



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 D6.1.2

Version 1 Matrix developed, mapping KT needs of Target Groups with sources of knowledge and KT Tools to be used in satisfying those needs

Due date of deliverable: Month 16

Actual submission date: Month 26

Start date of project: 011105

Duration: 4 years

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

Final version

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

Summary

This document synthesises the results of Knowledge Transfer Needs Survey. The survey has been carried out from May 2006 to September 2006, including project partners and external stakeholders as target groups. The main result of the survey was a matrix with mapping between Knowledge Transfer Needs of target groups with sources of knowledge and knowledge transfer tools to be used in satisfying those needs.

Background document to the EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer surveys – internal and external

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 Needs survey (internal and external)

Deliverable 6.1.2: Version 1 Matrix developed, mapping Knowledge Transfer Needs of target groups with sources of knowledge and knowledge transfer tools to be used in satisfying those needs.

In May 2006 an internal Knowledge Transfer questionnaire was sent out to all EFORWOOD Module and WP leaders. The interviewees were asked in an open question to suggest their most important sources of knowledge. Interviewees were also asked to choose the most relevant target groups and modes of knowledge transfer from a list of given options. Twelve responses were received.

In September 2006 (during the EFORWOOD stakeholder meeting in Kerkrade, the Netherlands) external stakeholders were asked to comment on the preliminary Knowledge Transfer plan, and to suggest the most important target groups and modes of knowledge transfer for each one of the EFORWOOD Modules.

The project partners' response resulted in a matrix identifying a range of different topics, i.e. the different "Sources of Knowledge" seen as important by the project partners. The results – different for each Module – were then incorporated in a summarizing document, listing all the given "sources of knowledge" and a ranking of suggested target groups and modes of knowledge transfer (see attached excel file: D 6.1.2 Overview KT Matrix – all responses)

Affiliation	CEPI		STI-Forecast	KVL	Shelfork	BRE	EGGW	Pajny	CTFO	ROKU	KVL	IFER
Modules	Module 4 (WP 4.1, WP 4.2, WP 4.3, WP 4.4)	Module 5 (WP 5.1, WP 5.2)	WP 4.1	WP (WP 6.1)	WP (WP 6.0, WP 6.2, WP 6.4)	WP 6	WP (WP 6.2)	WP 6.5 (WP 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2)	WP 1.8 (1.0, 1.2)	WP 1.8	WP 1.4, WP 1.4, WP 1.8)	WP 1.13
Sources of knowledge	1. Data collection / database	1. Market/consumer perspective on FWC while composing input/indicators for ToSIA	1. Lead indicators for manufacturing	1. What data can be found in different markets/stakeholders/consumers while dealing with FWC	Probably not applicable to FWC which is an identification module. But we are responsible for the very product itself. FWC is not predicting knowledge	1. Existing knowledge, work with user	1. All Module	1. Understanding of the choice	1.8. Indicator relative and defining external indicator relative to FWC	1. Application of FWC approach to SI of the FWC	1. To influence in EFORWOOD: presentation of meeting and deliverable	ToSIA model
	2. Upcoming and future process technologies (their impacts on sustainability)	2. Existing knowledge and knowledge gaps at market/stakeholders/consumers while dealing with FWC	2. What data can be found in different markets/stakeholders/consumers while dealing with FWC	2. Process improvement options for the industry	2. Hourly search	2. EU Commission	2. Indicator	2. Protocols for performing CRA, OEA on FWC with EFORWOOD as a part of decomposition of the results of these analyses	2. Inclusion of stakeholder performance in the evaluation of SI of FWC	2. To create a specific FWC model for use and products (ToSIA) and paper performance etc.		
	3. Process improvement options for the industry	3. Gathered data for ToSIA		4. Future competitiveness of the industry (opportunities, threats, and industry dynamics)	3. Link with other components in the frame of the	2. All participatory institutions	2. Trade agreement "Relation of externalities in parts of the FWC"					
	5. Involvement of industries and practitioners.											
Target groups												
Users	Partners within your WP											
	Other WP's in your Module											
	Other WP's in other Modules											
External												
	Industry (company level)											
	National forest-based industry federations											
	International forest-based industry federations											
	Business owners / entrepreneurs (including forest owners)											
	Regional or national business / entrepreneurs federations (EU)											
	International business / entrepreneurs federations (incl. forest)											
	National research institutes											
	International research institutes											
	Education (e.g. technical schools, universities)											
	Regional or national forestry administrations (government)											
	Regional or national political decision-makers											
	European / international administration											
	International political decision-makers (e.g. the European Parliament)											
	Intergovernmental bodies (e.g. UNECE, FAO)											
	Regional or national environmental NGOs											
	International environmental NGOs											
Mode of Knowledge Transfer												
	Web Pages including on-line tutorials											
	Conferences, workshops etc.											
	Promotional material											
	Databases											
	Training activities involving tutors and participants											
	Personal contacts with experts from within EFORWOOD											
	A combination of two or more of the above, please specify											

Figure 1: Screenshot of EFORWOOD KT Matrix - all responses

The external stakeholders' feedback was incorporated, resulting in a ranking of the Target Users and Modes of Knowledge Transfer, per Module. Stakeholders' priorities are indicated as follows: the highest relevance of target users and modes of knowledge transfer are indicated with a 1 (in yellow), consequently, the second most important priority is indicated with a 2 etc. The most frequently made observation by the stakeholders was that any material for external stakeholders should be "easy", "attractive" and "adapted to the specific needs of the target group" (see 2. EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer Plan (stakeholder feedback))

Sources of Knowledge Summary (status 20-10-06 – after 12 responses)

As the responses for sources of knowledge differed for each module and WP no ranking of answers has been applied, but a summary is presented below. For the identified target groups and modes of knowledge transfer a ranking could be applied.

