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| **Introduction** |

**Background**

1. At the 34th Session of the UNECE/FAO Joint Working Party countries and other stakeholders called for continuing the work on forest ownership reporting. In response to these requests, the work on forest ownership related reporting has been introduced to the UNECE/FAO Integrated Programme of Work 2014-2017 agreed at the meeting of the ECE Committee on Forests and the Forest Industry (COFFI) and the FAO European Forestry Commission (EFC) in Rovaniemi, Finland, in December 2013. The collection of data on forest ownership was included in the list of activities to be implemented in 2014 and 2015.
2. The overall objective of the forest ownership reporting is to learn about the relations between different forms of forest ownership and economic, ecologic and social aspects of forests as well as forest management systems. The forest ownership reporting will provide information for a better understanding of forest ownership in different member States. Furthermore the reporting will help identifying areas where data availability is lacking and needs to be improved.
3. The coordination of forest ownership reporting is carried out by the UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section and the European Cooperation in Science and Technology Action on Forest Land Ownership Changes in Europe: Significance for Management and Policy (COST Action FACESMAP). This collaboration, while respecting the interests of both partners, shall distribute burden, improve completeness and meaningfulness of the reporting.
4. To support the development of the Forest Ownership Questionnaire an informal Core Group was established. This Core Group comprises experts from the field of forest ownership: the Confederation of European Private Forest Owners (CEPF), the European Forest Institute (EFI), the European State Forest Association (EUSTAFOR), the Federation of European Communal Forest Owners (FECOF), the U.S. Forest Service, the Unión de Selvicultores del Sur de Europa (USSE) and the COST Action FACESMAP.
5. Furthermore the authors of the questionnaire received advice and guidance during the Team of Specialists meetings on Sustainable Forest Management, the 36th as well as 37th Session Joint FAO/UNECE Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management and the Seventy-second session of the ECE Committee on Forests and the Forest Industry (COFFI). Prior to the main data collection, Germany and Sweden financially supported the development of the questionnaire. Furthermore Sweden conducted a pilot reporting on the draft version of the questionnaire.

**Reporting Guidelines and Format**

1. The questionnaire is split into two parts, the quantitative part (p. 7-36) and qualitative part (p. 37-43). Correspondents of the UNECE/FAO are kindly asked to report on the quantitative and qualitative part of the questionnaire. COST Action FACESMAP correspondents are invited to support UNECE/FAO correspondents in this task, in particular in reporting on the qualitative part. For that purpose a UNECE/FAO FTS correspondent is encouraged to approach the COST Action FACESMAP correspondent after receiving the contact details from the secretariat and guide the joint work. During the joint reporting process the secretariat will act as a facilitator and support both correspondents in coordinating the joint reporting process.
2. In the case of a lack of response from UNECE/FAO correspondent, a COST Action FACESMAP correspondent would be asked to answer the questionnaire’s questions. In this case a report will have a status of a desk study.
3. The questionnaire requests provision of data that was not covered by the pan-European or the global reporting on forests. However the national correspondents are encouraged to report in a way, which ensures the highest possible consistency with the values provided for the above mentioned reporting processes.
4. The questionnaire has been prefilled with the use of existing data to the extent possible[[1]](#footnote-1). The prefilled data are of auxiliary character only and could be modified if for any reason incorrect, however please ensure that the provided data is compiled according to the definitions and methods set by the FAO Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) and the Joint FOREST EUROPE/UNECE/FAO Pan-European Reporting (pan-European Reporting). For prefilling, following sources were used:

Table 1a: FRA 2015, Table 18a

Table 2: FRA 2015, Table 18a

Table 3: pan-European Reporting 2015, Table 1.2a for *growing stock*; Table 3.1 for *net annual increment* and *annual fellings*

Table 4a: pan-European Reporting 2015, Table 3.2 (as figures for 2015 are not available yet, figures from 2012 were taken instead)

Table 7: pan-European Reporting 2015, Table 6.1 (year: 2010)

If data was *not available* in FRA 2015 or pan-European Reporting 2015 the respective cell of a table in this questionnaire was left empty.

1. If there are no figures available for the detailed forest ownership subcategories, please focus on reporting the main categories (public ownership, private ownership, unknown ownership and total respectively).
2. The questionnaire is focusing on Forest Land, countries with a significant amount of Other Wooded Land (OWL) are kindly asked to provide data on OWL too. In this case a country is asked to provide two questionnaires, one regarding Forest Land and the second regarding OWL; or selected tables regarding OWL only. Please indicate under “*General comments*” (table below introduction) if the whole questionnaire refers to OWL; respectively under table “*Country comments*” below each table in the questionnaire if selected tables on OWL are provided.
3. If forest is jointly owned by public and private forest owners, forest is assigned to the ownership category which holds the highest share. If the ownership shares are equal, the ownership entity which is the main decision maker is considered as the main.
4. Please indicate if sources for public ownership, private ownership and unknown ownership differ. Tables designated for this purpose will be found at the very end of each Reporting Form.
5. The reference years are 1990, 2010 and 2015 for most of the tables. Please refer to the reporting note at each reporting form for more detailed information.
6. Definitions where no source is provided, were exclusively developed for the purpose of this questionnaire.
7. The UNECE/FAO national correspondents and the COST Action FACESMAP respondents are kindly asked to submit jointly their completed national reporting format electronically (in Word processing software) in English to sebastian.glasenapp@unece.org and sonia.quiroga@uah.es, at the latest, by 31 October. Early submissions will greatly facilitate the Secretariat’s preparations and is highly appreciated.

|  |
| --- |
| *General comments:* |
| “Owned by the state at national level” means Federal ownership for the USA“Owned by the state at sub-national government scale” means state ownership for the USANo data available for tables: 7, 9Substantially limited data for tables: 1b, 2, 3, 4a, 4c, 6, 8References* Butler, Brett J., Jaketon H. Hewes, Brenton J. Dickinson, Kyle Andrejczyk, Marla Markowski-Lindsay, and Sarah M. Butler. 2015. “U.S. Forest Service National Woodland Owner Survey: National, Regional, and State Statistics for Family Forest and Woodland Ownerships with 10+ Acres, 2011-2013.” Res. Bull. NRS-99. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. http://dx.doi.org/10.2737/NRS-RB-99
* Oswalt, Sonja N., W. Brad Smith, Patrick D. Miles, and Scott A. Pugh. 2014. “Forest Resources of the United States, 2012.” Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-91. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. www.treesearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/47322.
* Powell, Douglas S., Joanne L. Faulkner, David R. Darr, Zhiliang Zhu, and Douglas W. MacCleery. 1993. “Forest Resources of the United States, 1992.” Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-234. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
 |

 **Part 1. Quantitative questions**

**1.1 Forest ownership**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 1: Forest ownership and management status** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| FORESTLand spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds *in situ*. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use. **Explanatory notes:**1. Forest is determined both by the presence of trees and the absence of other predominant land uses. The trees should be able to reach a minimum height of 5 meters;
2. *Includes:* areas with young trees that have not yet reached but which are expected to reach a canopy cover of at least 10 percent and tree height of 5 meters or more. It also includes areas that are temporarily unstocked due to clear-cutting as part of a forest management practice or natural disasters, and which are expected to be regenerated within 5 years. Local conditions may, in exceptional cases, justify that a longer time frame is used;
3. *Includes:* forest roads, firebreaks and other small open areas; forest in national parks, nature reserves and other protected areas such as those of specific environmental, scientific, historical, cultural or spiritual interest;
4. *Includes:* windbreaks, shelterbelts and corridors of trees with an area of more than 0.5 hectares and width of more than 20 meters;
5. *Includes:* abandoned shifting cultivation land with a regeneration of trees that have, or are expected to reach, a canopy cover of at least 10 percent and tree height of at least 5 meters;
6. *Includes:* areas with mangroves in tidal zones, regardless whether this area is classified as land area or not;
7. *Includes:* rubberwood, cork oak and Christmas tree plantations;
8. *Includes:* areas with bamboo and palms provided that land use, height and canopy cover criteria are met;
9. *Excludes:* tree stands in agricultural production systems, such as fruit tree plantations, oil palm plantations, olive orchards and agroforestry systems when crops are grown under tree cover. Note: Some agroforestry systems such as the “Taungya” system where crops are grown only during the first years of the forest rotation should be classified as forest.

