

*Forest Products Market Information
Systems in the UNECE region.*

L. Farquharson

August 2007

A report into Forest Products Market Information Systems _____ 1

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	_____	2
2. INTRODUCTION	_____	3
3. METHODOLOGY	_____	3
4. LITERATURE REVIEW	_____	5
5. DEVELOPMENTS	_____	8
6. RESPONSES	_____	8
7. SLOVAKIAN CASE STUDY PROVIDED BY ROMAN SVITOK	_____	9
8. DISCUSSION	_____	11
9. CONCLUSIONS	_____	12
10. RECOMMENDATIONS	_____	13
11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	_____	14
12. REFERENCES	_____	15

1. Executive Summary

Market Information Systems (MIS) for Forest Products exist in few countries in the UNECE region, in comparison with systems for agriculture or fisheries, which are more widespread. This report is the result of a rapid study that attempted to explore to what extent forest products MIS occur within the UNECE region; to examine the fundamental elements behind the creation and operation of a system and to begin to identify the reasons why few forest products MIS exist.

A MIS is defined, for the purposes of this report, as an interactive database that allows information about market activity for timber industries, wood products, pulp & paper, non-wood forest products, and forest policies. Such a database allows information to be stored, analysed, retrieved and queried. The benefits of such a system have been recognised by certain sectors and countries however, as the project has indicated, knowledge on this topic is lacking and use of Forest Products MIS confined to fewer than ten countries of the UNECE region.

In order to complete this project, a survey of the Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing was undertaken. The responses provided by participants provide much of the content of this report and were used to determine the degree of support that exists for MIS amongst forest products marketing specialists. In addition to this, literature relating to MIS, often in other sectors, was also consulted. Due to the lack of research on the issue of Forest Products MIS there still remains a great deal of scope for study and more in depth analysis on the topic.

This report also highlights any concerns expressed by those with a background in forest products and forest products marketing. By taking into consideration their views and opinions, a number of conclusions for Forest Products MIS have been made. In addition to these definite conclusions, a number of recommendations for the next steps to be taken regarding MIS are also suggested. The desirability for a more in-depth study of a small number of MIS is one of the recommendations, as this would give greater insight into the particular characteristics and functions of Forest Products MIS. This report does not provide all the definite answers for Forest Products MIS, however it has attempted to open up the issue for wider debate and further analysis.

2. Introduction

This paper sets out to identify what MIS exist in the UNECE region and to establish, where possible, what are the particular characteristics of a successful MIS. Through literature reviews and correspondence with the Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing (hereafter referred to as the Team of Specialists), the report tries to draw conclusions about Forest Products MIS and, in addition, to present recommendations for the next steps to be taken in furthering knowledge and understanding of this topic.

4.1. What is a Forest Products Market Information System (MIS)?

A Forest Products MIS is an interactive database that allows information about market activity for timber industries, wood products, pulp & paper, non-wood forest products, and forest policies. The database allows information to be stored, analysed, retrieved and queried. Making objective information of this kind accessible to forest growers, wood processors, government officials and other stakeholders, allows short-term changes and longer-term developments in markets and prices to be monitored, helping these groups to make better-informed short-term tactical decisions and to design well-founded long-term strategies. Using internationally agreed terms for forest products, and local standards, the MIS would be available to the public for searches and queries, and for uploading/downloading information.

A classic definition of a MIS is also provided by Kotler (1988):

A marketing information system is a continuing and interacting structure of people, equipment and procedures to gather, sort, analyse, evaluate, and distribute pertinent, timely and accurate information for use by marketing decision makers to improve their marketing planning, implementation, and control.

4.1.1. What is the Purpose of a Forest Products MIS?

At a practical level, a well-designed forest product MIS allows stakeholders to monitor market movements, determine realistic prices for their products, and provide input for management and sales decisions. The primary goal is to provide useful information that will help to improve marketing, planning and the execution of transactions by allowing information exchange between buyers and sellers. It could also be useful to individuals or organizations looking for investment possibilities. An MIS does not typically include advertising or selling but it could include these types of facilities, provided the users believe that this would be of benefit. The basis of MIS is the information required between buyer and seller: the omission of advertising information, be it for purchaser or seller, may be a shortfall of MIS. The specific German example of Marketing Information System and Market Information System will be touched upon later.

