

EFORWOOD  
Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment

**First stakeholder meeting on indicators**

Christian Gamborg



EFI Technical Report 35, 2011

**First stakeholder meeting on indicators**

Christian Gamborg

Publisher: European Forest Institute  
Torikatu 34, FI-80100 Joensuu, Finland  
Email: [publications@efi.int](mailto:publications@efi.int)  
<http://www.efi.int>

Editor-in-Chief: Risto Päivinen

Disclaimer: The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the European Forest Institute or the European Commission. This report is a deliverable from the EU FP6 Integrated Project EFORWOOD – Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Forestry-Wood Chain.

## Preface

This report is a deliverable from the EU FP6 Integrated Project EFORWOOD – Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Forestry-Wood Chain. The main objective of EFORWOOD was to develop a tool for Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of Forestry-Wood Chains (FWC) at various scales of geographic area and time perspective. A FWC is determined by economic, ecological, technical, political and social factors, and consists of a number of interconnected processes, from forest regeneration to the end-of-life scenarios of wood-based products. EFORWOOD produced, as an output, a tool, which allows for analysis of sustainability impacts of existing and future FWCs.

The European Forest Institute (EFI) kindly offered the EFORWOOD project consortium to publish relevant deliverables from the project in EFI Technical Reports. The reports published here are project deliverables/results produced over time during the fifty-two months (2005–2010) project period. The reports have not always been subject to a thorough review process and many of them are in the process of, or will be reworked into journal articles, etc. for publication elsewhere. Some of them are just published as a “front-page”, the reason being that they might contain restricted information. In case you are interested in one of these reports you may contact the corresponding organisation highlighted on the cover page.

Uppsala in November 2010

*Kaj Rosén*

EFORWOOD coordinator

The Forestry Research Institute of Sweden (Skogforsk)

Uppsala Science Park

SE-751 83 Uppsala

E-mail: [firstname.lastname@skogforsk.se](mailto:firstname.lastname@skogforsk.se)





**EFORWOOD**  
Sustainability Impact Assessment  
of the Forestry - Wood Chain



Project no. 518128-2

EFORWOOD

Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment

Instrument: IP

Thematic Priority: 6.3 Global Change and Ecosystems

**Deliverable PD0.1.3**  
**First stakeholder meeting on indicators**

Due date of deliverable: Month 17

Actual submission date: Month 17

Start date of project: 011105

Duration: 4 years

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: KVL(FLD-KVL), Denmark

Final version

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>PU</b>	Public	X
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
<b>CO</b>	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	



# **Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> EFORWOOD stakeholder meeting: Indicators for sustainability impact assessment of the forestry-wood chain**

Responsible for minutes: Christian Gamborg, WP0.1, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (FLD), Division of Economics, Policy and Management Planning, Forest & Landscape  
<http://www.eforwood.com>

The first stakeholder meeting under the EFORWOOD project took place on 13 September 2006 in Kerkrade at the Abbey Rolduc – venue of the annual EFI conference 2006. Total attendance was approx. 45 stakeholders, including project external stakeholders (15-20) representing research & development, industry along the forestry-wood chain (FWC), forest owners, forest managers, NGOs and policy making related stakeholders as well as IP board members and other representatives of EFORWOOD partners. For a more detailed description, please see the list of participants at the end of this document where a list of background documents and handouts as well as the agenda can be found as well.

## **1. Meeting sessions**

The meeting opened with a welcome of all participants, a general presentation of each of the meeting participants and a general introduction to the EFORWOOD project. Following that, the meeting was divided into two sessions: the morning session on indicators, and the afternoon session on tools in relation to indicators and sustainability impact assessment. The morning session involved, besides an introduction to the current indicator development process within EFORWOOD, a description of the status of the indicator set. This was followed by a work session dedicated at getting input to the current draft indicator set; participants were asked to mark, rank and discuss indicators as well as to provide comments on posters. The afternoon session contained a presentation on the use of multi-criteria analysis within the EFORWOOD project in relation to stakeholders, a presentation of what ToSIA (Tool for Sustainability Impact Assessment, which is one of the cornerstones of the EFORWOOD project) is and could be in order to create a shared image. This session ended with a presentation of the knowledge transfer module within EFORWOOD.

