

Manuscript Number: FORPOL2354R1

Title: 'What's in it for me?' - Contrasting environmental organisations and forest owner participation as policies evolve

Article Type: SI: Orchestration

Keywords: forest protection; national stakeholders; policy arrangement analysis; sustainable forest management

Corresponding Author: Dr. Berit Hauger Lindstad, Ph.D.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Norwegian University of Life Sciences

First Author: Berit Hauger Lindstad, Ph.D.

Order of Authors: Berit Hauger Lindstad, Ph.D.

Manuscript Region of Origin: NORWAY

Abstract: Abstract

Stakeholder participation in forest policy processes has over years received political and scientific attention. This empirical study brings in a dynamic element, exploring how and why participation change as policies evolve. Two Norwegian policy cases serve to contrast participation by environmental organisations (ENGOS) and forest owner organisations (FOs) over time. The policy arrangement approach (PAA) is used as analytical framework, first, to explore changes in coalitions, rules of game, power constellations, and discourses for each of the policy cases. Second, an initial exploration is offered on how changes in the PAA dimensions affect the assessments of 'what's in it for me' for ENGOS versus FOs. The results indicate that when standards for sustainable forest management are implemented, the value for ENGOS to participate in standard revision is decreasing, while in forest protection, the ENGOS chose to participate in a coalition requesting more money for voluntary protection, even after being excluded from identifying interesting areas for protection. Combining evolving policies and participation based on 'what's in it for me' help explain why participation changes over time. The findings provide alternative perspectives on former work presenting continued participation as a challenge and important messages related to future forest policy analysis.

<p>Manuscript Number: FORPOL2354</p>	
<p>Reviewer #1:</p>	<p>Responses</p>
<p>The overall framework is based on four concepts: discourses, power, coalitions and rules of the game. However, I feel that these concepts are insufficiently defined. I understand that the authors cite references which provide more in-depth definitions, but still the concepts need to be better defined. This is true especially as all the four concepts are "big" concepts, with varying definitions: Is power related to discourses or institutional positions, does actors have power in relationship to others, is it biopower, is it power of structures, or does it emphasize agency..etc. Discourse, is it media discourse, is it wider interpretation framework by which the world is understood.; Coalitions, are their coalitions at the level of arguments, so called discourse coalitions; or are the coalitions more based on concrete relationships between actors and organizations; Rules of the game: institutions, I think the idea of institutions is used quite loosely. So clear definitions are needed.</p>	<p>Going through the manuscript, I found these comments very relevant – and in the revised manuscript therefore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the four concepts/dimensions are better explained in section 3. Method. It is clarified that PAA is used as analytical framework, for exploring how the changes in one lead to changes in others (cf. next comment), for two steps of analysis: - In the first step of analysis, the focus is on simple, direct investigation of the four PAA dimensions, to describe HOW participation changes. Institutions are less in focus, caring for the critique of definition/use of this concept. - In the second step of analysis, it is clarified that from the PAA analysis, an INITIAL exploration of why participation by the two stakeholder groups change, according to how their possibilities of affecting the developments as the policy processes evolve.
<p>Second comment is also related to the four concepts: how they are linked and why they all should be examined in a same paper. Thus, justifying better the use of the four concepts by clearly outlining their interrelations. What is the added value of combining these concepts under same assessment?</p>	<p>As for first comment, the two steps of analysis is better explained – and through this the reasons for dealing with all four dimensions in one paper is hopefully better explained.</p>
<p>Discussion is quite loose and unstructured. It would be helpful to divide it under subsections, and also clearly link it to research questions.</p>	<p>Point taken. In the revised manuscript, the structure is changed so two separate steps are dealt with in the results, and hopefully the discussion is more tight and structured</p>
<p>The two research questions: is the first answered in results and second in discussions? This should be made clear. You could for example clarify the roadmap in this respect.</p>	<p>As response to former point clarifies, this is taken care of in revised manuscript – especially the 4.1 and 4.2 dealing with two research questions, followed by a more overall discussion.</p>
<p>The first part of the title is uninformative and too broad and not at all original. "Forest Policy Dynamics" can mean anything. More punchy first</p>	<p>Title is adjusted</p>

title would be useful.	
<p>Introduction should also stress what is the added value of this paper, empirically and / or theoretically. What is the knowledge gap, which is aimed to be narrowed? I think such gap could relate in theoretical level to innovative combination of the four concepts. It has been done previously by eg. Arts et al. 2006, so how this paper builds forward from that could be one point to show innovativeness of this paper.</p>	<p>The added value is better spelled out, to provide an alternative perspective on what others have referred to as challenges in maintaining participation. The paper was, and is, an empirical contribution, exploring dynamic aspects of stakeholder participation.</p> <p>Both Arts et al. 2006 and Leroy and Arts provide the theoretical underpinnings of the empirical cases studied in Norway.</p> <p>The main contribution is thus to demonstrate, first, how the four dimensions can describe changes in the policy processes, and second, how these can provide an alternative explanation for why ENGO interests are served without ENGOs participating (i.e. how new policy arrangement fosters new ways of working)</p>
Arst 2003 is missing from references.	Arts 2003 and other references are added in the reference list
<p>Reviewer #2:</p> <p>Introduction To begin with, the author(s) state that "numerous studies exists on forest governance, government to governance and private-public governance interactions" (pg. 1). Given this fact, it is important to clarify the original contribution of this paper, and how the study adds to state of the art. At present, only two articles are cited in the introduction, which is insufficient. It is also unclear why the paper is "explorative", and why only 2 organization have been included in the analysis, and I will get back to these concerns later on. More importantly, the aim of the paper is very general: "to contribute to understanding the difference between ENGOs and FOs when it comes to participation in policy processes, and to link this to policy developments within the selected processes and in the broader policy context". It comes as no surprise that these two types of actors have diverging views regarding biodiversity conservation and forest management.</p>	<p>Same point as reviewer 1 on clarifying contribution, which is hopefully better explained and elaborated in revised manuscript.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think more than two articles were cited in original introduction, and in revised manuscript more are cited – to put the current analysis into perspective. - It is also clarified that in the first, initial exploration only two organisations and two policy processes were covered. - The comment about divergent views between ENGO and FOs show that the objective was not clearly spelled out in the former version. Hopefully, it is now clear that the two stakeholder groups were selected to represent different opinions, and to explore how actors with partly opposite interests collaborate and do not collaborate (participate or not in coalitions) depending on how they see their interests best served. <p>Also, objective is better explained in new version: how participation in coalitions change – as policy develop – And especially how policy continues to evolve, sometimes in directions contradictory to FOs and ENGO participation in coalitions (lower</p>

