

## CHRONICLE



European Commission

European cooperation  
in the field of scientific  
and technical research

## COST Action E 27 PROFOR "Protected Forest Areas in Europe – Analysis and Harmonization": Final Conference and the Main Outcomes

COST is an intergovernmental framework for European Co-operation in the field of Scientific and Technical Research, enabling European countries to coordinate their national research programmes on the European level. COST Action E27 (PROFOR) has established to harmonize the wide-range of protected forest area definitions and categories used in European countries within the context of existing international systems of protected areas. Action was launched in 2001 ending in February 2006.

Representatives from 54 organizations of 25 European countries as Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech republic, Denmark, Finland, France, FYR of Macedonia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Spain Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom, joined together to implement objectives and work out the goals that were set in three working groups and Management Committee of the Action. Besides the mentioned signatory countries the following international organisations have an official Observer status and are fully involved in the working process with full access to all documents and data such as Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) – Liaison Unit in Warsaw, European Environment Agency (EEA) – European Topic Centre on Nature Protection and Biodiversity in Paris. COST Action E27 also co-operated directly with International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Environment for Europe – Pan European Biodiversity and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS) and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN-ECE). Objectives encompass the enhancement of the quality and clarity of information on protected forest areas at both the national and the European

level; attainment of the comparison of data and information on protected forest areas that will serve as a basis for international data collection; compilation of the information on the historical background and restrictions applied to different national classifications of protected forest areas (PFAs); collection of the relevant definitions of all categories of PFAs as well as forests with protective functions; making of the reporting of national information to international organisations transparent and comparable, such that this information can be used in the assessment of forest resources; attempt of a tentative description and quantification of the total economic value of PFAs, and seeking of the best options for the harmonisation of national data and definitions on PFAs within the context of international data collection processes. Countries – signatories set a number of the goals seeking 1) to deliver a comprehensive overview of European PFAs including: an account of their historical background, legal status and management; a tentative description of their total economic value; an analysis of the status of PFAs; a comparison of definitions and data collection processes related to PFAs; a proposal on the inclusion of the data collection into national forest inventories; 2) to clarify the concept of naturalness as used for forest protection; 3) to find more precise definitions as management restrictions, restrictions on hunting, wildlife management, strictly protected, legal basis, voluntary, protection regime, protected and protective forests, naturalness, forests out of management, forest type, *etc*; 4) to analyse the relationships of national to international classification systems like IUCN, Guidelines for protected area management categories, EEA Common data base on designated areas, MCPFE Categories of protected and protective forests and oth-

er wooded land in Europe and others; 5) to analyse feasible options for the integration of data collected by national forest inventories; 6) to contribute to the planning of networks of protected forest areas and collation of information on these areas; 7) to develop a COST Action web-site and interactive data bank on national categories of PFAs in Europe including a comprehensive information source on international classification systems of these areas and national and international organisations that are involved in PFAs; 8) to provide a basis for the mapping of PFAs using GIS based systems for various applications / purposes.

The main outcomes of the COST Action E27 were presented at the Final Conference "Protected Forest Areas in Europe – Analysis and Harmonisation" PROFOR that was coordinated with Management Committee meeting. Final meeting was held at the University of Barcelona in Barcelona, Spain in the ambience of one of the oldest and largest universities established in 1450. This ambience ensured special character of the meeting. A final round-table session was organized to discuss the main results of the Action with user and stakeholder groups. Representatives from the Government of Catalonia, Environment Ministry, COST TC Forests and Forest Products Domain, Forest Technologic Centre of Catalonia, European Forest Institute and also COST E27 have come in the Welcoming ceremony. Dr. Georg Frank (Federal Research and Training Centre for Forests, Natural Hazards and Landscape, Austria), Chairman of COST Action E27, pointed the main scope and key issues of the Action. Leaders of the working groups presented the main results. Leader of the first working group (WG1), James Latham (Countryside Council for Wales, UK), highlighted the main goals of the group and outcomes. The group set range of tasks exploring the national dimension of PFAs to provide understanding of the diversity of their types. As Jim Latham underlined, all participants of Action gathered wide-ranging information on protected forest areas that could be useful source for scientists, foresters, policy markers and other interested bodies. The group conducted a wide range of the analyses and synthesis work to identify trends, commonalities and differences relative to national and regional characteristics. As one of the outputs of the Action sequential from activity of the WG1, the Country Reports of Signatories turn important. Country Report was published in 2005 as LATHAM J., FRANK G., FAHY O., KIRBY M., MILLER H., STIVEN R. (Eds.), 2005: **COST Action E27: Protected Forest Areas in Europe – analysis and Harmonisation (PROFOR): Reports of Signatory States.** *Federal Research and*