## **2. Introduction to the meeting and to the EFORWOOD project**

*Piotr Paschalis-Jakubowicz*, member of the IP Board, a co-ordination and management team of EFORWOOD, welcomed on behalf of the project the participants to the meeting, stressing the importance of the dialogue with stakeholders and end-users represented outside and within the project, and hoping for a continuing successful collaboration with stakeholders in the EFORWOOD project.

*Christian Gamborg*, leader of the stakeholder involvement task in EFORWOOD, gave an introduction to the meeting; its aims, and the role of participants. The aim of the meeting was two-fold:

- To introduce the EFORWOOD project and the tool for sustainability impact assessment (ToSIA)
- To get comments and recommendations on a draft set of indicators for the whole European Forestry-Wood Chain (FWC) from a panel composed of a wide range of FWC-related stakeholders.

The role of participants was seen as strategic rather than technical, hereby acting on behalf of represented stakeholder organisations. More specifically, the role of the participants was to help guide project developments, identify gaps and give feedback and recommendations on indicators for sustainability impact assessment of the forestry-wood chain, e.g. by commenting on topics of indicators, data availability and definitions.

*Marcus Lindner*, responsible for ToSIA development, presented on behalf of project coordinator Kaj Rosén the aim, content, structure and possible outcome of the EFORWOOD project. The objective of EFORWOOD is to develop a quantitative decision support tool for Sustainability Impact Assessment of the European Forestry-Wood Chain (FWC) and subsets thereof (e.g. regional), covering forestry, industrial manufacturing, consumption and recycling. The Tool for Sustainability Impact Assessment (ToSIA) is the main product of EFORWOOD, which integrates major outputs from the Modules of the project. This tool will allow the assessment of the FWC, based on previously determined social, economic and environmental indicators and it will be developed as a dynamic analysis model, using a consistent and harmonized framework from the forest to the end-of-life of final products.

### **3. Indicator session**

*Ewald Rametsteiner*, responsible for the indicator work session in the workshop, gave a presentation on the general approach to indicator development taken within EFORWOOD and the current status of the draft indicator set. The draft set developed within EFORWOOD is based on already existing sustainability indicator sets (e.g. Eurostat SDI, MCPFE, CSD, PAIS) and takes into consideration the EU-SIA Guidelines. The development follows an iterative procedure, based on the ability to respond to user / user group needs and meet impact assessment development needs. Some of the main selection criteria for indicators are “relevance, data availability (international to local levels), costs and feasibility”. These topics were up for discussion at the meeting. The current draft set includes 9 economic indicators, 5 social, and 11 environmental plus 4 indicators under consideration. In total there are 14 “Lead+” indicators, 11 whole chain indicators and 56 module specific indicators. It was stressed that in order to get a common understanding, interaction and communication with end-users and other stakeholders is needed.

Comments to the current draft set were invited to sort out the issue of whether the development of indicators was on the 'right track', covering issues such as the purpose of the indicator set, the overall structure of the indicators and the adequate number of indicators. If some wanted to give (further) comments in writing it should be before 3. November 2006. In the work session, feedback on indicators (and themes addressed) was received using a system of rating indicators individually ("*Green/white points* to those indicators you agree with, *red points* to those indicators you would like to modify, *white tags* with name on for raising an issue during the plenary"). The actual tags and their distribution and comments were taken directly into consideration by the indicator group and will not be fully reflected within these minutes. However, the main issues raised by participants during the work session and plenary discussion are summarized in the following paragraph:

In relation to the purpose of the indicator set in EFORWOOD, one participant pointed out that the availability of data is very important for the development of the EFORWOOD indicator set, although it should be kept in mind that some data may not be available for free. In addition he stressed the need to create an 'ideal list of indicator' that includes indicators where currently no data are available, but might be collected in the future. Several participants asked whether the indicator set actually reflected a set of goals, looking ahead instead of measuring only what had been the practice until now. Another way to state this issue was to say whether the reference frame for the indicators is wide enough? One participant pointed out that the development of indicators and the ToSIA tool will affect and form future policies. Therefore it is important to get all stakeholders represented, and asked if more of the industrial stakeholders should be brought into such a meeting? Another concern addressed by one stakeholder was if the indicator set was only related to the production chain and sufficiently took into account the social dimensions, e.g. recreation and environmental services. This was an issue touching upon incorporating qualitative indicators into the EFORWOOD indicator set.

