Quercus suber
The Committee recommended that preparations for the research activities be continued and strengthened and felt that priority should be given to the establishment of a programme of work (para. 41).

8. The Committee recommended that the Secretariat look into the feasibility of establishing a research network on the development of Mediterranean forest products and services, a theme to which a complete chapter (D3) was devoted in the MED-FAP document (para. 43).

Forest resources assessment 1990, non-tropical developing countries - Mediterranean region

9. The Committee noted that it had been given a preview of the document on this subject and recommended that the model be refined, the concepts standardized by the *ad hoc* group that FAO was to establish, and the findings submitted to the countries concerned for review prior to final publication. It stressed the need for each country to know the status of and changes taking place in its forests and hoped that this type of study and appropriate projects would enable national capacities to be strengthened (para. 47).
INTRODUCTION

1. At the kind invitation of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, the AFWC/EFC/NEFC Committee on Mediterranean Forestry Questions - *Silva Mediterranea* - held its sixteenth session in Larnaca from 13 to 17 June 1994. The session was attended by delegates from the following members: Cyprus, European Economic Community, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sudan and Tunisia; and by observers from Albania and Germany. Representatives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) and the Economic Commission for Africa, and observers from the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (ICAMAS) and the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO) also attended. The full list of participants is given in *Annex B*.

2. The session was chaired by Mr. F. Mota, Chairman of the Committee. Mr. J. P. Lanly, Director, Forest Resources Division, Forestry Department, FAO, represented the Director-General of FAO. Mr. M. Malagnoux (FAO) served as Secretary.

3. Mr. Mota welcomed the participants and thanked the Cypriot authorities for their hospitality and for organizing the session. He stressed the particular importance of this session which was to discuss, among other items, the implementation of the Mediterranean Forest Action Programme.

4. Mr. G. Lycaurgos, Mayor of Larnaca, welcomed the participants on behalf of the municipality and the people and recalled the long history of Cyprus and Larnaca, whose wealth was closely linked to forest resources.

5. His Excellency the Minister of Agriculture, Natural Resources and the Environment, Mr. Costa Petrides, welcomed the participants and conveyed the best wishes of His Excellency Glafkos Clerides, President of the Republic, for the success of the session. He recalled the long and fruitful cooperation between his country and FAO in forestry matters. He then stressed the role of *Silva Mediterranea* as a forum for coordinating activities to meet the common problems facing the region's forests. He also stressed the important role that the forest and forest products had played and continued to play in his country's social and economic development.

6. Mr. Lanly welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director-General of FAO and thanked the Cypriot Government for the excellent arrangements made for the organization of the session. He recalled the challenge now facing foresters world-wide in the wake of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), Rio, 1992, as those responsible for the conservation and sustainable development of forest ecosystems. The Mediterranean Forest Action Programme, the implementation of which would be discussed at this session of the Committee, was an instrument of the implementation of the most important forestry decision of UNCED’s “Agenda 21” Programme which appealed to all countries to establish and implement national forest action plans and programmes. The Committee would also be invited to assess the work of its research networks, review the findings of the recent FAO survey on the region's forest resources and discuss the Mediterranean countries' forest administrative structures.

7. Before moving on to the agenda, the Chairman drew attention to a point of procedure concerning the sharing of responsibilities and voting rights between the European Economic Community and its member states. The Committee's attention was drawn to information note FO:SCM/94/Inf. 4 concerning the procedure to be followed in this session.
ADOPTION OF AGENDA (Item 1)

8. The provisional agenda was adopted after the addition of a further item Forest Resources Assessment, 1990" (Annex A). The list of documents prepared by the Secretariat on the various agenda items is given in Annex C.

ELECTION OF RAPPORTEUR (Item 2)

9. In conformity with the provisions of Article 11.5 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee unanimously elected Mr. Driss Ben Bahtane (Morocco) as Rapporteur.

FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE (Item 3)

10. The Committee noted document FO:SCM/94/2 summarizing the actions taken by FAO in response to the recommendations addressed to it by the fifteenth session. Those concerning the Mediterranean Forest Action Programme had been taken into consideration in the final formulation of the document. The Committee was informed of the conformity of the proposed amendment of its Rules of Procedure with the Organization's basic texts and the practical implications of its adoption. After recalling the reasons for its request, it confirmed its intention and recommended that FAO proceed with the amendment of its Rules of Procedure so that the election of officers may take place at the beginning of the session.

MEDITERRANEAN FOREST ACTION PROGRAMME (MED-FAP) (Item 4)

11. In presenting document FO:SCM/94/3 the Secretariat recalled the history of the Mediterranean Forest Action Programme, formulated at the request of member countries, expressed in the recommendations of the Near East Forestry Commission (1987), Silva Mediterranea (1989) and the tenth World Forestry Congress (1991). The Secretariat indicated that the contents of this document had been the subject of a broad consultation, particularly on the occasion of the special meeting of the Committee held in Lisbon in July 1993 at the initiative of the Chairman. The Committee was invited to discuss ways of implementing the Programme at national, sub-regional and regional levels. A further justification for the Programme was UNCED's recommendation appealing to all countries to implement national forest action plans or programmes.

12. The Committee confirmed its full support for the Programme. It was of the opinion that MED-FAP should be able to give further impetus to forestry activities in the Mediterranean basin and, in this way, further strengthen solidarity among the countries of the region. It noted with satisfaction that the document had been widely disseminated. It recommended that States and inter-governmental and community organizations, including funding agencies, express their commitment to the Programme within the allotted time in view of the urgent situation facing all Mediterranean forests. In this regard, the Committee had received a message from the World Bank confirming that organization's interest in participating in the implementation of MED-FAP.

13. The Committee noted that the Programme was a tool and mechanism designed to help harmonize international support and for the preparation (or review) and implementation of forest policies, strategies, plans and programmes at national, sub-regional and regional levels. It provided a reference framework for forestry planning throughout the region. It was characterized, above all, by its adaptability and flexibility which took into account the diversity of situations in Mediterranean countries. The decision to implement the Programme at national and regional levels
lay, above all, with governments. The Programme belonged to the countries, and FAO had mainly to facilitate its implementation. Although special reserve funding had not been allocated to it, the Programme was in a position to attract contributions from bilateral and-multilateral funding mechanisms and agencies, thanks to the establishment of coherent plans.

14. The Committee acknowledged that it should act as an inter-governmental forum for the coordination, monitoring and orientation of the Programme. As regards international coordination per se, this would have to be undertaken by FAO, through its capacity in forestry planning, which could be stepped up if necessary.

15. The Committee stressed the need to establish within the framework of the Programme a system of exchange of know-how and experience and of technology transfer within each sub-region and between the Mediterranean region's various sub-regions.

16. The Committee recalled the relationship between the Programme and some agreements reached within the framework of the Rio Conference, especially the conventions on biological diversity and on combating desertification. It stressed the importance to be attached to the economic assessment of the plans and programmes formulated within the framework of MED-FAP and the establishment of funding priority criteria.

17. The Committee stressed a certain number of significant actions to be implemented under the Programme, particularly those contemplated in the chapter "Ecosystem protection", actions combining conservation and socio-economic development in participatory approaches, such as those implemented in the management of certain biosphere reserves. Other important actions concerned the sustainable development of mountain areas, the protection and study of old-growth forest ecosystems and training in the management of protected areas.

18. The Committee stressed the importance of encouraging national and international private sector participation in forestry development activities. It noted the measures under way to this end in some countries of the region and the programmes aimed at informing and enhancing the awareness of the business community and the public at large.

19. As regards the implementation of the Programme at regional and sub-regional levels, the Committee acknowledged the need to identify common priority areas and to formulate programmes and measures for each one.

ACTIVITIES OF THE RESEARCH NETWORKS (Item 5)

20. After recalling the history of *Silva Mediterranea*, Mr. Morandini, responsible for the Committee's ad hoc Group on Forest Research, presented Secretariat Note FO:SCM/94/4, reporting briefly on current forest research capacity in the Mediterranean region and on the progress made with the research themes covered by *Silva Mediterranea*. He recalled the themes which were currently the subject of cooperation: forest fire management (coordinator: Mr. P. Delabraze), selection of multi-purpose species in arid and semi-arid zones (coordinator: Mr. N. Akrimi), silviculture of species: *Pinus pinea* (coordinator: Mr. O. Ciancio), selection of stands of Mediterranean conifers for seed production (coordinator: Mr. M. Topak), and silviculture of species: cork oak (coordinator: Mr. R. Sardinha). Mr. Morandini stressed that the effectiveness of the networks depended both on the dynamism of the coordinator and on the active participation of the national focal points.
Theme 1 - Forest fire management
[item 5(a) - document FO:SCM/94/5]

21. Mr. Delabraze (France), the network's regional coordinator, recalled the programmers three main components: (i) development of knowledge on the inflammability of the main species and the combustibility of woody formations; (ii) evaluation of ground-clearing methods and studies on the adaptation of agricultural implements to mechanized work in forest areas; (iii) socio-economic surveys and research on the causes of fires and the real motives of the people responsible for them.