3. Methodology

To rapidly assess the scope of MIS, a UNECE wide survey of MIS for Fisheries,

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Agriculture and Forestry was proposed. This would have involved assessing each country, in each sector area to determine whether MIS were/were not present.

Whilst knowledge of other sectors would have been desirable, it was considered more important, given the limited time available to focus on Forest Products MIS. An online survey was drawn up, which asked the following questions:

- *What information is displayed?*
- *What user groups are accessing the data?*
- *When was the system created?*
- *Who was behind the creation process? Who maintains the system now?*
- *Who provided the funding? Who provides the funding now?*
- *Who has access to the data?*

In addition to this data, it was also considered important to establish the status of prior policy that have been launched in the UNECE region and therefore to see whether, MIS operation is something that could be widely established throughout the UNECE region.

The initial idea of surveying all three sectors for each country proved to be too ambitious. Often data for government ministries did not go into sufficient detail, and websites were often in the native language, which meant difficulties in accessing information. Also, in some cases, the amalgamation of the relevant government ministry with others meant that sector specific analysis was not possible. Due to the time constraints placed on the project it was deemed more beneficial to focus on the second aspect of the report; specific Forest Product MIS analysis.

For the purposes of this project, an online questionnaire was chosen as a quick, yet insightful means through which to receive information. The questionnaire was distributed to the members of the Team of Specialists using the listings in the Timber Section database. Responses from the Team of Specialists were used to inform the study. These were the key questions:

- Personal experience/use of MIS in your own country and others. Primarily in forestry but knowledge of fisheries, agriculture MIS are also welcomed by way of comparison.
- What do you believe a country gains, could gain or stands to lose by having/not having a Forest Products MIS?
- Any market imbalances, to your knowledge, that have been resolved through MIS.

- Any personal recommendations for an optimal Marketing Information System for Forestry and Forest Products.

To supplement the online questionnaire a literature review of appropriate journal articles on MIS in other sectors and previous UNECE wide policy initiatives was also conducted. This looked also at forest policy and other wider environmental policy areas.

4. Literature Review

For the purposes of this literature review, draft proposals have been consulted, as there was very little literature on actual functioning Forest Products MIS. To complement the draft papers, MIS articles that refer to agriculture MIS, policy consultation papers and examples of European Forest policy have also been included. Sub-headings have been used to categorise literature consulted.

Developing a market information system has the intention of removing market imperfections. MIS is not isolated to Forest Products, if anything MISs are more abundant in areas of Agriculture and Fisheries. Gandhi (2002) discusses the need for a MIS in order to organise forest products market in India. The development of such a system would lead to better decision-making, and help reduce the mis-match between supply and demand. The use of MIS applies to other sectors, namely fisheries and agriculture and more information and details were found on both these topics. The Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries also discusses the benefits to be gained from MIS. The Massachusetts Project collects, analyzes, and distributes catch/effort and economic data from lobster, shellfish and "regulated" fisheries through catch reports from licensed fishermen. These data are used to assist market users and managers in the development of fisheries market.

The need for an established MIS is perhaps more necessary due to the globalization trends and market liberalisation which have occurred over recent years. The need for easily accessible information is crucial due to the new distances that transactions occur over, also the ability to document market trends that occur, which can be stored in a MIS, is also important:

Social actors now act transnationally and can exercise a great deal of influence over...consumption patterns in export markets as wells as production patterns in exporting countries. (Howlett, 2006)

Intensifying competition in international forest product markets exerts downwards pressures on national standards. This has lead to greater competitiveness in the market place and in order to address the negative effects of such advancement the availability of forestry information to all those involved in the process needs to be made widely available. Hogl (2002).

Is it conceivable that certain actors and agents might prefer not to have independent objective MIS because the market already operates in their favour? Innovation and change in this area would signify changes in the exchange of information and the balance of power within the forest products market. How might it be possible to know if all market actors would welcome this step?

Rametsteiner and Gerhard (2006), categorise the functions of a system, such as an MIS, into three categories:

- **To reduce uncertainties by providing information**
- **To manage conflicts and cooperation**
- **To provide financial and non-financial incentives**

The creation of an MIS could be expected to increase the information flow between local, regional, national and supra-national levels. However, to what level this would increase cooperation could be debated. As Rametsteiner highlights, cooperation is already occurring at many levels within the industry:

A current trend observed in the sector is a closer cooperation among forest owners as well as a closer interaction with the industries of the wood processing chain. The main reasons put forward for horizontal cooperation are a necessary rationalisation and the competition with raw materials suppliers from other countries. (Rametsteiner and Gerhard, 2006)

Cooperation clearly exists but whether the establishment of an MIS would further increase cooperation or challenge it, is something that remains unclear.