*Training Centre for Forests, Natural Hazards and Landscape*, Vienna: 413p. Country Reports and Tables of protected forest areas provide comprehensive information and description of protected forest areas throughout Europe and is an important basis for the further research and analysis. That is a concise account of the main parameters of PFAs including historical development, current situation of PFAs in the signatory country, main types, responsible organisations, selection criteria and representativity, inventory and monitoring, landscape and wider issues and future development. There is the great complexity of protected forest areas types in Europe and at once similarities of approach. Data on naturalness were gained from all signatories by questionnaires seeking to clarify the concept of naturalness as used in the field of forest protection. The important work was done in the study of Key Terms that are used throughout Europe. The created basis is usable for the multilingual glossary on protected areas. The assessing of the socio-economic values of protected forest areas has accomplished on the ground of the information gathered from the signatories seeking to identify factors and criteria to assess the socio-economic values of PFAs in Europe, analyse and discuss existing relations between limitations, benefits and compensations, which arise in connection with strict and non-strict protected areas for different groups of stakeholders, and analyse and discuss the effect of protected forest areas at regional level.

The leader of the second working group (WG2), Kris Vandekerkhove (Instituut Voor Bosbouw En Wildbeheer, Belgium), presented outcomes of the WG2, which aimed for the enhancement of the quality and clarity of information on PFAs at European level. This group fulfilled the analysis of the current procedures of national reporting to the international organisations by clarifying of problem areas, when using international classification systems and presenting options to harmonise definitions of protected forest area, and identification. Two international classification systems are most used for the reporting. There, TBFRA (Temperate and Boreal Forest Resources Assessment) in Europe used the IUCN Protected Area Management Categories for its and reporting on protected forests areas (TBFRA 2000); and MCPFE produced figures on protected forest area (indicator 4.9) in its 'State of Europe's forests 2003', using a separate methodology, covered in the endorsed Annex 2 of the Vienna Resolution 4 'MCPFE Assessment guidelines for the protected and protective forest and other wooded land in Europe'. Participants of WG2 have described, compared and assessed these systems on the ground of the results of

TBFRA, MCPFE and input of the signatories. The considerable variation is underlined on the basis of the comparison mentioned sources that implied the confusions and to date, inharmonious and incomparable dataset of protected forest areas. Kris Vandekerckhove emphasized that as the results are divergent, reported figures are based on reliable statistics with error up to 20% and less, and information is gathered using reliable data sources. Some differences arise from the new developments since the time the data were gathered as new areas could be designated or expanded. Differences in the definition of 'forest' are pointed out as an explanatory factor for the variation observed. The FRA (The Global Forest Resources Assessment) definition of forest provides a very straightforward but broad interpretation of forest such as crown 'cover > 10%, 5m high' while national definitions are more restrictive. The working group has produced an extensive document pointing out sources of uncertainty in the existent reporting systems, and formulates concrete suggestions and clarifications that should enabled to reduce the divergence in interpretations. That is way to more harmonised and comparable datasets. It is proposed to include extensive harmonisation stage in the reporting process. The WG2 states that the assessment of the amount of forest that is exclusively or primarily managed for conservation of biodiversity is an important indicator of the 'performance' of countries on this specific indicator of forest biodiversity conservation and should therefore be reported as clearly as possible. WG2 stressed the need for additional but separate reporting on habitat quality (a) and management (b) effectiveness, and essentiality of the complementary assessment of the conservation status and ecological management standards that are included in everyday practice in forests outside legally designated conservation areas. WG2 direct contribution to MCPFE Assessment Guidelines, to EEA Common Database on Designated Areas (CDDA) and direct co-operation with IUNC are pointed. The outcomes of WG2 are currently directly used to develop Implementation Guidelines for data collection and compiling the statistics of the 'MCPFE assessment guidelines for protected an protective forests and other wooded land in Europe'. COST E27 is considered officially as a leading actor concerning the focus-protected areas. The Action has carried out an inquiry to analyse and assess the Common Database on Designated Areas (CDDA), operated by the European Topic Centre on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity in Paris. On the whole, the CDDA is seen positively, if completed and regularly updated. Action E27 has invited representatives of IUNC to participate