22. Mr. Delabraze recalled the various documents distributed to all the focal points and most national coordinators, and the various exchanges of correspondence within the network. The network focused its activities on surveys and socio-economic research on the causes of fires and, more specifically, on the collection and processing of forest fire data.

23. The coordinator reported on the second workshop on the use of forest fire databases, held in November/December 1993 at the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (ICAMAS), Montpellier, France, as a follow-up to the first, held in Chania in November 1991. The network agreed to pursue its efforts with respect to forest fire data banks by holding workshops similar to that held in Montpellier. The report on that workshop would soon be published in English and French.

24. The Committee thanked Mr. Delabraze for the work accomplished during the eight years he had served as network coordinator and regretted his wish to be relieved of his duties. It recommended that the network continue its efforts in line with the scheduled programmes. Following the proposal of the Portuguese delegation, supported by several other delegations, the Committee appointed Mr. Ricardo Vélez (Spain) as network coordinator.

Theme 2 - Selection of multi-purpose species for arid and semi-arid zones
[item 5(b) - document FO:SCM/94/6]

25. In the absence of the network coordinator, Mr. Akrimi (Tunisia), Mr. Mongi Ben M'Hamed (Tunisia) recalled that the network's programme comprised the following phases: (i) an inventory of native and exotic plant genetic resources and selection of the most interesting species for national reforestation programmes; (ii) the stepping-up of exchanges of information and genetic material with a view to the establishment of comparative trials; and (iii) the implementation of a genetic improvement programme.

26. In order to complete the data obtained from some network members in reply to the questionnaires sent to them, the coordinator visited four network member countries in July 1992. The data refer to 15 member countries. A report had been prepared and sent to the focal points presenting the species to be included in the second and third phases of the network's programme of work and stating the criteria on which this choice was based. He then described the activities that would be worthwhile undertaking in the coming years.

27. The Committee took note of Mr. Akrimi's wish, transmitted by Mr. Morandini, to be relieved of his duties, and thanked Mr. Akrimi for the work he had accomplished.

28. The Committee felt, now that the inventory had been completed, that it was necessary to proceed to the next stage, i.e. the exchange of material and information and the establishment of comparative trials. It recommended that the Secretariat propose a new coordinator, without
delay, to be appointed in consultation with Tunisia's national coordinator, the officers of the Committee, and the institutions and other countries concerned.

Theme 3 - Silviculture of species: *Cedrus sp.*
[item 5(c) - document FO:SCM/94/7]

29. Mr. M'Hirit (Morocco), regional network coordinator, summarized the network's activities in the following areas: (i) inventory of experiments; (ii) genetic improvement project; (iii) international seminar on Atlas cedar; (iv) cedar database.

30. The coordinator presented a progress report on the inventory of experiments which he classified under the following four components: (i) selection and genetic improvement; (ii) silviculture and production; (iii) ecophysiology and auto-ecology; and (iv) protection of cedars and cedar stands. He suggested that this inventory be completed so that as comprehensive a list as possible might be drawn up.

31. The first phase of the regional genetic improvement project, i.e. the identification of seed-bearing stands and seed collection, had begun, and seeds from four countries (31 provenances) had been collected through funds allocated from FAO's Regular Programme. These seeds, which were now stored at the Avignon Forest Research Station, would be distributed to all the network's countries; seed collection would continue for two to three years; preparation of the catalogue of provenances, with the names of the persons in charge for the direct exchange of seeds, was under way; and a proposed common experimental design for the provenance trials was under review, as was a project for the identification of stands using genetic markers, which should be of interest to several laboratories.

32. The coordinator reported on the international seminar on Atlas cedar, held in Ifrane (Morocco) from 7 to 11 June 1993 at the king invitation of the Government of Morocco, the proceedings of which would soon be published in a special issue of "Annales de la recherche forestière au Maroc". Then, with the co-editor, Mr. Ferrandes (France), he presented a progress report on the monograph on cedar, which should be completed by September 1994 and published jointly by FAO, the French National Institute for Agronomic Research (INRA) and IUFRO. Before putting forward a programme of work for the next two years, the coordinator presented the database on cedar which consisted of a bibliography, an authors' index and an analytic index. It was compatible with the international database AGRIS and could be constantly updated and consulted by everyone. A printed version of the database, as it stood at present, would soon be available and would be distributed to the network members.

33. The Committee thanked the coordinator for the work accomplished. It recommended that the programme be pursued as it had been described, including the preparation, then publication, of the monograph on cedar. It expressed the wish that the possibility be looked into of orienting the programme towards a review of ways and means of conducting comparative trials on natural and artificial cedar stand management methods.

Theme 4 - Silviculture of species: *Pinus pinea*
[item 5(d) - document FO:SCM/94/8]

34. In the absence of Mr. Ciancio (Italy), regional network coordinator, Mr. Morandini presented the report on the network's activities. At the fifteenth session, the coordinator had prepared a series of proposals for a research programme covering the various aspects of taxonomy, genetics,
silviculture, and wood and cone production, etc. He had asked the national focal points to let him know what points interested them so that a detailed research plan could be drawn up.

35. The *Pinus pinea* monograph, which comprised a much larger bibliography than that distributed at the previous session, was soon to be published in French.

36. The Committee noted that, as for the research network on multi-purpose species, this network had also reached the end of the first phase of its programme of work, surveys and documentary review. The second phase should involve concrete action in the field. Bearing in mind the economic importance of *Pinus pinea* for several of the region's countries, particularly for fruits, but also for wood production, it requested the Secretariat to submit proposals to the Officers of the Committee for the continuation of activities such as the exchange of material, the setting-up of comparative trials and genetic improvement.

Theme 5 - Selection of stands of Mediterranean conifers for the production of seed to be used in reforestation programmes

[Item 5(e) - document Fo:SCM/94/9]

37. In the absence of the network coordinator, Mr. Topak (Turkey), Mr. Morandini presented the document on this subject. The coordinator had sent a circular letter to network members to gather information on the seed sources of countries and to determine the selection criteria to be used.

38. The Committee drew the network's attention to the need to highlight the findings of the trials conducted since its establishment. As regards the exchange of forest seed, it pointed out that some countries had passed laws prohibiting trade in genetic material of uncontrolled origin. It suggested that an inventory of forest genetic resources be drawn up to facilitate the exchange and trade of forest seeds. It also stressed the need to use good conservation and storage techniques, particularly with a view to preserving the seeds' germinating capacity.

39. The Committee confirmed its interest in this theme and stressed the need for the rapid establishment of a genuine programme. To this end, it recommended that network members who had not already done so complete the questionnaire drawn up by the coordinator, so that the final list of seed stands could be completed.

Theme 6 - Silviculture of species: *Quercus suber* [item 5(f) - document FO:SCM/94/10]

40. Mr. R. Sardinha (Portugal), coordinator, reported on the network's activities since its establishment by the previous session of the Committee in March 1992. With a view to establishing a programme, the coordinator had requested the network members to let him know the themes with which they would like the network to deal. Few replies were forthcoming. After recalling the various research activities on cork oak, particularly within the framework of Resolution N°2 of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (Strasbourg 1990), on the conservation of forest genetic resources, the coordinator explained that it had not been possible to associate the network with the activities of the scientific consultative group in line with the resolution taken at the meeting held in Lisbon in July 1993. The coordinator also outlined plans for research on the cork oak involving network member countries to be funded by the European Economic Community (EEC) within the framework of its *Science and Technology for Development (STD3)* programme.
41. The Committee thanked the coordinator for the work he had accomplished and took note of the difficulties facing the network. It **recommended** that preparations for the research activities be continued and strengthened, and felt that priority should be given to the establishment of a programme of work.

**General**

42. The Committee thanked Mr. Morandini, the network coordinators and the focal points for the work accomplished. It noted the lack of funding for the networks, but pointed out that limited funds might be mobilized inasmuch as the coordinators and the network focal points showed determination and commitment. The Committee expressed the hope that the EEC would facilitate the participation of researchers from countries other than those of the Community in its research initiatives and programmes.