(Source: FRA 2015[[2]](#footnote-2)) |

|  |
| --- |
| **FOREST AVAILABLE FOR WOOD SUPPLY (FAWS)**Forest where any legal, economic, environmental or other specific restrictions do not have a significant impact on the supply of wood. **Explanatory notes:**1. *Includes:* areas where, although there are no such restrictions, harvesting is not taking place, for example areas included in long-term utilization plans or intentions.
2. *Includes:* forests with trees that are not mature for harvesting yet but can be utilized for wood production once achieving harvesting maturity/thresholds.

(Source: Pan-European reporting 2013[[3]](#footnote-3) modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **OTHER WOODED LAND (OWL)**Land not defined as “Forest”, spanning more than 0.5 hectares; with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of 5-10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds; or with a combined cover of shrubs, bushes and trees above 10 percent. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.**Explanatory notes:**1. The definition above has two options:
2. The canopy cover of trees is between 5 and 10 percent; trees should be higher than 5 meters or able to reach 5 meters.
3. The canopy cover of trees is less than 5 percent but the combined cover of shrubs, bushes and trees is more than 10 percent. Includes areas of shrubs and bushes where no trees are present.
4. *Includes:* areas with trees that will not reach a height of at least 5 meters and with a canopy cover of 10 percent or more, e.g. some alpine tree vegetation types, arid zone mangroves, etc.
5. *Includes:* area with bamboo and palms provided that land use, height and canopy cover criteria are met.

(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |
| --- |
| **FOREST OWNERSHIP**Generally refers to the legal right to freely and exclusively use, control, transfer, or otherwise benefit from a forest. Ownership can be acquired through transfers such as sales, donations, and inheritance.(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP**Forest owned by the State; or administrative units of the Public Administration; or by institutions or corporations owned by the public administration.**Explanatory notes:**1. *Includes*: all the hierarchical levels of Public Administration (state or communal) within a country, e.g. State, Federal country/Province and Local governments.
2. Shareholder corporations that are partially State-owned are considered as under public ownership when the State holds a majority of the shares.
3. Public ownership may exclude the possibility to transfer ownership rights.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified)

|  |
| --- |
| **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP BY THE STATE AT NATIONAL LEVEL (Sub-category)**Forest owned by the State or by administrative units of the Public (State) Administration or by institutions or corporations owned by the Public (State) Administration at the national scale.(Source FRA 2015 modified) |
| **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP BY THE STATE AT SUB-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT SCALE (Sub-category)**Forest owned by the State or by administrative units of the Public (State) Administration or by institutions or corporations owned by the Public (State) Administration at the sub-national government scale (e.g. Provinces and territories (Canada), Bundesländer (Germany), Regioni (Italy), Comunidades autónomas (Spain) and States (USA)).(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
| **PUBLIC OWNERSHIP BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Sub-category)**Forest owned by a local government having a local sphere of competence. The legislative, judicial, and executive authority of local government units is restricted to the smallest geographic areas distinguished for administrative and political purposes (i.e. counties, municipalities, cities, towns, townships, boroughs, school districts, and water or sanitation districts). **Explanatory notes:**1. The scope of a local government’s authority is generally much less than that of the government at national or sub-national level, which should be reported under categories “Public ownership by the state at national level” or “Public ownership by the state at sub-national government scale” respectively.
2. Local governments may or may not be entitled to levy taxes on institutional units or economic activities taking place in their areas. They are often dependent on grants from higher levels of government, and act to some extent as agents of governments at national or sub-national level.
3. To be treated as institutional units local governments must be entitled to own assets, raise funds, and incur liabilities by borrowing on their own account. They must also have discretion over how such funds are spent, and they should be able to appoint their own officers independently of external administrative control.

(Source: ESA 2010[[4]](#footnote-4) modified) |

 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PRIVATE OWNERSHIP**Forest owned by individuals, families, communities, corporations and other business entities, private religious and educational institutions, pension or investment funds, NGOs, nature conservation associations and other private institutions.**Explanatory note:** 1. “Communities” are understood here in the sense of “tribal and indigenous communities”. Please see the definition of the relevant subcategory (“Private ownership by tribal and indigenous communities”) below.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified)

|  |
| --- |
| **PRIVATE OWNERSHIP BY INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES (Sub-category)**Forest owned by individuals and families.**Explanatory note:** 1. *Includes:* individuals’ or family owned businesses.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
| **PRIVATE OWNERSHIP BY PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTITIES (Sub-category)**Forest owned by private corporations, companies and other business entities etc.**Explanatory note:**1. *Excludes:* companies that are owned by individuals and families which should be reported under the subcategory above (“private ownership by individuals and families”).

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
| **PRIVATE OWNERSHIP BY PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS (Sub-category)**Forest owned by private non-profit organizations such as NGOs, nature conservation associations, and private religious and educational institutions, etc.(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
| **PRIVATE OWNERSHIP BY TRIBAL AND INDIGINEOUS COMMUNITIES** **(Sub-category)**Forest owned by communities of tribal or indigenous people. The community members are co-owners that share exclusive rights and duties; and benefits contribute to the community development.**Explanatory notes:**1. *Tribal communities:* Tribal people whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partly by their own customs or traditions or by special laws and regulations.
2. *Indigenous communities:* People regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the population which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at a time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all their own social, economic cultural and political institutions.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
| **OTHER PRIVATE COMMON OWNERSHIP (Sub-category)**Forest owned in common by a group of individuals or other private entities. The shareholders are co-owners with exclusive rights, duties and benefits associated with the ownership.**Explanatory note:**1. *Includes:* “Commons” - resource property regimes that are shared among users, where management rules are derived and operated on self-management, collective actions and self-organization (of rules and decisions). Common property regimes are well established in some European countries e.g. Portugal, Sweden, Slovakia, Romania and Italy.
 |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **UNKNOWN OWNERSHIP**Forest area where ownership is unknown, includes areas where ownership is unclear or disputed.(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOREST MANAGEMENT**Forest management is a system of measures to protect, maintain, establish and tend forest; ensure provision of goods and services; protect forest against fire, pest and diseases; regulate forest production; check the use of forest resources; and monitor forests; as well as to plan, organize and carry out the above mentioned measures. **Explanatory notes:**1. The management of forests can be done by either forest owners or wholly or partly delegated to others (e.g. public (state) administration, private companies, individuals, etc.).
2. Forest management is often organized, implemented in accordance with a formal or an informal plan applied regularly over a sufficiently long period; however the existence of a forest management plan is not a prerequisite for forest management.
3. *Includes*: set aside forest area.