in the joint meetings of E27 and conveyed to IUCN a concerted statement to the draft 'Forest Protected Areas and the IUCN protected area management categories – Guidance on the use of IUCN protected area categories for protected forest areas'.

The third working group WG3 concentrated efforts to create a clearinghouse mechanism for European protected forest areas. The leader of the WG3, Andreas Schuck (European Forest Institute, Joensuu, Finland) present information on portal for European



Final Conference, Barcelona, Spain 22-24 February 2006:  
*Field trip in the Montenegro and Corredor Park*

protected areas as outcomes from the COST Action E27. Namely the World Wide Web enables an availability of information in a cost-effective and pertinent fashion. The website of the E27 was developed according to the COST Action E27 Memorandum of Understanding include the interactive databases, diverse and condensed information on protected forest areas, and a document handling and access facility. The gateway of the COST Action E27 was established. The site includes restricted working group platforms; interactively searchable databases on PFAs categories; related literature; related maps and a photo gallery of PFAs. Database records are accompanied by metadata. This data enable to get an overview of the information resources at hand. WG3 at once participates in the elaboration of key terms related to PFAs seeking to better understanding among signatories and the development of technical glossaries and dictionaries in the forestry domain. Andreas Schuck pointed that the COST E27 website is at <http://www.efi.fi/projects/coste27/>. It will be further developed, and much of the information under the restricted section will be made publicly available.

Beside presentations of the main outcomes of the working groups of COST Action E27, participants of the Final Conference have the opportunity to get to know on the EU forests, past, present and Envi-

ronmental policies vs. Forest Policy (speaker Joost Van de Velde, European Commission, DG Environment). The representatives of signatories who were responsible for the set tasks of the WG1, reported on the history of protected forest areas in Europe and the concept of naturalness within forest protection (Jan-Karl Welzholz, Germany); selection criteria and representativeness of protected forest areas dedicated to biodiversity conservation in Europe (Etienne Branquart and Kris Verheyen, Belgium; Jim Latham, UK); analysis of organisations responsible for or involved in the establishment and maintenance of protected forest areas (Floor Vodde, The Netherlands); landscape, spatial relationships and other considerations (Cristina Montiel and Glòria Dominguez, Spain); forest definitions and assessment of Protected Forest areas (Georg Frank, Austria); visualisation of PFA statistical table

data (Andreas Schuck and Markus Lier, Finland); the COST Action E27 key term study: identification of a core set of key terms for protected forest areas (Karl-Manfred Schweinzer, Austria); data flow and reporting (Winfried Bücking, Germany); socio-economic aspects of protected forest areas (Cristina Montiel, task force leader, Spain); multivariate analysis of socio-economic effects concerning PFA (Pavel Cudlin, Czech Republic), and socio-economic implications of protected forest areas to the stakeholders (Glòria Dominguez, Spain). The field trip in the Montnegre and Corredor Park crowns the work of the Final conference.

**Olgirda Belova**

Lithuanian Forest Research Institute, Lithuania



**Figure 2.** COST Action E27 Protected Forest Areas in Europe – Analysis and Harmonisation (PROFOR) Final Conference, Barcelona, Spain 22-24 February 2006: Field trip in the Montnegre and Corredor Park. Farewell of the Action team

## INSTRUCTION TO AUTHORS

*Baltic Forestry* is open for papers of all major themes in forestry such as Silviculture; Physiology and Genetics; Forest Operation and Techniques; Inventory, Growth, Yield, Quantitative and Management Sciences; Forest Products; Forest Health (including monitoring *etc.*); Forest Environment (including ecosystem, site research and classification, forest hydrology, wildlife and habitat management, biodiversity conservation, *etc.*).

