

**UNECE/FAO/MCPFE/CEPF Private Forest Ownership Enquiry, Reporting Form F-8 (Answers to Specific Questions)**

<i>Questions 1-4</i>	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Austria	<p>There were no major changes in the private holding structure within the last 15 years in Austria. In fact, the forest owner structure is changing gradually. About 80% of forest area in Austria is privately owned. About 50% of the forest area is owned by small private forest owners (&lt;200 ha), most of them also own agricultural land. Small private forest owners have traditionally managed their forests primarily with the help of family members. As a result of structural changes in the last decades, the number of full-time farmers is decreasing constantly, and the share of non-farming forest owners is increasing. In consequence, these owners either feel less closely linked to the forest or completely lose this connection, and are therefore less willing to work in forests themselves.</p>	<p>No political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land are ongoing in Austria.</p>	<p>No plans concerning restitution/privatisation of forest land are known.</p>	<p>No major changes are observed. But there was a slight shift from 1980 to 1999 from smaller enterprises (5-20 ha forest area) to larger enterprises (20-50 ha, 50-200 ha, &gt;200 ha).</p>
Belgium	<p>We can estimate that the number of individual owners increases by 10% every ten years, due to the division after inheritance of forest holdings. For larger holdings (more than 100 ha.), many holdings have been constituted in property companies. A part of them remains "family owned" after inheritance. Since a 1999 federal law, a few "forest groups" have been created, with special tax status. 12 groups of this kind exist in Wallonia, for 3420 ha. In Flanders, mixed groups (with both private and public owners) are also created. 19 groups of this kind exist in Flanders.</p>	<p>unjustified in Belgium.</p>	<p>unjustified in Belgium.</p>	<p>see Question 1</p>
Bulgaria	<p>After 1997, upon entry into force of the "Law for restitution of forests and lands within the forest fund", a process of restitution followed which led to establishment of small in size and fragmented private forest ownership. The private owners lack interest for an active process of association between themselves. The private forest associations are inheritors of the existing ones before the nationalization.</p>	<p>There is no privatisation, the restitution is almost finished - there are still some unsolved cases in the Court and the application for ownership carries on through the Court.</p>	<p>Cannot talk about privatisation, but the restitution is still carried on as the Court trials continue.</p>	<p>The number increases as there is a transfer of ownership from one person to his/her inheritor or execution of partition.</p>

Questions 1-4	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Cyprus	Private forests consist of small, scatter holdings that have been acquired by inheritance from parents to children. A lot of these holdings were under small vineyards or other minor agricultural plantations on steep slopes or on poor in quality sites, scattered and far way from roads. Constituting uneconomic investments, these areas have been abandoned by their owners and have been forested naturally by nearby expanding forest vegetation. Because of this, the total number of private owners is not known and is very difficult to find.	Due to the lack of adequate infrastructure the private forests are vulnerable to forest fires. This causes problems even to the protection of State forests. Therefore, for the adequate protection of State forests, the Department of Forests purchases private forest lands that form either an enclave or a wedge into the State forests. A Rural Development Plan, which has been developed covering the three year period 2004 – 2006 and co-financed by the European Union, supports the afforestation of agricultural and non-agricultural land and investments for the conservation and improvement of the economic, ecological and social functions of forests.	No changes in the current situation or trends are expected in the future.	See answer of question 1.
Czech Republic	Area of state forest: in 1991: 95.8 %, agro-cooperatives 4.1 % and private forests 0.1 %; in 2006: 60.1 % (incl. public schools and universities); municipal 15.5; regional 0.2; forest co-operatives 1.0 %; private 23.2 %.	Main restitution law: No. 229/1991 Coll., restitution of municipal forest ownership: No. 172/1991 Coll. Majority of the public does not agree with further privatization of state forest.	Restitution is quite finished, except for some specific cases. Further privatisation is not expected.	Stabilised, slight oscillations.
Finland	The main changes occurring in the structure of forest ownership within the last 15 years were a decline in the number of farmers; forest owners moving their residence to somewhere outside the forest holding; migration to urban areas; an ageing of the population of forest owners; and a growing proportion of female forest owners.	No action.	No.	The number of private forest owners is slightly increasing
France	There were no important changes in the ownership structure in France in the last 20 years. The ratio between public (26%) and private (74%) forests does not evolve significantly. The afforestation of agricultural land by natural colonization or by plantations is slightly more important in private than in public forests. The public forests expand as well, mainly in the mountainous areas where public ownership is dominant. The average size of private forest has slightly increased between 1980 (2,6 ha) and 2000 (3,0 ha).	Does not apply in France.	Does not apply in France.	The number of forest owners decreased from 3 677 000 in 1980 (ESSES 1976-1983) to 3 483 000 in 2000 (2 361 000 owning less than 1 ha according to the cadastre and 1 122 000 owning 1 ha or more according to the Scees SPF 1999 survey). There is therefore a slight decrease of 0.2% per year.
Germany	Through reunification, national area has changed and hence comparison is not meaningful feasible.	Forest expropriated within the scope of the land reform in the GDR and transferred into public ownership is now either privatised or about to be privatised.	No	Data n.a.