European policies and instruments such as the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and many instruments for nature and landscape conservation in Europe have for some decades been dominated by centralisation and standardisation. (Pinto-Correia et al. 2006)

The EU forest policy is based on the principle of subsidiarity. This aspect accommodated the great variety of forests and their management as well as the different organisations within the EU member states. It seems to be more effective if decisions were made as close as possible to the people they affected. Despite this, more effectiveness could be expected by cooperation within communities and by networks between international institutions, national and local offices, research institutes, and commercial institutions or non-governmental organisations. (Wulf, 2003)

However, it is important to realise that encompassing such a wide array of actors necessitates that multi-level policy co-ordination be applied as it has been other areas of European policy. As the previous quote suggested, cooperation is already occurring at various levels within the Forest Products Sector. The complications that result due to multi-level policies are not necessarily something that should be applicable to Forest Products.

In reality, the forest policy process engages a collection of private interests, public agencies, legislative contingents, advocacy groups and judicial

organisations, as well as a host of resource professionals that bring to bear a variety of academic and professional experiences. (Gerben, 2006)

Issues pertaining to the wider field of forestry engage many other actors, however over-complication may not be beneficial to the Forest Products sector instead, keeping MIS country specific, and limiting the engagement of actors to those directly involved.

In order to build consensus, actors have to agree on the information used in the policy process/specific system e.g. basic facts and standards to be observed by all.

Currently, European freshwaters, glaciers, forests and other semi-natural and natural eco-systems and habitats are monitored by a number of networks established by different organisations. Many monitoring programmes have a narrow focus (e.g. targeting individual eco-systems) and most have different measurement protocols and sampling design. This has resulted in poor integration of ecosystem monitoring at a European level, leading to some overlapping of efforts and lack of harmonised data to inform policy decisions. (Parr et al., 2002)

The designation of such parameters means that common themes and goals can be identified. With globalization of process in the last decades collaboration and cooperation has been enhanced. However, in relation to this, Tomas Hellström (2000) states that “The enactment of...information in policy-making is affected by a number of elements:

- (a) The policy-maker’s opinion on what is helpful/important information,**
- (b) The way in which information is processed in the policy agency,**
- (c) Relative importance of the information compared to other interests.”**

MIS creators must ensure that they eradicate any biases, process their market information appropriately and decide on what information their system will encompass. Taking these steps to ensure standards would avoid duplication of effort. Whether or not these standards would be debated at a country specific level or on a UNECE-wide scale is still unsure, as both Wulf and Gerben highlight the potential number of actors involved in policy, there can be numerous: potentially, the greater the number of actors involved, the more complicated a system can become

5. Developments

Rich Vlosky, Leader of the Team of Specialists, suggested that the creation of a Forest Product MIS template would be helpful. A discussion of what standards should be adopted and what information to present is important. Each country could complete this internally. Bénédicte Hendrickx, European Panel Federation, and expressed concern at the forecast sheets the Association distributes to local experts in order to gather relevant market data. Often not all countries can fill out the forms and an official standard and sufficient training would be beneficial to harmonise the process. In her opinion

standardised titles for MIS i.e. wood raw material; wood energy; value added products and wood-based panels would help to give a good overview of the status of each product/sector within a country. Not only one can find key figures, if the data has been recorded and stored for some time one can identify market appreciation and detect trends/reasons behind the data. Developments

In countries where MISs have been in operation for some time, there are also opportunities to look at the marketing aspect. The point was touched on in the opening definition of MIS. While a MIS may not typically include advertising or selling, it could include these facilities, if the users want them.

The Department of Forest Economics at the University of Helsinki and the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, both offer university-level programmes in forest products marketing. The marketing function is the link between the organisation and the customers. (Pesonen: 1995) In addition to this, courses exist within the United States, e.g. Louisiana Forest Products Development Centre amongst other examples. The existence of such educational bodies indicates the high level with which these countries/regions regard Forest Product marketing experience. One would assume that marketing knowledge goes hand in hand, with a successful and efficient MIS. Finland and the Metla Metinfo website, which provides students with access to its online MIS, substantiates this hypothesis.

