

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Forstwesen = Swiss forestry journal = Journal forestier suisse

Herausgeber: Schweizerischer Forstverein

Band: 157 (2006)

Heft: 10

Artikel: Monitoring and evaluating participation in national forest programmes : the Catalan case

Autor: Domínguez, Glòria / Tena, Jordi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1098008>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 11.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Monitoring and evaluating participation in national forest programmes. The Catalan case

GLÒRIA DOMÍNGUEZ and JORDI TENA

Keywords: Forest policy; participation; governance; Spain. FDK 624 : 9 : (460)

1. Introduction

1.1 National forest programmes as a means to sustainable forest management

In recent years, sustainable forest management has become the paradigm for forest policy. In this context and in the broad sense, national forest programmes (NFP) are defined as planning instruments to achieve sustainable forest management at both national and subnational levels (ØISTAD & TRØMBORG 2002). The definition of sustainable forest management is taken from the Forest Principles and resolution H1 of Helsinki, and covers the harmonisation of ecological, economic and social interests in forestlands for present and future generations.¹

The challenges for forest policy is to increase the number of agreed strategies and improve communication relations with the wide range of stakeholders involved, as well as those posed by the multiple use of forests, perceived not only as a source of raw material but also of goods and services for society in general.

Although the definition and contents of European NFPs is in a permanent process of improvement, redefinition and discussion, it seems clear (since it appears implicit in several of their principles) that their formulation and implementation must entail a greater involvement of society in the decision making process, and more emphasis needs to be paid to participatory aspects.

Using the terminology of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE), forest programmes at national or subnational levels evolve from internal administrative processes and through a vision of sectorial planning, to become processes with territorial and intersectorial implications, which necessarily require the involvement of civil society and companies for their implementation.

1.2 Participation in national forest programmes

Different perceptions, manifold agents and new legislative frameworks necessitate a restructuring of the more classic and technocratic oriented approach of public policies for forest management. For this reason, in the middle of the current wide-ranging debate on increased democracy in the administration (BRUGUÉ & GALLEGÓ 1999, GRAMBERGER 2001), it seems unthinkable to avoid public participation, which is strongly reinforced by current legal developments at the European level (the Directive of Participation, Agreement of Aarhus). Furthermore, society demands the right to participate in the definition of public policies beyond the institutional channels that were conceived for different social and institutional realities. All this means that the difficulties that prevented the opening of new spaces for debate are being overcome.

Participation can be defined as the set of voluntary processes whereby people, whether as individuals or in groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome of the matter at hand (FAO/ECE/ILO 2000). Alternatively,

in a more generic form (EUROPARC – ESPAÑA 2002) like the process by means of which the individuals make decisions about the institutions, programmes and environments that affect them.

However, it is well known that the term «participation» covers a wide range of processes and mechanisms that do not give the parties involved the same rights or opportunities as those referring both to those processes in which the social agents participate directly in decision making or the execution of policy and other processes in which debates or seminars are organised with the aim of obtaining data or perspectives on certain themes. (YOSIE & HERBST 1998). The increase in participation in forming policies must be observed closely as no blueprint exists as to how such participation is to be achieved. This means that the participative process stands in danger of becoming an illusory spectacle, one that merely has the appearance of democratic participation (APPELSTRAND 2002), and ends up as an alibi to legitimate any decision already taken (BUTTOUD 1999).

There are three main objectives to be reached in a participative process (YOSIE & HERBST 1998, MARTÍ 2002):

- A: To obtain knowledge on certain aspects of the objectives, that is to say, information referring to the aim of the decision, as well as the participants interests and points of view.
- B: To identify and inform discourses and postures of the different stakeholders involved. To help the thought processes that will generate and feed such discourse and also to help consensus building, or to unblock conflict situations.
- C: To dynamize and construct a greater capacity for intervention. This objective is sometimes as important as the result of the participatory process since it improves the capacity for action, and facilitates processes for the agents, such as the development of strategies, the identification of objectives or the setting-up of guidelines. In a country and a sector with a recently acquired participative activity, this component of cohesion of the sector and building capacities through the creation of spaces of trust and dialogue becomes a key point. The component of hands-on learning allows the internalisation of attitudes and abilities by people through the relations they establish with other stakeholders and with the different roles that are assumed (Martí 2002).