|  |
| --- |
| **PRIMARILY MANAGED BY THE OWNER (Sub-category)**Forests, where the owner is the main decision maker. |
| **PRIMARILY MANAGED BY OTHERS (Sub-category)**Forests, where the main decision makers are others than their owners. **Explanatory notes:**1. Other decision makers can be e.g. public administration in the sense of state administration units at national and sub-national (Federal country/Provinces) scale and, institutions or corporations owned by the state or state administration units, or local governments; or managed by private companies; communities; or individuals; or managed jointly by more than one of the management categories mentioned.
2. *Includes*: communities – that are understood as self-defined, formal and informal, rural and urban forest user groups with shared values, knowledge and interests in forest management. The interests may include: property use and access rights; livelihoods based on the production of timber and non-timber products; employment; cultural identity; leisure and recreation; biodiversity conservation; and ecological restoration. This perspective also includes communities of interest which are not necessarily defined by location. (Source: WG-CIFM[[5]](#footnote-5) modified)
 |
| **UNKNOWN FOREST MANAGEMENT STATUS (Sub-category)**Forests where the decision makers are unknown.  |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FOREST MANAGEMENT DESCISION MAKER**A party who is responsible for deciding on the general management of property, includes setting the management goal for e.g. water protection, wood production, landscape protection, and deciding on main management activities e.g. harvesting, planting, developing infrastructure etc. |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| FIADB Database | High | Forest area and FAWS | 2015, 2010 | NFI |  |
| Powell et al. 1993 | High | Forest area and FAWS | 1990 | NFI |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 1a: Area of forest and Forest Available for Wood Supply (FAWS)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Forest area (1000 ha)** | **Of which FAWS (1000 ha)** |
|  | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 |
| **Public ownership (total)** | 86,801 | 98,547  | 99,235  | 53,213 | 60,680  | 61,177  |
|  | Owned by the state at national level | 68,025 | 76,275  | 76,204  | 39,115 | 43,859  | 43,673  |
| Owned by the state at sub-national government scale | 15,151 | 17,060  | 17,548  | 11,071 | 12,466  | 12,912  |
| Owned by local government | 3,625 | 5,212  | 5,483  | 3,029 | 4,355  | 4,593  |
| Other | - | -  | -  | - | -  | -  |
| **Private ownership (total)**  | 166,107 | 166,259  | 166,310  | 144,902 | 145,035  | 144,533  |
|  | Owned by individuals and families | 109,189 | 109,288  | 107,148  | 93,871 | 93,957  | 91,804  |
| Owned by private business entities | 46,784 | 46,827  | 49,425  | 44,217 | 44,257  | 46,046  |
| Owned by private institutions | 1,474 | 1,475  | 1,468  | 1,356 | 1,357  | 1,347  |
| Owned by tribal and indigenous communities  | 3,658 | 3,661  | 3,283  | 2,716 | 2,718  | 2,771  |
| Owned by other private common ownership | 4,999 | 5,004  | 4,982  | 2,740 | 2,742  | 2,562  |
| Other | 3 | 3  | 4  | 3 | 3  | 4  |
| **Unknown ownership (total)** | - | -  | -  | - | -  | -  |
| **TOTAL** | 252,907 | 264,806  | 265,545  | 198,116 | 205,715  | 205,710  |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| FIADB Database | High | Forest area | 2015, 2010 | NFI |  |
| Powell et al. 1993 | High | Forest area | 1990 | NFI |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 1b: Area of forest by management status

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | Forest area primarily managed by the owner (1000 ha) | Forest area primarily managed by others (1000 ha) | Unknown forest management status (1000 ha) |
|  | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 |
| **Public ownership (total)** | 86,801 | 98,547  | 99,235  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Owned by the state at national level | 68,025 | 76,275  | 76,204  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Owned by the state at sub-national government scale | 15,151 | 17,060  | 17,548  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Owned by local government | 3,625 |  5,212  | 5,483  | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other | - | -  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Private ownership (total)**  | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 166,107 | 166,259  | 166,310  |
|  | Owned by individuals and families | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 109,189 |  109,288  |  107,148  |
| Owned by private business entities | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 46,784 |  46,827  |  49,425  |
| Owned by private institutions | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 1,474 |  1,475  |  1,468  |
| Owned by tribal and indigenous communities  | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 3,658 |  3,661  |  3,283  |
| Owned by other private common ownership | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 4,999 |  5,004  |  4,982  |
| Other | - | -  | - | - | - | - | 3 | 3  | 4  |
| **Unknown ownership (total)** | - | -  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL** | 86,801 | 98,547  | 99,235  | - | - | - | 166,107 | 166,259  | 166,310  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tables 1a and 1b category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
| Table 1B, Public | It is assumed that all public lands are managed by the public agency that owns it. |
| Table 1B, Private | The largest percentage of private that is managed by others is TIMOs, but we do not have a good estimate of their acreage. There are some individuals that rely on foresters for decisions, but it is a relatively small percentage (Butler et al. 2015). |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tables 1a and 1b category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
| Table 1A, 2010 and 2015 | Excludes interior Alaska and Hawaii |
| Table 1A, 1990 Forest area | Ratio estimates based on Powell et al. FAWS statistics |
|  |  |

**Reporting note:**

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting years refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (1990, 2010 and 2015) noted in the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 2: Forest properties** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **PROPERTY**The forest area owned by one owner (as defined below), including all parcels of land in a country.**Explanatory notes:**1. *Includes:* all parcels of forest land owned by an owner, also if the parcels are managed in different ways.
2. For properties with shared ownership, they should be reported according to the category, which hold the majority of shares.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **OWNER**An owner is understood as any type of physical or legal entity having an ownership interest in a property, regardless of the number of people involved. An owner may belong to public ownership (i.e. the state, a local government unit) or private ownership (i.e. an individual, a combination of individuals; a legal entity such as a corporation or institution). |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| Birch (1996) – Table 3 | High | Private ownership | 1990 | NFI | Reporting year: 1993 |
| Butler (2008) | High | Private ownership | 2010 | NFI | Reporting year: 2006 |
| Butler et al. (2015) | High | Private ownership | 2015 | NFI | Reporting year: 2012 |
| Protected Areas Database | Medium | Public Ownerships | 2015 | O: Various GIS layers |  |

# Table 2: Area and number of forest properties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Year** | **Area and number of forest properties by size** |
| **Total**  | **≤ 10 ha** | **11-50 ha** | **51-500 ha** | **≥ 500 ha** |
| Area(1000 ha) | Number | Area(1000 ha) | Number | Area(1000 ha) | Number | Area (1000 ha) | Number | Area(1000 ha) | Number |
| Public ownership (total)  | 2015 | 99,235  | 3,180  | 2  | 431  | 38  | 1,039  | 344  | 1,080  | 98,851  | 630  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | …of which owned by local government | 2015 | 5,483  | 2,993  | 2  | 431  | 36  | 1,032  | 327  | 1,076  | 5,119  | 454  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private ownership (total) | 2015 | 166,310 | 11,214,000 | 7,897 | 6,971,000 | 41,318 | 3,617,346 | 48,200 | 591,000 | 68,895 | 33,926 |
| 2010 | 166,259 | 11,106,000 | 9,041 | 6,821,000 | 45,988 | 3,644,000 | 51,047 | 602,000 | 60,183 | 39,000 |
| 1990 | 166,107 | 9,902,000 | 7,011 | 5,795,000 | 45,444 | 3,479,000 | 49,034 | 600,000 | 64,618 | 27,000 |
| Unknown ownership (total) | 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 2015 | 265,545 | 11,217,180 | 7,899 | 6,971,431 | 41,356 | 3,618,385 | 48,544 | 592,080 | 167,746 | 34,556 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 2 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
| Size categories | The closest we have is: 0.5-4 ha; 4 – 40 ha; 40-404 ha; >= 405 ha (1-9 ac; 10-99 ac; 100-999 ac; >= 1,000 ac) and these are the categories used for all data in Table 2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 2 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
| Size, Public, 2010 and 1990 | No data available. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting note:**

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting years refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (1990, 2010 and 2015) noted in the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 3: Characteristics of Forest Available for Wood Supply (FAWS)** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **GROWING STOCK**Volume over bark of all living trees with a minimum diameter of 10 cm at breast height (or above buttress if these are higher). Includes the stem from ground level up to a top diameter of 0 cm, excluding branches. **Explanatory notes:**1. Diameter breast height refers to diameter over bark measured at a height of 1.3 m above ground level, or above buttresses, if these are higher.
2. *Includes:* living trees that are lying on the ground.
3. *Excludes:* smaller branches, twigs, foliage, flowers, seeds, and roots.