The same too can be said for Germany. As Fabian Schulmeyer¹ pointed out, within Germany the Holzabsatzfond is a marketing tool run by the federal administration. It does also supplement this work with the collation of statistics but it is predominately concerned with advertising. The Holzzentralblatt is the key provider of information on wood markets in German language. The close linkage between market and marketing seems most predominant in the aforementioned countries. These countries could be used as examples in the creation of a standardised format for MIS in the UNECE region.

6. Responses

The database lists upwards of 50 people in the Team of Specialists. All members received an invitation to complete the online questionnaire. The membership of the Team of Specialists is drawn from many UNECE countries e.g. Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, United Kingdom. A list of Team members is given in the Appendix.

Response levels were disappointing; fewer than a quarter of the Team responded and fewer still were able to offer useful comment and information. This point needs to be stressed as the outcome of the study relied heavily on the participation of the Team of Specialists. The low level of responses has impacted the study with the result that the report is less informative than it might otherwise they have been. Nevertheless, those responses that were received were particularly informative, some offering interesting suggestions.

¹ Fabian Schulmeyer, student, Freiburg University and former UNECE Timber Section intern,

Some respondents were unable to cite one country in which a MIS system for Forest Products was in operation, whilst others recounted the establishment process for MIS within their own country. This contrast in answers highlights the lack of knowledge and consensus² that exists on the subject. Perhaps greater emphasis and discussion of the topic, amongst the Team of Experts, would be beneficial for the wider Forest Products sector.

Many of the responses indicated an awareness of the benefits to be gained from a MIS. The ignorance, misuse and misinterpretation of data and information were a commonly cited problem. The issue of knowledge and data in the hands of the wrong people e.g. illegal loggers was a subject that occurred frequently in the responses. As long as this area remains unqualified and knowledge not harmonised, uncertainty remains. The potential to be gained from organisation of knowledge is being lost and power remains in the hands of few. The problem is identifying whom, if anyone, gains from this lack of information distribution, something that still remains unanswered.

Other email responses, Joseph Krauhauser, Holz-Zentralblatt, did not express concern at the lack of MIS in other countries. He did not feel that this was an important factor and it did not make countries with MIS, resent those without e.g. not want to share data with those outside of their country. It also suggests that MIS is a very country specific phenomena. Equally, he did not enthuse on the subject of MIS, if anything it would seem that the benefits/influences are exaggerated, in his opinion. This view was not an isolated one and others suggested that perhaps MIS was too highly regarded and not worth concentrating on.

Keith Forsyth, Velux (Denmark) added a new slant to the argument by comparing the Forest Products market with the non-ferrous metal market. It is important here to look at the dynamics of the various markets and consider why, in most respects, MIS seem to be more abundant in other sectors. As to why the forest products market differs to other markets, this is not entirely concrete. The perishable nature of Fisheries and Agriculture products necessitates that information be easily available and this could be one of the reasons for adoption of MIS in these sectors. The Forest Products market could be considered more centralised than the other markets and therefore the necessity for MIS not so apparent. The forest products producer caters for the point of destination recipient, and their specifications and necessary market information have already been made available to the producer. Therefore any additional market information is superfluous in this respect.

The interesting responses came from the countries that had recently established a Forest Product MIS.

7. Slovakian Case Study provided by Roman Svitok

The Forestry Market Information System for Slovakia (FMIS) was initiated by the Slovak Ministry of Agriculture, which also provided funding for its operation back in 1994. At that time, the information on timber trading and log grade prices was provided exclusively by

state agencies that also managed the forests of non-state owners. Due to restitution and privatisation forestland, however, other subjects, namely private forest management bodies, gradually started to participate in the collection, processing and evaluation of timber trade data. Since 1998, the data from state forests is whole-scale gathered whilst the data for non-state forests is gathered only from a selective set of reporting units.

Data available through FMIS play an important part in the Slovakian forestry sector. The System provides information on the domestic and international trading with timber and reproduction material while creating comprehensive data archives on the commodity supply and prices. Such a system provides permanent monitoring and evaluation of between year trends in log grade prices.

Verified information on forest commodities is made publicly available through a special "Newsletter" and the National Forest Centre (NFC) website. This way, the data are effectively disseminated among various reporting subjects as well as general public involved in forest products trading, usage and processing.