In relation to the structure of indicators, it was asked whether it was the aim to achieve a more even balance between the lead indicators (at present 9 "economic", 5 "social" and 11 "environmental")? In the response, and as pointed out by other participants, a more balanced set was welcomed as for example some indicators are broader than others. Several participants agreed to not necessarily trying to go for a balance in numbers, and that it might be useful to get the three 'dimension labels' in the background but to ensure transparency when doing this. As an example, 'employment' was used: as economic indicator, the value might be negative, as a cost, but as a social indicator, jobs would be positive.

As a third point, the number of indicators was discussed. There are currently 14 lead+ indicators, 11 whole chain and 56 module specific. Several participants argued that the number depends on the purpose of the indicators (what questions to answer with these); the list should be as comprehensive as the purpose demands.

On the issue of the general approach to the indicator development, it was pointed out that an important area, biodiversity, was missing. It was asked whether e.g. 'naturalness' which is included in the draft indicator list, was sufficient to cover biodiversity? (See further under the environmental indicators).

After the ‘*work session on indicators*’ the discussion points tagged by participants on the posters, were highlighted during the plenary discussion:

Social indicators: One issue concerned the boundaries of the indicators – how impacts outside Europe would be handled, and how issues related to developing countries, e.g. system of rights for rural communities or land tenure, would be addressed in the indicator set. Another issue in relation to boundaries was whether competition of wooden products with products of other material was addressed. In response it was stated that only wooden products are considered in EFORWOOD, not the relative sustainability. Thereafter it was asked whether the legal origin and/or legal compliance would be built into the set. This had not been taken into consideration until now, but the topic could be included. Following this, the issue of social acceptance of commercial forestry or forestry as industry was discussed. Several participants stated that it is important to address public relations. Everything can be managed sustainably, but if the public opinion does not think this way it will be a problem. Would there be a way to address this issue, and how would hunting be taken into consideration? Another issue raised was how quality of employment would be reflected, and what standards of occupational health and definitions of accidents would be used (EU standards will be used). In general it was agreed that indicators for social aspects of forestry were more wide-ranging and more difficult to take into account within the indicator set.

Economic indicators: It was pointed out that looking just at revenue and the overall profit is not enough, but the chain should be broken down to the value added within the chain. Viability is struggling under pressure for small micro players. A reasonable breakdown of revenue generation to the different segments should be shown in the indicators. In addition an issue of data availability was raised; how to get small and medium sized enterprise data, how close would it come to real numbers? In relation to this it was pointed out that there was almost no information on the woodworking industry and it is very difficult to collect data.

Environmental indicators: The issue of naturalness and biodiversity was raised again, where several of the participants expressed concern that ‘naturalness’ as indicator would not fully capture biodiversity. From the project, it was stressed that data actually existed for naturalness (MCPFE indicator). An alternative suggestion was to look at key indicator species. One participant made a reference to a newly started project (BioScore) where biodiversity impact assessment tools in relation to e.g. EU policies would be developed using species sensitivity scores. The mutual potential for cooperation was stressed. Regarding forest area one stakeholder noted that there was no information on wood available for supply and the intensity of resource use included into the draft indicator set. From the project it was said that the module specific indicator set addresses these issues that might however potentially be taken into account also in the whole chain indicator set. In relation to ‘water’, it was pointed out that it was at present not adequately reflected in the indicator set. In addition it was questioned whether there would be sufficient data at the national level. From the project it was acknowledged that the role of forests in watershed management and other issues could be better developed, however difficulties arise as no other European indicator set provides guidance. With regard to the environmental indicators, the difference between the lead indicators and

the indicators at the module level was discussed, stressing that these module level indicators still were under development. Stakeholders pointed out that it was difficult to see what was actually in the module specific indicators and what would be in the lead indicators.