	<p>ENGO participation, together with policy evolving in environmental direction).</p>
<p>Two processes are studied here: "1) the demand for more strictly protected forests and 2) standards for regular forest activities to take better care of the environmental values in forest management". To begin with, I have problems with the language used. After reading the full paper, it appears as if the second process (which is described first in the result section) is merely a review of the initiation and development of forest certification standards in Norway. Environmental considerations in managed forest landscapes is usually called retention forestry. Reconsider the use of buzz-words, such as "complexity", "understanding", "go deeper into" and "link up". For instance, what is to be understood? By whom, and with what consequences? What makes a case complex? etc. Explain what you analyze, and why, and how your study relate to theory and previous research.</p>	<p>Point taken, and text is revised in describing the two processes, the development of standards for SFM and protection of productive forests. Also the point of describing the gradual changes in the one and the other processes is hopefully better explained – and language improved in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The structure is improved, explaining better what is analysed, why and how the study relates to theory and previous work.</p>
<p>Material and Method As regards the material section, the first parts, line numbers 14-39, is a background context, not a clarification on the material analyzed in the study. The author(s) state that "a broad range of sources constitute the empirical material for this study". As it is written, I strongly disagree with this statement. Only 2 interviews, with 2 organizations have been undertaken for this study, which, in this case, is insufficient. Only two documents seem to be included in the analysis. An in-depth analysis of a policy-process requires more informed qualitative data, for instance, interviews with all of the actors that have taken part in the process (all of them are not even mentioned here, nor their relationship with each other), records of meetings, and other sources/policy documents with some degree of authority. The author(s) also state that other interviews have been used as background information. What interviews; with whom, where, and when? How to they related to theory?</p>	<p>Material and method (sections 2 and 3) are streamlined and clarified, also the issue of interviews and other sources of information. It is acknowledged that two Orchestra interviews were performed and inform specifically on the second part of analysis, why participation changes as policies develop. But it is also clarified that for an initial exploration the interviews and other sources describing the developments are brought together. Also, future investigations on broader stakeholder groups and with more details of the variety of interests are called for. In the initial exploration, the point was to explore alternative explanations for decreasing ENGO involvement.</p> <p>For a full investigation of the processes, a completely different investigation would have been required, including all actors and records of meetings. This was not the intention at this point, hopefully the overall aim of the current paper is better explained in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>For a single paper, it seems enough to describe the changes along the four PAA dimensions, and</p>

	<p>second to explore these together with changing assessments of ‘what’s in it for me’ as the policies evolve.</p> <p>In response to this comment, in the revised manuscript the provisional nature of the paper is better explained</p>
<p>When reading the text, it seems as if the 2 (?) interviews have been conducted mainly in 2013, which was 3 years ago. In what year does the analysis start and when does it end? To summarize, the choice of case studies is not motivated, the role of the two interviews highly unclear and a coding scheme is not described. Doing qualitative research requires care attention to the relationship between theory and methods. According to my judgement and experience, a method section should describe what was done and how it was done. Before, or in conjunction with, such a section, a theoretical framework should be clearly presented and explained. This is especially important in qualitative studies, which lack working hypotheses. It is unclear if the author(s) have understood the discursive-institutional approach correctly, since it is only described rudimentary. What is meant with "interrelatedness of agency and structural factors"? How do you define "Interrelatedness of discursive and institutional practice"? What is a discourse and how do you know if you find one? What do you mean with "interpretative schemes" (pg. 4)? For instance, the term "sustainable forest management" may be classified as a discourse. What is institutional change? How does change come about, and what about path dependency? I argue that other studies that analyses such conditions can be helpful, especially since a stronger theoretical framework is needed. The Arts and Buizer (2009) framework is not sufficiently described, nor how it supports the analysis in this paper.</p>	<p>Timing of two groups of interviews are clarified, including that the two conducted for Orchestra in 2015, and the 2013 interviews with reference to where they were reported.</p> <p>The time dimension of the two cases are better explained, and the choice of cases motivated. Also the initial exploration of evolving policy developments are stressed, and the structure and content intend to explain better the limitations of the study.</p> <p>Some of the concerns relate to similar issues like reviewer 1, and is responded to above.</p> <p>Based on the comment on the discursive-institutional approach, the DI is taken out (except for making the reference to the work by Arts and Buizer) – and the analysis stops with the four PAA dimensions – and the content is kept on a more “basic” level, avoiding the buss words.</p> <p>For an empirical paper the analytical framework seems more relevant, and this is hopefully better explained in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The work of Arts and Buizer on global forest policy changes is now only mentioned as an inspiration to study “similar issues “ at national level.</p>
<p>Results, discussion and conclusions</p> <p>Regarding the results, it is unclear when (in what year) the analysis starts and when it ends. A large part of the results section is background information to the development, starting in the early 1990s, of forest certification, in Norway. Clarifying the timeframe is essential in policy</p>	<p>Time dimension better explained</p> <p>I agree that parts of the result could be termed background, but I also consider that necessary when describing changes in the two policy processes.</p>

<p>studies. Likewise, the method and material shall correspond to the result section. It is unclear how these 2 processes, which actually seem to be many processes, spanning over several years, relate to the broader policy context (of Norwegian forest policy?). This, unfortunately, makes the authors' own empirical findings lack originality. Given these comments, I find it difficult as to why the paper is explorative. Issues of power, levels and quality of participation and deliberation, and rules of the game, are issues often studied in analyses of deliberative processes in natural resource management (see e.g. Lockwood et al. 2010).</p> <p>The conclusions lack a discussion about the merits and limitations of the Arts and Buizer (2009) framework. The authors conclude by saying that the "institutional-discursive analysis have revealed substantive changes in the understanding of how forest should be managed and the way the stakeholders work together". Unfortunately, based on the material and method used, I'm sorry to say that I'm not convinced that the paper makes an original contribution.</p>	<p>It is clarified that the two processes deal with the two central aspects of forest policy; protection and how to take care of different aspects on managed areas (forests in use).</p> <p>Explorative was possibly a wrong word, now "initial analysis" is used to point out that there are many other aspects that are not included in this first investigation of dynamic aspects of participation. Hopefully this also makes it clear what the original contribution of this paper is.</p>

TITLE PAGE

Title: ***'What's in it for me?'* - Contrasting environmental organisations and forest owner participation as policies evolve**

Author: Berit H Lindstad

Affiliation: Department of Ecology and Natural Resource Management, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, P.O.Box 5003, NO-1432 Aas, Norway.

Corresponding author: Berit H Lindstad, berit.lindstad@nmbu.no.

TITLE PAGE

Title: ***'What's in it for me?'*** - **Contrasting environmental organisations and forest owner participation as policies evolve**

Abstract

Stakeholder participation in forest policy processes has over years received political and scientific attention. This empirical study brings in a dynamic element, exploring how and why participation change as policies evolve. Two Norwegian policy cases serve to contrast participation by environmental organisations (ENGOS) and forest owner organisations (FOs) over time. The policy arrangement approach (PAA) is used as analytical framework, first, to explore changes in coalitions, rules of game, power constellations, and discourses for each of the policy cases. Second, an initial exploration is offered on how changes in the PAA dimensions affect the assessments of *'what's in it for me'* for ENGOS versus FOs. The results indicate that when standards for sustainable forest management are implemented, the value for ENGOS to participate in standard revision is decreasing, while in forest protection, the ENGOS chose to participate in a coalition requesting more money for voluntary protection, even after being excluded from identifying interesting areas for protection. Combining evolving policies and participation based on *'what's in it for me'* help explain why participation changes over time. The findings provide alternative perspectives on former work presenting continued participation as a challenge and important messages related to future forest policy analysis.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Four dimensions of policy analysis approach (PAA) structure explorations

Participation by ENGOs decreases as policies evolve

Forest owners follow up environmental commitments

Policy analysis needs to pay attention to evolving policies and dynamic participation

‘What’s in it for me?’ - Contrasting environmental organisations and forest owner participation as policies evolve

Abstract

Stakeholder participation in forest policy processes has over years received political and scientific attention. This empirical study brings in a dynamic element, exploring how and why participation change as policies evolve. Two Norwegian policy cases serve to contrast participation by environmental organisations (ENGOS) and forest owner organisations (FOs) over time. The policy arrangement approach (PAA) is used as analytical framework, first, to explore changes in coalitions, rules of game, power constellations, and discourses for each of the policy cases. Second, an initial exploration is offered on how changes in the PAA dimensions affect the assessments of *‘what’s in it for me’* for ENGOS versus FOs. The results indicate that when standards for sustainable forest management are implemented, the value for ENGOS to participate in standard revision is decreasing, while in forest protection, the ENGOS chose to participate in a coalition requesting more money for voluntary protection, even after being excluded from identifying interesting areas for protection. Combining evolving policies and participation based on *‘what’s in it for me’* help explain why participation changes over time. The findings provide alternative perspectives on former work presenting continued participation as a challenge and important messages related to future forest policy analysis.