FMIS provides transparent environment especially with respect to domestic market with forest commodities (notably for small enterprises) and trading between suppliers and customers avoiding various intermediaries and price falsification

FMIS currently operates in an optimal structure thus answering for multiple needs of its various users. With respect to its further development within the Forestry Information System it is necessary to introduce an effective communication tool enabling more efficient communication between reporting units and potential FMIS clients. At the same time, the tool facilitates a full functional link to customs statistics to ensure high-quality information based on timber trading.

Slovakia is not alone: Lithuania has also developed MIS. SINFOMEDIS and EKOMEDIENA are Lithuanian examples, private and public sector, since 1993 in the state sector and since 2001 in the private sector MIS. This involves both companies and cooperatives. As the Slovakian example demonstrates, crucial to the process is the supply of funding.

The readiness of actors to co-operate in elaborating common programmes is likely to be considerably increased when a common funding approach is integrated...when there is a clear commitment for financial measures [and returns] to be provided based on the collective output [as well as input]. (Hogl, 2003)

In the process of developing an MIS, the implementing body must be tactical and be able to look beyond the short-term objectives and the initial costs. It should not be motivated entirely by profit and should embrace the vital sector good it is addressing, something that might not necessarily be produced by a purely private-sector organization. This report suggests that in order to meet the costs of maintenance the public sector may have to work closely with the private sector.

A good example of successful funding and continued financial backing can be found in the German MIS example. The German system, The ZMP Zentrale Markt- und

Preisberichtsstelle für Erzeugnisse der Land-, Forst- und Ernährungswirtschaft GmbH (the Central Market and Price reporting Unit for Agriculture, Forestry and Food), was established in 1950 initially as a MIS for agriculture: forestry and timber products were then introduced in 1990 on behalf of the Holzabsatzfond (The German Timber Promotion Fund). This has specific paths for funding, which could well explain the longevity of the system. ZMP gathers data on supply, demand and prices for a wide range of agriculture and forestry products and identifies trends in those markets. Funding comes primarily from the Holzabsatzfond through a levy charged on all wood that is sold in Germany but the MIS raises cash too through the sale of its products and services to third parties.

8. Discussion

The research and surveys have not revealed a consensus view about what should be the aims of MIS. It is clear from the articles consulted that there is a desire, in some cases, for a MIS. However, the time and effort to create and maintain a system is not necessarily feasible. Some Team of Specialists members did not see any benefits that could be gained from a MIS. Others recognised the feasibility in theory, but failed to see how it would be implemented in practice. This has generated the greatest amount of discussion. Whether or not the MIS is an ideal, or actually an achievable aim. Forest products MIS exist in: Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovakia, Sweden, and Switzerland. However, the longevity of MIS has not been thoroughly tested. Whilst Germany and Finland provide examples of MIS that have operated successfully over many years, in general, the use of MIS on a wider scale, long-term basis has not yet been fully proven. The proliferation of certification schemes throughout the UNECE region was identified as adding to the complexity of forest products production. Many questionnaire participants expressed concern at yet another 'bureaucratic tool' for forest products. Whilst this was not the unanimous verdict, the responses were far more in the negative category than the positive.

It leads to the question, who is behind the process to increase the status of MIS? The responses suggest that there are not many who enthuse about MIS, nor many who are well informed on the subject. The responses received from those within the Forest Products Industry, suggest that there is already sufficient information circulating to enable buyers and sellers to function successfully within the marketplace. MIS, it would seem, whilst an interesting and useful ideal, is not something that has been expressed as a step to be taken by those actively operating in the forest products industry. The creation of MIS is something that, it would appear, has been suggested by those acting in political and institutional spheres. However, these suggestions should not go unnoticed, often it takes an observer to suggest steps toward improvement. Therefore for a successful system creation a dialogue between the two, forest products industry representatives and political/governmental/institutional representatives is advisable.

The following recommendations for MIS, cited by Weber et al. and Renko et al. would be applicable to Forest Products MIS, should the process move a step closer towards the creation of an MIS:

The appropriate institutional home depends upon the environment in which the MIS is operating; however:

It is important to place the MIS in a structure where the users of its services can demand accountability and put pressure on the system for good performance.