43. The Committee **recommended** that the Secretariat look into the feasibility of establishing a research network on the development of Mediterranean forest products and services, a theme to which a complete chapter (D3) was devoted in the MED-FAP document.

**FOREST RESOURCES ASSESSMENT 1990, NON-TROPICAL DEVELOPING COUNTRIES - MEDITERRANEAN REGION (Item 6)**

44. This item, which was added to the agenda, was presented by Mr. C. Racaut (FAO). Document FO:MISC/94/3 reviewed the forestry statistics available on the southern and eastern Mediterranean countries and proposed a mathematical analysis model for these data correlating three parameters (population density, percentage of forest cover and percentage of wet mountain area).

45. Compared with the situation in tropical forests, where the average annual deforestation rate of 0.8 per cent between 1981 and 1990 caused concern world-wide, the situation in some Mediterranean forests - an annual average deforestation rate of the order of 1 per cent - was as worrying, if not more so, but was ignored by the general public.

46. The Committee thanked FAO and the author for this work which highlighted the distressing trend in the forests of the southern and eastern Mediterranean countries covered by the study. It noted the limitations of the statistical data available on each country’s forest resources.

47. The Committee noted that it had been given a preview of this document and **recommended** that the model be refined, the concepts standardized by the *ad hoc* group that FAO was to establish, and the findings submitted to the countries concerned for review prior to final publication. It stressed the need for each country to know the status of and changes taking place in its forests and hoped that this type of study and appropriate projects would enable national capacities to be strengthened.

**FOREST ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES IN MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES (Item 7)**

48. In the wake of the Committee’s proposal at its fifteenth session (paragraph 68 of the report), the Secretariat had reviewed the forest administrative structures in Mediterranean countries and prepared Secretariat Note FO:SCM/94/11, which was presented by Mr. O. M’Hirit (Morocco). This note had no claim to a universally applicable solution, as a country’s forest administration depended on several factors, but tried to set out the differences and similarities of
the structures. It took note of the relationships and interactions between forest policies and administrative structures, the trend in the forestry sector in the face of ongoing changes, the organization of forest administrations and, finally, international cooperation-in this area.

49. Countries were expected to complete this note by providing information on their own administrative structures in their national reports. The 14 member countries represented, as well as Albania, presented a summary of their national reports, laying stress on their forestry sectors' administrative structures. These reports were made available to participating countries. All of the presentations bore witness to the wide variety of situations highlighted in the Secretariat Note.

50. The Committee noted with satisfaction that, whatever the solutions adopted, the traditional forestry functions had remained grouped within a coherent structure and that in general the forest's production and environmental functions were not placed under separate ministries. However, it underlined the usefulness of coordinating mechanisms in some cases.

51. With regard to decentralization, the Committee underlined the need for a clear definition of forestry responsibilities transferred from central to local level and for the local structures to be appropriately empowered.

52. The Committee stressed that the importance attached to the forestry sector in a given country was proportional to budgetary allocation, which remained insufficient in many countries, and to the relative position of the forest management structure in the national administration. Finally, it emphasized the need to develop indicators of administrative performance and reform effectiveness.

OTHER BUSINESS (Item 8)

- Future programme of work of the Committee

53. The Secretariat recalled the two main intersessional activities of the Committee: coordination of forestry research, and technical studies and surveys. The programmes of the research networks until the next session had been drawn up during the debate on agenda item 5. Since the fifteenth session, in addition to finalizing the Mediterranean Forest Action Programme, the Secretariat had been studying forestry administrative structures in the Mediterranean countries and examining how these operated.

54. After having underlined the Secretariat's support for the networks and called for a strengthening of research activities, the Committee reiterated its desire for the Secretariat to continue its studies in clearly-defined areas - more specifically: the role of the forester in the management of protected areas and, generally, the protection of the environment; forestry personnel training needs with respect to the management of protected areas, environmental protection and communication with the public at large on these matters; the role of forest management in the conservation of biodiversity; modalities for the transfer to the private sector of activities and functions currently assigned to the public sector; the feasibility of regional centres for the aerial control of forest fires; and broader studies on the forestry economy and the role of the forestry sector in social and economic development.
- Other matters

55. The Committee was informed that countries outside EEC were eligible for financial assistance from EEC for development, research and training projects through bilateral agreements. Delegates from non-EEC countries were advised to raise the matter with the EEC representative in their respective countries.

56. Participants were informed of the organization of the third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, which was to be held in Lisbon in 1998, and co-chaired by Portugal and Austria. It was suggested that topic proposals related to Mediterranean forests be submitted in good time to the conference organizers by way of *Silva Mediterranea*.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Item 9)

57. In compliance with Article IV-1 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee normally meets every two years. The next session will therefore be held in 1996. The Committee took note of the statement of the Italian delegation expressing its country's interest in hosting the next session. In accordance with the provisions of Article IV-2 of the Committee's Rules of Procedure, the dates and place of the seventeenth session will be decided by the Director-General of FAO in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.

ADOPTION OF REPORT (Item 10)

58. The Committee adopted the draft report placed before it, subject to certain amendments that have been included in the present text.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (Item 11)

59. In application of Article II-1 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee appointed the following officers:

Chairman: Savvas Theophanous (Cyprus)

Vice-Chairmen: Paolo Vicentini (Italy)
Hassan Osman Abdel Nour (Sudan)
Driss Ben Bahtane (Morocco)

60. At the closing ceremony, Mr. L. Peonides, Director of Forests of the Republic of Cyprus, thanked FAO and the Committee, on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forest Resources and the Environment and of all the foresters of his country, for having organized the sixteenth session of the Committee in Larnaca.
AGENDA

1. Adoption of Agenda
2. Election of rapporteur
3. Follow-up to the recommendations of the fifteenth session of the Committee
4. Mediterranean Forest Action Programme
5. Activities of the research networks
   (a) Forest fire management
   (b) Selection of multipurpose species
   (c) Silviculture of species: Cedrus sp.
   (d) Silviculture of species: Pinus pinea
   (e) Selection of stands of Mediterranean conifers for the production of seed to be used in reforestation programmes
   (f) Silviculture of species: Quercus suber
6. Forest resources assessment 1990, non-tropical developing countries Mediterranean region
7. Forest administrative structures in Mediterranean countries
8. Other business

Future programme of work of the Committee
Other matters

9. Date and place of next session
10. Election of officers
11. Adoption of report
ANNEX B

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Chairman: Fernando José Mota (Portugal)
Rapporteur: Driss Ben Bahtane (Morocco)
Secretary: Michel L. Malagnoux (FAO)

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

CYPRUS

Alexandros Christodoulou
Senior Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Tel: +357.2.302263
Fax: +357.2.451419

Savvas Theophanous
Chief Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Tel: +357.2.302528/352159
Fax: +357.2.352159

Vassos Stephanou Pantelas
Senior Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Tel: +357.2.305111
Fax: +357.2.305111

Aristos Ioannou
Senior Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Tel: +357.2.304335
Fax: +357.2.451419

Marcos Daniel
Senior Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Tel: +357.2.304335
Fax: +357.2.451419

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Jean-Pierre Derisbourg
Ambassador and Head of the Delegation of the Commission of the European Communities
P.O. Box 3480
Nicosia 137
Cyprus
Tel: +357.2.3692021314
Fax: +357.2.368926

FRANCE

Jean-Jaques Benezit
Chef, Departement international Office national des forêts
2, avenue de St Mandé
75012 Paris
Tel: +33.1.40.19.58.29
Fax: +33.1.40.19.58.78

Jean-Paul Ters
Ingénieur forestier Ministère de l'Agriculture
Direction de l'espace rural et de la forêt - SDF 1ter avenue de Lowendale
Paris 07 SP
Tél: +33.1.49.55.51.21
Fax: +33.1.49.55.41.97
Pierre Delabraze
Coordonnateur réseau de recherches sur les aménagements anti-incendies de
Silva Mediterranea
Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA)
Département des recherches forestières
Avenue A. Vivaldi
F-84000 Avignon
Tel: + 33.90.89.33.25
Fax: +33.90.89.98.73

Pierre Ferrandes
Ingénieur de recherches
Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA)
Domaine Experimental du Ruscas
4935 Route du Dom
83237 Bormes les Mimosas Cédex
Tél: + 33.94.05.32.10
Fax: +33.94.05.32.11

Jacques Lucien Grelu
Chargé de Mission
Ministère de l'Agriculture et forêts à Marseille Préfecture
66A rue St Sébastien
13006 Marseille
Fax: +33.91.57.27.20