Key words: forest protection; national stakeholders; policy arrangement analysis; sustainable forest management

1. Introduction

Stakeholder participation in forest policy processes has over years received political and scientific attention. While participation have long traditions in Nordic countries, the diversity of interests among stakeholders increased as the forest objectives broadened up with the elaborations of sustainable forest management (SFM). The statement that “Forest resources and forest lands should be sustainably managed to meet the social, economic, ecological, cultural and spiritual needs of present and future generations” (UNCED 1992 Rio Forest principles: Principles/Elements 2(b)) was followed by a recommendation that “Governments should promote and provide opportunities for the participation of interested parties, including local communities and indigenous people, industries, labor, non-governmental organizations and individuals, forest dwellers and women, in the development, implementation and planning of national forest policies” (UNCED 1992 Rio Forest principles: Principles/Elements 2(d), United Nations, UN 1992).

Numerous studies exist of stakeholder participation in forest policy processes, and developments described as change from government to governance. Appelstrand (2002: 281) discussed challenges for lawmakers and policy practitioners in “finding consensus in diversity” and blending of “multiple management objectives” while highlighting the value of including lay knowledge and subjective perceptions from the public. Kangas et al. (2010) explored stakeholder perspectives on proper participation in regional forest programmes. They identified three interlinked challenges to improve participatory processes: (i) how to

1 motivate relevant participants to contribute; (ii) how to commit to what is agreed, to avoid
2 confusion in the group; and (iii) how to run process, so participants will consider their time
3 spent as well worth the efforts (Kangas et al. 2010: 220). Along the same line, Faehnle and
4 Tyrväinen (2013) state that meaningful participation, from the point of view of actors, relates
5 to *‘what’s in it for me’*. In parallel to work discussing ways to ensure and improve
6 participation, other studies point to challenges in participation and ‘participation fatigue’. For
7 example, Wesselink et al (2011:2689) in natural resource management “suggest that some of
8 the ‘participation fatigue’ can be explained by the differences in expectations regarding
9 participation” between those involved in participatory processes and experts organising or
10 conducting research on participation.
11
12

13 This empirical paper builds on these studies, and takes as a starting point that stakeholders
14 will spend time and resources only on policy areas and processes where they consider
15 participation meaningful. The focus in the following is on how *‘what’s in it for me’*, i.e. the
16 meaningfulness of participation in policy processes, develops as the policies evolve. Dynamic
17 aspects of participation is investigated, contrasting involvement by environmental non-
18 governmental organisations (ENGOS) and forest owners’ organisations (FOs) in two forest
19 policy processes in Norway. The overall aim is to combine empirical evidence of changing
20 participation with broader conceptual discussions of meaningfulness of participation.
21
22
23

24 The objective is to elaborate on how and why participation change as policies evolve.
25 Employing the policy analysis approach (PAA) (Arts et al. 2006; Leroy and Arts 2006) as
26 analytical framework, participation by ENGOS and FOs in two forest policy processes over
27 time is investigated in two steps. First, changes along the four PAA dimensions: coalitions,
28 rules of the game, discourse and power relations, are described for the two policy cases.
29 Second, why participation changes is explored contrasting *‘what’s in it for me’* for ENGOS
30 and FOs respectively as the policies evolve.
31
32
33

34 The following two sections present the material and method. Next, developments in the two
35 policy cases are described, before changing participation by ENGO and FO in different
36 coalitions over time is elaborated in light of changes in power relations, rules of the game and
37 discourses. Finally, the results are discussed related to former and future work and
38 conclusions drawn.
39
40
41

42 **2. Material**

43 This study focuses on two Norwegian forest policy processes with diverse and changing
44 participation: “Living Forests”, developing standards for sustainable forest management
45 (SFM) and “voluntary protection”, a new way to protect productive forests. These cases
46 represent two prominent aspects of forest management: protection of productive forests and
47 sustainable management of forests, and were selected as interesting cases to explore changing
48 participation as policies evolve. The initial exploration is restricted to two stakeholder groups,
49 ENGOS and FOs, selected for being important players in forest policy and management in
50 general, as well as in the two policy processes of concern. The investigations cover the
51 processes from the start to current, highlighting changes over time.
52
53
54
55

56 The motivation for investigating complexity and gradual changes in participation in the two
57 processes by ENGOS and FOs grew from the author following national and international
58 policy developments and debates over years, and conducting interviews with multiple
59 national stakeholder groups for another project in 2013 (reported e.g. in Peters et al. 2015;
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Pezdevšek Malovrh et al. 2016). Interviews with ENGOs and FOs, and broader stakeholder
2 groups in 2013, revealed divergent opinions of the developments and collaborations between
3 environmental and economic interests within the two policy processes. The way stakeholders
4 described the collaborations over time, triggered the question of how and why the motivation
5 for ENGOs versus FOs to participate in the processes changes as the policies evolve.
6

7 Empirical data for the analysis, describing developments in the two policy processes,
8 including how participation changes, stem from a variety of written sources supplemented by
9 interview data. Changes and developments in the two processes are taken from policy
10 documents (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, MoA 1998; Ministry of Environment, MoE 2003).
11 Two evaluations, one of the Living Forest process and the Norwegian standards for SFM
12 (Arnesen et al. 2004) and one of the working method of voluntary forest protection
13 (Skjeggedal et al. 2010), as well as information from interviews among national stakeholders
14 conducted by the author for studies on closely related topics, also provided information on
15 the process evolutions. Furthermore, statements, letters and news coverage, a diverse range of
16 secondary sources and participatory observations by the author of national and international
17 forest policy processes over years have provided information on developments as well as
18 perceptions among different actors. The cases represent divergent trends regarding
19 stakeholder participation over time, and thus interesting cases for exploring how stakeholders
20 with different objectives, here ENGOs and FOs, act and react at different times of
21 developments.
22
23
24
25

26 Specific for the second, explorative part of the analysis, changes in *'what's in it for me'* on
27 the side of stakeholders, two semi-structured interviews were conducted for COST Action
28 FP1207 "ORCHESTRA" Working Group 3. As for interviews conducted by the author in
29 2013 (see above), all interviews were conducted face-to-face using semi-structured questions.
30 In line with the interview guide developed for Orchestra WG3, the main focus was on how
31 the two central representatives, one from ENGO, one from FO, considered their own and
32 other's participation, as well as their assessment of the participation over time. From the
33 stories told by ENGO and FO (2015 interview ENGO; 2015 interview FO), respectively, on
34 how the processes changed from a true collaboration on developing standards for sustainable
35 forest management to revisions without ENGOs involved, and how FOs took over the role as
36 initiating partner in processes to protect productive forests, the indirect assessments of
37 *'what's in it for me'* is constructed and elaborated in the following. The idea is that the
38 differences between ENGOs and FOs in participation and assessment of participation over
39 time provide an alternative perspective on the meaningfulness of participation, and that this
40 perspective is essential for orchestrating policy analysis.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **3. Method**