While the MIS needs to be accountable to its customers, it also needs significant managerial autonomy to carry out its tasks efficiently:

Management of the MIS must be fluid and efficient, because if the system is under heavy bureaucratic management an MIS will be less able to adapt to market dynamics and respond to emerging needs. (Weber et al. 2005)

The credibility of the MIS ultimately depends on the perception that it is providing objective, unbiased information. There-fore, the system needs to have structures, such as external advisory and review panels, that help guarantee the objectivity of the information and prevent the perception (or reality) that someone in the MIS's institutional home is manipulating the information for their own ends. Objectivity of the information diffused should be considered as a must for the sustainability of a MIS. If users don't trust the information provided, financing becomes a problem. So, credibility of the information, its regularity, and frequency of diffusion in tune with users needs are all critical in se-curing longer-term funding. Being able to guarantee the objectivity of the data and the analysis is also a critical factor in choosing the institutional home for the system. (Weber et al. 2005)

Again, referring to the example of Germany, the ZMP Supervisory board consists of shareholders, members of the main branches of the industry, the ministry of agriculture and forestry and producers associations.

Both Renko et al. and Weber et al. identify similar points:

The main task of MIS must be to ensure market transparency through the provision of relevant information to all interested participants.

Analysis and knowledge of the work of existing MIS organisations: identifies positives and negatives.

Harmonisation with existing MIS organisations...[e.g.] work methodologies, monitored product standards. This is increasing due to globalization of the market and the growing need to compare local and foreign markets. An appropriate comparison is possible only if based on equal parameters.

The collection of information primarily on supply, demand and prices is based on co-operation with producers, trades people, consumer associations, ministries and others.

Constant targeting and reassessment of user needs for market information and analysis (Renko et al. 2002)

9. Conclusions

It is clear that Forest Product market conditions are changing. However, to what extent MIS would benefit country specific markets still remains largely unanswered. Some

conclusions about the present state of affairs and recommendations for the future of MIS now follow:

- The case for having MIS does not seem to have been made convincingly. There is still a lot of misunderstanding about what *exactly* a MIS is and what purpose it serves.
- The reason the status of Forest Products MIS is different to other sectors i.e. agriculture and fisheries, is still largely unanswered
- Whether and how MIS benefits a country is uncertain and not qualified. However some examples do exist and they have provided some degree of evidence, and will hopefully continue to do so after some years of establishment.
- Several countries seem content to manage with the existing market information that may be found from a range of sources, including Internet sites, (many of which were recommended by those who participated in the online survey). However, whether or not a MIS is superior to such information remains largely, for the time being, subjective.
- Where the desire and enthusiasm for MIS lies is not entirely clear. Some of the respondents were operating within the forest products industries of their own countries. However, more often the interest in MIS seems to originate within the political and institutional sphere.
- In the few studies that have been undertaken, funding is a significant factor in the MIS creation process. The financial merit to be gained from an MIS is also an issue to consider. If there is no financial incentive to create and use an MIS, then it will be difficult to gain support from use in the Forest Products industry.

10. Recommendations

There is little readily-available published information about MIS for forest products in the UNECE region. There does not seem to have been any independent study of Forest Products MIS that *do* exist and of the services, costs and benefits that they provide. This rapid survey has only been able to scratch the surface of the topic and as many questions remain unanswered as have been answered. Nonetheless the following recommendation are offered:

- If there is to be any further work and advancement it should be a more detailed study of a smaller number of operating MISs in order to fully address all questions surrounding the topic.
- In order to effectively produce a useful and effective MIS, dialogue needs to occur between industry and political/policy making institutions. This would ensure that both stakeholder groups have an input in the establishment process and generate discussion for topics that need to be addressed regarding MIS.

- The study has not been able to look in depth at how the Forest Products market differs from the agriculture and fisheries markets, where the value of MIS seems to have gained wider acceptance. Therefore, a more detailed analysis of the different sectors should be undertaken in an effort to explain why differences exist in the use and application of MIS. Hopefully better knowledge in this area will lead to more definite answers for the Forest Products industry specifically.
- The benefit of MIS in addressing the problems of illegal and felling and trade is a recommended area for further study. The high profile status of this topic could benefit from better information. An in-depth study would be the best means to establish whether making objective market information available through a transparent.