GREECE
Asterios Zacharis
Director
Ministry of Agriculture
3, Ippokratous Street
Athens
Tel: + 30.1.3607438-9
Fax: +33.91.5442813

Evangelos Papaevangelos
Head of the Wildlife Management Section
Ministry of Agriculture
61 RododafnessStreet
Maroussi
Athens
Tel: + 30.1.3606752/3608084
Fax: + 30.1.3635359

ISRAEL
Omri Bonneh
Director, Research and Development Department of Forestry
P.O. Box 45
Kiryat Hayim, 26103

ITALY
Paolo Vicentini
Official in charge of Division
Ministero delle Risorse-Agricole, Alimentari e Forestali
Direzione Generale delle Risorse Forestali
Via G. Carducci, 5
00187 Rome
Tel: +39.6.46657041

Riccardo Morandini
Director
Istituto Sperimentale per la Selvicoltura
Viale Santa Margherita, 80
521100 Arezzo
Tel: +39.575.353021
Fax: +39.575.353490

Franco Favilli
Professeur Universitaire
Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Alimentari e Microbiologiche
Piazzale Cascine, 27
50144 Firenze
Tel: + 39.55.352 1 5 1
Fax: +39.55.330431

Vittorio Gualdi
Professeur d'aménagement forestier
Facoltà di Agraria
Università di Bari
Via Amendola 165/A
70126 Bari
Tel: +39.80.5443020
Fax: + 39.80.5442813

Ernesto Fusaro
Chercheur
Centro di Sperimentazione Agricola e Forestale (SAF-ENCC)
Via di Casalotti, 300
00166 Roma
Tel: + 39.0.61560241
Fax: + 39.0.61563703

JORDAN
Azzam Al-Muheisen
Director General
Department of Forests
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 2179
Amman
Tel: +962.0.837929
LEBANON
Jamil Dayem Abdayem
Director
Department of Forestry in Bikaa
Zahle-Shtoura
Tel: + 961.8.807592

MALTA
Joseph Borg
Principal Agricultural Officer
(Afforestation and Gardens)
Argotti Botanic Garden
Department of Agriculture
Floriana
Malta
Tel: + 356.224380
Fax: +356.234186

MOROCCO
Driss Ben Bahtane
Ingénieur en Chef
Direction des eaux et forêts et de la conservation des sols
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la mise en valeur agricole
Rabat- Ministères
Tel: +212.7.763015
Fax: +212.7.764446

Mohamed M'Hirit
Chef de la Division de recherches forestières
Division de recherches et d'expérimentations forestières
B.P. 763
10010 Rabat
Tel: +212.7.672547
Fax: + 212.7.671151

PORTUGAL
Fernando José Mota
Director, IFADAP
R. Miquel Torga, 26, 2º Esq.
5000 Vila Real
Tel: +351.59.71976
Fax: +351.59.72989

Jorge Casquilho
Director de Servigos de Estudos e Planeamento
Instituto Florestal

ROMANIA
Filimon Carcea
Dr.ing - Conseiller du Ministre
Ministère des eaux, des forêts et de la protection de l'environnement
Bd. Libertatii, nr. 14
Bucuresti-IV
Tel: +40.1.6316105
Fax: +40.1.3120403

SPAIN
Angel Barbero
Subdirector General de Ordenación de los Recursos Naturales
ICONA
Gran V(a de San Francisco, 4
28005 Madrid
Tel: +34.1.3476015
Fax: +34.1.3476303

Gabriel Catalan Bachiler
Director, Centro Investigación Forestal, INIA
Carretera de La Coruna, Km. 7.5
Madrid
Tel: +34.1.3476772
Fax: +34.1.3476303

SUDAN
Hassan Osman Abdel Nour
General Manager
Forests National Corporation
P.O. Box 658
Khartoum
Tel: +249.11.451575/451576

TUNISIA
Av. Joao Crisóstomo, 28-3º
1000 Lisboa
Tel: +351.1.3526239
Fax: +351.1.541462

Mongi Ben M'Hamed
Sous-Directeur des aménagements
Direction générale des forêts
30 rue Alain Savary
Tunis 1002

Raul Albuquerque Sardinha
Director, Estação Florestal Nacional
Ministério da Agricultura
Rua do Borja n° 2
1300 Lisboa
Tel: + 351.1.3973206
Fax: +351.1.3973163

Tel: +216.1.282550
Fax: +216.1.287487

Francisco J. Lopes
Delegaçao Florestal do Alentelo
Largo Dr. Evaristo, 15
7000 Evora
Tel: +351.66.22446
Fax: +351.66.21277
OBSERVERS FROM FAO MEMBER NATIONS NOT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

ALBANIA
(Mme) Zhaneta Prifti
Chef des relations extérieures, du personnel, et de la qualification
Direction générale des forêts
Rr. Ismail Qemali, N°4
Tirane
Tel: + 355.42.28432
Fax: + 355.42.23814

GERMANY
Hilmar E. Knopf
Professor
FH Hildesheim/Holzminden
Fachbereich Forstwirtschaft
Buspenweg 4
D-37077 Gottingen
Tel: +49.551.393882/53
Fax: +49.551.371667

REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Economic Commission for Africa
Ali Haribou
Project Analyst
UN Economic Commission for Africa
Joint ECA/FAO Agriculture Division
(FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT POLICY & PLANNING SECTION)
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
Tel: +251.1.510613
Fax: +251.1.510613

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Mohamed Skouri
Specialiste du Programme
Division des Sciences Ecologiques
Unesco
1, Rue Miollis
75015 Paris
France
Tel: + 33.1.45684054
Fax:+ 33.1.40659897
OBSERVERS FROM INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies

Placido Plaza
Administrateur principal
CIHEAM
11, rue Newton
75116 Paris
France
Tel: +33.1.47207003
Fax: +33.1.47201047

Alexandros Dimitrakopoulos
Research Coordinator
Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Chania
P.O. Box 85
73100 Chania
Greece
Tel: +30.821.81153
Fax: +30.821.81154

OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

International Union of Forestry Research Organizations

Savvas Theophanous
Chief Conservator of Forests
Department of Forests
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Nicosia
Cyprus
Tel: +357.2.302263
Fax: +357.2.451419

Riccardo Morandini
Director
Istituto Sperimentale per la Selvicoltura
Viale Santa Margherita, 80
521100 Arezzo
Italia
Tel: +39.575.353021
Fax: +39.575.353490
HOST COUNTRY SECRETARIAT

M. Daniel C. Nicolaou
M. Neocleous C. Logginos
A. K. Christodoulou S. Spyrou
Chr. Tifas S. Tsiakouris
Chr. Papakyriacou A. Panayi

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Amor Ben Romdhane
FAO Representative in Lebanon and Cyprus
P.O. Box 40010
Baabda (Beirut)
J. P. Lanly
Director, Forest Resources Division
Rome

M. Malagnoux
Secretary, Silva Mediterranea
Forest Resources Division
Rome

Eileen Nolan
Meetings Officer
Forestry Department
Rome

C. Racaut
Associate Professional Officer
Forest Resources Division
Rome

L. Lapenna Travertino
Secretary
Forest Resources Division
Rome

Interpreters:

A. Ben Ameur
D. Reyna
C. Bekalti
M. E. Sandoz
P. Farrell
F. Bron-Hadzinicolaou
R. Dewey-Valentino
H. T. Kilany
M. Diur
### ANNEX C

#### LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94t1</td>
<td>Provisional agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/2</td>
<td>Follow-up to the recommendations addressed to FAO by the fifteenth session of the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/3</td>
<td>Mediterranean Forest Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/4</td>
<td>Activities of the research networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(a)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/5</td>
<td>Report on activities of the research network on forest fire management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(b)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/6</td>
<td>Report of activities of the research network &quot;Selection of multipurpose species for arid and semi-arid zones&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(c)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/7</td>
<td>Report of activities of the research network &quot;Silviculture of species: Cedrus sp.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(d)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/8</td>
<td>Report of the activities of the network on Pinus pinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(e)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/9</td>
<td>Report of the network on selection of stands of Mediterranean conifers for the production of seeds to be used in reforestation programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(f)</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/10</td>
<td>Report of the research network &quot;Silviculture of species: Quercus suber&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FO:MISC/94/3</td>
<td>Forest resources assessment 1990, non-tropical developing countries - Mediterranean region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FO:SCM/94/11</td>
<td>Forest administrative structures in Mediterranean countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information documents**

- FO:SCM/94/Inf. 1: Information note
- FO:SCM/94/Inf. 2: Provisional timetable
- FO:SCM/94/Inf. 3: List of documents
- FO:SCM/94/Inf. 4: Statement of competence and voting rights by the European Economic Community and its member states
FOREST ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

IN MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES

Secretariat Note

1. At its previous session the Committee had expressed a wish for a debate on forest administrative structures in Mediterranean countries. They wished to gain a better understanding of the current situation and trends, and to assess both the efficiency of these structures and any inherent constraints.