A: In addition to multiple beneficial products and by-products afforded by participative democracy, the central and justificative function is the so-called epistemic value of democracy (NINO 1997). The ideal of face-to-face deliberation constitutes the best means for correct decision-making in the sense of this being fair in the field of political decision-making. To

¹ Second Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE), 16–17 June 1993, Helsinki, Finland. «Resolution H1: General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe». PDF file at: <http://mcpfe.mcnet.pl/index.php?kat=26&sel=26> (October 6, 2006).

this end, participation can provide decision-makers with practical information about the subject of the decision that is only well known to those who have a practical and daily involvement in it. This fact can entail participation favouring more effective management. However, in a deeper sense of the epistemological value of participation, this offers information on the interests and legitimate points of view of all parties involved (providing, of course, that there are no exclusions) and enables everything to be taken into account. It is in this sense that participation can lead to fair decisions.

B: In relation to the possibility of offering teaching opportunities, it seems reasonable to hope that in the case of the NFP these are not limited to the development of favourable attitudes and preferences for environmental responsibility and towards one's own environment. Another by-product that is expected to ensue from any participatory process consists of the inherent learning from the process. It is expected that the process will also stimulate the favourable development of beliefs and preferences for public participation and democratic institutions, including civic virtue and democracy in general. Some authors refer to this phenomenon as a «democracy school» (BLANCO & FONT 2003).

It is empirically proven that public participation and democracy are, in general, mechanisms that can increase acceptance of a policy. For public policy to be applied successfully, however, it is important that there is a high level of agreement between those it is addressed to and those who carry it out. Without this agreement, strategies are likely to develop that pervert the spirit and sense of policy (ADELANTADO 2000).

C: It is impossible to overestimate the importance of reinforcing the communities or sectors involved in a participatory process as this is one of the key aims. The creation of networks or the reinforcement of relations constitutes one of the many phenomena in the social field that cannot be obtained directly, but as a by-product of other activities, as described by ELSTER (1988).

The aim of the participants is the elaboration of a national forest programme, but a side effect of this sharing and working together, deliberating about the sector, etc., is the strengthening of the relations among themselves and between them and the administration.

The creation or strengthening of the relational networks can suppose the creation of social capital for the agents and have a positive effect for the participants and the sector as a whole. Social capital is understood as the resources that actors obtain in the form of obligations of reciprocity and private information from their relations of trust with other actors. On this point, according to HERREROS (2002) networks of relations can be conceived as a possible source of social capital, but not as social capital in itself. Furthermore, another by-product (GROOTAERT 2001) is the empowerment of the sector or community taking part in the process.

1.3 Monitoring and evaluation of participation in national forest programmes

Today, monitoring and evaluation is one of the most recurrent concepts in the field of public policies. Public administrations, as well as private companies and institutions, are becoming ever more aware of the importance of finding ways to measure the benefits of their actions, that is to say, to determine how the objectives set are reached. It is important to remember here that an evaluation goes beyond a mere exercise of analysis and demands the a-priori establishment of measurement criteria and some type of scale levels in order to determine how (and whether) objectives have been fulfilled. To this end, systems of such indicators and standards have been intro-

duced in recent years in the most varied spheres of public policy, from education to transport infrastructures.

Forest policy and the participatory processes are not, evidently, an exception. Some time ago already, the FAO set up the so-called community of practice (CoP). Among other questions, this group has been working on establishing the requirements and mechanisms for participation and criteria and indicators with which to evaluate them. The aimed for objectives must be able to be evaluated and compared to the participatory processes of NFP implementation and be carried out around the world (REEB 2004).

