

Defining and assessing forest governance¹

Forest governance research

Research into forest governance issues is a popular and timely endeavour. This is reflected e.g. by a large number of publications (e.g. Kleinschmit et al. 2009, Giessen et al. 2009 and Buttoud 2012, similar Hogl et al. 2013, Arts et al. 2013, Arts/Visseren-Hamakers 2012, Rametsteiner 2009, Agrawal et al. 2008, Glück et al. 2005). The high relevance of international forest governance research is further reflected by the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO) dedicating to this very topic its group 9.05 on Forest Policy and Governance, which includes a special working group 9.05.02 on Forest Governance.

Forest governance research can be understood as social science inquiry into forest-related decisions, their implementation and resulting effects within a given institutional setting. In order to arrive at relevant and valid conclusions, social science inquiry, more than their physical sciences counterparts, need to clearly define the terms, concepts and methodological frameworks which they apply (Krott/Giessen 2014). Unfortunately, this is not easily and, hence, not always done in forest governance research, running the risk of rendering the concept of forest governance a buzzword, rather than advancing scientific rigor.

At the core of the concept lie recent empirical observations about the changing role of private actors and institutions *vis a vis* the state with its government, multiple administrative actors and binding norms, rules, and procedures. An early claim within the political science about ‘governance without government’ (e.g. Rosenau/Czempiel 1992, Rhodes 1996) led to numerous studies at multiple levels on the role and effects of private actors and institutions. This is reflected by forest governance studies addressing issues such as forest certification, national forest programmes, community forestry and decentralisation, payment for ecosystem services, international forest deliberations (Glück et al. 2005). This view was later challenged by critiques (e.g. Peters/Pierre 1998, Agrawal et al. 2008, Hysing 2009, Howlett et al. 2009, Bell/Hindmoor 2012, Giessen 2010, Arts, 2014) for its strong focus of governance research on private actors and institutions. This gave rise for the advancement of the forest governance research programme towards scrutinizing both, private as well as public actors and institutions and their interplay in light of their effects on forests.

This broader conception of forest governance promises analytical added value in two ways. Firstly, it promotes social science research which engages with the broader settings, the interplay between public and private actors and institutions as well as formal and informal aspects of forest-related decisions, their implementation and effects. Secondly, the concept of forest governance spurs interdisciplinary research among the forest-related social sciences such as political science, sociology, legal studies and economics, but also between the social and the physical science. The endeavour of the forest governance research programme of also scrutinizing the effects of public and private

¹ for more details refer to:

Giessen, L., & Buttoud, G. (2014). Defining and assessing forest governance. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 49, 1-3.

actors' decisions and their implementation creates research bridges between the social science disciplines and physical science inquiry analysing biophysical effects, which social sciences alone are not able to generate (comp. Giessen 2013a).

Defining forest governance

In the abovementioned sense we propose a wide definition of forest governance, which scholars may find useful to build upon and to further develop according to their empirical cases. Accordingly, ***forest governance comprises a) all formal and informal, public and private regulatory structures, i.e. institutions consisting of rules, norms, principles, decision procedures, concerning forests, their utilisation and their conservation, b) the interactions between public and private actors therein and c) the effects of either on forests.***

The shortcoming of such a wide definition is that it is difficult to cover all these aspects within the methodology of one study, while at the same time maintaining scientific rigour. Rather, a number of smaller, particular studies may be expected (and actually have been reported already), each focusing on a different aspect of forest governance. In such a research programme, forest governance studies often focus on a particular level of analysis, ranging from global to international to national to regional and local. Accordingly, it may be useful to focus the above definition of forest governance to any of these levels as one among other criteria for categorising these studies. This requires developing and adapting definitions and concepts on global forest governance (e.g. Giessen 2013a,b), international forest governance (e.g. Rayner et al. 2010), national forest governance (e.g. Krott 2005), regional forest governance (e.g. Giessen 2010), and local forest governance (Djogo/Syaf 2004, Secco et al. 2014)

Assessing forest governance

Assessing forest governance can be done as a scientific endeavour conducted within the scientific realm, or as a practical enterprise undertaken by actors in the field of forest conservation and utilisation practices.

Within the scientific realm, the researchers are guided by methodological frameworks, which they develop intersubjectively in order to advance scientific knowledge about real world phenomena. There are two broad approaches for such scientific analyses: *Analytical* studies are concerned with the mere reflection of these phenomena and their explanation and strive for developing value-free methodological frameworks. In contrast, *normative* analyses imply value judgements on desirable conditions within their methodological frameworks and often develop recommendations towards selected ends. In both approaches, the researchers are free to define their concepts and hypotheses on potential causalities following scientific thought and rigour.