(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |
| --- |
| **NET ANNUAL INCREMENT**Average annual volume of gross increment over the given reference period less that of natural losses on all trees, measured to minimum diameters as defined for “Growing stock”.(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |
| --- |
| **ANNUAL FELLINGS**Average annual standing volume of all trees, living or dead, measured overbark to a minimum diameter of 10 cm (d.b.h.) that are felled during the given reference period, including the volume of trees or parts of trees that are not removed from the forest, other wooded land or other felling site. **Explanatory note:**1. *Includes*: silvicultural and pre-commercial thinnings and cleanings left in the forest; and natural losses that are recovered (harvested).

(Source: TBFRA 2000[[6]](#footnote-6) modified) |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| FIA Evalidator | High | All | 2010, 2015 | NFI |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 3: Growing stock, growth and drain

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Growing stock****(million m3 over bark)** | **Net annual increment (1000 m3 over bark)** | **Annual fellings****(1000 m3 over bark)** |
|  | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 | 1990 | 2010 | 2015 |
| Public ownership (total) |  | 15,937.62  | 16,497.76  |  | 119,959.01  | 109,668.90  |  | 38,262.10  | 39,848.19  |
|  | …of which owned by local government |  | 755.41 | 832.86 |  | 25,207.75 | 27,204.30 |  | 7,451.06  | 9,533.79 |
| Private ownership (total) |  | 25,079.14  | 26,310.01  |  | 772,804.17  | 775,512.22  |  | 521,998.19  | 478,292.77  |
| Unknown ownership (total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 41,016.76  | 42,807.77  |  | 892,763.18  | 885,181.12  |  | 560,260.29  | 518,140.96  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
| 1990 | Comparable data for these ownership categories are not available. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting notes:**

1. ***Reference years for growing stock:*** The figures for the reporting years refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (1990, 2010 and 2015) noted in the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.
2. ***Reference years for net annual increment and annual fellings:*** The figures for the reporting years refer to the average for the 5-year periods (1988-1992 for 1990, 2008-2012 for 2010 respectively 2013-2014 for 2015), not to the data for the “central year” (1990, 2010 and 2015) noted in the Table.
3. For a definition of Forest Available for Wood Supply (FAWS) please consult the terms and definitions in Reporting Form 1.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 4: Economic indicators** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **WOOD REMOVALS**The wood removed for production of goods and energy regardless whether for industrial, commercial or domestic use.**Explanatory notes:**1. The term “removal” differs from “felling” as it excludes harvesting losses (stemwood) and trees that were felled but not removed.
2. *Includes:* removals from fellings in an earlier period and from trees killed or damaged by natural causes.
3. *Includes:* all wood collected or removed for energy purposes, such as fuelwood, wood for charcoal production, harvesting residues, stumps, etc.
4. *Excludes:* woodfuel which is produced as a by-product or residual matter from industrial processing of roundwood.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMERCIAL VALUE OF WOOD REMOVALS**For the purpose of this table, value of wood removals is defined as the commercial market value at the site of harvest, road side or forest border. **Explanatory note:**1. If values are obtained from a point further down the production chain, transport costs and possible handling and/or processing costs should be subtracted whenever possible.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **CERTIFIED AREA**Forest area certified under a forest management certification scheme with published standards that are nationally and/or internationally recognized and independently verified by a third-party.**Explanatory notes:**1. *Includes:* forest area under Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and/or Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification schemes (PEFC).
2. Areas under different international certification should not be added together as they may overlap.
3. This refers only to forest management certifications and excludes areas covered only by chain of custody certification.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **NON-WOOD FOREST PRODUCTS (NWFP)**Goods derived from forests and other wooded land that are tangible and physical objects of biological origin other than wood.**Explanatory notes:**1. Generally includes non-wood plant and animal products collected from areas defined as forest (see definition of forest).
2. Specifically includes the following regardless of whether from natural forests or plantations:
* gum arabic, rubber/latex and resin;
* Christmas trees, cork, bamboo and rattan.
1. Generally excludes products collected in tree stands in agricultural production systems, such as fruit tree plantations, oil palm plantations and agroforestry systems when crops are grown under tree cover.
2. Specifically excludes the following:
* woody raw materials and products, such as chips, charcoal, fuelwood and wood used for tools, household equipment and carvings;
* grazing in the forest;
* fish and shellfish.

(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMERCIAL VALUE OF NON-WOOD FOREST PRODUCTS (NWFP)**For the purpose of reporting on this variable, value is defined as the commercial market value at the forest gate.**Explanatory note:**1. If values are obtained from a point further down the production chain, transport costs and possible handling and/or processing costs should be subtracted whenever possible.

(Source: FRA 2015) |

|  |
| --- |
| **FOREST ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (FES)**Forest ecosystem services (other than production of goods) comprise ecological, biospheric, social, amenity and other services that are forest-dependent or mainly forest-related.**Explanatory notes:**1. **Ecological services:** Include services related to the prevention of soil erosion, preservation of water resources, maintenance of other environmental functions and protection of infrastructure as well as management of natural resources against natural hazards.
2. **Biospheric services**: Include services related to:
	* Protection of forests and other wooded land to conserve biodiversity, landscapes and specific natural elements;
	* Forests conservation and utilization of forest tree genetic resources (*in-situ* or *ex-situ* gene conservation of genetic resources) and for seeding.

This class also includes carbon-sequestration related afforestation projects in the context of the Kyoto Protocol.1. **Social services**: Include e.g. hunting or fishing licences, renting of huts and houses as well as forest-based leisure, sport and outdoor adventure activities and educational services.
2. **Amenity services**: Include those related to spiritual, cultural and historical functions, e.g. sacred, religious, or other forms of spiritual inspiration, sites of worship , landscape features (mountains and waterfalls), “memories’’ in the landscape from past cultural ties, aesthetic enjoyment and inspiration, historic artefacts.
3. **Other services**: Include e.g. payments to woodland owners for licences for gravel extraction, telecommunication masts, wind farms and electricity distribution.

(Source: Pan-European reporting 2013 modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMERCIAL VALUE OF FOREST ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (FES)**Value of forest ecosystem services collected from the production of forest ecosystem services. For this purpose value may include concession fees and royalties, taxes and charges based on forest area special levies on forestry activities and payments into forest-related funds, other miscellaneous inspection, licence and administrative fees levied by forest administrations, permit and licence fees for recreation and other forest related activities that are directly related to the provision of forest ecosystem services.(Source: Pan-European reporting 2013 modified) |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| FIA Evalidator | High | Removals | 2010, 2015 | NFI |  |
| Certification organization websites and personal communications | High | Certified area | 2015 | O: Self- reporting | Cannot account for overlap |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 4a: Wood removals and certified area

