

Competing for Legitimacy: The Development and Evolution of Forest Certification in Finland

Presented By:
Keith Mars
Dr. David Ostermeier

Department of Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries
University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Abstract

- Forest certification in Finland has evolved in favor of PEFC and not FSC
- Rate and scale is unprecedented
- Extremely politicized and contested
- Forest landowner organizations have wielded the most influence in the direction of certification

Outline of Seminar

- Why should anyone care?
- Background information
- Objectives of thesis
- Methods
- Results/Discussion
- Conclusions
- Significance of findings
- Suggestions for future studies

Why Should Anyone Care?

Forest Certification

- Profound shift in rule-making
- Deficiency in research

Finland

- Finland represents microcosm of issues
- Ripeness of study
- Lessons to be learned

Proliferation of Schemes

- FSC (1993)
- SFI (1994)
- CSA (1996)
- PEFC (1999)



National Schemes in Europe

- PEFC v. FSC
- Highly contested and politicized
- Long traditions of non-industrial private forestry
- Initial support for forest certification

Forest Certification in Finland

- FFCs/PEFC scheme
- Splintering of
- 95% of forest
- 1st scheme en
- FSC limited p
adamantly op
landowners



Objectives

1. Describe key characteristics of two competing forest certification schemes in Finland
2. Analyze and explain the evolution of forest certification in Finland
3. Evaluate the ecological criteria to determine notable similarities and differences with the objective of determining if the standards differ in ecological rigor
4. Provide lessons learned for future studies and interested parties in forest certification

Methods-Objective One

Describe key characteristics of schemes

- Basis of criteria: Meridian Institute (2001), contemporary issues, and current status
- Sources: existing literature, e-mail correspondence, and quantitative data

Methods-Objective One

- Mission and scope of the two schemes
- Is certification voluntary?
- How have the schemes addressed the issues of small landowners?
- How is third party independence assured?
- Twelve descriptive questions

Methods-Objective Two

Explain why certification developed in favor of PEFC

- Analytical explanatory case study analysis (Yin 1994)
- Preferred methodology when: (1) questions are “how” and “why”, (2) no control over events, and (3) contemporary event in real context
- Reflection of reality: (1) reliance on all relevant sources (information from objective one, etc.) and (2) inductive and deductive reasoning to postulate explanation
- Hypothesis: There are a suite of extractable factors that explain why forest certification developed the way it did in Finland
- Data source: information from results-objective one, e-mail correspondence, and supplemental quantitative data

Explanatory Results

Internal Factors

1. Private landowners ownership of forestlands
2. Strength of MTK despite fragmentation
3. Iron triangle of power
4. FSC irrelevant by traditional interests

External Factors

5. Concurrent development of FSC competitor scheme
6. Lack of significant end-consumer demand

Factors Tending Towards Polarization

7. Forestry representatives lead PEFC--ENGOS lead FSC
8. ENGOS vs. traditional forest interests
9. Implied criticism of FSC towards traditional forestry

Conclusions

- FFCS co-option of existing institutions
- Lack of end consumer demand for FSC
- Power and influence of MTK
- Triad of power
- Obstacles in the development of new institutions
- Scale of transaction costs

Significance of Findings

- Sheds light on temporal and contextual developments
- Adds to explanatory literature
- Lessons learned for those interested in certification

Future Works

- Impacts of forest certification on land management
- Role of government

Thank You

Major Professor

- Dr. David Ostermeier, University of Tennessee- Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries

Committee Members

- Dr. William Park, University of Tennessee- Natural Resource Economics
- Dr. David Feldman, University of Tennessee- Political Science

Finland

- Pasi Miettinen, FSC-Finland
- Auvo Kaivola, FFCS