Questions 1-4	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Hungary	Privatisation started in 1993 and ended in 1998. During that time around 200 000 ha formerly state owned forests and 500 000 ha forests formerly cooperatives' possessions were privatised. Since then the changes in the holding structure have been moderate. Development in the formation of the new management units - still being seriously hindered by common ownership - was important. According to estimations, only one third of the private forest area is owned by individual owners, the rest is owned by groups of owners. Privatisation took place in the form of a voucher system. It was not a restitution but a compensation: instead of getting back their former properties the legitimated owners or their inheritors received vouchers with nominal value. The vouchers could have been used as currency on auctions where beside other properties forests were privatized. In addition to the compensation, another form of privatization was adopted: members of agricultural cooperatives had the right to claim for any of the assets including forest areas of the given cooperative up to the financial value of their membership in the specific cooperation.	ref. above	There is no official intention of further privatisation of state owned forests.	The number of forest owners is increasing through inheritance.
Iceland	Since 1990, the part of private holdings in forestry has increased because of newly started regional afforestation projects which aim is to increase participation of farmers in forestry and afforestation.	The government did start special regional afforestation programs in all regions of Iceland in 1990-2000. These projects will in general favour afforestation of private land.	There is no indication of change in ownership of the present forest and woodland from private to public and vice versa; but on the other hand, the increasing participation of farmers in afforestation will lead to an increment in the private part of forested areas in Iceland.	Increasing with increasing afforestation on private holdings
Ireland	An estimated 15,000 farmers have switched their land use from agriculture to forestry since 1990, and has been the main contributory factor to a 220,000 ha increase in the forest area since 1990. Many of these areas are however relatively small (2-3 ha), compared with the larger average block size in the publicly owned forest, and the private estates in existence prior to the mid 1980s .	There have been no recent political processes concerning privatisation of forest land in Ireland	Privatisation of publicly-owned forest land is not envisaged.	Increasing – see 1

<i>Questions 1-4</i>	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Latvia	<p>After the restoration of Latvia's independence in 1990, the ownership structure has changed significantly, as a result of privatisation and the restoration of property rights. In the year 1990, practically all forests were managed by the state, but in the year 2005 private forests made up to 47% of all forests, 50% was owned by the state and the rest was owned by local governments. Changes in the private holding structure are mainly related to the land privatisation and the restoration of property rights process. In recent years, the forest ownership structure has been more or less stable and it is expected that changes will be not be significant in the future. If changes in the private holding structure are analyzed for the recent five year period (2001 - 2005), area of properties and land assigned for the use of legal persons is increasing, while the area of properties and land assigned for the use of natural persons is decreasing.</p>	<p>Political decisions related to the land privatisation/restitution process are fixed in laws. Special issues regarding forest land are covered by the Forest law. The Forest law states that State forest land shall be the land of the Forestry Department of the Ministry of Agriculture according to the situation on 21 July 1940, which has not been transferred, in the course of the land reform, to other natural or legal persons for permanent use, as well as such forest land which belongs to, or is within the jurisdiction of the State. State forest land shall be entered in the Land Register in the name of the State. State forest land shall not be granted for permanent use and shall not be alienated or privatised, except in the following cases: 1) in the performance of a land exchange in the cases specified and according to the procedures in the Law On the Rights of Landowners to Compensation for Restrictions on Economic Activities in Specially Protected Nature Territories and Micro-reserves; 2) if the State forest land is necessary for the performance of the following local government autonomous functions specified in the Law On Local Governments. Alienation or privatisation of State forest land shall be permitted by an order of the Cabinet, issued each time, in the cases mentioned above.</p>	No. Please see answers to questions 1 and 2.	It was increasing because of the restitution/privatisation process.
Lithuania	<p>The on-going land restitution process since 1992 led to a large number of private forest owners. On 1 January 2006, there were 213,000 forest owners and 717,000 ha. of private forests (or 34% of the total forest area). The average size of forestland holding in Lithuania is growing slowly. Presently, it is less than 5 ha.</p>	<p>After the re-establishment of independence on 11 March 1990, the Republic of Lithuania adopted the laws, which legalised private ownership in land, forest and other immovable property. Forest land restitution started in 1992. The restitution process is not completed in Lithuania yet. From 1 May 2005, companies are allowed to own forest land. Restitution should be finished in general in 2-3 years.</p>	The privatization of state owned forest land is not foreseen in the near future. Even leasing of state owned forest land for forestry is forbidden by the Forest Act.	The number of private forest owners is increasing as a result of restitution.

<i>Questions 1-4</i>	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Netherlands	The structure stayed more or less the same during the last 15 years. The only change in the private holding structure is an increase in the number of forest owning foundations. In 2006, 129 foundations owning a forest area of more than 5 ha were registered in the Netherlands.	In the Netherlands, no political processes concerning privatisation/restitution have been recently undertaken. In the past, the focus of the government was on nature management by the state forest service and large nature conservation organisation. However, during the last decade, the government has been stimulating private nature management by subsidies that are specifically designed for this aim. This is a result of the fact that the government has become aware of the important role that private owners play in the conservation of nature in the Netherlands.	Privatisation or restitution of forest land is not expected to happen during the upcoming years. However, due to the realisation of the National Ecological Network, large areas of agricultural land are bought by the government. This agricultural land has to be transformed into nature areas to become part of the Network. For this reason, the management of the land is handed over to the State forest service or to large nature conservation organisations in the Netherlands. In this way, private soils are, in the case of the State forest service, directly resituated or, in the case of management by private nature conservation organisations, indirectly resituated, because these organisations are heavily subsidised by the Dutch government. The National Ecological Network is a connected network of valuable natural areas, woodlands and water areas and important landscape features which together form the backbone of the Dutch countryside in the Netherlands.	The number of private forest owners is stable in the Netherlands. The number of private forest owners owning a forest area of more than 5 ha has not changed since 1992.
Norway	The private holding structure has been practically stable. 90% of Norwegian forest holdings are family forestry, managed through generations. 97% of forest sales are done within the family. The forest owners' co-operatives make it possible to manage small holdings relatively efficient. For most of the owners, forest management is a part time activity and contributes partly to their income.	There have been no dramatic changes, but the official policy is supporting private ownership. Since 90% of the forest production is private, this is no big issue.	There is very limited state ownership, but local municipalities have some forest managed in the same way as private holdings. The restitution question is not applicable. In 2006, about 1.25 million ha of forest and other wooded land in the Finnmark county will be transferred from State ownership into a formal private ownership, under administration by a board consisting of representatives from regional and indigenous people's (Sami) authorities.	Stable
Poland	Structural changes in the Polish rural area started several years ago and increased particularly after accessing to the EU in May 2004. The most characteristic results of these changes are a decrease in the number of private agricultural holdings, and an increase in their average size, mainly as the result of buying agricultural land from the state.	Privatisation or restitution of forest land did not occur and there is no political will for such processes at present.	It is not expected in the nearest future.	This number has been increasing slowly during the last 3-4 years. It is the result of a balance between two processes: 1) the purchasing agricultural land for afforestation by inhabitants of towns, 2) a slow decrease of total number of agricultural land owners.

