

## **National report – Czech Republic**

### **1. In what way are the EFSOS ‘Conclusions and Policy Recommendations’ (pages 209-226) relevant for your country?**

It is possible to convey that foresters and other stakeholders of forestry sector of the country do not feel urgent need to make too precise sector forecasts.

We use to have economically optimised level of the total annual felling. If there is some small surplus of timber we believe that there is a possibility to export it and on reverse – some small lack of timber can be covered by import.

Wood processing industry is oriented and adapted (steadily by market) to:

- i) allowable cut according to felling possibilities and
- ii) by requests of consumers.

These limits are considered as a projection of sustainable management in forestry of the Central Europe already hundreds of years. There is no need to build capacities for processing of raw material, which should be imported from opposite part of the globe.

### **2. Which of the policy scenario assumptions made in EFSOS fits best to the situation in your country (see Chapter 3)?**

???

### **3. What kind of significant changes are you expecting with regard to your country’s forest sector policy in the next 3-5 years as a (direct or indirect) result of the EFSOS analysis, conclusions and recommendations?**

We believe that it should be a support of local (national) wood processing industry. But the question is the methodology used in working out of particular scenarios by authors of this study (it seems that outputs have sometimes a contradictory character). As for decision making on national level the study is not detailed enough and therefore another question is how it could be worked out on national level.

### **4. Who uses the information, conclusions and recommendations presented in EFSOS in your country? Who else could potentially benefit from EFSOS?**

The potential beneficiaries are the state administration, particular ministries (not only those responsible for forests and environment, but having in mind declaration of MCPFE in Vienna, 2003 speaking about cross-sectoral approach) and their bodies. In our case it should be particularly Ministry of Industry and Commerce (MPO).

Probably the study should be useful also for political parties in formulation of political programmes. But generally forests are not considered as a issue of highest political value (there is a space for PR, improvement of awareness and involvement in forestry matters, education on all levels of society).

**5. What process is used to make EFSOS known and review it at the national level?**

National experts from local institutions took part on meetings of the EFSOS committees and the Czech Republic contributes by offering of respective national data. Knowledge gained will be implemented to projects and particular measurements of the National Forest Programme amendment and its continuation in between 2006-2013.

**6. What are significant information/analysis/ideas to national policy debate (inside and outside sector) added by EFSOS?**

The Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic supposes to use this material in formulation of new forestry policy. It should be used also in preparation of updated version of National Forestry Programme for the period 2007 – 2013.

It seems that very important is special emphasis on cross-sectoral policy linkages. We believe that it has something to do with MCPFE General Declaration from Vienna. Forests are still on behind of everything and MCPFE motto “common benefits – shared responsibilities” should be underlined and put into the practice.

**7. Do you have any comments on the EFSOS country profile for your country (see attachment)?**

There are no comments on the Czech Republic country profile.

**8. What are your suggestions and comments with regard to further UNECE/FAO Forest Sector Outlook activities?**

The main purpose of the EFSOS is to offer basis for political decisions on national and international levels. As forestry as such is not of high priority in the Czech Republic up to data it is difficult to suggest anything re. forestry, position of which is very unsatisfactory in the last year. But we feel that this study should become one of the background materials for formulation of the EU Action Plan for Forests.

And consequently it should be another tool for pushing local policy makers to fulfill previous commitments (see add 6 – joint responsibility for forestry issues).

Still there is lack of knowledge on value on NWFPs. Valuation of other than wood products should be repeatedly a subject of some intl. seminar or workshop. Sharing of knowledge in this field is considered as very useful as there is a lack of arguments (read: financial expression) for compensation of free access and usage of forest as well as its further benefits and services.