In relation to the indicators under consideration, the issue of “compliance cost” was raised. Also it was asked how community participation could be taken into account. One participant stressed the importance of governance and capacity building with regard to community involvement. In addition one participant stated that from an industrial view-point, he would like not to include an indicator that addresses toxicity or use of chemicals as until now it is not clear what is toxic and what not; the standardisation process is on-going and not addressing characteristics of the wood products. Thus, it is currently too critical to be addressed as easily the wrong issues could be addressed.

#### **4. Session on tools: MCA, ToSIA and Knowledge Transfer**

In the afternoon, *Bernhard Wolfslehner* presented on behalf of Workpackage 1.5 of Module 1, MCA as one of the tools for sustainability impact of the forestry-wood chain. MCA is a set of methods designed to take account of multiple, conflicting indicators, criteria or objectives, structure a decision problem, identify the most preferable option among alternatives, e.g. between optional FWCs. In this context, stakeholder input was highlighted as a way to help with the selection of indicators (from a defined list) as well as other aspects of the sustainability evaluation.

Points made and issues raised during the plenary discussion session included the issue that not all indicators just seen in the indicator draft set were considered equally important by all parties, and that indicators might conflict, as well as the issue of how to aggregate preferences. A concern was voiced that the results of MCA could be misused, even though the MCA was *not* developed with the intention of fast-track decisions. Another participant stressed the need for the involvement of policy makers here, but that it also depended a great deal on the kind of feedback which was looked for. From project side, this point was taken, and in the subsequent stages of the tool development, policy makers and other end-users must to a higher degree be involved.

*Petri Vasara*, responsible for ToSIA development, gave a practical view of what ToSIA *could* look like and what it *might* do, when it is finished. It was stressed that ToSIA is far from finished and it is not supposed to be finished yet. This presentation was meant to give all stakeholders and EFORWOOD partners a joint ground image. It was stressed that there will be several versions of ToSIA. The simplest version will contain “pre-packaged” question sets for the relevant problems to be solved with ToSIA. The “expert versions” will be customisable.

*Denis McGowan*, responsible for the EFORWOOD Knowledge transfer and dissemination, gave an overview of this part of EFORWOOD, which is focused on the dissemination of project results. The current web portal <http://www.eforwood.com> was presented. A needs assessment of external and internal target group’s needs and use was in the process of being finalised. It included e.g. European / internal administration, regional or national forestry administrations (governmental), regional or national political decision-makers, international political decision-makers (e.g. the European Parliament),

national forest-based industry federations, international research institutes and intergovernmental bodies (e.g. UNECE, FAO). Input was asked for and received from participants in the meeting as to knowledge transfer and dissemination needs; e.g. what is the most needed information, what methods would be preferred. Response was collected at the meeting.

## **5. Closing and further involvement**

*Christian Gamborg* thanked all speakers and the participants for contributing to the meeting and outlined the further process, where stakeholder and end-user involvement was needed and would be most welcomed. All comments from the meeting will be passed on to the relevant work packages and Modules in EFORWOOD for further investigations and decision-making.

### **Background documents for the meeting**

- EFORWOOD Indicator development background document, 28 August 2006 (by *Ewald Rametsteiner* and *Helga Pülzl*, BOKU)
- Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) of the forestry-wood chain background document (by *Manfred J. Lexer*, BOKU, *Bernhard Wolfslehner*, BOKU, *Harald Vacik*, BOKU, *Bo J. Thorsen*, *Suzanne Vedel*, FLD)

### **Handouts at meeting**

- The EU Integrated Project EFORWOOD
- Sustainability indicators for the forestry wood chain
- Module 6 knowledge transfer