47

48 To investigate developments in the Norwegian policy processes, the policy arrangement
49 approach (PAA) (Arts et al. 2006; Leroy and Arts 2006) serves as analytical framework.
50 Leroy and Arts (2006) emphasised that the four PAA dimensions; coalitions, rules of the
51 game, discourse and power relations, are equal sources of change and stability. Changes in
52 any of these dimensions can lead to changes in the other: the actors involved in the policy
53 domain, and their coalitions (including their oppositions); the division of resources between
54 these actors, leading to differences in power and influence; the rules of the game within the
55 policy arrangement, either in terms of formal procedures or as informal rules and 'routines'
56 of interaction; and the policy discourses, entailing the norms and values, the definitions of
57 problems and approaches to solutions of the actors involved.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The first step of the analysis is inspired by Arts and Buizer (2009) exploring changes in
2 global forest governance. Developments in two national forest policy processes are
3 investigated, focusing on changes and interactions in coalitions, rule of game, discourse and
4 power. The dynamics in these four dimensions of policy arrangement analysis (PAA) (Arts et
5 al. 2006) are explored, focusing on changes in participation and power as the overall policies
6 evolve (with changing discourse and rules of the game). Following this paper's focus on
7 participation by ENGOs and FOs – and changes therein – the involvement by these two
8 stakeholder groups in the two processes and in related broader coalitions over time, is
9 emphasized in the investigation. In this initial investigation, coalition(s) refer to involvement
10 by ENGOs and FOs, respectively. Rules of the game are taken directly from the process
11 developments, interpreted as the changes in how standards for SFM are developed and
12 implemented as well as how productive forests are protected. Acknowledging that changing
13 discourses and changes in power relations cannot be taken directly from any “face value”,
14 discourse is here interpreted as the common, dominant understanding of what SFM entails,
15 while power is understood as the actors' ability to influence the policy developments.
16
17
18

19 The second step, the initial exploration of why participation changes as the policy evolves,
20 combines developments along the four dimensions of PAA with former work stressing the
21 importance of making participation worth the efforts (cf. e.g. Kangas et al. 2010; Faehnle and
22 Tyrväinen 2013). In line with the main objectives of this paper, the focus is on changing
23 participation as policies evolve, contrasting ‘*what's in it for me*’ for ENGOs and FOs over
24 time. This step aims at bringing the empirically based PAA results into a broader conceptual
25 discussion of participation and policy development.
26
27
28

29 **4. Results**

30 **4.1 Changes in policy arrangements**

31 **4.1.1 Case 1: Standards for sustainable forest management (SFM)**

32 *Coalitions*

33 National standards for SFM were developed as one part of the project “Living Forest”, 1995-
34 1998 (MoA 1998). The project was initiated by the forest sector as a response to increasing
35 pressure and demands, also from international markets, to improve and document long-term,
36 responsible forest management, including proper environmental considerations. The ENGOs
37 were invited to participate, and the project initially represented an innovative collaboration of
38 economic, environmental and social interests, with 50% of the costs covered by the (at that
39 time) Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture (Arnesen et al. 2004:7).
40 Informants from both ENGO and FO consider the first phase, resulting in the agreement on
41 the first set of standards in 1998, to be truly collaborative, with broad participation and
42 consensus-based decisions (2015 interview ENGO; 2015 interview FO).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The collaboration run into trouble soon after the 1998 agreement. The ENGOs were
51 disappointed by the FOs use of the standards, and what the ENGOs considered to be
52 modifications “behind closed doors” to make the standards suitable for certification (Arnesen
53 et al. 2004, 2015 interview ENGO). The initial plan for revision of the standards after 5 years
54 was delayed, and when the first revision was conducted in 2006, one of the ENGOs (Friends
55 of the Earth) did not take part. At the time of the second revision (2010), all ENGOs (and
56 some of the social groups) withdrew from the process, because they were not satisfied with
57 the progress (two years delay of returning to two of the standards), and continued
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 disagreement on two standards (tree species acceptable for planting and questions of mapping
2 of key biotopes). The 2015 revision of the standards was conducted with no ENGOs
3 participating.

4 *Rules of game*

5 The work on standards for SFM and their later use for forest certification followed the trend
6 of market-based private governance systems emerging in the forest sector in the early 1990s
7 (e.g. Gulbrandsen 2014). The work is an example of the “participation of interested parties”
8 recommended by the Rio Forest Principles (see section 1) (United Nations, UN 1992). The
9 rules of the game were changed from traditional government to governance following the
10 trend of market-based private governance systems emerging after Rio 1992, and inspired by
11 follow-up processes in Europe (Forest Europe) and neighboring countries (Finland and
12 Sweden).

13 When the standards were used for forest certification, it represented a profound change in the
14 rules of the game for forest management. Forest certification was implemented very fast in
15 Norway, with group certification through forest owners’ organisations. According to the
16 certification bodies, all “serious timber buyers” require timber to come from sustainably
17 managed forest, meaning it has to be certified (Norsk skogsertifisering 2016). This
18 requirement implies that the use of the standards for SFM is institutionalised through forest
19 certification. Moreover, the change in rules for how to conduct forestry is an example of
20 change in *content*, additional to the change in *procedure* with broader participation in policy
21 process, described above.

22 *Discourse*

23 With the understanding of “*discourse* as interpretative schemes” (Arts and Buizer 2009:343),
24 the discourse(s) on forest management changed gradually through different stages. Initially,
25 before the collaboration through the Living Forest project, the ENGOs and FOs had rather
26 different perceptions of forest management, i.e. conflictive discourses existed. Through the
27 first round of developing standards (1995-1998), a more common understanding emerged of
28 what the situation and challenges were in forest management. An ENGO informant stated
29 that “through collaborations and work on standards, I have a better understanding and
30 increased sympathy for some of the challenges in practical forest operations, for example the
31 difficulties in fixing terrain damage from transport in cases of heavy rain” (ENGO interview
32 2013). Likewise, it is reasonable to assume that FOs, through the close collaboration with
33 ENGOs, learned more of the critical environmental considerations in forest management. For
34 example, Arnesen et al. (2004:65) refer to WWF as “the knowledge producer for the
35 biological perspective” in developing the standards for SFM. The resulting understanding of
36 the situation and critical aspects to further improve forest management were, at the point of
37 agreement on the standards in 1998, closer to a common perception of challenges and
38 opportunities, and preferred management of forests, i.e. a common discourse.

39 In later revisions, ENGOs did not participate in the coalition, because they had a competing
40 understanding of remaining problems in forest management. The ENGOs raised concern
41 about the certification systems not working (standards not strict enough, lack of control and
42 breaking the existing regulations) and to forest activities outside the certification scheme (e.g.
43 fire wood collection) (ENGO interviews 2013). Still, a central ENGOs representative has
44

1 referred to the national standards for SFM as a success, because they are providing
2 “minimum environmental requirements for all forest management” (Andresen 2013).