2. Catalonia: a case study

2.1 The national forest programme

Following the approval of the 1978 Constitution in Spain, almost all responsibilities for forests were eventually transferred to the 17 autonomous regions (Comunidades Autónomas) and the 2 autonomous cities (Ciudades Autónomas: Ceuta and Melilla). In this context, many of them have developed their own Forest and Nature Conservation Acts and national forest programmes, at sub-national levels.

The first forest plan of Catalunya was approved in 1994. This plan, known as the General Forest Policy Plan (GFPP), was in force until 2004. Although certain deficiencies are apparent today, it must be recognised that it was an innovative plan in its time. Nevertheless, diverse factors have made its application difficult: such as catastrophic forest fires in 1994 and 1998. It became clear that the distribution of powers between the departments involved needed serious modification. Work began in 2003 on its revision and a new GFPP has been established for the 2006–2016 period.

Despite the lack of a tradition of participation, in the Catalan forest plan there was a strong desire to make participation real; it was felt that it would benefit the sector by generating higher cohesion and increasing social agents' trust in the administration.

APPELSTRAND (2002) made the following recommendations for participation in the national forest plans, which were followed in the case of Catalonia:

a) *At the beginning*

- Political commitment about the use of the results
- Designation of sufficient financial resources to support participation
- Inter-sectorial representation
- Use of an independent moderator
- Mutual agreement for exchanging information
- Setting up of mechanisms to follow up the process
- Recognition that the process is a long-term one

b) *Aspects of procedures*

- Early participation, while options are still open
- Real opportunities to take part in the process
- Transparency
- Access to all the relevant information
- Subjecting the process to a code of conduct (the rules must be clear to everyone)

3. Monitoring and evaluation of the Catalan national forest programme

3.1 Objectives of the analysis

An external research team was contracted to elaborate the monitoring evaluation of the process. The study conducted

was not an evaluation process in a strict sense and, although it was carried out with the participation of the social agents for the evaluation of some aspects of the participative process, it cannot be considered a participative evaluation.

Four primary objectives were defined:

1. Impact of the contributions of the participants on the contents of the NFP
2. Impact of the participatory process on the networks of relations between the actors
3. Development of the process
4. Participants' perceptions of the contents of the NFP and the participatory process

The first objective is essential for the analysis. It is not necessary to say that the main purpose of a participatory process is epistemic. It consists of collecting participants' proposals and opinions in order to make an informed decision, in this case, on the contents of a NFP.

The second objective focuses on the creation of new bonds and links between the participants. Initially, the intention had been to observe the possible creation of different bonds at three levels (between participants in the same category, participants of different categories and, finally, between the participants and the administration) but difficulties with the answers (number obtained in each class) made the idea impracticable and it was discarded in favour of an analysis that centred on the creation of new bonds between the participants in general.

The third objective was the one that most directly affected the work carried out by the team responsible for the process. It becomes essential to verify whether the minimum requirements that must be fulfilled by any participative process have been considered. These requirements have to do with factors such as who the subjects of the participation are, or in which objective conditions the process has been developed. Works from PINDADO (2002) and ANDUIZA (2004) served as the basis for the design and dimensions of the objective. This objective has an extensive number of dimensions and indicators, which we will not go into in depth here. Nevertheless, it is perhaps important to emphasize that the question of who participates played a major role in the analysis and special attention was paid as to whether all the relevant actors participated or not.

Regarding the «how», that is to say, the conditions in which the process was developed, a painstaking effort to ensure the availability (in advance) of all the necessary information for

participating in the process and determining whether the necessary conditions for a correct collective deliberation had occurred.

Finally, the fourth objective is also very important. In any participative process, in addition to the objective information, it is fundamental to observe the participants' subjective perception. To a great extent the possible success of a process will depend on the degree of identification and agreement of the participants with the process and its results. This agreement is essential, among other things, to achieve the strength of social networks and sector cohesion, induce the stakeholders to assume the contents of the NFP, increasing its possibilities of successful implementation, and generate the above-mentioned learning process among the participants.