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Year** | **Total wood removals** | **Certified area**  |
| Volume (1000 m3) | Value(1000 local currency) | Area (1000 ha) |
| Public ownership (total) | 2015 | 39,848,192 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
|  | …of which owned by local government | 2015 | 9,533,786 |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
| Private ownership (total) | 2015 |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 478,292,768 |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
| Unknown ownership (total) | 2015 |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 2015 | 518,140,960 |  | +23,900 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| James Chamberlain, US Forest Service (personal communication) | Low | All | 2015 | O: Various studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 4b: Main Non-Wood Forest Products (NWFP) in 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Rank (importance)** | **Name of product** | **Unit (e.g. local currency, kg etc.)** | **Value/ Quantity** |
| Public ownership (total) | 1st | Pine nuts | US$ | $922,000 |
| 2nd | Christmas trees | US$ | $48,000,000 |
| 3rd | Galax | US$ | $18,000,000 |
| 4th  | Crafts & Florals | US$ | $69,000,000 |
| 5th  | Edible & culinary | US$ | $31,000,000 |
| Private ownership (total) | 1st | American Ginseng | US$ | $27,000,000 |
| 2nd | Maple syrup | US$ | $21,000,000 |
| 3rd | Saw Palmetto | US$ | $14,000,000 |
| 4th  | Blueberries | US$ | $69,000,000 |
| 5th  | Pine straw | US$ | $90,000,000 |

|  |
| --- |
| *Please insert additional information on NWFP here:* |
|  |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| Evan Mercer, US Forest Service (personal communication) | Low | All | 2015 | O: Various studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 4c: Main Forest Ecosystem Services (FES) in 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Rank (importance)** | **Name of service** | **Local currency**  | **Value** |
| Public ownership (total) | 1st |  |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |  |
| 3rd |  |  |  |
| 4th  |  |  |  |
| 5th  |  |  |  |
| Private ownership (total) | 1st | Wildlife habitat/hunting | US | $861 million |
| 2nd | Federal payments for "bundled services" | US | $588 million |
| 3rd | Wetland mitigation | US | $446 million |
| 4th  | Conservation easements/ banks | US | $251 million |
| 5th  | Carbon offsets | US | $6.5 million |

|  |
| --- |
| *Please insert additional information on FES here:* |
| Estimates for private ownerships are based on the amount of revenues that landowners received in 2012. These are not Values but rather actual payments received and are from my analysis for the 2010 National Report on Sustainable Forests. There are state-level estimated values for forest ecosystem services, but they use different methodologies and focus on different sets of ecosystem services and different motivations and the results vary by an order of magnitude from $151/acre to $1700/acre. |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tables 4a, 4b and 4c category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
| Table 4a, Certified area | The three major certification programs in the US are the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), and American Tree Farm System (ATFS). Some landowners have their land certified under more than one system and there is no data currently available on the overlap. We know there are more than 23.9 M ha certified, but it is not possible to definitively say how many more, but I would guess many millions. There is also no data available on is the certified acreage is on public or private lands, but we know there are both.SFI: 23,900,000 haFSC: 13,600,000 haATFS: 9,700,000 ha |
| Table 4c, Public | No data available |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tables 4a, 4b and 4c category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting notes**:

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting years refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year”, 1990, 2010 and 2015 for total wood removals; 2010 and 2015 for certified area; 2015 for Non-Wood Forest Products (NWFP) and; 2015 for Forest Ecosystem Services (FES), or in a nearest year for which data is available.
2. Roundwood is to be reported “under bark”.
3. The value of roundwood reported should be the market value at the site of removal. If possible, felled (roadside) values should be reported. If a different basis is used (e.g. standing sales value), values should be converted to felled (roadside). In the case where values are obtained from a point further down the production chain, transport costs and possible handling and/or processing costs should be discounted. Values and conversion factors used in the calculation should be provided in the country specifications.
4. Please feel free to add more rows for NWFP and FES if you want to report more.

**1.2 Public Ownership**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 5: Structure of public forest ownership** |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| FIADB Database | High | All | 2015 | NFI |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 5: Institutional framework of the public forest in 2015

|  |
| --- |
| **Institutional Framework** |
| **Major Ministry managing Public Forests**  | *US Forest Service* | *63,052* | [1000 ha] |
|  | Of which managed by *state forest management organisation* | *US Forest Service* | *63,052* | [1000 ha] |
| Main management level: | [x]  National | [ ]  Sub-national | [ ]  Local  |
| **Other Ministry managing Public Forests** | *Bureau of Land Management* | *13,463* | [1000 ha] |
| **Other Ministry managing Public Forests** | *National Park Service* | *4,045* | [1000 ha] |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 5 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 5 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  | There are many other federal agencies in the US, but these control the largest acreage. There are also many state (sub-national) and local agencies. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting notes:**

1. This table seeks to provide information about the distribution of the supervision of the public forests (management) among the public administration units (e.g. educational forests supervised by a ministry of education, military forest supervised by a ministry of defence, protected forests managed by a ministry of environment, productive forests managed by ministry of agriculture/industry, etc.).
2. The expression “Main management level:” distinguishes between the three main levels of governments: national, sub-national and local. Please see the Reporting Form 1, “public ownership” for a more detailed definition.
3. Please feel free to add more categories (respectively rows) if needed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 6: State forests management organisations** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STATE FOREST MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION (SFMO)**A state forest management organisation (SFMO) is the entity that is responsible for the supervision and the organisation of the execution of the management of state owned forest. SFMO represents a variety of legal, organisational and financial frameworks. With some degree of generality, from the point of view of the relationship to the state budget financing, for this reporting three forms of SFMOs are distinguished: State budget financed organisations/units; State owned organisations/enterprises/companies; and Non-state entities.**Explanatory notes:**1. Please see the definition of Forest Management at Reporting Form 1.
2. The forest management organisation is not necessarily the Forest Management Decision Maker. Please see the definition of Forest Management Decision Maker at Reporting Form 1.

|  |
| --- |
| **STATE BUDGET FINANCED ORGANISATIONS/UNITS**Forest management organisations that are funded through the state budget. The state budget financing is provided by the state on national or sub-national level and available on a regular basis (e.g. each year). **Explanatory notes:**1. Revenues produced by the forest management are not available to the forest management organisation but returned to the state budget.
2. The forest management organisation might benefit from direct and indirect subsidies.
3. Forest management organisation doesn’t own forests and only manages them as a state property.
 |
| **STATE OWNED ORGANISATIONS/ENTERPRISES/COMPANIES**Comprises forest management organisations of various legal statuses that function as state owned enterprises, public law companies, limited companies, etc. Their finances are generally independent from the state budget. They generate their own income from managing the state property to cover the accumulating costs. These forest management organisations are detached from the government administration system and act as independent organisations (like companies) however, the state as the owner/shareholder has significant control (supervision) over the forest management organisation.**Explanatory notes:**1. A state owned enterprise/organisation might pursue commercial as well as non-commercial goals.
2. The forest management organisation transfers dividends or other contributions in cash to the state budget on a regular basis (e.g. every month). Subsidies for certain services might be provided to the organisation.
3. Forest is not owned by the described forest management organisation but only managed.
 |
| **NON-STATE ENTITIES**Forest management organisations that manage state owned forest land based on lease or rental contracts and provide services to private business entities and receive funding in return. **Explanatory notes:**1. The forest management organisation could be a part or branch of a private company and might pursue commercial as well as non-commercial goals.
2. The forest management organisation may pay a rent fee to the state budget on the state property used. Subsidies for certain services might be provided by the state to the organisation for pursuing non-commercial goals.
3. Forest is not owned by the described forest management organisation.
 |

 |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| USDA Forest Service, Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Overview | High | National | 2015 | O: Financial report |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 6: State forests management organisations in 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main management level** | **State budget financed organisations/units** | **State owned organisations/enterprises/companies** | **Non-state entities** | **Others\*** |
| Turnover [1000 local currency] | Forest area [1000 ha] | Turnover [1000 local currency] | Forest area [1000 ha] | Turnover [1000 local currency] | Forest area [1000 ha] | Turnover [1000 local currency]  | Forest area [1000 ha] |
| National level | $6,264,941 | 78,100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-national level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*\*Please provide the appropriate definition for other state forest management organisations in the country comments.*

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 6 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  | These figures are only for the largest public forest agency in the USA, the US Forest Service. Funding and staffing for the USFS is used for more than just management, but the exact figures are not available. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 6 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
| Does a state forest management organisation have any administrative functions (on public or private forests) that are normally served by the state? Please give a short overview about the situation in your country: | Yes. Public agencies management public forest lands. They also administer programs to help private landowners. And, where applicable, enforce laws and regulations. |
|  | There are many public agencies that manage forest lands. There is no central repository of who they are or what their budgets are. And for many agencies, they do more than manage forest lands, so the budget for forest management is not clear. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting notes:**

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting year refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (2015) noted in the headline of the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.
2. The expression “Main management level:” distinguishes between the three main levels of governments: national, sub-national and local. Please see the Reporting Form 1, “public ownership” for a more detailed definition.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 7: Structure of public forest holdings** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **PUBLIC FOREST HOLDING**One or more parcels of forest which constitute a single unit from the point of view of management or utilization. A holding may be defined as the management unit, for which a forest management plan (or its equivalent) is developed, e.g. forest district or forest superintendence, national park.**Explanatory note:**1. Holding is different than property, e.g. state owned forests constitute one property, which might be managed through more than one holding (e.g. forest districts, national parks, hunting areas).

