



**EFORWOOD**

Sustainability Impact Assessment  
of the Forestry - Wood Chain



Project no. 518128

EFORWOOD

Tools for Sustainability Impact Assessment

Instrument: IP

Thematic Priority: 6.3 Global Change and Ecosystems

**Deliverable D6.1.3:  
Initial Knowledge Transfer implementation plan agreed and actions carried  
out accordingly.**

Due date of deliverable: Month 18

Actual submission date: Month 26

Start date of project: 011105

Duration: 4 years

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: **EFI**

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	
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	x
<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)	

## **Summary**

Based on the response to the initial Knowledge Transfer Survey, a more detailed survey has been carried out. This KT survey listed all deliverables and the responsible partners. The survey asked partners to identify the preferred target groups and modes of knowledge transfer for each one of the deliverables they are responsible for.

# Background document to EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer Implementation Plan

Gerben Janse and Andreas Schuck, EFI

## *1. Introduction*

With the rise of forest issues on the global agenda and the increasing relevance of other sectors, communication has become a key element in present-day forestry. Add to that the periodically flaring media/public attention to recurring “hot topics” such as illegal logging, forest fires, storm damage to forest etc., and it becomes clear that there is an increased need for sound information on forest issues – for policy-makers, specific target groups and society at large.

Considering the fragmentation of policy networks, at national and most certainly also at European Union (EU) level, there is a clear need for inter-sectoral policy approaches. Fragmentation – mirrored in the domain specific composition of almost all EU institutions – is particularly pronounced concerning forest policy because of the wide distribution of competence within the European Commission (COM) (Hogl 2000). Communication is an integral part of any attempt to come to a more inter-sectoral approach to forest policy.

Another aspect of the call for strengthening communication in forest policy processes relates to the need for sound scientific information in decision-making. Seppälä (2004) (and many others) write(s) that forest policy decision-makers and other users of research results tend to see that the problem of the insufficient use of existing information is mainly the fault of the research community. The users often blame researchers for not working on relevant projects, which would supply the information they need right now. As for the researchers, they tend to criticize the user community; they do not understand and do not even want to understand what scientists say and are not basing their decisions on the best available scientific information.

The forest policy process in particular engages a collection of private interests, public agencies, legislative contingents, advocacy groups and judicial organizations, as well as a host of resource professionals that bring to bear a variety of academic and professional experiences. In addition, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) representing expanding shares of the public have gained influence in forest policy processes (Weber and Christophersen, 2002). Consequently, natural resource management agencies across the world are increasingly using public participation processes as means to involve citizens affected by planning decisions (Hjortsø, 2004). Especially in urbanized societies, planning and acting on issues relating to people’s living environment have increasingly become a socially embedded practice, shifting from serving an abstract public interest to actively engaging the public. Central to this is a greater emphasis on exchange of knowledge and development of ideas through communication with relevant stakeholders, including users, residents and community groups (Van Herzele, 2004). A first step towards public participation is informing the public. Although public participation is ethically necessary – as addressed at the Aarhus Convention (UNECE 1998) – it is also pragmatically necessary to justify policy options. Especially in controversial situations such as in policies concerning the environment, stakeholders and the public at large will be emotionally involved in the issue. Thus making the spreading of information towards the public an essential part of any policy plan.

Also recent policy statements reflect policy-makers' increased attention for the following needs in respect to strengthening communication:

- The need for sound scientific information in forest policy deliberations and the need to improve communication between science and policy (UN 2002a, MCPFE 2003a, UNECOSOC 2004, COM 2006);
- The need for increased stakeholder and public participation in forest policy processes (UN 1992, UNECE 1998, Council 1999, MCPFE 2003b, UNECOSOC 2004, COM 2006);

Research results – i.e. on the Fireparadox – are therefore not only relevant for the scientific community or policy-makers, but also for a host of other stakeholders or end-users, such as land managers, fire fighters, land owners, etc. and the public. The FIREPARADOX Knowledge Transfer Implementation Plan is a first step towards the realization of sound communication with this extensive portfolio of end-users.

## *2. The EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer Implementation Plan*

**Deliverable 6.1.3:** Initial Knowledge Transfer implementation plan agreed and actions carried out accordingly.

Based on the response to the initial Knowledge Transfer survey, a more detailed survey was developed. This KT survey listed all Deliverables and the responsible partner. The survey asked partners to identify the preferred target groups and modes of knowledge transfer for each one of the deliverables they are responsible for.

In March 2007 a blank KT Matrix was sent out to all partners responsible for a Deliverable. Eleven responses were received to date.
---

The result of this survey is an Excel sheet with all Deliverables, for which the suggested (by the responsible partners) target groups and modes of knowledge transfer are listed (see attached Excel file: D 6.1.3). The final column in the filled-in matrix shows the linkage with the EFORWOOD Communication Plan. The references in this column refer to the numbered communication actions in the Communication Plan.



Nonetheless the KT matrix is valuable for it provides all EFORWOOD partners an overview of how other partners see the knowledge transfer of their respective deliverables, i.e. which target groups should be addressed by which means. It also serves the purpose of awareness raising, i.e. to think about communicating the outputs of the deliverables already at an early stage of the project.

As communication needs may change over the project's lifetime, due to new insights for example, it may be useful to repeat the KT Matrix exercise in due course , e.g. tied up with the EFORWOOD week in 2008. From a communications perspective this is logical, considering the iterative character of communication. Another reason to repeat the exercise is the approximately 30% response rate. As it may be that WP leaders at the point in time in which the KT Matrix was sent out were not yet able to comment on any future communication activities as their WP's were still in the development phase.

This Knowledge Transfer Implementation Plan has been incorporated in the overall EFORWOOD Communications Strategy.