### **Presentations at the meeting (ppt)**

- Introduction to the meeting, *Christian Gamborg*
- The EU Integrated Project EFORWOOD. Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Forestry-Wood Chain, *Kaj Rosén* c.o. *Marcus Lindner*
- EFORWOOD Sustainability Indicators for the Forestry Wood Chain, *Ewald Rametsteiner*
- Multi-criteria analysis of the forestry-wood chain, *Manfred J. Lexer* c.o. *Bernhard Wolfslehner*
- What is ToSIA? Creating a shared image as a starting point, *Petri Vasara*
- Module 6 Knowledge Transfer, *Denis McGowan*

**For copies of documents, handouts or presentations or for other questions concerning the stakeholder involvement in EFORWOOD, please contact:**

**Christian Gamborg**, Senior Scientist, PhD  
Danish Centre for Forest, Landscape and Planning,  
The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (KVL) Rolighedsvej 23, DK-1958  
Frederiksberg, Denmark, Tel. +45 3528 1734, Fax +45 3528 1508, Email [chg@kvl.dk](mailto:chg@kvl.dk),  
<http://www.sl.kvl.dk>

## Agenda and list of registered participants in condensed format

9.00	9.30	Plenary	Introduction to the meeting and to EFORWOOD
<b>Morning session on indicators (9.30 – 13.00)</b>			
9.30	10.00	Plenary	Introduction to the EFORWOOD FWC indicators
10.00	10.30	Plenary	Introduction to indicator session
10.30	12.00	Group discussion	Indicator discussion session in groups
12.00	13.00	Plenary	Indicators overall deliberations
13.00	14.00		Lunch break
<b>Afternoon session on tools (14.00 – 16.00)</b>			
14.00	14.45		Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) and Indicators
14.45	15.15		What is ToSIA? a practical demonstration
15.15	15.30		Coffee break
15.30	15.50		EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer
15.50	16.00		Final comments/questions and further involvement

Name	Organisation/institution
Alexandra Wieshaider	European State Forest Association (EUSTAFOR)
Andre Giacini de Freitas	Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
Angeline de Beaufort Langeveld	Confederation of European Paper Industries (CEPI)
Andreas Kleinschmit	European Confederation of Woodworking Industries (CEI BOIS)
Arie Hooimeijer	KCPK
Ben Delbaere	European Centre for Nature Conservation (ECNC)
Bernhard Lombard	Confederation of European Paper Industries (CEPI)
Bernhard Wolfslehner	BOKU
Birte Schmetjen	Confederation of European Forest Owners (CEPF)
Bo Jellesmark Thorsen	The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (KVL)
Carl Olsmats	STFI Packforsk
Christian Gamborg	The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (KVL)
Ciara Leonard	Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE)
David Edwards	Forest Research (FR)
Denis McGowan	Innovawood
Diana Vötter	University of Freiburg
Edgar Kastenholz	European Network of Forest Entrepreneurs (ENFE)
Ewald Rametsteiner	BOKU
Gerben Jansen	European Forest Institute (EFI)
Gero Becker	University of Freiburg
Gert Jan Nabuurs	ALTERRA
Gunilla Rodfors	Skogforsk
Helga Pülzl	BOKU
Hubert Duijsens	European Paper Merchants Association (EUGROPA)
Jesus San Miguel	EU Joint Research Centre (JRC) INFOREST
Julia Falconer	FLEGT DG Development
Kaj Rosen	Skogforsk
Manfred Lexer	BOKU
Marcus Lindner	European Forest Institute (EFI)
Michael Diemer	Union of European Foresters (UEF)
Mikael Possomnet	INRA
Oliver Scholz	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification schemes (PEFC)
Oscar Barreiro Mouriz	Union de Selvicultores del Sur de Europa (USSE)
Per Friis Mortensen	Wooden Construction elements (FEMIB)
Petri Vasara	Jaakko Pöyry
Piotr Paschalis	Warsaw Agricultural University
Roman Michalak	Ministerial Conference of the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE)
Suzanne E. Vedel	The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (KVL)
Yves Lecocq	Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE)
<b>REPRESENTED THROUGH OTHERS</b>	
Kevin Bradley	The International Confederation of Paper and Board Converters in Europe (CITPA)
Lars Omdahl	European Federation of Fibreboard Manufacturers (FEROPA)