(Source: TBFRA 2000 modified) |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 7: Area and number of forest holdings in 2015

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Area and number of forest holdings by size** |
| **Total** | **≤10 ha** | **11-500 ha** | **501-10,000 ha** | **10,001-100,000 ha** | **>100,000 ha** |
| Area(1000 ha) | No. of holdings | Area(1000 ha) | No. of holdings | Area(1000 ha) | No. of holdings | Area (1000 ha) | No. of holdings | Area(1000 ha) | No. of holdings | Area(1000 ha) | No. of holdings |
| **Public ownership (total)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owned by the state at national level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owned by the state at sub-national government scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Owned by local government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 7 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  | No data on this topic are available for the USA. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 7 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting note:**

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting year refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (2015) noted in the headline of the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 8: Workforce in public forests** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **FOREST MANAGERS**Persons that are directly involved in forest management and have managerial responsibilities for planning organizing, supervising and managing forests (i.e. managers, supervisors, officers, as well as other specialists). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FIELD FOREST WORKERS**Persons directly performing forest operations in the field e.g. planting, logging, protection activities (e.g. chain-saw operators, harvester operators)

|  |
| --- |
| **EMPLOYEES (Sub-category)**Workers that are regular employees of the entity that holds the management rights of the forest. |
| **CONTRACTORS (Sub-category)**Workers that are employed through agreements to perform specified activities. |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **OTHER STAFF**Persons supporting the process of forest management (i.e. specialists, technical staff, clerical workers etc.). They are neither forest workers nor do they have managerial responsibility for planning, organizing, supervising and managing forests. |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| USDA Forest Service, Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Overview | High | National | 2015 | O: Financial report |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 8: Workforce in public forests in 2015

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Forest managers** | **Field forest workers** | **Other staff** |
| employees | contractors |
| Public ownership (total) |  |  |  |  |
| Of which in state forest management organisation |  |  |  | 32,872\* |
| Of which owned by local government |  |  |  |  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 8 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  | \* Only includes US Forest Service employees. Numbers are not available by the proscribed categories. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 8 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting note:**

1. ***Reference years:*** The figures for the reporting year refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (2015) noted in the headline of the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.

**1.3 Private Ownership**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 9: Removals from private forest properties** |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 9: Removals from private forest properties in 2010

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ownership category** | **Removals (1000 m3) from properties by size classes** |
| Total | < 10ha | 11-50 ha | 51-500 ha | > 500 ha |
| Private ownership (total) |  |  |  |  |  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 9 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  | Data for this table are not available for the USA. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 9 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting notes**:

1. ***Reference year:*** The figures for the reporting year refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (2010) noted in the headline of the table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.
2. For a definition of **Wood Removals** and **Property** please consult the terms and definitions in Reporting Form 4 respectively Reporting Form 2.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 10: Demographic information on individual forest owners** |

|  |
| --- |
| **PRIMARY OWNER**The owner listed on the title of a property. If there are two or more owners of the property, the name of the primary owner appears first. The owner may be an individual or a group. There may also be two primary owners of a property. For example, in the case of a married couple, the husband and the wife may both be primary owners.(Source: PropertyFinderTM [[7]](#footnote-7) modified)  |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| Butler et al. 2015 | High | Age, gender | 2015 | NFI |  |
| Butler 2008 | High | Age, gender | 2010 | NFI |  |
| Birch 1996 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 10: Individual forest owners by age and gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year** | **Age classes (years)** | **Number of primary owners** | **Share of female primary owners [%]** |
| Individual owners | 2015 | Total | 10,656,000 | 21.3 |
| 2010 | 10,361,000 | 11.3 |
| 1990 | 9,902,000 |  |
| 2015 | < 40 | 3,046,484 | 21.4 |
| 2010 |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |
| 2015 | 40 to 60 | 3,347,512 | 20.4 |
| 2010 |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |
| 2015 | > 60 | 4,262,004 | 22.0 |
| 2010 |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 10 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 10 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting note**:

1. **Reference years:** The figures for the reporting years refer to the situation in a reference year, a “central year” (1990, 2010 and 2015) noted in the Table, or in a nearest year for which data is available.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reporting form 11: Social background and objectives of individual forest owners** |

**Terms and definitions**

|  |
| --- |
| OBJECTIVES OF INDIVIDUAL FOREST OWNERSAesthetic enjoyment: Forest primarily owned for its aesthetic values.Farm and domestic use: Forest primarily owned for farming and domestic purposes (e.g. fuelwood for private use, pasture areas).Land investment: Forest primarily owned for monetary reasons e.g. to hedge against inflation.Part of residence/farm: Forest primarily owned because it is a part of the owner’s residence/farm.Recreation: Forest primarily owned for recreational purposes.Timber production: Forest primarily owned for production of wood, fibre, bio-energy and/or non-wood forest products.(Source: Private Forest Land Owners of the United States 1994[[8]](#footnote-8)) |

|  |
| --- |
| PLACE OF USUAL RESIDENCEPlace of usual residence is the geographic place where the enumerated person usually resides; or it may be the person’s legal residence. A person's usual residence should be that at which the person spends most of her/his daily night rest.(Source: UNECE Statistical Standards and Studies- No. 49 modified[[9]](#footnote-9)) |

**Data Sources:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References to sources of information** | **Quality**  | **Category** | **Year(s)** | **Type of inventory** | **Additional comments** |
| Butler et al. 2015 | High | All | 2015 | NFI |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Table 11: Occupation, residence and objectives of individual forest owners

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *a) Occupation* |   |   |   |
|  | Field/Status of occupation | Share of owners [%] | Share of forest area [%] |
| Individual owners | Agriculture/Forestry (total) | 9.3% | 14.6% |
| Agriculture/Forestry (full-time) |  |  |
| Agriculture/Forestry (part-time) |  |  |
| Outside Agriculture/Forestry | 39.6% | 36.4% |
| Pensioner | 51.1% | 49.0% |

|  |
| --- |
| *b) Place of usual residence* |
|  | Location of residence | Share of owners [%] | Share of forest area [%] |
| Individual owners | Primary residence in vicinity of their forest property | 62.5% | 56.0% |
| …of which farmers (active or retired) |  |  |
| Primary residence is not in vicinity of their forest property  | 37.5% | 44.0% |
| …of which in cites/towns  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| *c) Objectives of ownership* |
|  | Objectives | Share of owners [%] | Share of forest area [%] |
| Individual owners | Aesthetic enjoyment | 77.9% | 75.8% |
| Farm and domestic use | 38.4% | 50.4% |
| Land investment | 47.7% | 56.5% |
| Part of residence/farm | 57.4% | 50.0% |
| Recreation\* | 54.2% | 44.2% |
| Timber production | 22.4% | 36.6% |
| Other\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