Questions 1-4	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Romania	<i>please see table in the national report</i>	Law no. 18/1991 : about 356 000 ha of forest were restituted to the private owners; Law no. 1/2000 : additional 1.8 million ha of forest were restituted to the former forest owners; Law no. 247/2005 : an estimated area of about 2 million ha will be further restituted to former owners	See above	It is slightly increasing
Serbia	In Serbia we did not have any significant changes in the structure of private forests within the last 15 years.	Forest land in Serbia is not part of the process of privatization. Forest land in Serbia is part of restitution to religion organization (church).	Until 2008, we will finish restitution of forest land to religion organization (church). Some estimations are that the state will give back about 45 000 ha of forest land. This is just an estimation and we are expecting precise information soon.	The number of private forest owners in Serbia is not changing.
Slovakia	The private holding structure has changed substantially in Slovakia within the last 15 years. Before the year 1991, when the act on restitutions entered into force, all forests were held and managed by state organizations (1 912 905 ha) and agricultural co-operatives (8 800 ha). The management of forests of Agricultural Cooperatives was also under the supervision of state forest enterprises. Comparing the ownership structure of forests with the status of use in 2005, it can be seen that the state organizations of forestry have 1 130 786 ha of forests in use, including "unknown" or "non-claimed" ownership. This is more than 323 033 ha of forests than the area of forests under the ownership of the state. Without "unknown" forest land, it is 210 237 ha. The return of forests to their original owners has stagnated since 1997 (on the average about 10 000 ha annually) because of the mainly small individual ownership of forest property. These cannot be identified in the terrain, as they are mainly in shared co-ownership. Owners refuse associating or they did not submit the documents relating to their property contrary to call. Completion of this process will be possible only after removing existing legislative, technical and economic barriers.	Intention of non-privatisation of forest estates in state ownership is included in Program declaration of new government of the SR. Enforcement of radical amendment of legislation related to arrangement of ownership rights concerning forest estates with the objective of removal of existing stagnation in restitution process is one of the fundamental measures resulting from the proposal of "The Concept of Agriculture Development for 2007-2013 - Part Forestry".	Probably, there will not be more privatisation in the future; but more progress in the completion of restitution process should be made. Through new legislation, issues related to the land of unknown owners should be solved, with the objective of forming assumptions for the development of markets with lands, in favour of entrepreneurial subjects managing such lands.	The forest area of private forests is slightly increasing due to the ongoing restitution process. Growing stock is also increasing, mainly due to the actual age structure of all forests, including private ones.
Slovenia	The area of the private forests has increased because of the denationalisation process which started in 1991, and because of abandoned agricultural activities in last decades. Forest holdings are continuously split between relatives during the heritage process.	Private forests, owned by individuals, have been the prevailing ownership category for more than 100 years. After World War II, private ownership was limited by area according to the socioeconomic status. The Denationalisation law was adopted in 1991 and the process is not yet finished.	The process is quite close to the end and big changes are not expected.	The number is increasing permanently.

<i>Questions 1-4</i>	1. How has the private holding structure changed in your country within the last 15 years?	2. Please describe recent political processes concerning privatisation/restitution of forest land in your country.	3. In the future, will there be more restitution/privatisation of forest land in your country?	4. Is the number of private forest owners in your country increasing or decreasing?
Sweden	The holding structure has not changed much the last 15 years in Sweden. Number, area and average area per holding are almost the same. The share of female owners has increased by 2 percent and the average age among the holders has also increased slightly.	There is no political process in Sweden regarding privatisation/restitution. As mentioned in the country comments, a revision has been made in the category forest industries regarding the state owned company SveaSkog which used to be categorized as a "Forest industry" but are now categorized in the "State category".	There is no indication that the share of private forest land will increase.	The number of private forest owners has increased by 2-3 percent during the last ten years. The main reason for this are children inheriting forest estates from parents. In the near future, the increase is expected to be the same (2-3 percent).
Switzerland	Number of holdings: 2004: 246415; 2000:246117; 1995: 257113; 1990: 256137; 1980: 250052 (Source: Swiss Forestry Statistics; www.agr.bfs.admin.ch, see timeline; no conclusive answer can be given concerning the reason for the variance of the data (methodological bias and/or real changes) n.a. for other aspects of ownership, such as size, category etc.	Currently, there are no political processes in relation to privatisation/restitution going on in Switzerland.	The inertia of changes in ownership during the last decades (low volatility in the forest estate market), the minor importance of forest holdings regarding income (see below) and the stability of the institutional/legal framework are indicators for the preservation of the status quo.	see question 1
United Kingdom	The area of farm woodlands has increased substantially, but with less increase in the number of farm woodland holdings. No data are available for time trends for other types of woodland.	A disposals programme between 1980 and 1997 resulted in a net reduction of about 120,000 hectares in Forestry Commission forest land. The programme ended in 1997.	n.a.	Comprehensive data are not available, but the number is estimated to have increased since 1990 (see MCPFE 2006).