On the contrary, *practice-oriented assessments* of forest governance inherently imply value judgements which are closely related to the interests of the authors' organisations developing the methodological frameworks. Recently, a number of such practice-oriented frameworks for assessing forest governance have been developed (FAO 2014, WRI 2013). In such works, value judgements are

an implicit or even explicit part of the methodological framework. WRI (2013), for example, build on the normative concept of good forest governance. This does not mean that such assessments are non-scientific; they often are a combination of scientific and practical aspects which are integrated and through this provide for added value to real world challenges (similar Stevanov et al. 2013).

Lukas Giessen and Gerard Buttoud

Literature

- Agrawal, A., Chhatre, A., Hardin, R. (2008). Changing governance of the world's forests. *science*, 320(5882), 1460-1462.
- Arts, B., Behagel, J., van Bommel, S., Koning, J., & Turnhout, E. (Eds.). (2012). *Forest and nature governance: a practice based approach* (Vol. 14). Springer.
- Arts, B., & Visseren-Hamakers, I. (2012). Forest governance: A state of the art review. In: Arts, B., van Bommel, S., Ros-Tonen, M., & Verschoor, G. (Eds.). *Forest-people interfaces*. Wageningen Academic Publishers. pp. 241-257.
- Avdibegović, M, Buttoud, G, Marić, B, and Shannon, M (2012, Eds.). *Assessing Forest Governance in a Context of Change*. Faculty of Forestry University of Sarajevo, 85pp.
- Bell, S., & Hindmoor, A. (2012). Governance without government? The case of the Forest Stewardship Council. *Public Administration*, 90(1), 144-159.
- Buttoud, G (2012). From PES to REDD: Making policy tools and economic mechanisms interact for a better forest governance. *Forest Policy and Economics* 18 (2012) 1–3.
- Djogo, T., & Syaf, R. (2004). Decentralization without accountability: power and authority over local forest governance in Indonesia. Indiana university. Digital library of the commons (DLC).
- FAO/PROFOR / Cowling, Phil, Kristin DeValue and Kenneth Rosenbaum (2014). *Assessing forest governance: A Practical Guide to Data Collection, Analysis, and Use*. PROFOR and FAO. Washington DC.
- Giessen, L (2010): *Regional Forest Governance - Potentials for forestry and political drivers in integrated rural development policy*. Goettingen University Press, 313pp.
- Giessen, L. (2013): „Fragmentierung“ als Schlüsselfaktor des internationalen Waldregimes: von einem mono- zu einem multi-disziplinären methodischen Rahmen für eine vertiefte Forstpolitikforschung. *Allgemeine Forst- und Jagdzeitung*, 184 (3-4), 47-57.
- Giessen, L. (2013): Reviewing the main characteristics of the international forest regime complex and partial explanations for its fragmentation. In: *International Forestry Review*, 15 (1), 60-70.
- Giessen, L.; Kleinschmit, D. and Böcher, M. (2009): Between power and legitimacy – discourse and expertise in forest and environmental governance. In: *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11 (5-6), 452-453.

- Glück, P., Rayner, J., Cashore, B., 2005. Change in the governance of forest resources. In: Mery, G., Alfaro, R., Kanninen, M., Labovikov (Eds.), *Forests in the Global Balance — Changing Paradigms*. IUFRO, Helsinki, pp. 51–74.
- Hogl, K., Kvarda, E., Nordbeck, R., & Pregernig, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Environmental governance: the challenge of legitimacy and effectiveness*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Howlett, M., Rayner, J., & Tollefson, C. (2009). From government to governance in forest planning? Lessons from the case of the British Columbia Great Bear Rainforest initiative. *Forest policy and economics*, 11(5), 383-391.
- Hysing, E. (2009). Governing without government? The private governance of forest certification in Sweden. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 312-326.
- Kleinschmit, D.; Böcher, M. and Giessen, L. (2009): Discourse and expertise in forest and environmental governance — An overview. In: *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11 (5-6), 309-312.
- Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (1998). Governance without government? Rethinking public administration. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 8(2), 223-243.
- Rametsteiner, E. (2009). Governance concepts and their application in forest policy initiatives from global to local levels. *Small-scale Forestry*, 8(2), 143-158.
- Rayner, J., Buck, A., Katila, P. (2010, Eds.). *Embracing Complexity: Meeting the challenges of international forest governance. A global assessment report*. Prepared by the Global Forest Panel on the International Forest Regime. IUFRO World Series Volume 28. Vienna. 172 pp.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: governing without government¹. *Political studies*, 44(4), 652-667.
- Rosenau, J. N., & Czempiel, E. O. (Eds.). (1992). *Governance without government: order and change in world politics* (Vol. 20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevanov, M., Böcher, M., Krott, M., Krajter, S., Vuletic, D., & Orlovic, S. (2013). The Research, Integration and Utilization (RIU) model as an analytical framework for the professionalization of departmental research organizations: Case studies of publicly funded forest research institutes in Serbia and Croatia. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 37, 20-28.
- WRI / DAVIS, C, WILLIAMS, L, LUPBERGER, S, DAVIET, F (2013). *Assessing Forest Governance - The Governance of Forests Initiative Indicator Framework*. World Resources Institute.