3.2. Methodology of the analysis

With regard to the methodological aspects of the analysis, it is necessary to emphasize different questions:

- The present work about monitoring and evaluation formally concluded with the participative process. The output of the process, however, cannot be considered to be the final and definitive NFP. This may yet be modified by the Department, the formal process of public information, or, later, in the parliamentary proceedings;
- The information referred to in the first objective and, some in the third, was obtained from an analysis of the documents elaborated during the process. It was determined to what extent the contributions made by the participants had been included.

In order to obtain the remaining data, different research techniques were triangulated (semi-structured interviews and questionnaire survey). Information on the participants' subjective perception was gathered in semi-directed interviews, whereas the information of which objective indicators could be easily constructed was collected by means of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was distributed at the last meeting of the participatory process (June 29, 2005). 42 of the 66 questionnaires were returned and used for our study. The sample is not statistically representative and we should also take into consideration that a positive bias might exist (the actors most critical of the process probably did not attend this last meeting).

Table 1: Dimension analyzed, indicator and method of source of information.

DA: Document analysis, I: Interview, Q: Questionnaire

Dimension	Indicator	Source of information
Objective 1: Impact on the content		
Integration of the opinion of participants in the document	Integration of statements proposed by different kinds of participants	DA
Objective 2: Impact in the relationships networks		
Establishment of relation networks among participants	New collaborations as a consequence of taking part in the process	Q
Objective 3: Process development		
Extension of participation	Participation in the process of all the pertinent agents	I, Q
Conditions of participation		
• Information	Availability of information for the process (quality, on time, etc)	I, Q
• Deliberation	Availability of possibilities for deliberation	I, Q
Objective 4: Perception about the content and the process of NFP		
Perception about the process and the content of the programme	Perception about the content of the NFP Perception of the process	I, Q I, Q

In order to compensate for these limitations different techniques were used to gather different aspects of reality (table 1). Topics that had been broached in the interviews were introduced into the questionnaire, and vice versa. In addition, given the possibility of a positive bias, some interviews were carried out with the most critical actors.

Thus, and in spite of the mentioned limitations, which are also inherent to any investigation, it seems reasonable to maintain that the results of the analysis would not change markedly with deeper research. In addition, these results are quite clear and it seems unlikely that a larger sample would change the sense of the results.

3.3. Results of the analysis

Considering all the limitations referred to above, the following results can be highlighted: In relation to the first objective: «impact of the contributions by the different categories of participants on the content of the NFP», it can be concluded that the contributions analysed are ostensibly included in the contents of the NFP. The contributions from the participants directly invited by the administration («group of experts» in the first phase and experts from the Department in the second) are much more extensively included than those made by the other more peripheral participants (entities and individuals) to the process, given that the former work with more complete documentation. Within the latter group, the contributions to the diagnosis are more present than those to later documents. Despite this, there are contributions by the agents in each new document presented.

In reference to the second objective: «impact of the participative process on the network of relations between the public and private actors in the process», it is notable that many of the participants interviewed have got to know other participants with whom they have established or intend to establish contacts or collaboration.

With respect to the third objective: «development of the process». Special attention was paid to the participants (a) and to the moment and phase of participation (b).

a) Participants

In the design phase, it was decided to introduce different levels of participation for the agents with direct interests (owners, exploitation companies) and those with indirect interests (associations of excursionist or users of the environment), as well as the general public.

In the field of the administration (in the field of institutional policy, and another in the technical field) the greatest importance was placed on the involvement of the administration experts in the application of the decisions with respect to a national forest plan in the decision-making process to improve the success of implementation. In a study on the participation in different regional forest plans in Spain (DOMÍNGUEZ 2001) it was seen that this internal participation did not take place in many cases, and this aspect was emphasised by the interviewees as a failure in the process.

Thus four groups were defined (table 2) where action was needed: experts, stakeholders, the public in general and the administration experts.

Experts: Persons in the sector active in one or more entities or associations but who take part in their own name. The composition of the panel of experts aimed to include, on one hand, experts with real knowledge of the terrain, and a certain territorial balance as well as people from the majority of entities from the sector.