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
Austria	<p>Forest area and growing stock are increasing in Austria mainly because of the decreasing agricultural area and low harvesting rates. Forest area: The Austrian balanced increase in forest cover of 5,100 hectares per annum is the difference between increases (9,700 ha p.a.) and decreases (4,600 ha p.a.). These dynamics cannot be explained solely by planned interventions, such as planned afforestations or officially approved clearing. The development of forest cover is influenced primarily by natural processes such as e.g. the overgrowth of areas formerly used for agriculture, or small-scale natural disasters. The slow natural reforestation of waste land and alpine pastures no longer managed following the total or partial abandonment of operations results in a marked increase in forest cover in the ownership category private forests (&lt; 200 hectares), especially along the forest borders. However, the decision of many part-time farmers to afforest agricultural borderline areas also results in an increase in forest cover. Therefore it is not surprising that 90% of the total increase in forest cover takes place in the area of private forests. Stronger increases in forest cover can be observed not only in the higher alpine pasture regions, but also in the structurally weaker regions. As a result of farmers reducing their farming activities to part-time, as well as migration from rural areas and property sales, the number of full-time farmers is decreasing. This results in a decreasing interest in intensive agricultural use. Growing stock: With 1.095 billion m<sup>3</sup> overbark, the growing stock in Austrians productive forest is higher than ever before. The increase results only partly from a change in forest area. The stands themselves have also increased their growing stock and trunk count. The average increase in stock from 1994 (Austrian Forest Inventory 1992/96) to 2001 (AFI 2000/02) was 30 m<sup>3</sup> overbark/hectare. This is due to the increase in increment and a declining utilisation. The private forest (&lt;200 ha) has shown strongest increases with an increase by 44 m<sup>3</sup> overbark/hectare. And with 333 m<sup>3</sup> overbark/hectare it also has the highest average stock of all ownership types. In large forests with more than 1,000 hectares and at Österreichische Bundesforste AG (ÖBf AG), the increases by 10 m<sup>3</sup> overbark/hectare are still considerable, albeit markedly lower.</p>	<p>There are three Forest Owner Associations on the federal level in Austria, two of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations. 1. Austrian Chamber of Agriculture: Umbrella organisation of the 9 Provincial Chambers of Agriculture. Membership in these Chambers of Agriculture is compulsory by law for owners of agricultural and/or forest land. Member of COPA. 2. Waldverband Österreich (Austrian Farm Foresters' Association) and 8 regional associations: Forest sector organisations in the framework of the Chambers of Agriculture. Membership is voluntary. 3. Land &amp; Forstbetriebe Österreich (Austrian Association of Farm and Forest Owners): 7 member organisations. Representative body of (large) private forest owners and farmers in Austria. Membership is voluntary. Member of CEFP.</p>	<p>Austrian Chamber of Agriculture: All forest owners. Waldverband Österreich: 52,100 forest owners, 810,000 ha. Land &amp; Forstbetriebe Österreich: 600 members, 800,000 ha (85% forest area, 15% agricultural area).</p>	<p>There are no differences concerning game management between private and public forests.</p>

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
Belgium	Total private area is now quite stable, after an increase for the 40 last years (due to plantations in former agricultural land and marginal lands). So the mean area of the holdings is decreasing, as the number of owners is increasing (see question 1.)The growing stock increased due to age classes in conifers stands and transformation from coppice or coppice with standards to high forest in broadleaved stands. We think that this increase will stop in the next years, as for conifers, fellings are now equal or higher than increment.	The "Société Royale Forestière de Belgique" is the main forest owners association, member of CEPF. A few cooperatives exist for sales and forest operations.	About 3000 owners are members of SRFB, for about 30000 ha of forests.	n.a.
Bulgaria	There is increase in the forest area and respectively in the growing stock.	There are two national associations: one is the Bulgarian Forest Chamber (Association of the nonstate forest owners) and the other is National Association of the non-state forest owners "Gorovladeletz". The first one is a member on CEPF and the second has undertaken steps to become a member of CEPF.	The National Association "Gorovladeletz" has 35 000 members, representing 27 800 ha altogether. The Bulgarian Forest Chamber represents 170 members, but there is no correct data for the size of the lands they own.	None
Cyprus	The private forest area is expected to increase slightly in the future, especially around existing forested areas, because of the continuing abandonment of unproductive agricultural plantations and the gradual expansion of native forest vegetation. The growing stock will increase in some forested areas where no thinnings and fellings are carried out.	None. Private forest owners are numerous but they are not organized into an association yet. Their total number is not currently known and is very difficult to find.	See answer of question 6.	There are no differences between private and public forests concerning game management.
Czech Republic	No significant changes seen because of the short period since the restitution. In the past (before World War II), some of the municipal and quite all the small private (farmer's) forests were of the lowest quality.	Four. None. Memberships in ELO, EOS, ENFE.	Data not available.	Data not available.
Finland	There will be no changes in private forest area but the growing stock will increase because annual fellings are lower than annual growth.	There are 154 local forest management associations, whose umbrella organisation, the Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners (MTK), is the member in the international organisation. Local associations are not.	Almost all of the family forest owners are members in national FOAs.	No significant differences. Some differences in the opinions of hunters and foresters and forest owners.

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
France	The area and growing stock increase regularly. The forest area is increasing because of the agricultural decline, mainly in mountainous areas where agriculture is little productive. The growing stock is increasing because the harvested volumes are much smaller than the increment, even when including self-consumption (cf. MCPFE table 6 and Indicateurs de gestion durable des forêts françaises 2005).	The main union of private forest owners is the Fédération Forestiers Privés de France (ex Fédération nationale des Syndicats de Propriétaires Forestiers Sylviculteurs). <i>Is it member of an international association?</i> The FPF is a member of the Confederation of European Forest Owners (CEPF).	60 000 owners are member of a professional forestry organization (syndicate, CETEF...). They own 2 520 000 ha.	Modalities of use of hunting right differ in public forests (most often renting through public auction) and private forests (use of hunting right by the owner or amicable renting). However, the rules for hunting big game are settled by the Prefect of the department. The problems of damage caused by the game are then posed in identical terms (cf. Indicateurs de gestion durable des forêts françaises 2005, indicateur national 2.1.1).
Germany	The area of private forests did not increase during the last inventory period (only 0,4 per cent), but growing stock increased during this period about 26 per cent. (Data Source: National Forest Inventory 2; only old Federal States of Germany)	Data n.a.	Data n.a.	No information available
Hungary	The private forestry sector is increasing both in area and growing stock. Due to afforestation processes, the increase in area is around 10 000 ha annually. Related to the growth of the recently afforested areas and the unmanaged forests the growing stock of private forests is increasing; however, spatial variation of this phenomena is high.	The Association of Private Forest Owners (MEGOSZ) is the main NGO of national importance dealing specifically with private forest ownership. (Some additional small associations exist) Besides this - as a fragment of their profile - the National Forestry Association (OEE) and the Federation of Wood Industry (FAGOSZ) also have an interest in private forestry.	The MEGOSZ has 1500 members among which 57 integrators can be found. Integrators indirectly represents approximately 20 000 forest owners. The total area of the members is about 100 000 ha. Unfortunately, there are no official records on other (mainly local or regional) forest owners' associations, their number can be estimated to 20.	The Law on hunting and game management makes no difference between the types of ownership. In this respect, private and public forests are under the same regulation. Concerning the establishment of hunting units, due to the trifling number of requirements, state owned forest management units have a better chance to establish their own hunting units, than the private forest owners mainly with small forest lots. (The minimum area for big game hunting is 3000 hectares.)
Iceland	Yes because of increasing participation of farmers in afforestation	There is a one National Forest Owner Association which is an umbrella organisation for six regional FOA. It is not member of an international FOA.	They are about 700	There is no game management in Icelandic forests.
Ireland	See 1 and as result of government policy to increase forest cover to 17% (currently just over 10%).	The main forest owner associations are the Irish Timber Growers Association (ITGA) and the Irish Farmers Association. There are another 3-4 smaller groups. ITGA is a member of CEPF.	Approximately 2,200 private forest owners are members of national Forest Owner Associations. There are no data available on the area that they represent.	Apart from older, larger forest estates there is little game management in private forests. Deer are becoming an increasing problem. The state forestry company has an active game management plan, but it too is experiencing problems with deer