*Baltic Forestry* publishes original research papers of the results both theoretical and experimental in the Baltic's and elsewhere. Review papers and brief research reports on topics of interest to a wide audience will be considered for publication.

### *Submission of manuscripts*

Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate. Graphs, photographs (high quality is need) can be submitted in triplicate separately. The data should be saved in the Win Word format. On the diskette you should indicate your name, institution, the word processing programme you have used and the date. Contributions should be in English .

Submission of manuscripts should be accompanied by a cover letter from the author who will be responsible for correspondence regarding the manuscript. The letter should contain a statement that the manuscript has been seen and approved by all authors. The contribution will imply that this paper has not been published elsewhere and, if accepted for publication in the *Baltic Forestry*, it will not be published in any other journal in the same or similar form without our written consent. All papers submitted to *Baltic Forestry* are peer reviewed by at least two independent referees. To ensure fairness, referees are anonymous.

Manuscript copies on the disk are required at the first stage ensuring operativeness. After the paper has gone through reviewing process and correction before the final revision and acceptance, the paper should be submitted on a 3.5 diskette or CD together with printout in triplicate.

Reproduction of contributions is not permitted.

### *Manuscript arrangement*

**General:** It is recommended that the text of original article (*Research Reports*) should not normally be longer than 20 printed pages, including tables, illustrations, references and summary. The authors should aim to submit their work, as concisely as possible and longer papers will be accepted under exceptional circumstances. The *Brief Reports* and *Chronicle* will be published in addition to submission of the original articles. The *Brief Report* must not exceed 10 pages. The style should be the same as in original papers. These manuscripts will normally be published quickly after receipt of completed manuscripts. The editors may suggest that manuscripts will be resubmitted in this form. The *Chronicle* should include brief surveys on different kinds of scientific and respective events *etc.* The entire manuscript

may be 1.5 spaced, leaving 3.0-cm margin on the left, 2.5 cm on top and bottom. The A4-size paper is most preferred. A font size no smaller than 11 should be used for the word-processed manuscripts. Upon receipt, the paper will be given a received date. *Number all* pages in the upper right corner. The approximate position of the tables and figures should be indicated in the left-hand margin. *Scientific names* must be in *Italics*. The manuscript should includes:

- Title;
- Author(s)name(s);
- Address(es): department(s), institution(s), location(s), post code, country (use only English letters);
- Abstract;
- Key words;
- Introduction;
- Materials and methods;
- Results;
- Discussion and conclusions;
- Short acknowledgements (if you wish);
- Summary in Russian with Key words;
- References;
- Illustrations;
- Legends for illustrations;
- Tables

**Title:** Title should be as brief as clarity permits (max. 50 characters). Authors' names and addresses of institutions are included below. The name of the correspondence author to whom all correspondence will be sent should be marked with \*, and the electronic address and phone number should be indicated in the address.

**Abstract:** The text of an abstract should not exceed 350 words for original papers and 150 words for the *Brief reports*. Problems, objectives, methods employed and main results should be stated. Do not include figures, tables, undefined abbreviations, equations and references in the abstract.

**Key words:** Key words refer to all relevant key words including those already in the title.

**Text:** Following headings should be used such as ***Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Discussion and conclusions.***

The *Introduction* should provide a general orientation of the subject of the article and present the reasons for and the main aims of the study. It should be concise. The *Materials and methods* must provide information enough to permit exact replication of the research. The methods should be described in detail . The *Results* should be concise and as objective and descriptive as possible. Refer to the figures and tables as *Figure* and *Table*. All the references cited in the text should indicate the author's name followed by the year of publication in brackets. For more than two authors, the first author's name should be followed by "*et al*" in italics. If several references are cited together, they are arranged chronologically such as (Ellenberg *et al.* 1992, Kouki *et al.* 2001, Jensen & Hofmann 2002). No discussion of the results is permitted in this part of the text. The *Discussion and conclusions* should not repeat results and should be concisely written. These should point out the significance of the results.

**References:** List all references cited at the end of paper alphabetically according to the first author.

*a. For periodicals*

**Cape, J.N. and Fowler, D.** 1981. Changes in epicuticular wax *Pinus sylvestris* exposed to polluted air. *Silva Fennica*, 15: 457-458.