2. In 1984 FAO carried out a survey public forest administrations in French-speaking African countries". This was followed by a seminar in Tunis in 1985 which reviewed the situation. The review was considered in this note, which also uses data from the various country reports to the tenth World Forestry Congress, to the sessions of the relevant Regional Forestry Commissions, and to Silva Mediterranea. The note also refers to FAO Forestry papers N° 86 (1988) and 92 (1989), Forestry policies in Europe, and N° 111, Forestry policies in the Near East region: analysis and synthesis (1992). Lastly, the note takes into account the conclusions and recommendations of the tenth World Forestry Congress and decisions of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) (Rio de Janeiro, June 1992).

3. This paper lays no claim to universally applicable proposals, as a country's forest administration depends on many things: country size, the size of its forest, the political institutions, the territorial organization and, of course, the national forest policy. More realistically, the paper proposes to set out the major differences and similarities for a certain number of forest administrative structures, particularly those concerning organization and responsibilities. The observations and suggestions on possible improvements also include the institutional component of the Mediterranean Forest Action Programme (MED-FAP). The paper will be supplemented after the session by an analysis of the answers to the questionnaire addressed to each country.

1. FROM FORESTRY POLICIES TO FOREST ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

4. There has been a vast ongoing discussion at national and world levels on forestry problems in recent years. The stimulus has been the serious degradation or shrinking of wooded areas nearly everywhere, particularly in the tropics and in the Mediterranean, and the debate reflects widespread and growing public concern.

5. There is a concomitant need to gear administrative structures to these changes. The importance and urgency of these organizational problems cannot, however, conceal the current and universal malaise of forest administrations in terms of financial, staff and operational resources, aggravated by their isolation from the political power structure and poor public image. Any structural reform which fails to lift these constraints, which are due to the (apparently) poor economic performance of Mediterranean forests, is doomed to fail. Restoring forestry policy to its rightful place in overall national policy is the right way to lift these constraints. The direct economic effects of the forest on industry, commerce and tourism, and indirect economic effects on other sectors, particularly agriculture, grazing and the protection of infrastructure, must be clearly brought out. Lastly, the public at large and policy-makers need to be briefed on the non-economic -i.e. the social, cultural, recreational and scenic - functions of the forest.

1.1 Forest Policy trends

6. Forest policy is implemented by a complex set of instruments and factors, including the private and public sectors and legislation. The definition of a good policy must precede the search
for the best administrative tool for policy implementation. Conversely, forest administration and administrative organization also help to inspire and frame forest policy.

7. Both the Mediterranean countries and their forest policies are highly diverse, but they do have common denominators. While it is impossible to recommend a universal plan for good administrative organization (there is no such thing), one can use a MED-FAP-based analysis to identify certain past errors, and to formulate a few principles based on national experiences which countries can use as a guide for reviewing their forest administrative structures.

1.2 Current factors in forestry policies

8. These are:

(i) the growth of urbanization and the consequent rise of a body of urban opinion which increasingly favors the social function of wooded areas, i.e. the scenic and recreational function (often to the detriment of the traditional economic function), to which policy-makers are increasingly receptive;

(ii) the new world demand for forests to help conserve biodiversity and mitigate the "greenhouse effect";

(iii) the shrinking and degradation of wooded areas in the Mediterranean region caused by forest fires, aggravated by rural depopulation and the subsequent regrowth of vegetation in the northern Mediterranean countries, and by a poverty-generating excessive population pressure in the southern and eastern parts of the Basin. Clearing for agricultural land, overgrazing and overexploitation for fuelwood are further factors;

(iv) the accelerating degradation of nature: water erosion in watersheds, wind erosion on inland and maritime sand dunes, soil degradation, desertification; and the increasingly important protection and heritage roles of the forest;

(v) the increasingly important role of trees in rural areas given the limited potential for afforestation (scarce availability of land, degraded soils);

(vi) the growth and diversity of new and difficult (and frequently non-forestry) tasks for forest administrations: management of protected wild lands such as parks and reserves, soil, wildlife and plant conservation, etc...;

(vii) the universalization of the forest debate and the development of international cooperation between North African and Near Eastern countries, and between them and the northern countries; the growth of bilateral and multilateral cooperation; and the increasingly active role of the private sector and of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

(viii) the impact of major political decisions external to the forest sector and yet profoundly affecting it, such as administrative decentralization.

All these changes and transformations have been very swift and clearly many national forest administrations have not reorganized and are not in a position to take up these new challenges.

1.3 Institutional response to these changes

9. There are a number of possible responses to these changes:

(i) break the isolation of forest administrations:
at the central level, by establishing cooperation and consultation linkages with other ministerial departments and agencies working in the forest sector;

- lower down in the hierarchy, by reorganizing rural sectoral services or linking forest services more closely with those responsible for the environment, rural development, agricultural and pastoral activities, etc;

(ii) adopt a more dynamic administrative stance with respect to development in addition to the basic duty to monitor and enforce observance of forestry regulations) including advisory services, technical supervision, information, extension, rural leadership, introduction of participatory structures, etc...;

(iii) redefine central authority administration so as to bring administrative decisions closer to beneficiaries, users and target populations, by means of:

- decentralization, i.e. the transfer of State responsibilities to institutions closer to the problems in the field;

- devolution, i.e. the transfer of centrally concentrated administrative authority to lower levels of the hierarchy for quicker decision-making and increased field responsibility;

(iv) enlist the participation of municipal authorities, local populations, etc...;

(v) in countries where State ownership is predominant, encourage privatization or community forestry, both to lighten the managerial role of the administration and to increase participation;

(vi) design and implement forest operations in the overall context of integrated rural development, remembering that the solutions to forest problems must be found outside the immediate forest sector;

(vii) develop agro-forestry and silvo-pastoralism;

(viii) respond to the imperious need to establish the capabilities to effectively ensure "sustainable forest management" that can consolidate and maintain the many uses of the forest and ensure the protection, production and continuity of this renewable resource.

1.4 Strengthening the forest administration

10. Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 adopted by UNCED is very clear on this point (11.2): "To improve and harmonize administrative structures and mechanisms...n. The need to strengthen forest-related institutions is continually stressed.

11. Strengthening usually means a bigger budget, greater operational capacity, and more staff, training and motivation (this last via greater responsibility given to staff and better career prospects). Internal organization efforts can also help to boost the productivity of available staff.

12. These improvements can be made without changing the structures. Additionally, administrative efficiency can be enhanced through initial and ongoing training at all levels, not only technical training but also training in planning, economics and communications. A search for solutions to concrete problems, a forest inventory and the availability of reliable statistics are crucial to efficiency.
2. ORGANIZING THE FOREST SECTOR IN THE LIGHT OF ONGOING TRANSFORMATIONS

2.1 Intersectoral cooperation

13. Forest administrations everywhere have long remained isolated and fiercely independent, limiting interventions to their own sector and jealously defending their own territory against any encroachment by other administrations. One outcome of this solitary stance was a forest policy which stood alone when it could usefully have helped to enrich, or to benefit from, other policies. Forest policy specifics notwithstanding, forests are one component of land use planning, an essential component of the environment, and an economic sector which creates jobs and employment. Forest management is increasingly the concern of the entire society.

14. Forest policy must therefore be linked and balanced: with agricultural policy for land allocation and clearing; with livestock policy for forest grazing, with tourism for recreation, and with infrastructural and urban policy for green areas. Forest policy needs to take its rightful place in general planning and in pluri-annual socio-economic development plans.

15. It is important at the same time to institutionalize dialogue with the other economic and social sectors and with those working in the forest sector: those who plant trees, own forests, use them, as well as wood industry managers, conservation NGOs, scientists, teachers and other qualified people. Countries such as Morocco and France have advisory bodies such as committees, commissions and conferences which are chaired by the Minister responsible for forestry questions, or regional structures led by the local administrative authority.