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
Latvia	Comparing the forest area in the years 1935 and 2005, it has almost doubled. The main expansion of forest area took place on private land especially in the years after World War II and in the 1960s, when natural afforestation took place or the abandoned agriculture lands were afforested. In table 1, forest area is given on the basis of State Forest Register information, but first results of National Forest Inventory shows that the actual forest area is bigger than registered in the register. The reason is natural afforestation of abandoned agricultural land.	There are approximately 40 national forest owner associations including those associations which are established using support for rural development from the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund. Two of them are members of international Forest Owners Associations.	Approximately 3000 private forest owners are involved in national Forest Owner Associations. They represent approximately 25 000 ha. of forest.	Game management requirements in private and public forests are similar.
Lithuania	Both forest area and growing stock in private forests are increasing as result of restitution of land and afforestation of agricultural abandoned land. Growing stock is increasing in forests which are reserved for restitution, as result of forbidden fellings in these forests.	More than 3,000 private forest owners attended forestry training courses in recent years. This number is increasing on an annual basis. Every year, over 1,600 forest owners attend the forestry training courses, organised by the FOAL network. A similar number is served by State Forest Enterprises.	I.d.	There are no differences.
Netherlands	The forest area is stable, but the growing stock is increasing due to reduced harvesting intensities, especially by small forest owners. 40% of the private forest owners in the Netherlands, owning a forest area of more than 5 ha, do not harvest wood. This percentage is higher (52%) for forest owners owning an area between 5 and 25 ha. The growing stock is also increasing, because the forests in the Netherlands are aging.	There is one National Forest Owner Associations in the Netherlands. This forest owner association is part of the Federation for private landownership in the Netherlands. The association is looking after the interests of four different categories of forest owners: 1. Private forest owners, 2. State forest service, 3. Nature protecting organisations and 4. (local) government. This National Forest Owner Association is a member of the Confédération Européenne des Propriétaires Forestiers (CEPF). Besides the National Forest Owner Association, there is the Bosschap, the board for Forestry and Silviculture in the Netherlands, there are four cooperatives of forest owners and there is the Royal Dutch Forest Society. The Royal Dutch Forest Society is a union of professionals in the forestry sector, ranging from forestry practice, forest owners, advisors, and policy makers to forestry research. These organisations are not considered as forest owner associations.	In total, 900 forest owners are members of the Dutch National Forest Owners Association. 400 of these owners are private forest owners who represent a forest area of 52,000 ha.	Yes, there are differences between different groups of forest owners. Nature conservation organisations are in particular reserved concerning game management and hunting. However, this difference does not have negative effects on sustainable forest management, because the Netherlands has a very strict law based on the European Bird and Habitat directive.

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
Norway	Both public and private forests are generally slowly increasing in forest area and more rapidly in growing stock. The main reasons are changed agricultural and grazing practices, significant silvicultural efforts over several decades and fellings that are lower than the annual increment.	The Norwegian Forest Owners Federation has 45.000 members, but represents 90 per cent of the private forest production. This organisation is member of all relevant international organisations (CEPF, COGECA, IFFA (The International Family Forestry Alliance) and PEFC certification scheme. The other organisation, NORSKOG, has about 200 members, mostly owners of larger holdings.	Approximately 46 000 forest owners (of a total of 120 000 over 2.5 ha.) are members of associations, but they represent 95% of the private forest production. We prefer to measure the importance of forestry by volume, since this is a better representation of the productivity of forests in a mountainous country such as Norway.	Very few differences. Some of the public forests near cities have reduced the hunting, and in some areas political influence tries to limit the price of hunting rights. In practice the differences are marginal.
Poland	The private forest area increases step by step as the result of enhancing afforestation of agricultural land. Growing stock increases slowly, because the area of younger classes still dominates in age structure of stands belonging to individuals	The Union of Forest Owners Associations of Republic of Poland is in the middle of registering at the court. Thereafter, only when the national Union will be strong enough, it will join CEPF.	Above 300 forest owners are members of 7 local FOAs and 2 associations being in the final stage of registration. Their forests occupy about 1000 ha. It is expected that all local FOAs will join the national Union in the near future.	There are no differences.
Romania	No information available	The Association of Private Forest Owners from Romania is the largest and it is member of the Confederation of European Forest Owners. There are other few smaller associations.	The Association of Private Forest Owners from Romania has 21 branches and subsidiaries and comprises about 670 legal persons and 190 individuals. Each legal person is in turn an association of forest owners. One can estimate a number of about 1 million forest owners, which is larger than the total number estimated through our inspectorates. There is a lack of accurate information on this figure. This association is an associated member of the Confederation of European Forest Owners.	There are no differences
Serbia	According to some preliminary results of the national forest inventory, which has to be finished until the end of 2006, forest area is increasing. The reason is probably migration from rural to urban areas and natural changes where forest take space from agriculture land. According the same source, growing stock is larger than indicated by official statistics. One of the reasons are larger forests, but also the accuracy of data has a significant influence. In the past, the state just estimated the state of private forests without measurement.	We have not national forest owner association. In Serbia exist only one private forest owner association.	n.a.	There are no differences between private and public forest concerning game management.
Slovakia	Forest area of private forests is slightly increasing due to going on restitution process. Growing stock is also increasing mainly due to actual age structure of all forests including private ones.	There are these four (4) associations in Slovakia: Union of the regional associations of non-state forest owners in Slovakia, Association of Municipal Forests in Slovakia, Union of Diocesan Forests in Slovakia and Association of private and co-operative forests owners in Banská Bystrica county.	Forest land owners with total forest area of 536 132 ha (67%) are members of mentioned associations; 33% of non-state forest owners (264 727 ha) are not members.	The same system of game management is applicable in private and public forests, resulting from uniform legislation.