The expert panel played a very important role apart from its important contribution of knowledge of and vision into the

forests and the sector. Participants had the background and the point of view of their institutions, but by participating on a personal basis, their postures were less radical than if they had been defending the interests of their respective institutions. On the other hand, the first five meetings dealt with the theme of diagnosis, in which it was easier to reach a consensus among the various parties. This panel of experts facilitated the establishment of a working dynamic and a dialogue between those persons who would represent their entities and associations in a later phase.

Associations and entities in the sector (stakeholders): The entities and associations especially invited to take part were selected through a definition of themes based on the criteria of the pan-European process. Thus, forest owners, industry, environmentalist entities and also excursionists and consumers were invited. In total, over 80 entities were directly invited to take part.

Administration experts: Between three and seven people took part in each of 25 thematic groups, which were led by a coordinator. They were mainly included in the designing phase (how) once the stakeholders and experts had decided (what).

Table 2: Groups considered by phase of the process.

X: Invited to participate in the elaboration; 0: Invited to express an opinion on an already elaborated document.

	Experts	Stakeholders	Staff at the administration	Public in general
Diagnosis	X	0	0	
Objectives	X	0	0	
Definition of strategies	0	X	X	0
Definition of action	0	X	X	0
Evaluation		X		

b) The moment and phases of participation

During the analysis and diagnostic phases of the GFPP, a working group was set up, co-ordinated by the Undersecretary of Forests and Biodiversity Management and made up of an expert from the Environment Office, another from the Centre for Forest Ownership and two specialists from areas of both fundamental and applied research (Forest Technologic Centre of Catalonia). They were responsible for conducting the process and elaborating working documents and also the final version. The process involved different groups in different phases (table 3) in order to make a tailored process for every one.

At the moment of writing this paper, the budget has yet to be decided and a process of public information begun in which the document will be presented to all the social agents.

Regarding the results related to participants' perception of the third objective, it can be noted that the majority of the interviewees (78.95%) considered that there had been no notable absences among the participants. Among the respondents (21.05%) and interviewees who stated that they had been aware of absenteeism, in most cases these were university departments or administrative bodies.

Regarding «who» has participated, we can say that there was a series of categories of participants who could be called the «traditionals» of Catalan forest policy and who were already known to each other before the process. These were the categories made up of those agents and organisations that, thanks partly to the hegemony of a specific concept of the sector, have historically carried more weight in the country's forest sector. These categories comprise organisations, institutions and individuals from the economic, property owning,

academic and trade union spheres. In all these cases, between 15 % and 25 % of the interviewees responded that before the process they knew members from all or practically all of the entities of the categories that participated in the process. At the other extreme there were actors, such as the conservationist entities and users, who were previously much less well known by the interviewees, who have had a more peripheral role, historically speaking, in the definition of the country's forest policy.

Regarding the perception about the «how» of participation, information and deliberation, the results show that 50 % of the interviewees considered that they had always had all the information in good time, and 35.70 % said that this had been the case most of the time. As far as time for deliberation was concerned, 54.80 % of the interviewees stated that the necessary conditions had always been ensured and a further 35.70 % considered that this had been so most of the time. On the whole, those interviewed said that they were satisfied with the degree of achievement of these two dimensions.

The fourth and last objective: «perception of the participants» shows even more positive results. 71.43 % of the respondents were very or quite satisfied with the development of the process and only 4.76 % expressed little or no satisfaction.

90.48 % of the interviewees considered that the process was having a positive or very positive influence on the contents of the NFP and not a single participant assessed the influence as negative.

The interviews showed that perceptions towards public participation for drawing up public policies are very positive. In most cases, these positive perceptions centred on the positive impact of participation on the contents of the policies. Moreover, some interviewees mentioned the impact of the participatory process on the social network and its possible future impact on the resolution of conflicts.