**Country comments:**

1. Harmonization of reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 11 category | Comments related to the relevance of national classifications and definitions to the system proposed in this questionnaire. |
|  | \* Only includes hunting |
|  | \*\* This category is highly depending on number of other categories asked and would likely be 100%. We have plenty of “other” but it would take some to tabulate and would likely not be meaningful. |
|  |  |

2. Description of reported data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 11 category | Comments on the reported status and trends. Information about subregional variety. Additional information, examples, description of the reported area.*Please provide this information, in particular if quantitative data is not available; use additional sheets if needed.*  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Reporting note:**

1. Please provide data for recent available year.

# Part 2. Qualitative Questions

* 1. **FOREST OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT**
		1. **How have forest ownership structure and management changed since 1990?**

*Significance: 0 (not relevant); 1 (to some extent); 2 (rather important); 3 (highly important)*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Changes between public and private ownership**
 |
| Forest ownership structure (public/private) is influenced by… |
| *Please select the period of time you are referring to:* | [x]  *1990-2000* | [x]  *2000-2014* |
| 1. Restitution of forest land (returning state forest land to previous owners such as local governments; or private individuals or institutions).
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. Privatization of forest land (selling state forest land to other owners such as local governments; or private individuals or institutions).
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. Nationalization or preservation of public ownership of a forest.
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. Forest land is purchased by public forest owners.
 | *0* ***1*** *2 3* | *0* ***1*** *2 3* |
| 1. *Others, namely:*

|  |
| --- |
| Conversion of vertically integrated forestry companies to TIMOs and REITs |

 | *0 1 2* ***3*** | *0* ***1*** *2 3* |

Please explain shortly and/or give case examples for each of these trends that are relevant in your country. Please indicate also if there are scientific studies or other material available for further investigation or experts that could be contacted. If data in *Table 1a* (quantitative part) is considered as not sufficient please add quantitative figures where possible. This will reveal how much ownership really changed (e.g. how much forest is restituted, privatised [%, ha]). The description should be max. 1 page long.

|  |
| --- |
| *Please insert a short description here:* |
| Conversion of vertically integrated forestry companies to TIMOs and REITs occurred mainly in the 1990s, but there still a lack of good statistics on current acreage owned by TIMOs and REITs. We, the Forest Service, FIA program, are currently working to fill this void. Some references on the reasons for this transition and its consequences (or lack thereof) are:Binkley CS, Raper CF, Washburn CL (1996) Institutional ownership of US timberland: History, rationale, and implications for forest management. Journal of Forestry 94:21–28.Butler BJ, Wear DN (2013) Chapter 6. Forest ownership dynamics of southern forests. USDA-Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC Zhang D, Butler BJ, Nagubadi RV (2012) Institutional timberland ownership in the U.S. South: Magnitude, location, dynamics, and management. Journal of Forestry 110:355–361. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Changes within public forest ownership**
 |  |
| Public forest ownership is influenced by… |
| *Please select the period of time you are referring to:* | [x]  *1990-2000* | [x]  *2000-2014* |
| 1. Privatisation of public forest land.
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. Change of structure/commercialization of public forest management (introduction of new forms of management, e.g. state owned company).
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. Exchange of forest land among public ownership types (e.g. state and local governments; national and sub-national level).
 | *0* ***1*** *2 3* | *0* ***1*** *2 3* |
| 1. The introduction of new forms of public ownerships.
 | ***0*** *1 2 3* | ***0*** *1 2 3* |
| 1. *Others, namely:*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | *0 1 2 3* | *0 1 2 3* |

Please explain shortly and/or give case examples for each of these trends that are relevant in your country. Please indicate also if there are scientific studies or other material available for further investigation or experts that could be contacted. If data in *Reporting form 1 and 5 - 8* (quantitative part) is considered as not sufficient please add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long.

|  |
| --- |
| *Please insert a short description here:* |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Changes within private forest ownership**
 |  |
| Private forest ownership is influenced by… |
| *Please select the period of time you are referring to:* | [x]  *1990-2000* | [x]  *2000-2014* |
| 1. Splitting forest properties through the process of inheritance.
 | *0 1* ***2*** *3* | *0 1* ***2*** *3* |
| 1. Afforestation/deforestation (of non-forest lands) by private owners.
 | *0 1* ***2*** *3* | *0 1* ***2*** *3* |
| 1. Trade of forest land among private owners.
 | *0 1* ***2*** *3* | *0 1* ***2*** *3* |
| 1. Changing life style, motivations and attitudes of forest owners (e.g. when farms are given up or heirs are not farmers any more).
 | *0 1* ***2*** *3* | *0 1* ***2*** *3* |
| 1. Appearance of new forest owners (afforestation or purchase of private forest).
 | *0 1* ***2*** *3* | *0 1* ***2*** *3* |
| 1. Consolidation of forest land (reduction of fragmentation of forest parcels).
 | *0* ***1***  *2 3* | *0* ***1*** *2 3* |
| 1. An increasing share of institutional investors.
 | *0 1 2* ***3*** | *0* ***1*** *2 3* |
| 1. *Others, namely:*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 | *0 1 2 3* | *0 1 2 3* |

Please explain shortly and/or give case examples for each of these trends that are relevant in your country. Please indicate also if there are scientific studies or other material available for further investigation or experts that could be contacted. If data in *Reporting form 1 and 9 - 11* (quantitative part) is considered as not sufficient please add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long.

|  |
| --- |
| *Please insert a short description here:* |
| All of these are topics that are discussed in the USA, but the magnitude, and ultimate impact on forests and forest owners, has yet to be quantified. |

* 1. **FOREST MANAGEMENT**
		1. **Who typically manages the forests in your country?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please refer to the definition of “Forest Management” (Reporting Form 1) and explain shortly, if relevant give case examples for your country. If data in *Table 1b* (quantitative part) is considered as not sufficient please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| Most forests in the USA are “managed” by the owner. For public lands, this is a public agency working within the mandates provided by laws and regulations and dictated by budget constraints. TIMOs are a major exception where they often use outside firms to management their lands due to the fact that the TIMOs often have little expertise in forestry. For individual owners, most of these lands are actually not actively managed in the traditional sense, e.g., most do not have management plans or consult with professional foresters. |

* + Please consider in your answer all public and private forest ownership types.
	+ Has the management of forest changed since 1990?
	+ Please describe the roles of forest owners, forest owners associations, commons, state forest management organizations, the government, private companies/entrepreneurs, or other.
	+ If forest management is not carried out by an owner, is it done on the basis of short or long term contracts, licences, etc.?
	+ How do new forest ownership types (see definition below) organise forest management services?
		1. **Who typically supervises that forest management is carried out according to the national legislation/other binding rules in your country?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain shortly, and if relevant give case examples that are relevant in your country. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| It depends somewhat on the ownership type. Federal lands fall under federal jurisdiction and management is subject to legislative oversight and participatory input from stakeholders. Numerous lawsuits have been filed to oppose certain forest management legislation or implementation of management, particularly at the federal level. For non-federal lands, most forestry rules are at the state (not national) level and the rules can vary substantially across the 50 states. Depending on the type of activity being monitored, it is typically a state forestry or environmental protection agency that enforces the rules. Some local jurisdictions, such as towns, can have additional rules that they enforce. |