Questions 5-8	5. Are your country's private forests increasing/decreasing in forest area and growing stock? If yes, what are the reasons?	6. How many National Forest Owner Associations are present in your country? How many of them are members of international Forest Owner Associations?	7. How many of your country's private forest owners are members in national Forest Owner Associations? How many hectares do they represent?	8. Are there differences between private and public forests concerning game management? If yes, how does it influence SFM?
Slovenia	There is a positive trend in both categories: forest area and growing stock. The reasons for an increasing private forest area are: denationalisation, the practice of splitting property between relatives during the heritage process and abandoned agricultural activities. The reasons for an increasing growing stock are: Conservative forestry management planning in last four decades, sufficient other energy sources for heating, decreased economic interest in wood harvesting.	There is one National Forest Owner Association in Slovenia, established in May 2006. It is not yet officially a member of an international FOA.	There are a little more than 1000 members in national FOA. The forest area is not known, but the members are owners of larger-than-average forests.	There are no differences in game management according to the forest ownership category.
Sweden	There is no indication that the share of private forest land will increase.	There are four forest owners' associations within the country that are associated with the Federation of Swedish Farmers. They are all, more or less, members of international forest owner associations, since the Federation of Swedish Farmers is the focal point for international contacts and cooperation between Swedish and international forest owners. In addition to that, there are two small independent associations.	The four national forest owners' associations in Sweden have some 90 000 members with a total area of 6.2 million hectares.	No, in general there are no differences in game management.
Switzerland	Yes. Area: mainly in mountainous regions caused by the abandonment of agricultural land (15% of PFO say, that the parcel was agricultural land in the past, Source: ETH 2004; Growing stock: caused by the decrease in forest management activities (tending, cutting)	i.d.; numerous Forest Owner Associations (private, public, mixed with various organizational form and legal status) exist at the national, regional, cantonal, communal and local levels.	i.d.; the membership is estimated to be roughly 10% (Source: ETHZ 2004)	Game is a public good in Switzerland. The cantons are in charge of game management (legal base: Article 3 Swiss Federal Law on Hunting and the Protection of wild Mammals and Birds)
United Kingdom	Increasing in both area and growing stock. For area, new woodland creation, mostly grant-aided, and FC disposals until 1997. For growing stock, additional increase from maturing of conifer plantations newly created in 1950s to 1980s.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Questions 9-12	9. How many individual private forest owners attend forestry training courses each year? Has the figure altered in the last 15 years or is it expected to alter?	10. How has the share of urban forest owners in your country altered in the last 15 years? How will it alter in the future?	11. What role does property fragmentation play for your country's individual private forest owners?	12. Are youth interested in managing family forests in the future? Are they involved and integrated into family forest management?
Austria	Estimation: 6000 (The figure is based on statistics of the two federal Forestry Training Centres. Share of private forest owner, multiple attendance of forestry training courses and attendance of forestry training courses in other training centres are estimated.) Over the past years the number was relatively constant.	In general, the share of urban forest owners is expected to increase. Since only two studies (2001 and 2006) have been conducted by today, no statement towards a significant change for the past 15 years and for the development in the future can be made by now.	In general, property fragmentation is no big issue in Austria and there is no worsening trend, but in some areas it is a problem. In such areas, very small lots of land make forest management difficult. Austria's forest policy tries to improve this situation by encouraging cooperatives of small forest owners (e.g. joint forest management ventures).	There are many good examples of young interested people involved and integrated into family forest management. However, no data or studies are available to quantify the present situation.
Belgium	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Bulgaria	36 people (average) per year through the last 5 years. The is an interest towards education among them.	No data.	The high scale of the fragmentation hinders the sustainable forest management. It is a prerequisite for insufficient incentives for the individual private forest owners in fulfilling their fixed legal obligations towards their ownership.	No
Cyprus	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Fragmentation is highly present in the private forests of the island. This is mainly because of the way that these areas were forested and also because of the absence of any legislation prohibiting land use change in private forests. Fragmentation and the lack of adequate infrastructure make these forests vulnerable to forests fire which is the greatest enemy of Cyprus forests. For the better protection and adequate management of the State forests, the Department of Forests purchases private forest lands that form either an enclave or a wedge into the State forests.	Private forestry in Cyprus cannot be a viable business for reasons like: • there are many private forest owners owning small pieces of land usually less than 1 ha and, • the productivity of the forests is very low (usually less than 1 m <sup>3</sup> /ha/year) and this is because of the prevailing climatic conditions and the low forest soil productivity. Therefore neither the owners, nor their children are involved in forest management.
Czech Republic	No information. Any forest owner must have a licensed professional forest manager. For small forest owners, the expenses of such a manager are paid by the state.	No significant changes.	Data not available.	Data not available.
Finland	Some 40 000 forest owners. There are no substantial changes during 15 years. The number is expected to increase slightly.	The share of urban forest owners has increased from 1990 to 2003 from 33% to 40%, and it is expected to increase slowly.	Fragmentation is a kind of problem. The number of small holdings is increasing. However, also the number of large holdings (> 100 ha) is increasing.	Depends on the location and the size of the farm, among other things.