The creation of Forest Products MISs throughout the UNECE region is a long way off. In fact, whether or not such forest products MIS will ever become more widespread is open to discussion. National MIS are lacking in most countries in the UNECE region. However, the small amount of information retrieved during this project has generated some amount of discussion amongst Forest Product specialists. Whether or not the MIS agenda has advanced due to this is debatable. What has been made clear is that further, more extensive, discussion is necessary in order to realise common goals of any Market Information System and to determine the best means of establishment.

11. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to the UNECE Timber Section staff for their help and cooperation throughout my project. Special thanks to Douglas Clark and Ed Pepke for their contribution. Also, thank you to Matt Fonseca for his help and advice. Thank you to the Team of Specialist members for their responses. I hope they will find the project valuable for raising discussions on the topic during their October 2007 meeting.

12. References

Gandhi, V.P. (2002) A Decision-Oriented Market Information System for Forest Products in India. *Proceedings of the World Congress of Computers in Agriculture and Natural Resources*. 651-661.

Gerben, J. (2006). Information search behaviour of European forest policy decision-makers. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8, 579–592.

Hellström, T. (2000). Technoscientific expertise and the significance of policy structures. *Technology in Society*, 22, 499– 512.

Hogl, K. (2002) Patterns of multi-level co-ordination for NFP-processes: learning

from problems and success stories of European policy-making. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 4, 301–312.

Howlett, M. and Rayner, J. (2006). Globalization and Governance capacity: explaining divergence in national forest programs as instances of “next-generation” regulation in Canada and Europe. *Governance: an International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 19:2, 251-275.

Kotler, P. (1988). *Marketing Management: Analysis Planning and Control*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 102 pp.

Parr, T. W., Ferretti, M., Simpson, I.C., Forsius, M. and Kovács-Láng, E. (2002). Towards a long-term integrated monitoring programme in Europe: network design in theory and practice. *Environmental Monitoring Assessment*. 78:3, 253-90.

Pinto-Correia, T., Gustavsson, R. and Pirnat, J. (2006). Bridging the gap between centrally defined policies and local decisions - Towards more sensitive and creative rural landscape management. *Landscape Ecology*, 21, 333–346.

Rametsteiner, E. and Gerhard, W. (2006). Innovation and innovation policy in forestry: Linking innovation process with systems models. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8, 691–703.

Renko, N., Nikolasevic, S. and Pavicic, J. (2002). Case Study: The market information system and state support for the market and agricultural products in Croatia. *British Food Journal*, 104:7, 543-557.

UNECE/FAO Timber Section. (September 2006). Proposal Outline: Developing a Forest Products Market Information System for the Western Balkans. Draft for discussion purposes only.

Weber, M.T., Donovan, C., Staatz, J.M. and Dembélé, N.N. (2005) Guidelines for

building sustainable Market Information Systems in Africa with strong public-private partnerships. *Policy Synthesis for Cooperating USAID Offices and Country Missions*, 78, 1-6. <http://www.aec.msu.edu/agecon/fs2/psynindx.htm>. Accessed April 2007

Wulf, M. (2003). Forest policy in the EU and its influence on the plant diversity of woodlands. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 67, 15–25.

Internet References

The German Timber Promotion Fund
<<http://www.germantimber.com/>>. Accessed May 2007

Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries
<<http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dmf/programsandprojects/lobinves.htm>>. Accessed May 2007

FAO Corporate Document Repository. Article by Personen, M. (1995)
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/v7850e/v7850e09.htm> Accessed July 2007

13. Appendix 1.

	Title	Last Name	First Name	Organisation Name	Communication Country
1	Mr.	Wall	Jeremy	European Commission	Belgium
2	Dr.	Castano	Jairo	FAO, Regional Office for Asia & Pacific	Thailand
3	Mr.	Boutin	Marc P.	Canadian Lumber Standards Accreditation Board	Canada
4	Mr.	Venables	David	American Hardwood Export Council	United Kingdom
5	Mr.	Hviid	Peter	Ministry of the Environment	Denmark
6	Mr.	Svitok	Roman	Forest Research Institute (LVU)	Slovakia
7	Mr.	Nilsagard	Hans	Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications	Sweden
8	Ms.	Istratescu	Constanta	National Institute of Wood	Romania
9	Mr.	Forsyth	Keith	Velux A/S	Denmark
10	Mr.	Ciurea	Ioan	National Institute of Wood	Romania
11	Dr.	Ince	Peter J.	USDA Forest Service	United States of America
12	Dr.	Rametsteiner	Ewald	Universität für Bodenkultur	Austria
13	Dr.	Kovacs	Zsolt	University of West Hungary	Hungary