16. Budgetary arbitration rarely favors the forest sector, whose characteristically long-term nature totally obviates the urgency factor in investment decisions. There are two further reasons as well:

- national accounts never reckon the non-commercial value of the forest services for the public at large;

- policy-makers, preoccupied with the short term, fail to understand the medium- and long-term threat hanging over wooded areas, and the significance of the social and ecological functions of the forest for present and future generations.

17. Because of the generally low rate of return of forest investment, of the handicap of its long-term nature of forestry and its generally low economic priority, only a strong and well-respected administration can provide the necessary inter-ministerial cooperation for forestry questions, carry its weight at the political level and win in difficult-to-arbitrate situations. The forest administration's central headquarters must include some mechanism whereby discussion, dialogue and consultation can promote understanding of the needs of the forest. The administration must build closer support and cooperation with the forest industries sector, the wood trade and markets. At the same time it must speak authoritatively to the public and to pressure groups, particularly on issues related to sustainable forest management, reconciling at one and the same time the economic, environmental and social roles of the forest.

2.2 Integrated rural development

18. At its former session the Committee stressed "the importance of an integrated and multi-disciplinary approach to rural development. The Rio Conference made the same recommendation, one which is particularly justified in the case of Mediterranean forests. The problems of the management of erosion-plagued watersheds, of the desertification of arid zones, and the abandonment of fragile rural areas are not typical forestry problems, but rather wider-reaching questions of overall rural development. The forestry policies of the past were too sectorial in design and implementation. The forest must be an integral part of rural development, embodying sound policies and methods that are environmentally sustainable at the regional as well as the national levels."
19. The only feasible integrated rural development approach has to involve several Ministries and coordinate intervention by leaders from all economic and social sectors. The various administrations involved, particularly the forest administration, must become more outward-looking, adapting their structures accordingly. The integrated approach is two-pronged:

- participation by rural people, the prime beneficiaries. People's participation implies information, awareness-building, extension, a concerted study of land capability, priority-setting, etc... This is not limited to forestry aspects;

- the implementation of economic development activities (agriculture, livestock husbandry, forestry) as well as social projects. Global development must be orchestrated by a leader who can coordinate all of these various sectors.

20. Foresters are not always trained to take on the multi-disciplinary tasks of rural leadership, coordination and orchestration of integrated development, but they must contribute their skills and resources to the effort. Mediterranean countries have various approaches to integrated rural development, as the following paragraphs show.

(a) Creating a multidisciplinary administrative structure

21. Tunisia set up Development Offices to implement rural development. In 1988 these were taken over by Regional Commissariats for Agricultural Development. Each of them represents all directorates of the Ministry of Agriculture in a region ("Governorat"), including the forestry districts which also come under the Directorate of Forests.

22. Morocco also integrated its forestry local echelons under Provincial Directorates for Agriculture (DPA) which group all of the decentralized units of the Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform (MARA).

23. France set up a Directorate of Rural Lands and Forests (DERF), regional directorates (DRAF) and departmental directorates for agriculture and forests (DDAF) where agronomists, foresters, rural engineers and land use planning experts all work together.

(b) Rural activities entrusted to forest administrations

24. Some countries have included desertification control and watershed management in the terms of reference of their forest administrations. Some (Libya, Afghanistan) include pasture management. Others have included other rural development responsibilities such as soil conservation (Morocco, Jordan), land development (Egypt) and natural resources conservation and development (Cyprus).

25. Under the Ministry of Forests of Turkey, the General Directorate of Forests and Rural Development implements rural development plans in the agroforestry zones (forest villages), helping to create rural cooperatives to carry out this work.

26. In Iran, the Directorate of Forests and Husbandry and its provincial natural resource directorates have recently been put under the Ministry of the Jihad and infrastructure ("Jihad e Sazandegi"). This large Ministry, recently formed to promote integrated rural development, also includes a watershed management directorate separate from the forest administration.

(c) Participation of the forest administration in rural development programmes, but without rural responsibilities

27. No optimum operational structure clearly emerges from the above examples. Should foresters really be the ones to steer integrated rural development? Most are not trained to do so and this extremely challenging job does detract from the already very demanding forestry mandate.
28. Iraq’s country report to the eleventh session of the Near East Forestry Commission in 1990 expressed the hope that tasks not specific to forestry could be entrusted to another Directorate so that the Forestry Directorate could concentrate on enhancing the forest resources for which it is responsible. This seems sensible, considering that forest administrations were wrong in the past in accepting to perform an excessive number of non-forestry tasks for which they lacked the resources.

29. As for integrated rural development, everywhere advocated and seldom practiced, there has never been a clear definition of the skills and structures needed to implement it. Foresters undoubtedly play a major role in desertification control and watershed management. But perhaps the best approach would be to distinguish between:

  - the steering of the activities by a local development committee backed by an administration competent in land allocation and land use planning, able to make the necessary general studies, and at the same time to raise local awareness and ensure extension activities; and

  - the participation of all sectors concerned, and particularly the forest administration which would be a solidly entrenched part of this group process, contributing skills and resources.

2.3 People’s participation

30. People’s participation is an approach much stressed in UNCED’s Agenda 21: “to promote the involvement of the local population...” (12.14), “to create the capacity of village communities to take charge of their development and the management of their land resources...” (12-27)... " to establish mechanisms for the involvement of land users..." (12.57), etc. The same can be said of the recommendations of the tenth World Forestry Congress.

31. The old forest policy whereby vast tracts were reforested and then closed to user populations not only proved inadequate, but also contributed to the creation of animosity towards the forest services. The participatory approach, instead, assumes a partnership between public authorities and local populations, with a real pooling of responsibilities. The administration needs local support and locals need State assistance. "God helps those who help themselves" as the old saying goes.

32. Profound institutional changes are implicit in the participatory strategy:

  - training in ecology as part of the primary and secondary school curricula (cooperation between foresters and teachers);

  - establishment of an effective extension service;

  - introduction of training in communications skills in the basic and in-service training of foresters of the field echelons and revision of their terms of reference.

33. Participation in terms of the forest sector alone is inconceivable; there must be an integrated approach covering the full spectrum of rural activities and aspirations within a given area. In structural terms, participation implies the organization of groups:

  - pastoral groups: a 1988 Tunisian law set up "silvo-pastoral interest groups";

  - village associations: in Turkey a Directorate for Forests and Rural Relations has administrative authority over forest village populations, establishes rural development plans and helps to establish rural cooperatives for forestry activities;
- less formally, a local rural development committee can be formed to bring together local authorities, local protagonists and local expertise. The committee would be responsible for land allocation, land operations and development programmes.

34. Participation cannot be disinterested: populations must reap a diverse range of economic and financial benefits:

- State assistance to enhance village life, local production, etc...: this is the real meaning of integrated development and the real interest of foresters to participate;

- income generated by State-owned forests on communal lands (innovative measure implemented by the Government of Morocco).

2.4 Forest appropriation

35. Forest appropriation, either collective (e.g. village forests) or private, is another way to have people share in the benefits of forest management; private or collective ownership of the forest is the best guarantee of interest for the landlords who identify themselves with their forests.

36. In the Mediterranean countries of western Europe, forests are mostly privately owned: the figure is 2/3 in France, Italy and Spain, and 3/4 in Portugal. Most wooded areas in North Africa and in the Near and Middle East are basically State-owned, in contrast.

37. Private appropriation creates a solid bond between the forest and the owner: it is in the owner's interest to enhance and conserve his property. There are disadvantages as well: appropriation favors the economic function, there is less guarantee of permanence, and there may be forest clearing and mismanagement. Above all, private appropriation may well mean fragmentation and division of the land through sale or inheritance.

38. State management of State forests necessarily implies scant involvement by rural people in forest conservation and development. Conflict between the administration managing these forests and the people living in or around them is an inevitable risk.

39. In State forests, moreover, the overlapping of State ownership and user rights singularly complicates management. In a comparable situation, French forest policy in the nineteenth century resorted to a cantonment procedure whereby a user was granted full ownership of a section of the forest, relinquishing user rights over the rest in exchange. Many communal or district forests owe their origin to this procedure.

40. In private forests, on the other hand, fragmentation was solved by the establishment of collective management, and nationalization was not even a consideration. Concerning the State-appropriated forest, excessive and monolithic concentration was avoided by an approach that substituted appropriation and profit-sharing, and here systematic privatization was not a consideration either.

41. Concerning structures and administrative efficiency, the two forms of appropriation privatization and community ownership - create new actors, strongly motivated with respect to forest management. Thus, the possibilities for action by the administration are facilitated, since the administration is often too busy with the management of public forests. The forest administration can then provide leadership, while enjoying the support of both local populations and new communal or private forest owners.