Asked about the content of the NFP, 68.29 % of the interviewees were satisfied or very satisfied with what had been elaborated of the NFP. By contrast, just 4.88 % declared themselves to be little or not at all satisfied. Among those interviewed there was also a wide predominance of the positive conceptions, and the comprehensive and transversal approach was praised repeatedly.

To sum up: the results of the analysis of the participatory process carried out for the elaboration of GFPP 2005–2014, have been very positive. Considering that the process for the approval of the plan is not yet concluded, perhaps it is worth closing this section with some of the reflections about the utility of the NFP from the participants interviewed.

Table 3: Chronography of the participation.

Diagnosis and Objectives

In spring 2003, an advisory panel was set up comprising a small group of forestry experts from the different areas of the sector. All members of the panel had practical experience in the forest sector but their training, fields of work and geographic origin varied.

Five working sessions were held, moderated by a team of professionals in participative processes and helped by the working group. A wide range of forest related institutions were subsequently invited to send their comments on the diagnosis that arose from this process, and these were included in our evaluation.

Definition of strategies and action programme

To draw up the proposals for action, the diagnosis prepared by the experts was taken into account, together with the action planned and carried out in the previous GFPP, the indicators for sustainable forest management on a regional scale, the declarations and manifestos drawn up by different institutions, the international processes and the planning documents from other countries or autonomous regions, as well as the general legal and programme framework.

In summer 2004 some 30 interviews were carried out with experts and those with knowledge of different fields, who enriched the proposal with their contributions until a document was built up to a strategic proposal that was structured into 5 programmes, 24 themes, 70 objectives and 204 tools.

In October 2004, an extended group of experts met again to work on the document. The results of that meeting led to the number of objectives and tools increasing to 75 and 312, respectively.

Once this proposal had been validated by the panel of experts, it was sent to the Environment Office, the Territorial Services of the Department of the Environment and Housing, the Parks, the Centre for Forest Ownership and further institutions involved in applied research. This process added one new theme, two new objectives and 13 tools to the document. On 10th December 2004 a draft of the programmes and tools was presented to all the municipal and district councils and associations. A formal act for the presentation of the document and the opening of the period of contributions was also held in Manresa. Parallel to this the document and the response forms were put on the web of the plan (plapoliticaforestal.net) together with a link to the web of the Department of the Environment and Housing.

It was decided to invite only those institutions that had made a contribution to attend the workshop and individual people were also encouraged to make contributions. It was possible to enter the document at three levels (in function of the time that one could dedicate to this) and ad hoc response forms were created with this in mind.

A workshop was held on 22nd January 2004 to which all responding institutions were invited. The aim of the workshop was to validate or discard the comments received during the contributive phase. Only points that were still open to controversy were included, not points where there was already agreement.

25 working groups were set up in the administration made up of personal who were given the results of the previous workshop. The aim was to define «how» after society had defined «what». After two months of work, during which they met numerous times and invited people from outside the group to participate, a document was drawn up with a proposal for an action programme, together with schedule and an associated proposal for a budget.

In June 2005, this programme document (without the budget) was presented once again, at a workshop for the associations in order to give them the opportunity to make comments. A series of bilateral meetings commenced with government representatives to talk about specific aspects.

On the one hand, some interviewees referred to the question of the budget allocation. This subject was not discussed and its regulation will be presented only in the formal process of compulsory public information. On the other hand, it was emphasised that the national forest sector was weakened at the moment of beginning the process. The process has been informed throughout by actors from all over the country and has generated very optimistic expectations. If these are not met, the effect could be very negative for the NFP and the participatory culture of the country.