14	Mr.	Desclos	Pierre-Marie	(None)	Italy
15	Mr.	Buckley	Michael	World Hardwoods	United Kingdom
16	Dr.	Vlosky	Richard P.	Agricultural Center, Louisiana State University	United States of America
17	Mr.	Borlea	Gheorghe Florian	National Forest Administration	Romania
18	Mr.	Benin	Andrey	Russian Federation State Duma	Russian Federation
19	Mr.	Ivanov	Vangel	Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	Bulgaria
20	Prof.	Glavonjic	Branko	Belgrade State University	Serbia
21	Mr.	Kaubi	Ulvar	State Forest Management Centre	Estonia
22	Dr.	Johnson	Steve	International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)	Japan
23	Mr.	Labbé	Sylvain	Quebec Wood Export Bureau (Q-WEB)	Canada
24	Dr.	Gaston	Christopher	Forintek Canada Corporation	Canada
25	Dr.	Schuler	Al	USDA Forest Service	United States of America
26	Mr.	Bumgardner	Matthew	USDA Forest Service	United States of America
27	Mr.	Newman	Paul	Council of Forest Industries	Canada
28	Prof.	Akim	Eduard L.	Saint Petersburg State Technological University of Plant Polymers	Russian Federation

29	Mr.	Cooper	Roger	University of Wales, School of Agriculture and Forest Sciences	United Kingdom
30	Mr.	Martin	Paul C.	Timber Trade Federation	United Kingdom
31	Mr.	Leek	Nico A.	Probos (formerly Stichting Bos en Hout (SBH))	Netherlands
32	Mr.	Krejzar	Tomas	Ministry of Agriculture	Czech Republic
33	Mr. Dr.	Splawa-Neyman	Andrzej	State Forests - Poland	Poland
34	Mr.	Martikainen	Pasi	Finnish Forest Industries Federation	Finland
35	Mr.	Montgomery	Ken	Industry Canada	Canada
36	Mr.	Jordans	Harijs	Latvian Timber Exporters' Association	Latvia
37	Mr.	Parik	Tomas	CEPI - Confederation of European Paper Industries	Czech Republic
38	Mr.	Koskinen	Antti	Jaakko Pöyry Consulting Finland	Finland
39	M.	Costrel de Corainville	Yves	Fédération nationale du Bois	France
40	Mr.	Oliver	Rupert	Forest Industries Intelligence	United Kingdom
41	Dr.	Kozak	Robert	Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia	Canada
42	Mr.	Murphy	Gerard	Coillte - the Irish Forestry Board	Ireland
43	Mr.	Bali	Ramazan	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Turkey

44	Ms.	Cace	Anita	Ministry of Agriculture, Latvia	Latvia
45	Mr.	Taylor	Russell	International WOOD Markets	Canada
46	Mr.	Westcot	Thomas	U.S. Department of Agriculture	United States of America
47	Mr.	Guertin	Carl-Eric	Quebec Wood Export Bureau (Q-WEB)	Canada
48	Ms.	Vahanen	Tiina	Food and Agriculture Organization	Italy
49	Mr.	Pavel	Alexandru	National Institute of Wood (INL)	Romania
50	Mr.	Wiles	Roderick	Broadleaf Consulting	United Kingdom
51	Mr.	Krasavcevs	Igors	Latvian Forest Industry Federation	Latvia
52	Dr.	Buehlmann	Urs	Enkeboll Designs	United States of America
53	Mr.	Kravka	Miroslav	Mendel University	Czech Republic
54	Dr.	Bowyer	James	University of Minnesota	United States of America
55	Mr.	Hashiramoto	Osamu	FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Italy
56	Mr.	De Morogues	Francis	Association Forêt-Cellulose	France
57	Mr.	Döry	Laszlo	European Panel Federation	Austria
58	Dr.	Packer	Michael	Timbmet Silverman	United Kingdom

59	Mr.	Rathke	Steffen	Holzwerk Keck, Keck GmbH	Germany
60	Miss	Hendrickx	Bénédicte	European Confederation of Woodworking Industries - CEI-Bois	Belgium
61	Mr.	Seppälä	Jarno	Jaakko Pöyry Forest Industry Consulting	Finland
62	Mr.	Jones	Bob	Natural Resources Canada	Canada