42. Private appropriation requires legal provisions to limit abuses and to guarantee the respect for forest functions of interest to all. Private forest ownership, on the other hand, should enjoy financial incentives and appropriately geared tax schemes.
43. Private initiative can also be tapped to create new forests through afforestation. In Libya, whereas all natural forests are State-owned, 10 per cent of the reforestation has been done by private owners.

44. Two types of private ownership are of special interest:
- the so-called "farm" forest or tree planting - particularly the agroforestry mode, which benefits from the expertise, equipment, available time and proximity of the rural owners. This is an asset for rural land-use planning as well;
- productive afforestation combined with a wood processing unit to foster economic development and create jobs locally.

45. Collective (or more generally community) appropriation is prominent among the final recommendations of the tenth World Forestry Congress: "the allocation of forest lands or lands designated for forest development to local authorities makes it possible to involve more effectively local populations with the administration of the forest heritage".

46. The expertise and proximity of village communities can be a guarantee of sustainable use. Collective appropriation is, in fact, the only acceptable way to manage and conserve wooded areas whose dominant function is to serve the general public.

2.5 Sustainable forest management

47. State forest management is the responsibility of the State, either the forest administration (the more usual case) or a separate (usually a para-statal) agency. In communally-owned forests, the communal owner and the public authorities share management decisions. The State is usually responsible for management and the community usually receives the income and finances the work. Private forests are managed by their owners, but there are legal constraints geared to the general interest which limit the owners' rights to some extent.

48. All of these ownership systems are covered by strict protective legislation. As a guarantee of sustainable management, in particular, the legislation stipulates the establishment of management plans under centralized management guidelines approved at the higher echelons and controlled by the State administration.

49. Additionally, the permanent status of areas designated as forest must be guaranteed: controlled clearing, observance of the principle of inalienability, strict control of concessions, etc. It is extremely important for any concession which constitutes a departure from the law to remain the competence of the highest authorities.

2.6 Communications

50. The three spheres of communication concern the internal administrative structure; the external sector (professionals in the forestry, agricultural and pastoral sectors, particularly through the use of a well-performing extension service); and the public at large.

51. The public's reaction to the forest is intuitive or sentimental, and is not based on a true knowledge. In this sense, the forest suffers from a considerable communications gap in all countries. Foresters at all levels are unable to get their message across. At the tenth World Forestry Congress a representative from a major NGO publicly declared "This congress is about foresters, not about the forest".

52. This communication gap is a serious one as the forestry sector will only enlist the support of policy-makers to the extent that it is able to get its message across. It is essential for the forest administration to have an effective documentation and information service, attached to the office of the Director, to gather, store and disseminate information and to prepare carefully targeted and convincing messages, projects, interviews and commentary, and so forth. It should also become
automatic for foresters at all levels to present their problems, difficulties and successes, thus familiarizing
their audience with the forest.

3. ORGANIZING FOREST ADMINISTRATION

3.1 Opening remarks

53. The basic objective of yesterday's forestry policies was to create (through afforestation), enhance
(through silviculture and management) and conserve the forest heritage. Regulations were designed more
as prohibitions than as incentives. The police role of the forester was performed within highly stratified,
military-type administrations divorced from their social context.

54. As a result the forest administration was in constant confrontation with two opponents: the local
population, which was affected by prohibitive forestry regulations and the public at large which was
uninformed as to why forests were declining and disappearing and what could be done about them. The
administration, in response to this lack of understanding, was forced to come up with an organized and
dynamic approach in which forest development would be integrated with rural development and all
concerned would be consulted.

55. Though the forest is part of the rural sector, this should not hide the highly specific nature of forest
management and of the forest administration. Rural development and forest policy have two different
rationales. The first responds to immediate needs and quick profits. The second is a long-term operation
which can easily be sidelined because the real value of forests cannot be quantified and because forests
cannot be counted as current assets.

56. Repressive action alone is no longer sufficient to cope with the pressure exerted by a burgeoning
population and the vital needs of the people who are currently overexploiting wooded areas. However, that
same much-criticized repressive legislation did help safeguard forests and is still necessary today. This
should not be forgotten, and is the reason why structural reforms (often imposed from outside) should be
measured and prudent. Indeed the will to decompartmentalize has now gone too far, and the new
responsibilities and structural changes have entailed:

- excessive structural fragmentation: afforestation to the Ministry of Agriculture, wood processing to the
  Ministry of Industry, the conservation of biodiversity and nature to the Ministry of the Environment,
  forest fire protection to the Ministry of Interior, and so forth. The fragmentation is such as to prevent an
  overall view of the sector;

- weakened terms of reference which lead to duplication of efforts and conflict, despite the universally
  affirmed need for forest management to embrace the ecological, economic and social functions;

- resources are stretched too thin.

57. This analysis forces two conclusions: forestry policies must be an integral part of development Plans
and of land use planning, and foresters must make arrangements to cooperate with other sectors so that
their concerns will become part of the larger framework. At the same time, within this dual framework, the
forest administration must remain solid and consistent.

3.2 The transfer of powers

58. The key words today are decentralization, devolution and regionalization. Reform is implicit in these
new strategies and the point is not to revise the mandate of the forest administration but rather to establish
new relationships which will enable it to enhance its own action and also to delegate activities to other
structures and other actors.

59. The decentralization recommended by UNCED ("establish administrative structures for more
decentralized decision-making and implementation") means that an administration will delegate action,
perhaps by:
- supporting and developing the private sector: in Spain, Portugal and France, afforestation has been essentially private sector action with State assistance through subsidies, technical support and tax exemption;

- the transfer of government responsibilities to the private sector: in France the regional centres for forest owners amount to a delegation of State powers. These organizations of private owners are now responsible for leadership and enforcement, the management of public monies and even regulatory powers (licensing cutting, approving management plans);

- the transfer of central administrative responsibilities to the provincial level: in Tunisia the Regional Commissariats for Agricultural Development (CRDA), set up in 1989, are public agencies under the Governors which act as the sole representatives of all directorates of the Ministry of Agriculture. The forest districts, which are field services of the Directorate of Forests, come under these Commissariats;

- support for the constitution of cooperatives and protection associations: their establishment, with administrative support and supervision, gives responsibility to local actors and helps them to organize for self-management;

- lastly, there is considerable education of the public and participation of local communities in non-economic environmental protection and rehabilitation activities, actions which should become increasingly important in the future in the Mediterranean area.

60. Countries like Spain and Italy have pushed regionalization to the point where regional political authorities are governments with elected, law-making assemblies. Forest policy in this context is a regional affair and each has its own forest administration. Other countries, France in particular, have also regionalized, setting up regional executives and elected assemblies, but have not decentralized their forest policy which remains the prerogative of the central government.

61. Other countries, such as Morocco, which have still not regionalized political power, are beginning to see the devolution of governmental authority to regional districts. The need appears for devolution to a regional level intermediary between a strong central Directorate and the too-distant field echelons.

62. In heavily regionalized countries, the federal or central authority is turned over to the regional administrations who make law, formulate policy and manage the human and financial resources. There are still jobs which ought not to be done at this level, however, and which should be maintained or recentralized to an adequately staffed national administration:

- cooperation and international liaison (although the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at the political level they are very difficult for provincial or local structures to handle at the technical level);

- coordinating research and training;

- forest inventories and statistics;

- national parks and biological reserves of national interest;

- pest and forest fire control.

63. Devolution is the organized delegation of decision-making to the lower echelons of an administrative hierarchy. The process, still insufficiently implemented by forest administrations paralyzed by excessive centralism, was recommended by the Tunis seminar (review of forest administration organigrams to consolidate the principle of devolution).
64. This delegation of powers can in fact breathe new life into an overstaffed and top-heavy administration. It cuts through excess red tape, simplifying and shortening channels by bringing the decision-maker closer to the problem or to the person whom the decision involves; it avoids costly duplication of effort; but most of all, it frees the top levels to focus more on other tasks and hands over more responsibility to the lower echelons.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

65. Forest administrations have different kinds of responsibilities, whether limited to reforestation, management and forest exploitation or also embracing environmental protection, erosion and desertification control, hunting and fishing, etc...:

- first there are the sovereign power of guidance, control and public authority which ought not to be decentralized;

- then there are the everyday management and technical functions which should be delegated to independent para-statal structures or to the private sector.

4.1 Para-statal structures

66. A para-statal agency is operationally flexible, particularly in financial terms (not coming under the annual ministerial budget) and in terms of staff recruitment (not subject to civil service staff regulations). It has the legal personality and financial autonomy for self-financing. Lastly, it is answerable to a governing council representing a number of interests. A para-statal structure can take many different forms, juridically speaking: state company, joint venture, public enterprise, etc.