* Please consider in your answer all public and private forest ownership types.
* Please describe the roles of supervisors and to what extend they are influencing the forest management applied respectively what management rights were transferred to them.
* Is supervision of forest different for public and private lands?
* Has this changed since 1990?
	+ 1. **Which forest owner organisations (forest producer groups, forest owner co-operatives, co-operations or associations) exist in your country with a focus on joint or cooperative forest management?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain shortly and if relevant give case examples for the Forest Owner Organisations (FOO) that are relevant in your country. As far as possible, please provide the number of forest owner organisations in your country, as well as the forest area and share of owners (referring to the total number of owners in a country) that are covered by these organisations. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| There is one national, ATFS listed below, and many state-level forest owner organizations, but most private owners do not belong to these groups. There are also a couple of large trade organizations for corporations, NAFO, listed below, is the largest/most active right now. |
|  | *Name Forest Owner Organisation* | *Forest Area* | *Share of owners [%]* |
| FOO 1 | American Tree Farmer System (ATFS) | 8,900,000 | 44,000 members |
| FOO 2 | National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) | 32,400,000 ha | 80 members (some are groups with many members, some are individual companies) |
| FOO 3 |  |  |  |
| FOO 4 |  |  |  |
| *< please add more rows if needed >* |

[**http://nafoalliance.org/about/our-members**](http://nafoalliance.org/about/our-members)

* + Forest owner organisations have many different names and forms. We are here interested in organisations that focus on the mutual support of the forest management, not on interest representation; although we know that many organisations do actually both. We also distinguish between forest **commons that jointly** **own** **forest** (these should be given as a separate ownership type) and **forest owner organisations** (to be described here).
	+ Please describe shortly their main aims and mechanisms, and if they work on local, sub-national or national level. Please also describe their history, success and challenges.
	1. **NEW FOREST OWNERSHIP TYPES**
		1. **Which new forest ownership types emerge in your country?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please name, define and explain shortly, if relevant give case examples for your country. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| Public agencies have been fairly constant in the USA with few substantial changes for quite some time. The emergence of TIMOs and REITs in the 1990s as described above has been one of the largest changes seen across the USA. Among the Individual owners, there are constantly new owners and research is being conducted to see how much they differ from previous owners, but additional research is needed to see if the differences are substantive. There seems to be an increase in amenity-oriented owners and female forest owners. There is talk of parcellation, but the numbers have yet to prove this is a dominant or widespread phenomenon as consolidation is also occurring in some areas.  |

**Terms and Definition:**

|  |
| --- |
| **NEW FOREST OWNER:**Forest owners that recently acquired forest land and have not owned forest land before; or have non-traditional goals of ownership; or apply non-traditional methods of management.**Explanatory notes:** 1. *Includes:* transformed public ownership categories (e.g., through privatisation, contracting out forest management, transfer to local governments, etc.).
2. *Includes:* new legal forms of ownership in the countries (e.g. new common property regimes, community ownership), both for private and state land.
3. *Includes:* relevant phenomena of changing forest ownership (e.g. urban, absentee, and non-traditional or non-farm owners as well as investments of forest funds or ownership by new community initiatives, etc.)
 |

* 1. **ILLEGAL LOGGING**
		1. **Is illegal logging considered as a serious problem in your country? Does it affect certain ownership categories in particular and if yes, in which way?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain shortly and if relevant give case examples that are relevant in your country. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| Illegal logging is not a major issue in the USA. Timber theft does sometimes occur, but it appears to be limited and sporadic.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **ILLEGAL LOGGING**Illegal logging takes place when timber is harvested, transported, bought or sold in violation of national laws. (Source: Brack et al. 2001 [[10]](#footnote-10)) |

* 1. **POLICY QUESTIONS**
		1. **What kinds of influence have policies on the development of forest ownership?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain shortly, and if relevant give case examples that are relevant in your country. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| Forest policies influence how much and where public forests exist, but much of that is really historical. Changes in the tax code are commonly cited as one cause for the increase in TIMOs and REITs, but other factors, such as investor expectations, are also cited. Inheritance laws are often cited as causing parcellation of properties. There are MANY policies across that USA that impact forests either directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally – there are whole books written on it. Policies such as the Conservation Reserve Program have resulted in the planting of forests across millions of hectares of marginal farmland. |

* Are there any specific policy instruments that stimulate the restitution, privatisation, nationalisation, commercialization or decentralization of forests (e.g. pre-emption rights)?
* Are there regulations related to inheritance rights with an effect on creating smaller parcels or hindering such a development (fragmentation/defragmentation)?
* What are the policy instruments fostering the afforestation of agricultural land? Please assess the level of afforestation in private/state lands in the last decade.
* Are there any policies creating new forest owner types in your country?
	+ 1. **Which policy instruments (including financial incentives and taxation) exist that specifically address different ownership categories, in particular new (non-traditional) forest owners? Which policy instruments and organisational concepts do exist in order to reach different ownership types?**

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain shortly and if relevant give case examples that are relevant in your country. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| See above about taxation and TIMOs/REITs. Property tax policies are the most important impacting Individual owners, but these policies vary substantially state-by-state. Financial programs are used by only a minority of the landowners and current research is questioning the effectiveness of many of these programs. |

* Are there any new types of advice or advisory systems that respond to the needs of different ownership types (e.g. new owner types)?
* Were there specific campaigns launched to reach new or non-traditional forest owners?
* Please describe the policy instruments used to stimulate association of small forest owners.
	+ 1. **The financial flows into and out of forests in regard to different ownership categories. What is the situation in your country?**

|  |
| --- |
| The cash flow should be presented according to the main ownership types (Private ownership, Public ownership by state and Public ownership by local government). Please explain shortly and if relevant give case examples that are relevant in your country. If possible please elaborate how forests in different ownership categories contribute to and/or benefit from the state budget. Please feel free to add quantitative figures, to the extent possible. The description should be max. 1 page long. |
| It is estimated that private forestlands annually contribute $110 billion to the gross domestic product and public lands contribute an additional $17 billion. Federal, state and local government budgets provide funding for the management of public forest lands, but there is no consolidated listing of this expenditures. Federal and state agencies also have many programs that provide financial and technical to private owners, but there is no consolidated listing of the funding for these programs either. Forest lands are an important tax base for local governments as property tax is a primary source of revenue for many of them.  |

* + - How are forests and forest management taxed; please distinguish between different ownership types and the authorities that collect incomes from taxes (state budget or communal authorities)? What is the tax rate, are there any tax exemptions? What is the overall public revenue for the country (given per year and ha)?
		- How are forests and forest management subsidised (please distinguish between different ownership types)? What are the subsidy aims and what kinds of measures are subsidised? What is the overall public spending for the country (given per year and ha)?
		- Are there any other forms of money transfers between the forest owners (managers) and the state? Do private or public forests (please distinguish between national, sub-national and local forests) overall contribute to or benefit from public (state or communal) budgets? How much is that (given per year and ha/other quantity unit)?

|  |
| --- |
| **PUBLIC FOREST REVENUE**All public revenue collected from the domestic production and trade of forest goods and services. For this purpose they include:* *Goods*: sale of roundwood; biomass; and non-wood forest products.
* *Services*: concession fees and royalties, stumpage payments, public timber sales revenue, taxes and charges based on forest area or yield, taxes on domestic trade and export of forest products, special levies on forestry activities and payment into forest-related funds, other miscellaneous inspection, licence and administrative fees levied by forest administrations, permit and licence fees for recreation and other forest related activities.

**Explanatory note:** 1. *Excludes:* taxes and charges generally collected from all individuals and enterprises (e.g. corporate taxes, payroll taxes, income taxes, land and property taxes, sales or value-added taxes); import taxes or duties levied on forest products; repayments of government loans to individuals and enterprises engaged in the production of forest products and services.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |

|  |
| --- |
| **PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON FORESTRY** All government expenditure on forest related activities.**Explanatory notes:** 1. Correspond to the total budget allocated and spent by all concerned institutions.
2. *Includes:* expenditures for administrative functions, reforestation funds, direct support to forest sector (e.g. grants and subsidies) and support to other institutions (e.g. training and research centres).
3. *Excludes:* expenditures in state owned organisation/enterprise/company. Please find a definition of state owned organisation/enterprise/company in reporting from 6.

(Source: FRA 2015 modified) |
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