3 *Power relations*

4 In the early stage of developing standards, both ENGOs and FOs tried to influence the policy
5 changes in their preferred directions. They had common interests in finding joint solutions,
6 and thus balanced their individual power. The new discourse and rules of the game,
7 influenced by national work as well as international trends, require regular revisions of the
8 standards for SFM used for forest certification. The FO informant stated (2015 interview
9 FO): “The decision on the standard revision is for those at the table. Still, we could not relax
10 the [environmental (author remark)] requirements, we had to be careful with changes. We
11 had honest and open discussions, including on what is possible in practice. The standards
12 could maybe have been stronger with the ENGOs at the table.” It may be argued that the
13 power of the FOs within the process increased when the ENGOs withdrew. Still, through the
14 earlier steps, in particular through the changes in the discourse and the rule of game, the new
15 situation that certification is required to sell timber to professional buyers, the shadow of
16 ENGO interest remained in the process after they left the coalition. Furthermore, the
17 comment that the standards could have been stricter with ENGOs at the table, is a question of
18 difference in degree (that the exact restrictions could have been different in a situation with
19 ENGOs participating), while certification established as routine when selling timber
20 constitutes a greater change to the power balance, with third party monitoring the conduct in
21 forest management.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The ENGOs, on the other hand, likely possess more power by not being part of the coalition.
30 Standing outside the process, they have the power to bring cases to the media attention, and
31 blame and shame forest actions compared to what has been promised by the FOs.
32

33 **4.1.2 Case 2: Voluntary forest protection**

34 *Coalitions*

35 Protection of more productive forests was on the political agenda in Norway from the 1980s
36 (Framstad et al. 2002). In the traditional system for protection, environmental authorities
37 identified areas of interest for protection and included them on a gross list of forest areas
38 considered for protection. Biologically valuable areas were sometimes identified by ENGOs,
39 while FOs were not informed before learning that a part of their forest was interesting for
40 protection. Areas on the gross list for protection had restrictions on forest activities, and as
41 progress in the process to formal protection was slow, the system created a lot of conflicts
42 (see e.g. Bergseng and Vatn 2009). The FOs were critical about lack of information, and the
43 (informal) coalitions between environmental authorities and ENGOs at this early stage.
44
45
46
47
48

49 An evaluation of Norwegian forest protection (Framstad et al. 2002), initiated by the Ministry
50 of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, pointed to low shares of protected
51 productive forests in Norway and recommended a considerable increase in protected
52 productive forests (from less than 1% to minimum 4.5% of the area). This evaluation and the
53 increasing attention in international markets and on policy agendas contributed to enhance the
54 search for alternative ways to increase the area of protected productive forests in Norway. In
55 2003, the FOs initiated a pilot project on voluntary protection (MoE 2003), which was later
56 made permanent (Skjeggedal et al. 2010). As an alternative to “traditional” protection
57 processes, forest owners individually or in groups offer selected areas for protection. The
58 process is unique in establishing close coalitions between environmental authorities and FOs.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The ENGOs are critical to some of the aspects of voluntary protection process, e.g. the
2 identification and prioritizing of areas. Still, they have over years taken part in coalitions
3 arguing for increased funding for protection – out of which the largest share go to voluntary
4 protection. Central ENGOs have signed letters to the prime minister, the minister of finance
5 and the minister of climate and environment requesting more money for forest protection (e.g.
6 Norges Skogeierforbund et al. 2014). The alliance between ENGOs and FOs lobbying for
7 more money to forest protection has been termed “an extremely rare coalition” by a
8 Norwegian newspaper (Aftenposten 2004), and the ENGO interviewees in both 2013 and
9 2015 voice strong support for more funding for forest protection.
10
11
12

13 *Rule of the game*

14 From environmental authorities (and sometimes ENGOs) initiating forest protection, the FOs
15 regained control over the protection process through voluntarily offering areas for protection.
16 If environmental authorities find the areas interesting, the area and the compensation is
17 negotiated between individual forest owners and environmental authorities. After agreement,
18 the proposed area for protection is sent on public hearing, also to ENGOs, in line with other
19 types of protection, as required by the Nature Diversity Act (Ministry of Climate and
20 Environment, MoCE 2009). After a successful pilot testing, the voluntary protection scheme
21 was made permanent as standard procedure, and consequently the rule of the game for forest
22 protection were changed.
23
24
25
26

27 It is worth mentioning that the ENGO informant refer to the voluntary protections scheme as
28 time and cost effective, avoiding never ending debates, and that the quality of the areas
29 protected are acceptable (2015 interview ENGO). He is less happy with the process,
30 especially that only FOs and environmental authorities are involved in selecting the areas. As
31 for the standards for SFM (see above), this indicate a more negative/different assessments of
32 the new procedure than of the content/results of the process on the side of the ENGOs.
33
34
35

36 *Discourse*

37 With discourse as interpretative scheme (cf. above, Arts and Buizer 2009), a considerable
38 change is revealed in the FOs perception of proper conduct, i.e. discourse. The FOs consider
39 economic compensation for leaving environmentally valuable areas untouched as an
40 alternative to regular forest use. This situation is similar to Finland, where Sarkki et al.
41 (2015:14) found that “the METSO programme was able to transform the problem definitions
42 related to biodiversity conservation by initiating voluntary protection schemes in which forest
43 owners can offer their forests for conservation and are paid for doing so. (...) [thus]
44 questioning the guiding assumptions regarding forest owners’ attitudes towards conservation
45 and going as far as changing the whole framework of how forest owners’ rights and
46 obligations are dealt with.” By this change in perceptions among FOs, a common
47 understanding is developing with the ENGOs on the need for more protected forests, even if
48 the two stakeholder groups have different opinions of how best to select areas for protection.
49
50
51
52

53 More generally, the use of alternative wording is an example of discursive struggle for
54 acceptance of divergent interests and values involved. Skjeggedal et al. (2010) refer to the
55 positioning between different actors, with the FOs winning through with “voluntary
56 protection”, and partly also their use of “compulsory protection” about the traditional
57 protection scheme. Public documents now refer to “voluntary protection”, for example the
58 Ministry of Climate and Environment presenting new areas protected (MoCE 2015). Through
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the established use of ‘voluntary protection’, the concept has emerged as a mini-discourse
2 changing how actors think about protection of forests in Norway.

3 *Power relations*

4 Skjeggedal et al. (2010) found that conservation organisations/ENGOS are involved less and
5 later in the voluntary protection process – and that they have lost some power in debates of
6 forest protection. The ENGOS are no longer involved in proposing areas for protection, and
7 the ENGO informant state that “when areas proposed for protection is coming on public
8 hearing, after agreement is reached between forest owner and environmental authorities, it is
9 often too late for influencing the allocation” (2015 interview ENGO). Individual forest
10 owners (and the FOs), on the other hand, have increased their power by having the exclusive
11 right to propose areas to be considered for protection, direct negotiations with environmental
12 authorities about compensation, and the mandate for final decision. A condition for the FOs
13 to work with voluntary protection was that public authorities could not first invite forest
14 owners to offer areas voluntarily, and next, if they did not reach agreement, there would be a
15 risk on that the authorities would turn to “traditional protection”, and protect the area against
16 the will of FOs (2015 interview FO).

17
18 The ENGOS are critical to the power of FOs in the process, illustrated by the ENGO
19 interview (2015): “The forest owners are heavily involved with a lot of power and control.
20 The environmental and social side are practically not involved.” And: “The politicians have
21 given up their authority by being left to say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to proposals from the forest owners.
22 It is a *sector controlled* protection scheme” (cf. the discourse dimension above).