Summary

In recent years, sustainable forest management has become the paradigm for forest policy. In this context, national forest programmes (NFP) are defined, in the broad sense, as planning instruments to achieve sustainable forest management at both national and subnational levels. The challenges for forest policy is to increase the number of agreed strategies and improve communication relations with the wide range of stakeholders involved, as well as those posed by the multiple use of forests, which are perceived not only as a source of raw material but also of goods and services for society in general. Although the definition and the contents of NFPs in Europe is in a permanent process of improvement, redefinition and discussion, it seems clear (since it appears implicit in several of their principles) that their formulation and implementation must entail a greater involvement of society in the decision making process, and more emphasis will have to be placed on the aspects of participation. The umbrella of participation covers a wide range of different processes and in this context the need emerges to monitor and evaluate this participation. This paper describes the monitoring and evaluation and shows the main results of the participation conducted in the framework on the national forest programme of Catalonia during the years 2003–2005.

Résumé

Contrôle et évaluation de la participation aux programmes forestiers nationaux. L'exemple de la Catalogne

Au cours des dernières années, la gestion durable des forêts est devenue la philosophie de la politique forestière. Dans ce contexte, on a défini des programmes forestiers nationaux, au sens large du terme, comme instruments de planification pour parvenir à une gestion durable des forêts sur le plan national et subnational. Les défis de la politique forestière sont les suivants: accroître le nombre de stratégies convenues et améliorer les relations de communication entre les différents représentants des groupes d'intérêts, à l'instar des exigences posées par les multiples usages des forêts qui ne sont pas seulement perçues comme une source de matière première, mais aussi comme un fournisseur de biens et de services pour la société en général. Même si la définition et le contenu des programmes forestiers nationaux sont constamment améliorés, redéfinis et rediscutés en Europe, il apparaît clairement (comme certaines directives le laissent transparaître implicitement) que leur formulation et leur application doivent mieux intégrer la population dans le processus de décision et mettre davantage l'accent sur les aspects de la participation. Les formes de participation comprennent un vaste choix de processus. Cet article décrit le contrôle et l'évaluation de ces différentes méthodes et présente les principaux résultats de la participation obtenus dans le cadre du programme forestier national de Catalogne au cours des années 2003 à 2005.

Traduction: CLAUDE GASSMANN

Zusammenfassung

Kontrolle und Evaluierung von Mitwirkung in nationalen Waldwirtschaftsprogrammen am Beispiel von Katalonien

In den letzten Jahren wurde nachhaltiges Waldmanagement zum Paradigma in der Forstpolitik. In diesem Kontext werden nationale Waldwirtschaftsprogramme (NFP) im weiteren Sinn definiert als Planungsinstrumente, um nachhaltiges Waldmanagement auf nationaler und subnationaler Ebene zu erzielen. Die Herausforderungen für die Forstpolitik bestehen darin, die Zahl vereinbarter Strategien zu erhöhen und die Kommunikationsbeziehungen zwischen den unterschiedlichen Stakeholdern zu verbessern ebenso wie diese sich bei der vielfältigen Nutzung der Wälder stellen, die nicht nur als Quelle für Rohmaterial, sondern auch als Quelle für Güter und Dienstleistungen für die Gesellschaft im Allgemeinen wahrgenommen werden. Obwohl Definition und Inhalte der NFPs in Europa laufend verbessert, neu definiert und diskutiert werden, scheint es klar (da es in einigen Richtlinien implizit erscheint), dass deren Erarbeitung und Anwendung einen stärkeren Einbezug der Gesellschaft im Entscheidungsprozess bedingen und dass mehr Nachdruck auf die Aspekte der Mitwirkung gelegt werden muss. Formen der Mitwirkung umfassen eine grosse Auswahl verschiedener Prozesse, und in diesem Umfeld entsteht der Bedarf, Mitwirkung zu kontrollieren und zu evaluieren. Entsprechend werden in diesem Aufsatz die Kontrolle und Evaluierung beschrieben und die wichtigsten Resultate der Mitwirkung gezeigt, die im Rahmen eines NFPs in Katalonien in den Jahren 2003 bis 2005 erzielt wurden.

