

rise, suppression costs drop, and the damage to forest resources abates. However, those resources don't include buildings or property located in the wildland/urban interface. NFMAS only recognizes values for Forest Service lands. Fires that spread into other federal lands or into the wildland/urban interface are not taken into account. Thus, NFMAS significantly underestimates the true cost of firefighting and almost ensures inadequate firefighting resources in these populated areas.

Yet, there does seem to be some light at the end of the tunnel. In April of 2000, the Forest Service released *Protecting People and Sustaining Resources in Fire-Adapted Ecosystems—A Cohesive Strategy*. Written as a response to a GAO report spotlighting the threat of catastrophic wildfires in the West, the Forest Service's strategy lays forth an aggressive effort to treat and thin 40 million acres of forest in the Interior West by 2015. Some concerns voiced by those outside of the Forest Service charged that the agency would merely concentrate on treating acres at low-risk for fire, since these areas would be least costly to treat. However, the Forest Service's strategy outlines a commitment to prioritize high-risk areas, for these areas pose the largest threat to neighboring com-

munities and typically consume the most suppression resources. The strategy also realizes the need for interagency standards for fighting fires and the mandate to employ a larger "ecosystem management" approach to addressing the fuels problem. Perhaps the most progressive of the plan is the drive to integrate social science with fire science. A recognition of the unique problems of the West's wildland/urban interface and a renewed commitment to involve community stakeholders in forest restoration efforts forms the most visionary basis of the Forest Service's efforts.

Although the results of the Cerro Grande Fire were tragic and, to some extent, preventable, federal fire management agencies need not allow the mistakes of the past to hinder efforts to circumvent tragedies in the future. The proliferation of communities along the wildland/urban interface simply attests to the fact that people continue to be fascinated with nature. The citizens of Los Alamos learned all too well the effects of a federal land management policy that emphasized merchantable timber over ecosystem values. Perhaps the wildfires racing across the West will form the crucible that produces a new stewardship ethic and respect for the nation's forests. Only the ashes will tell.

IPF Proposals for Action: An International Agreement for Sustainable Forests

Nadine Block

In 1997, the UN Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) recommended 147 Proposals for Action to the international community, to address a range of forest problems at the global level. In developing the Proposals, the IPF was mandated to "pursue a consensus and formulate...actions in order to combat deforestation and forest degradation, and to promote the management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests."¹

The Proposals for Action represent progress and considerable consensus toward the advancement of sustainable forest management worldwide. The international community, including the U.S.,

has agreed to implement the 147 Proposals in some manner consistent with national political, social, and economic limits. Countries involved have been urged to undertake a systematic assessment of the Proposals in the context of their national forest programs and national policy frameworks in a coordinated manner, with the participation of interested persons.

Although the participants in the IPF process are not legally bound by the Proposals, there is a world political obligation to give effect to the IPF Proposals. The Proposals contain measures to be taken at the international and national levels. There are few indications in the IPF report regard-

ing the means by which countries should implement the Proposals nationally. There is, however, the recommendation that countries prepare an assessment of the Proposals against domestic forest-related policies, programs, and priorities. The goal is that through such a process, the Proposals will be integrated and internalized by the cooperating nations so that country-specific action toward forest sustainability may be taken.

A recent report by the Global Forest Policy Project (GFPP) criticized the lack of action to date by the United States in implementing the Proposals for Action. In particular, the report highlights the lack of leadership in addressing the Proposals, and the lack of inter-agency communication. Furthermore, the report suggested that there is strong opinion among forest owners that the U.S. is already managing its forests well and does not need to change much. The report states, "...While the state of U.S. forests and forest management has significantly improved over the last half-century, there are still well-documented, serious problems that need attention. And in an increasingly inter-related world community, where the U.S. should be demonstrating leadership, it is essential for the U.S. to respect international agreements like the IPF Proposals, which the United States officially and publicly pledged to implement."²

As part of its ongoing program in *Institutional and Policy Change to Implement Sustainable Forestry*, the Pinchot Institute recently became involved in a cooperative effort with the Interagency Coordinating Team on Sustainable Forests (ICTSF) to organize the U.S. response to the IPF Proposals for Action.

The Pinchot Institute identified a number of linkages between the Proposals for Action and another ongoing effort, that of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators. The goal behind the Montreal Process was to advance the development of internationally agreed criteria and indicators for the conservation and sustainable management of temperate and boreal forests at the national level. The Montreal Process was engaged in by the U.S. and 12 other nations, which collectively represent 90 percent of the world's temperate and boreal forests. The seven Criteria and 67 Indicators that came out of this process constitute a set of conditions and variables which, when

measured over time, provide an account of forest conditions in a given country.