Questions 9-12	9. How many individual private forest owners attend forestry training courses each year? Has the figure altered in the last 15 years or is it expected to alter?	10. How has the share of urban forest owners in your country altered in the last 15 years? How will it alter in the future?	11. What role does property fragmentation play for your country's individual private forest owners?	12. Are youth interested in managing family forests in the future? Are they involved and integrated into family forest management?
France	14 000 owners participate every year in forest information meetings. They own 540 000 ha. A comparison with the ESSES 1976-1983 survey does not show whether this figure has changed since 1980. One can assume that the development of training offers by professional agencies induces an increase of owners' participation.	The comparison between the Scees ESSES 1976-1983 enquiry and the SPF 1999 enquiry does not show any significant change of owners' residence (rural areas, towns, cities) between 1980 and 2000.	Property fragmentation is a major economic hindrance to the competitiveness of wood mobilization; it enhances locally a lack of management. For this reason, the forestry law of 9 July 2001 has established new tools for land reorganisation. Forest cooperatives and services' groupings have also developed their activities to cover not only the wood sales but also to assist owners in their forest management activities. There are 35 cooperative groupings that count 83 000 members and 1 800 000 ha forest.	The forest owners are aged : 59% are over 60 years old in 2000. Ageing increases : they were only 41% in 1980. As a comparison, this generation represents only 21% of French population according to the 1999 census.
Germany	Data n.a.	Data n.a.	No information available	No information available
Hungary	n.a.	n.a.	Property fragmentation is highly influencing private forestry. Fragmentation is mainly caused by inheritance leading to the deterioration of the fragmented ownership structure. Beside fragmentation, common private ownership is a wide spread phenomenon hindering the proper forest management of the concerned areas. Property concentration is encouraged by the authorities, but being a long process, no significant results have been achieved yet.	n.a.
Iceland	About 150 individuals are participating annually in training program offered by the state. The figure have been increasing and will probably do so in nearest future.	The share is most likely increasing because urban people are buying holdings in the countryside for leisure and are probably more active in afforestation than the farmers.	Property fragmentation is ongoing to some extent but is to some degree controlled by special "land-laws" It will probably lead to changes in the utilization of the land. It will not be linked to the need of income and be more secondary than before, when farmer families tried to have all their income from the land.	With increasing afforestation of private land more people in general are involved in forestry and on the farm the whole family is actively taking part in the work of planting trees which is the main work in Icelandic forestry at the moment.
Ireland	2002 51 Forestry Courses - 574 attended 2004 19 Forestry Courses - 288 attended 2005 47 Forestry Courses - 590 attended 2006 36 Forestry Courses - 893 attended	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Questions 9-12	9. How many individual private forest owners attend forestry training courses each year? Has the figure altered in the last 15 years or is it expected to alter?	10. How has the share of urban forest owners in your country altered in the last 15 years? How will it alter in the future?	11. What role does property fragmentation play for your country's individual private forest owners?	12. Are youth interested in managing family forests in the future? Are they involved and integrated into family forest management?
Latvia	To minimize the impact of the privatization/restitution process on this issue - only a five year period was analyzed (year 2000-2005). There are two main ways how private forest owners can receive information about forest management - consultations and seminars provided by respective institutions (state, private and other). More detailed information is available only through consultations provided by the State Forest Service. The figures show that the amount of consultations provided by the State Forest Service has doubled, comparing the years 2000 and 2005. The main reasons for this are changes of private forest owner's attitude to forest management, and the need for consultations on forest legislation. It is expected that in future, private owner's interest with regard to consultations and seminars on forest management will increase.	There is no information about changes. Information on the situation as of the year 2004 is available (table 7.2)	Property fragmentation plays a significant role in forest management in the country as a whole because the average forest property is only 7,5 hectares.	It is difficult to find an indicator on how to evaluate this issue. In general, from year to year, more and more attention is paid to public education work. Many activities in this process are pointed to educate youth about forests. Each year, Forest days are organized. In the year 2006, there were more than 500 events organized within this period. Many of these events provided for the participation of youth.
Lithuania	More than 3000 private forest owners attended forestry training courses in recent years. This number is increasing year after year. Every year over 1600 forest owners attend the forestry training courses, organised by FOAL network. The similar amount is served by State Forest Enterprises.	Almost half of forest owners are living in urban areas.	Fragmentation of forest properties is a big obstacle for achieving economically sustainable private forestry. According to the Forest law, it is forbidden to split forest holdings in size 5 ha and less.	There is no research conducted on this aspect. It was, however, noticed that young people living in the country site and those who had obtained education in the forestry are more interested in family managed forestry than others.
Netherlands	The number of private forest owners attending forest training courses is not known. Due to a change in forest management during the last decades in the Netherlands, from a traditional system to a nature oriented way of forest management called "integrated forest management", a large number of private forest owners have been attending courses and workshops in which this type of forest management is taught. The attendance of these courses are stimulated by the national government and the forest owner cooperatives.	In the Netherlands, the majority of the country can be considered as urban. For this reason, making a distinction between urban and non urban forest owners might be doubtful. Besides this, no or little research has been conducted with regard to the characteristics of private forest owners in the Netherlands. For this reason, it is not possible to specify here the change in the share of urban forest owners.	Fragmentation of private forest holdings is of course happening in the Netherlands, for instance due to the splitting of property between different heirs. However, the extent of this fragmentation is not known.	Detailed information necessary to answer this question is not available. The Dutch federation for private land owners has, for instance, a youth department that tries to involve the next generation of land owners in the management of the family property. A problem seems to be that the old generation wants to pass the property on to the next generation in its current traditional way, having difficulties with some of the new ideas of the next generation. It is very difficult to earn money from forestry in the Netherlands; as it only costs money, the next generation has to search for new sources of income. In order to develop these new sources of income, some changes have to be made and a large number of the old generations have difficulties to cope with these.

