



Joint Session of the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission

Location, Turkey – 10-14 October 2011



Swedish Forest Sector Outlook Study

Ragnar Jonsson, Future Forests Program, SLU, Sweden



Forest resources



Forest industry



Other woody biomass



Energy user



➤ SWEFSOS is based on results from the EUwood project

A central feature: the Wood Resource Balance (WRB)

a balance sheet for wood

→ source		use ←	
[mio. m ³]			[mio. m ³]
stemwood	EFISCEN	EFSOS Conversion factors and WRB	Sawmill industry
forest residues			Panel industry
bark			Pulp industry
	other material uses		
Woody biom. outside for.	Literature & modelling	EU RES 2020 calc. enquiries	Wood based fuel industry
post consumer wood			wood industry internal use
sawmill by products	biomass power plants		
other industrial residues	household use		
black liquor	liquid biofuels		
Processed wood fuel	Energy use		

Source: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/studies/doc/bioenergy/euwood_methodology_report.pdf



Econometric modeling => material use of wood

GDP projections from IPCC's A1 and B2 scenarios

A1: Rapid economic (GDP) growth and technological progress, regional convergence, **intensified global trade**, limited environm. awareness,

B2: Slower economic growth and technological progress, local & regional solutions to economic, social and environm. sustainability. **High environm. awareness.**

Region	Average annual GDP growth (%) 2010–2030	
	A1	B2
Western Europe	2.0	1.1
Eastern EU countries	6.4	3.9
Russia, Ukraine and Belarus	6.4	4.4
World total	4.3	2.7

Source: Moiseyev et al. Journal of Forest Economics 17 (2011): 197–213



Energy use of wood based on the EU RES Directive

	2008	Target for 2020
Austria	28.5 %	34 %
Belgium	3.3 %	13 %
Bulgaria	9.4 %	16 %
Cyprus	4.1 %	13 %
Czech Republic	7.2 %	13 %
Denmark	18.8 %	30 %
Estonia	19.1 %	25 %
Finland	30.5 %	38 %
France	11.0 %	23 %
Germany	9.1 %	18 %
Greece	8.0 %	18 %
Hungary	6.6 %	13 %
Ireland	3.8 %	16 %
Italy	6.8 %	17 %
Latvia	29.9 %	40 %
Lithuania	15.3 %	23 %
Luxembourg	2.1 %	11 %
Malta	0.2 %	10 %
Netherlands	3.2 %	14 %
Poland	7.9 %	15 %
Portugal	23.2 %	31 %
Romania	20.4 %	24 %
Slovak Republic	8.4 %	14 %
Slovenia	15.1 %	25 %
Spain	8.7 %	20 %
Sweden	44.4 %	49 %
United Kingdom	2.2 %	15 %
EU 27	10.3 %	20 %

Source: Eurostat



Wood Resource Balance for Sweden

(in million m³)

Reference future B2							
potential	2010	2020	2030	2010	2020	2030	demand
forest woody biomass	108	110	116	83	86	87	material uses
other woody biomass	43	45	46	36	36	48	energy uses
total	151	155	162	119	123	135	total

Reference future A1							
potential	2010	2020	2030	2010	2020	2030	demand
forest woody biomass	108	110	116	83	91	100	material uses
other woody biomass	43	47	52	36	36	48	energy uses
total	151	158	168	119	128	148	total

Note: Medium mobilisation scenario of forest woody biomass



Wood Resource Balance for EU 27

(in million m³)

Reference future B2							
potential	2010	2020	2030	2010	2020	2030	demand
forest woody biomass	686	678	680	458	495	528	material uses
other woody biomass	287	311	334	346	573	752	energy uses
total	973	989	1015	805	1068	1280	total
Reference future A1							
potential	2010	2020	2030	2010	2020	2030	demand
forest woody biomass	686	678	680	458	529	620	material uses
other woody biomass	287	327	375	346	573	752	energy uses
total	973	1005	1055	805	1102	1372	total

Note: Medium mobilisation scenario of forest woody biomass



Conclusions

Given modelling assumptions, **wood resources** in the EU as a whole **will not suffice, by far**, to reach the targets for renewable energy

In addition to **increased imports** of bio-energy feedstock from other regions, already a fact, one would expect a **soaring demand pressure on the forest resource** in the EU, not the least in Sweden and other forest rich member states:

- **Forest owners** in Sweden and other European countries stand to **gain** from higher prices for woody biomass
- An elevated harvest level and **intensified forest management** - shortened rotation periods, increased fertilization, increased extraction of logging residues and stump harvesting - could **compromise** biodiversity and other **non-wood ecosystem services** such as water quality and recreation. In particular, the **general consideration** for biodiversity on all productive forest land, a trait of Swedish forest policy, could be at risk.

However, the modeling does not consider **dynamic processes** (no overall equilibrium model), e.g., an expanding bioenergy sector crowding out pulp and paper.

Further, progress in **electronic ICT** should also decrease future demand for pulpwood