67. The para-statal structure acts as the executing agency and "project manager" for forestry operations programmed by the "owner, which may be the State for State forests through State-approved management plans, or Municipal Councils for communal forests, etc.

68. In Portugal, a law passed in April 1993 to reorganize the Ministry of Agriculture profoundly reformed the forest administration, setting up a legally and financially autonomous body: the Forest Institute. The Institute assumed the former forest administration's responsibilities for publicly- and privately-owned forests. Led by a governing council and advised by a consultative committee representing all interested parties, the Institute has regional (forest delegations) and local (forest zones) units.

4.2 State Forest Administration

69. As for the area of responsibility of the State Forest Administration, situations lie somewhere between these two main types:

- an omnipresent administration exercising traditional authority over forestry, fishing and hunting activities, but also gradually overwhelmed with responsibilities for nature conservation, environmental management, rural development and management, desertification control, watershed management, etc;

- and an administration which has shed all but specifically forestry responsibilities: nature conservation (parks, reserves, flora and fauna) come under the Ministry of the Environment; forest fire control (which in France is the responsibility of a State-financed Civil Security Department) is also delegated; and forest industries come under the Ministry of Energy and Industry (Spain).

70. Both extremes have advantages and drawbacks. The advantages of the second are a greater range of skills and resources, allowing forest personnel to be assigned directly to protection and utilization, thus avoiding vague terms of reference for which foresters have not been trained. This disadvantage, however, is that responsibilities are diluted and people may easily have quite different perceptions of their job, leading to conflict and inconsistencies. Nonetheless, this may be the better
approach, providing that two as-yet-unmet conditions are fulfilled: the dispersion of responsibilities is well under control, and the Minister responsible for forests must have real authority to coordinate all forest policy action.

4.3 A co-existing State administration and para-statal agency

71. Forest development in Algeria is the responsibility of the National Forest Agency, which was set up in 1990. The Agency is backed by six regional offices for programme implementation. There is also a National Agency for the Protection of Nature. In France, a National Forestry Office was set up in 1965 to manage public forests (state and communal). The Office is also empowered to carry out missions delegated by the Administration and to provide services in response to national or international demands. In Bulgaria, the entire forest sector comes under the Forest and Wood Industries Association which co-exists with a Directorate of Forests which is responsible for Bulgaria's forest policy.

72. Unless the rules are observed, conflicts may arise between coexisting State Administrations and independent para-statal Agencies. The rules are that the administration has authority and supervision, whereas the agency implements the programme of action and guidelines, forest by forest, within approved management plans.

73. In practice, it is up to the Ministry responsible for forestry matters to strike the right balance and to arbitrate where needed. Para-statal responsibilities could even be delegated to forest field operations.

74. The administration, free of the day-to-day business of administration and management, nonetheless has a major role to play, and substantial authority over:

- the definition and periodic review of forest policy, leadership, coordination and control over all aspects of policy implementation;

- the tackling of forest issues in pluri-annual economic and social development plans;

- interministerial and intersectoral coordination;

- budget control;

- new legislation and regulations;

- forest research and education guidelines and reviews;

- communications with national media;

- international cooperation.

4.4 Ministerial responsibility for forests

75. Which Ministry should be responsible for forestry administration? In Turkey, the Ministry of Forests has four general directorates which share a wide range of forest, rural and environmental management responsibilities. Organizationally, this is the most powerful forest administration in the region.

76. The forest services of Albania, Greece, Jordan, Portugal and Tunisia come under the Ministry of Agriculture. In other countries the name of the ministry lists other functions but, oddly enough, the word “forest” is never mentioned; the Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform (Morocco, Afghanistan, Syria); Fishing or Fisheries (France, Malta); Natural Resources (Cyprus); Land Development (Egypt, Libya); Food (Hungary).
77. The name of the directorate responsible for forests often includes a further responsibility: livestock (Libya, Afghanistan), soil conservation (Morocco, Jordan), pastures (Albania).

78. There is some logic in this dependence on agriculture. Agriculture and forestry are complementary, e.g. silvo-pastoralism and agroforestry, and yet they may entail fierce opposition, e.g. conflict over land use, which a Minister of Agriculture is in a better position to arbitrate. Many people have pointed out the inherent drawbacks, however, and would favor placing the administration under a Ministry of the Environment or Natural Resources, thus stressing and promoting the ecological and protective functions. Alternatively, a Ministry responsible for the entire forest wood sector would affirm that all of these functions are compatible.

79. Whichever Ministry takes the lead, the main point is to avoid dispersing forest responsibilities among too many Ministries and agencies. The Ministry responsible for the forest sector must have real and institutionalized powers to coordinate administrative activities, however they are organized.

80. Other organizational options may be cited: in Israel a private structure, the autonomous Land Development Authority, is in charge; in Iran it is the Ministry of "Jihad e Sazandegi" which has one directorate for forestry and livestock matters and another for watershed management.

4.5 Local and field services

81. A survey evaluating the organization of forest field administrative services would be of great interest, particularly for local forest monitoring and work supervision. A wide variety of situations range from the classic field hierarchy of warden, district chief, sector chief prevalent in most countries, to municipal responsibility for forests in Libya and Egypt.

82. An analysis of these varied situations would reveal certain organizational principles: the need to reinforce the local echelons; a streamlined executive level; reducing hierarchical fragmentation to benefit broader geographic coverage and a team-led effort; devolution of authority and resources to the lower echelons which would assume as much responsibility as possible.

5. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

83. The discussion on the forest issue and the means of assuring forest protection have taken on an increasingly international tone in recent years. This growing, though sometimes rather haphazard, movement cries out for streamlining of the debates and, above all, the will to steer discussion towards concrete action.

84. Additionally, the technical and financial support mobilized in the context of international cooperation between developed and developing countries can only be effective if the recipient country strengthens its capacity to enter into dialogue and participate in project design, implementation and monitoring. Success hinges upon the reinforcement of national institutions.

85. Nor is cooperation limited to assistance and financial support between developed and developing countries. Groups of countries with identical problems need to cooperate: air pollution in northern Europe and forest fires in the south; desertification in North Africa and in the Near East.

86. A model for the organization of international cooperation may be seen in the highly pragmatic approach of the Ministerial Conference which brought 31 European countries together in Strasbourg in 1990. No new techno-structure was created, but the Conference dealt with a limited number of specific subjects, with no need for unanimous approval. It was possible to move from discussion by qualified experts to the involvement of political figures and approval by the ministers concerned. Regularly scheduled conferences (Helsinki, 1993) ensure high-level follow-up and the possibility for new action.
5.1 Reinforcing the various types of cooperation

87. Continual stress has been laid on the need to reinforce cooperation, particularly at the Rio Conference, with regard to:

- UN and other intergovernmental agencies (FAO, UNEP, ILO, Unesco, World Bank) and their specialized bodies (such as Silva Mediterranea and its networks);

- specialized regional agencies such as ICAMAS;

- competent international non-governmental organizations such as IUFRO;

- and other regional cooperation structures where neighboring countries share the same problems - e.g. the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU).

5.2 Establishing and strengthening cooperation administration

88. No form of cooperation makes sense unless it benefits all forestry institutions, sectors and people within the country, and unless continuity and follow-up are guaranteed. In structural terms, much remains to be done in terms of building sound, effective, lasting cooperation.

89. Excessive regionalization can have the adverse effect of depriving some countries of operational structures for international cooperation and liaison. There are also still far too many occasional or purely personal links between experts which are not part of a coherent and larger strategy of cooperation. In contrast, international framework programmes such as MED-FAP have been implementing sound cooperation programmes for some years now.

90. As the foregoing implies, an international unit, directly attached to the Director-General of the Forest Administration, should be available at the most central level within each country. This small unit would have one or two very experienced officers, speaking several languages, organized as follows: the international organizations and other countries would speak through them; all cooperative action within the country would go through them once the political stances had been defined and the priorities and programme established; they would ensure a three-way link internally with all forest institutions in the country (training, research and administration), with professional associations and with the competent authorities for what concerns international policy (foreign affairs).

6. FUTURE ACTION - DISCUSSION

91. As emphasized in the introduction, this paper was written to support the work of the Committee's sixteenth session and is supplemented by the answers to the questionnaire in the country reports. The Committee is invited to take up the topics covered item by item so as to define regional or subregional cooperation in forest management and administration.
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