23 **4.2: ‘What’s in it for me?’ - Changing participation as policies evolve**

24
25 Moving to the second research question, the aim is to elaborate on how changes in the four
26 PAA dimensions, coalition, discourse, rule of game and power relations, can contribute to
27 explain the changes in participation between ENGOS and FOs as policies evolve. As stated
28 above, the exploration will combine described changes along the four PAA dimensions (cf.
29 section 4.1) with former studies stressing that stakeholders will participate where and when
30 they can influence the policies, i.e. consider their participation meaningful (Kangas et al.
31 2010; Faehnle and Tyrväinen 2013). ENGO and FO participation is thus contrasted, focusing
32 on how their possibilities for influencing policy developments change as the policies evolve.
33 In line with the provisional nature of the elaborations, focus is on how developments in the
34 two cases interact with the broader policy context, and in particular dynamic aspects of
35 participation by ENGOS and FOs within and across the policy cases.

36
37 The empirical cases, developing standards for sustainable forest management and the
38 voluntary protection scheme, showed increasing environmental considerations and decreasing
39 direct involvement of ENGOS over the years investigated. The ENGOS left the *coalitions*,
40 withdrawing from revision of standards for SFM (Arnesen et al. 2004) and were excluded
41 from the identification of areas for protection as the voluntary scheme emerged (Skjeggedal
42 et al. 2010). The FOs continue work on standards and have a central role in forest protection.

43
44 Contrasting ENGO and FO participation in the work on standards for SFM, it seems that in
45 the initial stage both groups had something to win by participating in the coalition. The
46 ENGOS were seeking to change forest management in a more environmentally friendly
47 direction, while FOs saw the need for documenting and improving environmental aspects of

1 forest management. In the implementation, when individual forest owners and FOs are bound
2 by the commitments, the ENGOS have less to win by participation in the coalition. The lower
3 score on *'what's in it for me'* is linked, first, to that the situation is already improved with
4 having the standards in use (related to rules of the game, see below), and, second, to the fact
5 that adjustments in standards are less likely to make large shifts, i.e. the difference between
6 establishing a new system and modifying an existing system.
7

8 In forest protection, ENGOS were excluded from finding areas for protection, but then choose
9 other ways of influencing. Through participating in coalitions arguing for more money for
10 forest protection they ensure visibility of own work, and get attention to the need for
11 increasing protected areas. They promote their primary opinions, and rather than spending
12 time identifying potential areas for protection, take shares in the large increases in public
13 funding for forest protection (from 50 mill NOK annually in 2002, to a record 331 mill NOK
14 in 2013 (Lindstad 2015)). The FOs, on their side, through the collaboration with
15 environmental authorities on offering areas for protection, regained power to decide on the
16 management of their private forests.
17
18
19
20

21 The possibilities for ENGOS to affect policies – while not being part of the coalitions – are
22 also linked to the *new rules of the game*, with use of standards for SFM in certification and
23 voluntary protection institutionalised. With these, the FOs are influenced by the new
24 understanding of how forests should be managed and in their new role as providers of areas
25 for protection. With «certification required for selling timber to serious buyers» (Norsk
26 skogsertifisering 2016), the FOs have self-imposed reasons to continue the work, including
27 regular revisions of standards. Likewise, in work on voluntary protection FOs have to fulfill
28 their part of the commitments, by continuing to provide environmentally important areas for
29 protection. In both cases the gradual developments have had path-forming influences (Arts
30 and Buizer 2009) on how forest management is considered among FOs and the greater
31 public, in ways taking care of the ENGOS interests.
32
33
34
35

36 On paper the ENGOS may have lost some *power* while from the developments described, the
37 environmental considerations in Norwegian forest management are strengthened. With a
38 broader perspective, it is a question if the ENGOS' withdrawal (voluntary and forced) from
39 the two case under investigation, is compensated for by their engagement in the broader
40 developments. In forest protection, ENGOS affect developments through keeping forest
41 protection on the political agenda, in particular as a watch dog for the quality of protected
42 areas and the annual areas protected when lobbying for more money to compensate for
43 protection. Regarding standards for SFM, the ENGOS use the established commitments to
44 name and shame forest activities, as well as for bringing cases to court. Standing outside the
45 process, they have more power to bring cases to the media attention, blaming/shaming in line
46 with what has been promised earlier, checking for real improvements, and even bring what
47 they consider violations to certification system to the court. In both cases, arguing for
48 increased funding for protection, and using standards for naming and shaming, and bringing
49 cases to court, the ENGOS influence on forest policy and management may be as great, or
50 greater, than when they had more prominent roles within the two processes.
51
52
53
54
55

56 Moving to *discourses*, a general reflection is that increased attention to forest protection and
57 general environmental considerations in forest management, described in the two national
58 cases, correspond with an emerging sustainable forest management discourse. As commented
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 among others by Pülzl et al. (2014:388), the SFM discourse is linked to the meta-discourse of
2 sustainable development, which is also promoting public participation. On an overall level,
3 this points to participation as a *procedural aspects* of the SFM discourse, supplementing
4 standards for SFM and attention to protected forests as *content parts* of the SFM discourse.
5

6 The discourse promoting participation by non-governmental organisations (i.e. both ENGOs
7 and FOs) may have been important in the initial stage of the Living Forest project developing
8 standards for SFM. One indication of this is the economic support to the project, with 50%
9 covered by public sources, as mentioned above (Arnesen et al. 2004:7). Also in the protection
10 case, attention to involvement by affected parties may have contributed to a more positive
11 attitude by environmental authorities to greater involvement of the FOs in proposing areas for
12 protection.
13
14

15 In later stages of both cases, it seems that the ENGO ideas are reflected in the new *discourses*
16 so that their interests are taken care of without them participating in the coalitions (den
17 Besten et al. 2014). Through developments on both standards and protection, it is a question
18 if the forest sectors' promises and commitments on environmental contributions, as part of
19 the more environmentally friendly forest discourse, have created higher expectations and
20 leave greater room for ENGOs for naming, blaming and shaming (cf. e.g. den Besten et al.
21 2014:41). Also, they avoid providing legitimacy to standards used for PEFC certification, a
22 debated issue within ENGOs supporting FSC certification.
23
24
25

26 5. Discussion

27
28
29 Summing up, the two policy cases have revealed complex changes along the four dimensions
30 of PAA: actor coalitions, discourse, rules of game and power relations over time. The
31 interactions between gradual development in the two policy processes, along the four
32 dimensions of PAA, and environmental considerations over time is illustrated in Figure 1.
33
34

35 **FIGURE 1 APPROXIMATELY HERE**

36
37 The empirical cases have demonstrated that as policies evolve, the assessment on the side of
38 the actors of '*what's in it for me*', changes. What different actors can achieve by participation
39 change as the policy processes and broader policy environment evolve. This provides an
40 alternative perspective on changing participation, and in particular challenges in continued
41 participation as identified e.g. by Wesselink et al (2011), Kangas et al. (2010), and Faehnle
42 and Tyrväinen (2013). The results indicate that as policies evolve, the FOs are bound by
43 earlier commitments for revisions and use of standards for SFM and to offer new productive
44 forests for protection, and thus the ENGOs interests are served without them participating.
45
46
47