Übersetzung: MARGRIT IRNIGER

References

- ADELANTADO, J. (coord.) 2000: Cambios en el estado de bienestar: políticas sociales y desigualdades en España. Barcelona, Icaria Bellaterra, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions, DL.
- ANDUIZA, E. 2004: Evaluació de la participació en polítiques públiques. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, unpublished.
- APPELSTRAND, M. 2002: Public Participation and Collaboration. Background paper for COST Action E-19 «National Forest Programmes in a European Context». PDF-file at: <http://www.metla.fi/eu/cost/e19/appelstrand.pdf> (October 6, 2006).
- BLANCO, I.; FONT, J. 2003: Polis, la ciutat participativa: participar en els municipis, qui, com i per què? Barcelona, Diputació de Barcelona, Xarxa de Municipis, cop.
- BUTTOUD, G. 1999: Principles of participatory processes in public decision-making. In: Niskanen, A.; Väyrynen, J. (eds.): Regional forest programmes: A participatory approach to support forest based regional development. EFI proceedings 32.
- BRUGUÉ, Q; GALLEGO, R. 1999: Una administración pública democrática? Manuscript.
- DOMÍNGUEZ, G. 2001: El papel de los actores sociales forestales y modelos de participación. In: Actas del II congreso técnico-científico forestal del arco atlántico. Silleda, 20–22 diciembre, 2001: 51–63.
- ELSTER, J. 1988: Uvas amargas: sobre la subversión de la racionalidad. Barcelona, Península.
- EUROPARC – ESPAÑA 2002: Plan de Acción para los espacios naturales protegidos del estado Español. Ed. Fundación González Bernáldez. Madrid, 168 p.
- FAO/ECE/LO 2000: Public Participation in Forestry in Europe and North America. Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry, Geneva.
- GRAMBERGER, M. 2001: Citizens as Partners. OECD Handbook on Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-making. OECD, France.
- GROOTAERT, C. 2001: Local Institutions, Poverty, and Household Welfare in Bolivia. Policy Research Working Paper 2644, World Bank, Washington, 66 p.
- HERREROS, F. 2002: Por qué confiar?: el problema de la creación de capital social. Madrid, Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales.

- MARTÍ, J. 2002: La realidad que se percibe, se mide y se transforma: Métodos y técnicas para la participación social. Comunicación en las Jornadas de Participación Ciudadana: Una apuesta para la sostenibilidad. Palma de Mallorca, 13–14 de diciembre de 2002.
- NINO, C. 1997: La constitución de la democracia deliberativa. Barcelona, Gedisa.
- ØISTAD, K.; TRØMBORG, E. 2002: National Forest Programmes as a Holistic Approach to Address Inter-Sectoral Impacts on Forests – Opportunities and Challenges with a Reference to Norwegian Experiences. In: Tikkanen, I.; Glück, P.; Pajuoja, H. (eds.): Cross-Sectoral Policy Impacts on Forests. EFI proceedings 46: 7–13.
- PINDADO, F. (coord.) 2002: Bases, mètodes i tècniques, eines per a la participació ciutadana. Barcelona, Diputació de Barcelona, Xarxa de municipis, cop.
- REEB, D. 2004: Towards the development of criteria and indicators to assess the level of participation in NFP processes. In: Buttoud, G.; Solberg, B.; Tikkanen, I.; Pajari, B. (eds.): The evaluation of forest policies and programmes. EFI proceedings 52: 75–85.
- YOSIE, T.F.; HERBST, T.D. 1998: Using Stakeholder Processes in Environmental Decisionmaking. An Evaluation of Lessons Learned, Key Issues, and Future Challenges. Ruder Fin, Washington. PDF-file at: <http://www.gdrc.org/decision/nr98ab01.pdf> (October 6, 2006).

Authors

GLORIA DOMÍNGUEZ, Forest Engineer, Centre Tecnològic Forestal de Catalunya, Pujada del Seminari s/n, ES-25280 Solsona, Catalonia, Spain. E-mail: gloria.dominguez@ctfc.es.

JORDI TENA, Sociologist, Centre Tecnològic Forestal de Catalunya, Pujada del Seminari s/n, ES-25280 Solsona, Catalonia, Spain. E-mail: Jordi.Tena@campus.uab.es.