Questions 9-12	9. How many individual private forest owners attend forestry training courses each year? Has the figure altered in the last 15 years or is it expected to alter?	10. How has the share of urban forest owners in your country altered in the last 15 years? How will it alter in the future?	11. What role does property fragmentation play for your country's individual private forest owners?	12. Are youth interested in managing family forests in the future? Are they involved and integrated into family forest management?
Norway	Approximately 5,000, depending on the definition of training courses. Connected to changes in the certification system we had some years with a higher activity. Due to increased mechanisation and decreased manual harvesting, the activity has been reduced. The training is changing towards management skills - away from practical skills. The Norwegian Extension Institute is developing computer based training to be able reach the modern owners in a better way.	Still 90% of Norwegian forest owners live closer than a 30 minutes drive from their property. The share of urban forest owners will, however, slowly increase.	So far, the Norwegian forestry and agricultural regulations have worked against fragmentation. Fragmentation does not impose a large problem in Norway, but the stable structure also works against the merging of properties.	In our most recent survey, only 25% answered that their children were not interested in forestry. 97% believed that the property would remain in the family for the next 15 years, 50% believed that they themselves still remained as owners and 45% that one of the children had taken over. Normally, the forest is a matter that involves the children. This may be reduced over time, but there are no indications so far.
Poland	There are no systematic and continuous training courses for forest owners. Constant advisory tasks are fulfilled by the State Forests or district forestry officers as a part of supervision on private forests. In 2005-2006 short trainings supported by EU on afforestation and young-growth tending principles were organised by the State Forests for agricultural land owners. It is expected that such trainings will be continued.	The share of urban forest owners increased in the last years as the result of national and EU support to enhancing afforestation of agricultural land. No data is available. However, it is possible that this trend will not last, if new regulation changing the principles of purchasing agricultural land will take effect.	Fragmentation is the basic problem of private forest ownership in Poland, as the average size of forest property in agricultural holdings amounts to 1,28 ha only and furthermore the forest property consists approximately of 3 plots. The fragmentation significantly influences the forest quality.	Generally, there is no concept of family forests in Poland. The majority of private forests create a part of family agricultural holdings.
Romania	According to national legislation, forest owners are obliged to ensure forest management either by their own established forest structure, with staff formed by professional foresters, or by contracting management services with existing state or private management structures (forest districts). Private forest owners - individuals, with smaller areas, if not associated, are contracting such services.	n.a.	In order to eliminate the fragmentation of property of individual private owners' inconvenience concerning the SFM, appropriate legislation has been developed. Accordingly, forest owners are obliged to ensure forest management either by their own established forest structure or by contracting management services with existing state or private management structures (forest districts). Private forest owners - individuals, with smaller areas, if not associated, are contracting such services.	Not applicable
Serbia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Families and youth are interested on an average level in forest management. It depends significantly on the size of the property.
Slovakia	Between 2000 and 2005, there were professional (average attendance: 356) and general (average attendance: 161) educational activities for non-state forest owners and forest workers. This number is increasing slightly.	There is not available information in this issue.	We consider the fragmentation of forest property an unfavourable phenomenon with regard to sustainable forest management. Therefore, through the act on forests, the issuance of the approval of the respective body by the state administration is required for forest land with area of less than 10 000 m <sup>2</sup> .	There are not any significant measures adopted so far in this field.

Questions 9-12	9. How many individual private forest owners attend forestry training courses each year? Has the figure altered in the last 15 years or is it expected to alter?	10. How has the share of urban forest owners in your country altered in the last 15 years? How will it alter in the future?	11. What role does property fragmentation play for your country's individual private forest owners?	12. Are youth interested in managing family forests in the future? Are they involved and integrated into family forest management?
Slovenia	In the year 2005, almost 200 courses were organised with 3500 participants (main topics: silviculture, forest protection, safety at work, harvesting). First courses in new organisational scheme of forestry in Slovenia were organised in 1995 by SFS. During the first five years, there was a boom of activities and participants. In the last five years, there has been a stagnation in the numbers indicated above. In the period 10 - 15 years ago, Slovenia and Slovenian forestry passed a process of transition and just a few activities in this field were organised.	According to general trends in society, urban forest owners predominate. They possess more than half of private forests owned by individuals.	Property fragmentation is a huge problem for the smallest private forest owners. They are less and less economically dependent on income from forests. The average private forest property in Slovenia is split between three different locations.	Youth are not very interested in managing family forests in urban areas, but in the rural areas, the results of many activities done by field foresters shows some positive trends amongst younger people. Generally speaking, much more should be done with this population with regard to the topic of active forest management in the future.
Sweden	We cannot answer this question since we do not have any statistics regarding this. The Swedish Forest Agency as well as the forest owners' associations are carrying out forestry training for forest owners. A guess is that the number of forest owners attending these activities has slightly increased since the new forest owners are coming from urban areas and do not have any experience in farming or forestry.	The share of urban forest owners has increased in the last 15 years and will continue to increase in the future.	Property fragmentation is just a problem in some small areas in Sweden.	It is still very common with transfer of forestry estates to children; but children tends be less interested in managing the family forest. They are to a lesser extent not living near the forest estate and get income from other sources than from the forest.
Switzerland	Attendance (Source: ETH 2004): more than once a year 1.3%, once a year 1.7%, every second year 1.3%, every 2-5 years 6.9%, less 18%, never 70.9%. An information campaign (including training courses) on occupational safety designed for Private Forest Owners was initiated in 2006.	n.a.	Characteristic of Private Forest Owners in Switzerland is the small-scale parcels of forested land (s. Table F2). A cost-efficient management by the individual Private Forest Owner is very difficult, if not impossible. In addition, the income from the forest has no or only a minor importance for the Private Forest Owner (<2% of PFO say the income from their forest is important (Source: ETHZ 2004).	n.a.
United Kingdom	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.