In 1998, a group of stakeholders formed the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests, as a forum to share information and perspectives that will enable better decision making in the U.S. regarding sustainable forests.³ The initial focus of the Roundtable has been to implement and promote utilization of the Criteria and Indicators of the Montreal Process as a means of measuring national progress towards achievement of this goal. The Roundtable's participants include federal, state, and tribal governments, as well as academic, industry, environmental, and professional organizations.

It is the expectation of those involved in the Roundtable that improving the quality and cohesiveness of information available to policy makers will result in more informed, and therefore, improved public policies as well as public- and private-sector forest management decisions.⁴ To further that goal, the Roundtable sponsored a series of technical workshops in the spring of 2000 in order to assess the state of knowledge and available data related to each of the Criteria and Indicators.

The Pinchot Institute has participated in the work of the Roundtable, including the Technical Workshops, in order to facilitate coordination of the Criteria and Indicators with the IPF Proposals for Action. The Proposals for Action are oriented towards institutional frameworks, such as programs and policies that address forest management. As such, there is considerable overlap with

¹ Report of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests on its fourth session. Feb. 11-21, 1997.

² W. E. Mankin, Global Forest Policy Project. United States Country Report on Implementation of the U.N. IPF Proposals for Action. March 19, 2000.

³ Charter for the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests. Feb. 24, 1999.

⁴ Roundtable on sustainable Forests. Summary of Information on the Technical Workshops. Dec. 17, 1999.

Criterion 7 of the Criteria and Indicators, which examines the legal, institutional, and economic framework for forest conservation and sustainable management. The Pinchot Institute developed a crosswalk that illustrated these linkages, which highlights the opportunities for coordination. As considerable progress is being made towards implementing the Criteria and Indicators, this coordination offers promise for implementing the Proposals for Action.

For more information about the Pinchot Institute's project on implementing the IPF Proposals for Action, please contact Nadine Block at (202) 797-6585 or neblock@pinchot.org.

Recent Developments in European Forest Law Examined

Dennis LeMaster

Thirty (30) European countries enacted new forest laws or substantial revisions of existing laws during the period 1990-1998. The reasons for this change, as well as descriptions of the new or revised forest laws, are presented in a recent publication of the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO) titled *Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry: Recent Developments in European Forest Law*. It is a collection of 35 reviewed papers edited by Franz Schmithuesen, Peter Herbst, and Dennis LeMaster, and is one of the World Series publications by IUFRO.

Two general causes for the unprecedented change are identified: (1) the transition of Eastern European countries to a market economy, and (2) the response of Western European countries to "changing economic conditions, new social demands, and (the desire for) more political participation of interest groups and citizens at local and regional levels." The "new social demands" are based on recognition of the need for forests to provide for both present and future generations

and their "multifunctional capabilities in terms of economic productivity, environmental values, and aesthetic qualities."

Thirty-three (33) of the papers contained in *Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry* are in English, and two (2) are in German. Most of the papers in English are translations of papers written in another language, usually the official language of the country whose forest law is the subject matter.

The papers were assembled through the work of the IUFRO Research Group on Forest Law and Environmental Legislation (6.13.00), chaired by Franz Schmithuesen and co-chaired by Peter Herbst. Two symposia were held in Ossiach, Austria, the first in June 1998 and the second in September 1999. The subject of each was the experiences of Eastern European countries with their new forest and environmental laws. After these papers were compiled and edited, they were augmented by papers assembled by Franz Schmithuesen, professor of forest policy and economics at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, Switzerland. (Note: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology is usually referred to by its acronym, ETH, taken from the German version of its name.)

Eight trends are identified among the new forest laws of Europe. (1) Sustainable forest management is a public expectation; anything less is objectionable. (2) The objectives of the new laws are more diversified, recognizing forests as sources of "multifunctional renewable resources." (3) Forestry administrative authority is increasingly decentralized, and increasing opportunities exist for public participation in decision making in policy implementation. (4) Forest regulation is used as an instrument to protect forest areas from exploitative practices, but financial incentives are increasingly used to compensate forest owners for performance of specific tasks that are in the public interest. (5) Informational instruments, such as public education programs and technical assistance programs for forest landowners, are growing in use. (6) Forest policy development and implementation is a collaborative effort, and the emphasis is "to support" forest landowners both public and private. (7)