Sources of knowledge

- Guidelines for data collection / database
- Upcoming and future process technologies (their impacts on sustainability)
- Process improvement options for the industry
- Future competitiveness of the industry (opportunities, threats, and industry dynamics)
- Involvement of industries and practitioners.
- Market/consumer perspective on FWC while composing input/indicators for ToSIA
- Existing knowledge and knowledge gaps at market/stakeholders/consumers while dealing with FWC
- Gathered data for ToSIA
- Lead indicators for manufacturing

- What data can be found in different databases (such as Eurostat)
- Feedback to other Modules
- Existing knowledge, work with users
- New research
- Links with other European partners in the frame of the above
- Understanding of the chains
- Indicators
- A guideline selecting and defining externalities related to FWCs
- Application of MCA approaches to SIA of the FWC
- To colleagues in EFORWOOD: presentation at meetings and deliverables
- Protocols for performing CBA, CEA and MCA within EFORWOOD and a report documenting the results of these analyses
- Inclusion of stakeholder preferences in the evaluation of SI of FWC
- To people outside: Final knowledge-based products (ToSIA) and papers/manuals etc.
- Training session "Valuation of externalities in parts of the FWC"

Internal Target groups (ranked)

1. Other WPs in other Modules
2. Partners within own WP
3. Other WPs within own Module

External Target Groups (ranked)

1. European / Internal Administration
Regional or national political decision-makers
2. Regional or national forestry administrations (governmental)
National forest-based industry federations
3. International political decision-makers (e.g. the European Parliament)
International forest-based industries federations
Intergovernmental bodies (e.g. UNECE, FAO)
International research institutes

Mode of Knowledge Transfer (ranked)

1. Web Pages including on-line tutorials
Conferences, workshops etc.
2. Training activities involving tutors and participants
3. Promotional material
4. Personal contacts with experts from within EFORWOOD

External stakeholders' comments on the preliminary Knowledge Transfer plan

External stakeholders were asked to comment on the preliminary KT plan and to suggest the most important target groups and modes of knowledge transfer for each one of the EFORWOOD Modules. The two matrices below present the results.

This knowledge transfer and dissemination plan has been incorporated in the overall EFORWOOD Communications Strategy.

2. EFORWOOD Knowledge Transfer Plan (stakeholder feedback)

Source of Knowledge	Target User						Mode of Knowledge Transfer						
	Industry	EU Policy	Citizen	Educators	Research	Other	Web Pages	Meta database	Database (internal; web based; local)	Promotional tools	Training modules	Specific needs	Other
Module 0. Scientific Co-ordination & Management	2	2	3	3	1	2 NGOs , MCPFE	1	1	2	3	3		
Module 1. Sustainability Impact Assessment (across full value-chain)	3	3			2	1 (NGOs, MCPFE)	1	3	2	1	2	Easy and customer related and multi-lingual	
Module 2. Forest Resources Management		2	2		1	1 (NGOs, MCPFE)	1	1	1	3	2		
Module 3. Forest to industry Interactions	1					1 (NGOs, MCPFE)	2	2	1	1	1		
Module 4. Processing, Manufacturing & converting	2				1	2 (MCPFE)	1	2	2		1		
Module 5. Industry to Consumer Interactions	1		1		1	1 (MCPFE)	1	3		3	2		
Module 6. Knowledge Transfer	2	2				1 (MCPFE)	1			2	2		

AIM	AUDIENCE	MESSAGE	METHODS/ ACTIVITIES	MEASURE
1. Raise awareness	End users: Industry, Policy makers, Planners, Researchers, Educators, NGOs (the general public in the EU: yes or no?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create awareness on the EFORWOOD project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create EFORWOOD web site 2. Write initial summary of the project 3. Present/ discuss the project's aims 4. Write an article that can be use in different contexts 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather feedback from target groups 2. Analyze and increase response level
2. Create understanding	End users: Industry, Policy makers Planners, Researchers, Educators,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create understanding of the potential benefits 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write an article that can be used in different contexts (press release type) 2. Send a leaflet/ poster to potentially interested organisations 3. Issue easy understandable, short blurbs aimed at different target groups (e.g. forest contractors) 4. Present project outcomes at science/policy meetings 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather feedback from target groups and stakeholder panels. 2. Gather feedback from Website 3. Analyze and increase response level 4. Request involvement in the project
3. General conviction	End users: Industry, Policy makers Planners, Researchers, Educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convince the audience of the project's innovative, added-value and importance <p>[stakeholders remarked: This is definitely a major challenge for EFORWOOD]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present EFORWOOD at other relevant Conferences/ Seminars in different countries 2. Organize EFORWOOD conferences and meetings 3. Present output to interested users (tailored presentation to specific target groups) 4. Bilateral meetings (e.g. between project leader with EU policy-makers) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather feedback from target audience, e.g. evaluation questionnaires 2. Increase number of participants 3. Increase response level 4. Gather feedback on Website

4. Stimulate action	End users: Industry, Policy makers Planners, Researchers, Educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the use of the system with the audience • Encourage stakeholders to give feedback 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use case studies to show how the benefits of the tools apply to target audiences. 2. Organize trial sessions in selected training institutions with the target audience 3. Survey participants and update based on results. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather feedback from target audience and from Website 2. Increase response level 3. Increase number of participants
----------------------------	---	---	--	--