48 PAA was useful as analytical frame, first for a structured analysis of changes and
49 developments in the four dimensions: coalitions, rules of game, discourse and power relations
50 in the two policy cases, and second, for exploring why participation changes as new rules of
51 the game are gradually institutionalised, new discourses emerging, and ENGOs interests are
52 better served by not participating in the coalitions. Recalling the provisional status of this
53 study, it should be reiterated that the two stakeholder groups and the selected policy cases
54 serve as examples. Simplifications are acknowledged, in contrasting only ENGOs and FOs,
55 not paying attention to divergent opinions within these groups, and for providing only a
56 glimpse of national forest policy developments. With these limitations, the results are
57 discussed versus former and future policy analysis.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 First, in policy documents (e.g. UN 1992) participation is presented as an end, or objective,
2 while for stakeholders, participation is a means to an end; to influence policy developments.
3 This can explain why actors choose not to take part even if invited (ENGOS in standards
4 revision) and why they choose a different level of coalition when closed out from identifying
5 areas for protection (ENGOS participating in coalition arguing for more money to forest
6 protection). As participation will be assessed based on *'what's in it for me'*, different actors
7 will choose the level and the process giving the greatest influence on police development at
8 any time. This can explain 'participation fatigue' (Wesselink et al 2011) as well as challenges
9 in continued participation by stakeholder groups (Kangas et al. 2010; Faehnle and Tyrväinen
10 2013). Policy analysts intending to orchestrate different actors, thus needs to pay attention to
11 emerging and declining coalitions, multiple processes and alternative levels of coalitions, as
12 well as the influence stakeholder can pursue even if not participating in coalitions.
13
14

15
16 Versus challenges described with participation, cf. section 1, the dynamic perspective
17 employed in this study, point to reasons for changes in participation. Different from the
18 challenges identified by Kangas et al. (2010) this study finds that (i) the motivation to
19 participate will change as policies evolve, (ii) actors will use the agreements/commitment in
20 ways that best serve their own interests, creating confusion among former allies, and (iii)
21 some of the actors will find their time and resources not worth the efforts, and will not
22 participate. This study indicate that policy analysis acknowledging the dynamic aspects of
23 how and why stakeholder participation changes as forest policies evolve, can provide more
24 realistic perspectives on participation over time. Future studies need to take these aspects into
25 account, while also including broader stakeholder groups and greater diversity in interests.
26 Building on the current study, further details on the four dimensions of PAA and their
27 interactions over time is recommended for future investigations.
28
29
30

31 While this study has focused on participation, a note is in place on alternative sources
32 influencing the policy developments. In a situation with increasing environmental pressure,
33 from ENGOS as well as in markets, the FOs could consider standards for SFM as one way to
34 regain control over forest management. In initiating voluntary protection, aside from getting a
35 hand on the steering wheel in proposing areas for protection, the broader question is if the
36 FOs also saw that the increasing environmental considerations, including the standards for
37 SFM, together with falling timber prices gradually extended the areas of forests that could not
38 be economically utilized. In a situation of reduced economic potential in the forests,
39 protection could be considered an alternative source of income for forest owners. Alternative
40 sources of influence(s) also require attention in policy analysis.
41
42
43
44

45 The findings contribute to explain former observations (e.g. Arts 2003), that the ENGOS
46 often play important roles in initiating policy changes, while when the system is established,
47 the ENGOS have less to win by continued participation. The current study indicate that these
48 changes follow from both internal reasons: lower prospects for great changes (as long as
49 system is established) and external factors: new issues calling for attention (Arnesen et al.
50 2004 pointing to ENGOS moving from standards to protection, and in own interviews:
51 ENGOS moving to global forest challenges e.g. REDD+). Also, the gradual changes within
52 the two policy cases in Norway, raise the question if they together could be seen as elements
53 of spiraling to higher environmental consciousness, similar to what was revealed for REDD+
54 (Den Besten et al. 2014). If so, the Norwegian policy cases may be seen to contribute to (any
55 of) the existing environmental meta-discourses (Pülzl et al. 2014) where over time, new
56 perceptions of proper behavior are institutionalised. Such a gradual strengthening of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 environmental requirements provide an alternative perspective on how future actions are
2 considered in an evolving policy context.

3
4 The findings in Norway show similarities with changes in Swedish forest policies, for
5 example that “ecological modernization had a discursive impact by introducing sustainable
6 forest management as a viable policy alternative” (Hysing and Olsson 2008:742). In early
7 stages of developments, the findings follow the Swedish case (Hysing and Olsson 2008: 743)
8 “reframing perceptions of policy problems and solutions, including of new priorities of
9 ecological values and new modes of governing”. Also, the later developments, with gradual
10 withdrawal of ENGO support for work on standards resembles the developments in Sweden.
11 Johansson (2012) found reduced ENGO support, even for FSC certification in Sweden. The
12 reduced ENGO support in Norway and Sweden is contrary to the third phase of non-state
13 global governance proposed by Bernstein and Cashore (2007) suggesting that with the
14 certification system established, a third phase with shared norms would materialize. From the
15 Norwegian cases the question for future research is how ENGOs and FOs use former
16 commitments to strengthen their own standing, including how ENGOs will use standards and
17 FOs promises when complaining about concrete actions, by naming, shaming and legal
18 actions.

22 23 **6. Conclusions**

24
25 The analysis have revealed substantive changes in the understanding of how forests should be
26 managed and the way the stakeholders work together. The Norwegian cases thus represent
27 national examples of gradual emerging “new social practices on forests in the course of time”
28 as revealed at global level by Arts and Buizer (2009:346). Overall, the empirical cases
29 showed a decreasing involvement of ENGOs over time, an apparent contradiction in
30 decreasing ENGO involvement and increasing environmental considerations. The findings
31 support former accounts of complexity in forest policy development and governance. The
32 initial exploration of two policy processes focusing on ENGOs and FOs call for attention to
33 various levels of coalitions, rules of game, discourses and power relations. From the two
34 cases, participation in establishing new policy schemes seem to attract broader participation
35 than modifications in existing systems. The ENGO participation in broader coalitions,
36 arguing for more funding to forest protection and their strategic use of the standards for SFM,
37 show how the process commitments may be used also by actors not participating in
38 processes. The empirical cases point to changes in ‘*what’s in it for me*’ for ENGOs versus
39 FOs, and call for attention to dynamic aspects of participation, with stakeholders choosing
40 levels and processes in response to evolving policies.

46 47 48 **Acknowledgement**

49
50 Funding for this study was provided by the Norwegian University of Life Sciences and the
51 Research Council of Norway (project 215555). I’m grateful to national stakeholders for
52 sharing information on participation in and opinions of the two policy processes, as well as to
53 two anonymous reviewers and the editor for providing useful comments to an earlier version
54 if the paper.

57 58 59 60 **References**

1 Aftenposten 2004. NU og skogeierne krever penger til skogvern [Nature and Youth and the
2 forest owners require more money for forest protection] Aftenposten: 10 May 2004 (Updated:
3 19 Oct 2011). [http://www.aftenposten.no/viten/NU-og-skogeierne-krever-penger-til-
4 skogvern-6304435.html](http://www.aftenposten.no/viten/NU-og-skogeierne-krever-penger-til-skogvern-6304435.html). (Assessed 7 March 2016).

5
6 Andresen, L. 2013. Levende Skog - forhandlinger & årsaker til brudd [Living forest -
7 negotiations & reasons for breakdown] Master Thesis, Norwegian University of Life
8 Sciences, Department of Ecology and Natural Resources.

9
10 Arnesen, T, Eide, TH, Aasetre, J. 2004: Levende Skog prosessen – fortid, nåtid og framtid.
11 En evaluering. [The Living Forest process – past, present and future. An evaluation] ØF-
12 rapport nr. 16/2004. Østlandsforskning, Lillehammer. 112 pp.

