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Study: Towards a sustainable European forest based bioeconomy – assessment and the way forward

• Assigned by EFI’s MDTF for policy support
• 48 scientists from 26 institutions in 12 countries

Main objectives: review scientific knowledge regarding:
• the importance of forests for a European bioeconomy
• economic, social and environmental sustainability
• future developments that may affect the forest-based bioeconomy
Main contents of the study

1. European policy framework
2. Critical issues
   - Biomass availability, biodiversity, climate change, resource efficiency, amenity values, competitiveness, employment, forest ownership, forest-product markets, non-wood forest products
3. Bioeconomy indicators
4. **Policy relevant conclusions**
II. Core findings and policy relevant conclusions

1. The scope of the forest-based bioeconomy
2. Regional diversity
3. Sustainability
4. Bioeconomy and society
II.1 The scope of a forest-based bioeconomy

**Key findings**

- Current bioeconomy strategies and their implementation focus on forest biomass (Sec. 2.2: Pülzl, Giurca, Kleinschmit, Arts, Mustalahti, Sergent, Secco, Pettenella, Brukas)
- Non-wood forest products and other forest ecosystem services have substantial
The scope of a forest-based bioeconomy (2)

Consumption per capita of forest-biomass-based products and GDP growth in Europe
(Data: FAOSTAT, World Bank, here Sec. 3.9: Jonsson, Hurmekoski, Hetemäki, Prestemon)
The scope of a forest-based bioeconomy (3)

Possible end uses of new wood-based products (Cowie et al, 2014; Pöyry, 2016; here Sec. 3.9: Jonsson, Hurmekoski, Hetemäki, Prestemon)

- Medical, environmental, and industrial sensors
- Water and air filtration
- Cosmetics
- Organic LEDs
- Flexible electronics
- Photovoltaics
- Recyclable electronics
- Battery membranes

- Textiles
- Biofuels (crude oil, diesel, ethanol, jet fuel)
- Construction elements
- Cement additives or reinforcement fibers
- Automotive body & interior
- Packaging & paper coatings
- Paper & packaging filler
- Plastic packaging
- Intelligent packaging
- Hygiene and absorbent products
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The scope of a forest-based bioeconomy (4)

Non-Wood-Forest-Products

• Estimated value €2.2 billion, representing around 10% of the value of round wood (Forest Europe, 2015)
• New research indicates significantly higher economic importance in Europe
Cultural ecosystem services (Sec 3.5: Tyrväinen, Plieninger, Sanesi)

- Nature based tourism, recreation & health
- Education
- Spiritual values
Conclusions and recommendations

- Economic activities relating to forests are diverse and diversifying.
- Define the forest-based bioeconomy as encompassing economic activities relating to the entire spectrum of forest ecosystem services.
II.2 Regional diversity

**Key findings**
The forest based bioeconomy is regionally diverse

- **Biophysical** conditions
- **Socio-economic factors & institutional setting**
Average harvesting intensity (a; %) and harvested timber volumes (b; m³/ha) for the period 2000–2010 (Source: Levers et al, 2014, here Sec 3.1: Kraxner, Fuss, Verkerk)
Level of restrictions in private forest management identified across Europe (calculated based on 37 indicators assessing owner’s rights (Nichiforel et al, forthcoming, here Sec 3.8: Weiss, Lawrence, Nichiforel)
Conclusions and recommendations

- Multi-level approach: European framework and regional profiles
- Consider transnational “bioeconomic regions”
II.3 Sustainability

[Image of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals]

[Diagram showing the pillars of Sustainability: Social, Environmental, Economic]
Sustainability – environmental dimension

- **Climate change mitigation:** forests and wood products sequester ca. 13% of the anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions in the EU (Sec. 3.3: Lindner, Hanewinkel, Nabuurs)

- **Biodiversity:** significant trade-offs relating to intense forest biomass production, but also significant potentials to better use existing synergies (Sec. 3.2: Bauhus, Kouki, Paillet, Asbeck, Marchetti)
Sustainability – environmental dimension (2)

**Biodiversity smart forestry** (Sec 3.2: Bauhus, Kouki, Paillet, Asbeck, Marchetti)

- Science based landscape approach with retention
- Intensification where biodiversity impacts are minimal or positive
  - Diversified forest bioeconomy creates synergies
Sustainability – social dimension

Example: employment

- Very little information available
- Significant enlarged employment portfolio: green jobs
- Liberalisation, diversification, automatization, digitalization

Change in reported **totals employed in the forest sector** in Europe. (Source: Original analysis based on UNECE Statistical Database >> [Forestry (FOREST EUROPE/UNECE/FAO)](http://www.forest.europe.int) >> [Socio-Economic Functions](http://www.forest.europe.int) [accessed October 2016], here Sec. 3.7: Lawrence, Spinelli, Toppinen, Salo)
Sustainability – economic dimension

Competitiveness

• European based forest companies still amongst the leading globally, but strong pressure relating to costs and innovations

→ Sustainability as a long term asset for European companies

**EBITDA margin by region (%)** and **reinvestment ratio (US $ billions)** (data from PWC, 2016, here Sec 3.6: Toppinen, Korhonen, Hurmekoski, Hansen).
Conclusions and recommendations

- Forest based bioeconomy – **sustainability promise**, but not sustainable per se – need to **invest in sustainability**!
- Policy needs to create a level playing field: **internalize social and environmental sustainability** (standards and economic instruments) (see also Sec 3.4: Olsson, Asikainen, Junginger)
- Explore **synergies**
- **Monitor** sustainability (Sec 4: Wolfslehner, Linser, Pülzl, Bastrup-Birk, Camia, Marchetti; advised by: Wolf-Crowther)
- Form **cross-sectoral alliances**
- Explore **new sustainability markets**
Key findings

- Human agency is in the center of the forest-based bioeconomy
- Changing lifestyles, attitudes and perceptions impact the entire value chain
Conclusions and recommendations

- An (societally) inclusive forest-based bioeconomy is imperative in Europe
- Sustainability and bioeconomy diversification are key to access urban milleus

Bioeconomy evolution (cf. Bugge et al., 2016)
Thank you!
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