13
14 Appelstrand, M. 2002. Participation and societal values: the challenge for lawmakers and
15 policy practitioners. *Forest policy and economics*, 4(2002)281-290.

16
17 Arts, B. 2003. Non-State Actors in Global Governance. Three Faces of Power. Max Planck
18 Institute for Research on Collective Goods, Bonn. Report 2003/4. 53 pp.

19
20 Arts, B, Leroy, P, van Tatenhove, J. 2006. Political Modernisation and Policy Arrangements:
21 A Framework for Understanding Environmental Policy Change. *Public Organiz Rev* (2006)
22 6: 93–106.

23
24 Arts, B, Buizer, M. 2009. Forests, discourses, institutions. A discursive-institutional analysis
25 of global forest governance. *Forest Policy and Economics* 11(2009)340–347.

26
27 Bergseng, E, Vatn, A. 2008. Why protection of biodiversity creates conflict – some evidence
28 from the Nordic countries. *Journal of forest economics* 15(2009)147-155.

29
30 Bernstein, S, Cashore, B. 2007. Can non-state global governance be legitimate? An analytical
31 framework. *Regulation & Governance* 1(4)2007: 347–371.

32
33 Den Besten, JW, Arts, B, Verkooijen, P. 2014. The evolution of REDD+: An analysis of
34 discursive-institutional dynamics. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 35(2014)40–48.

35
36 Faehnle, M, Tyrväinen, L. 2013. A framework for evaluating and designing collaborative
37 planning. *Land Use Policy* 34(2013)332-341.

38
39 Framstad, E, Økland, B, Bendiksen, E, Bakkestuen, V, Blom, H, Brandrud, TE. 2002.
40 Evaluering av skogvernet i Norge. NINA Fagrapport 54, 2002. 146 pp.

41
42 Gulbrandsen, LH. 2014. Dynamic governance interactions: Evolutionary effects of state
43 responses to non-state certification programs. *Regulation & Governance* 8(2014)74-92.

44
45 Hysing, E, and Olsson, J. 2008. Contextualising the Advocacy Coalition Framework:
46 theorising change in Swedish forest policy. *Environmental Politics* 2000(17)5:730-748.

47
48 Johansson, J. 2012. Challenges to the legitimacy of the private forest governance, the
49 development of forest certification in Sweden. *Environmental Policy and Governance*
50 22(2012)424-436.

1 Kangas, A, Saarinen, N, Saarikoski, H. 2010. Stakeholder perspectives about proper
2 participation for Regional Forest Programmes in Finland. *Forest Policy and Economics*
3 12(3)2010: 213-222.

4 Leroy, P, Arts, B. 2006. Institutional dynamics in environmental governance. In: Arts, B,
5 Leroy, P (Eds.) *Institutional dynamics in environmental governance*. Springer, Dordrecht.

6
7
8 Lindstad, BH. 2015. Changes in Norwegian forest policies: what are the effects of the
9 international forest regime complex? *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*
10 2015:30(3)246-254.

11
12 MoA. 1998. St.meld. nr. 17 (1998-1999) Verdiskaping og miljø – muligheter i skogsektoren
13 [White Paper to the Parliament 17 (1998-1999) Value Adding and Environmental Concerns –
14 Opportunities in the Forest Sector, in Norwegian]

15
16
17 MoCE 2009. Lov om forvaltning av naturens mangfold (naturmangfoldloven) [Nature
18 Diversity Act]

19
20
21 MoCE 2015. Verner 66 nye områder [Protecting 66 new areas]. Press release from Ministry
22 of Climate and Environment, December 2015. (*Assessed 1 February 2016*)
23 [https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/verner-66-skogomrader-i-norges-storste-](https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/verner-66-skogomrader-i-norges-storste-skogvernvedtak/id2466706/)
24 [skogvernvedtak/id2466706/](https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/verner-66-skogomrader-i-norges-storste-skogvernvedtak/id2466706/)

25
26
27 MoE. 2003. St.meld. Nr. 25 (2002-2003) Regjeringens miljøvernpolitikk og rikets
28 miljøtilstand [White Paper to the Parliament 25 (2002-2003) The Government's
29 Environmental Policy and the National State of the Environment, in Norwegian]

30
31 Norges Skogeierforbund, WWF, Norsk Industri, SABIMA, Norges Naturvernforbund,
32 NORSKOG, Greenpeace, Fremtiden i våre hender, Friluftslivets fellesorganisasjon, Natur og
33 Ungdom, Norsk Ornitologisk Forening 2014. Organisasjoner for skogeiere, industri, miljø og
34 friluftsliv ber om penger til skogvern [Organisations for forest owners, industry, environment
35 and outdoor recreation ask for money to protect forests] (Latest assessed 14 March 2016)
36 [http://naturvernforbundet.no/getfile.php/Bilder/Fellesbrev Skogvern 2014.pdf](http://naturvernforbundet.no/getfile.php/Bilder/Fellesbrev_Skogvern_2014.pdf)

37
38
39
40 Norsk skogsertifisering 2016. Sertifisering av skog [Forest certification] (Latest assessed 14
41 March 2016) http://skogsertifisering.no/sertifisering_av_skog/

42
43 Peters, DM, Wirth, K, Böhr, B, Ferranti, F, Elena Górriz-Mifsud, E, Kärkkäinen, L, Krč, J,
44 Kurttila, J, Leban, V, Lindstad, BH, Pezdevšek Malovrh, S, Pistorius, T, Rhodius, R, Solberg,
45 B, Zadnik Stirn, L. 2015. Energy wood from forests - stakeholder perceptions in five
46 European countries. *Energy, Sustainability Energy, Sustainability and Society*, 2015, 5:17.

47
48
49 Pezdevšek Malovrh, S, Kurttila, M, Hujala, T, Kärkkäinen, L, Leban, V, Lindstad, BH,
50 Peters, DM, Rhodius, R, Solberg, B, Wirth, K, Zadnik Stirn, L, Krč, J. 2016. Decision
51 support framework for evaluating the operational environment of forest bioenergy production
52 and use: Case of four European countries. *Journal of Environmental Management*,
53 2016(180)68–81.

54
55
56 Pülzl, H, Kleinschmit, D, Arts, B. 2014. Bioeconomy – an emerging meta-discourse affecting
57 forest discourses? *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 29(4)2014: 386–393.

1 Sarkki, S, Niemela, J, Tinch, R, Jappinen, JP, Nummelin, M, Toivonen, H, Von Weissenberg,
2 M. 2015. Are national biodiversity strategies and action plans appropriate for building
3 responsibilities for mainstreaming biodiversity across policy sectors? The case of Finland.
4 Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 2015: 1-20.
5

6 Skjeggedal, T, Gundersen, V, Harvold, KA, and Vistad, OI. 2010. Frivillig vern av skog -
7 evaluering av arbeidsform. [Voluntary forest conservation – Approach evaluation, In
8 Norwegian with English summary] Joint Report NIBR/NINA 2010, Oslo. 160 pp.
9

10 UN 1992. Non-legally binding authoritative statement of principles for a global consensus on
11 the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests. Report of
12 the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
13 1992.
14
15

16 Wesselink, A, Paavola, J, Fritsch, O. 2011. Rationales for public participation in
17 environmental policy and governance: practitioners' perspectives. Environment and Planning
18 A, 2011(43)11:2688-2704.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

FIGURE 1: Gradual developments through interactions among the four dimensions of PAA over time with increasing environmental considerations

