Introduction

1. The Seminar on “Forestry and our Cultural Heritage” was held in Sunne, Sweden, from 13 to 15 June 2006, under the auspices of the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Experts Network to implement Sustainable Forest Management and the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE). Host for the seminar was the Swedish National Board of Forestry in cooperation with the Regional Forestry Board in Värmland/Örebro. The purpose of the seminar was to elaborate on the Vienna resolution V 3, “Preserving and Enhancing the Social and Cultural Dimensions of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe”.

2. Participants from the following 13 countries attended: Albania, Austria, China, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom. In addition the following organizations were represented: Council of Europe (CoE), UN/ECE and UNESCO.

Opening of the Seminar

3. The seminar was opened by Mr. Göran Enander, Director General of the Swedish National Board of Forestry, who welcomed the participants to Sweden, Värmland and Sunne; which he described as the ideal venue for a conference concerning forestry and our cultural heritage. In Sweden the inventory project Forest & History as well as the initial work with the bio-cultural heritage, has boosted work on conservation and the use of the cultural heritage in Sweden. Beside the value of their own, the cultural aspects also represent important social and
natural values. The exchange of knowledge and experiences during this seminar will hopefully function as a platform and catalyst for a continuous and increased cooperation in the future.

4. The participants were also welcomed by Mr. Piotr Borkowski on behalf of Liaison Unit Warsaw. The focus of this seminar is to clarify the cultural significance in sustainable forest management. Cultural, spiritual and social values are much related and the forest has an important role in overall sustainable management. There is therefore a need to preserve the attractiveness of the landscape, as well as the cultural values of the world.

5. Mr. Kit Prins welcomed the participants on behalf of the UN/ECE and the Joint Experts Network. Following a long history of human influence, nearly all European forests and woodlands, forests are indeed a cultural heritage and have cultural, spiritual and social dimensions. But at the same time forestry could also pose a threat on the cultural heritage and this threat has too long been neglected. Mr. Prins saw a need to acquire a better understanding on the topic. To what extent should we accept the changes concerning the cultural heritage of the forest and what is the role of forest owners? He welcomed this first intergovernmental seminar dealing with forestry and our cultural heritage; as so far the cultural dimensions haven’t been taken seriously into consideration.

Adoption of the agenda

6. Chaired by Mr. Gunnar Nordanstig, the provisional agenda was adopted.

Election of officers

7. After a proposal by the Chairman, the following discussion leaders were appointed:
   Theme 1 Mr. Piotr Borkowski
   Theme 2 Mr. Kit Prins
   Theme 3 Ms. Elisabeth Johann

Key note presentations

8. Following key note presentations were presented:
   Mrs. Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons (CoE) The European Landscape Convention and forests
   Cultural heritage in Sweden – cultural and biocultural perspectives from a Swedish point of view

9. Mrs. Mechtild Rössler provided the background and introduction to the World Heritage Convention which has been under constant development since it was adopted by UNESCO in 1972. She further presented some of the 87 forest areas under the Convention. Sites could be included on the World Heritage List for either their outstanding cultural or natural value to humanity. Since 1992 a site could also be included as a “cultural landscape”, defined as outstanding interaction between people and the environment. The World Heritage Convention aims at linking culture and nature through recognition of the interaction between people and nature and the connection between biological and cultural diversity – these linkages needs a better recognition. The intangible heritage, as manifested in e.g. sacred forests, is another important aspect of the cultural heritage in need of increased awareness. Integrated management through international collaboration among site managers and stimulation of international debate are important factors for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

10. Mrs. Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons presented the European Landscape Convention, the latest of the Council of Europe’s “Heritage Conventions” that came into force in March 2004. The
Convention expresses a concern to achieve sustainable development based on a balanced and harmonious relationship between social needs, economic activity and the environment. It aims to respond to the public’s wish to enjoy high quality landscapes. In distinction to the World Heritage Convention, the European Landscape Convention concerns not only unique areas, but also ordinary or degraded landscapes. Similarities with the World Heritage Convention are among others, the encouragement of trans-boundary cooperation. The Council of Europe expects to present the conclusions of the work carried out by the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration as well as other initiatives at one of the next meetings of the Committee for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention.

11. Mr. Mårten Aronsson presented the development in the Swedish forests, which still has a rich and diverse cultural heritage. Ancient monuments such as graves, the cultural heritage defined in the Swedish Forestry Act, e.g. crofts, the bio-cultural heritage such as pollards and the immaterial cultural heritage e.g. names of places and features, exist together. The introduction of modern forestry based on machines has destroyed a big part of the cultural heritage and is still the main threat. In recent years the recognition of the cultural heritage in the forests has risen. Propositions from the Swedish government underlines the need for measures to increase the knowledge of and the preservation of the cultural values of the forest. The connection between cultural, natural and social values is emphasized. The Swedish Forest Administration is, with limited resources, working to reduce all known threats to the cultural heritage. The main tools are inventories, education and information. The situation is that we know what we should do but we have too little money and personnel to work efficiently enough.

**Inventory, planning and mapping (Theme 1)**

Moderator: Mr. Piotr Borkowski

12. The following papers were presented under this theme:

Mr. Alfred Grieshofer (Austria) Planning and presentation of cultural values and performances by a specific “Technical Forestry Plan”;

Ms. Marta Gaworska (Liaison Warsaw) Forest sites with cultural and spiritual values – review of national data indicator 6.11;

Mr. Jonas Enström (Sweden) Forest & History – how it all began;

Mr. Mauro Agnoletti (Italy) Between nature and culture: cultural approaches and research perspectives in the conservation of forest landscape in Italy;

Mr. Kit Prins How to measure success in achieving cultural (UN/ECE Timber committee) objectives in SFM – Indicator 6.11 of MCPFE.

13. In his keynote-presentation, Mr. Alfred Grieshofer introduced the specific Austrian background; a mountain dominated country that consists of almost 50 % woodlands dominated by private land and family farming. He then gave an informative presentation of the Technical Forestry Plan, which is a practical plan for cultural values. The Technical Forestry Plan should be prepared by the landowner or forest manager, but is at present free of charge. The Technical forestry plan contains all existing official data, including digital maps, ortho photographs, borders of protected areas, historical data and maps etc. On the subject “Forest and Culture”, three pilot projects has been realised, of which “The cultural services of
three forest enterprises in the Styrian Eisenwurzen” were focusing on collecting available information and developing a strategy on the subject for further development.

14. Ms. Marta Gaworska provided the background of the Vienna declaration and for Improved Pan-European Indicators for SFM. The number of archeological sites, giant unusual trees, sites of historical events or special ceremonies or customs, particularly beautiful landscapes etc. that are officially designated, is a rough indicator of the cultural and spiritual values assigned to its forest by society. The review of national data indicator 6.11, based on a survey conducted in the MCPFE countries, contributed to the list of potential objects. A total number of 14 countries (30%) responded to the questionnaire that among others showed a lack of coherent systems for collecting data. Another conclusion was that monitoring of sites designated as having cultural or spiritual values needs to be digitalized, which is time consuming.

15. Mr. Jonas Enström informed about the inventory project Forest & History, which begun close to the venue of the meeting. It started with only 8 persons, but since 1995 a number of 5 000 formerly unemployed people has worked for at least 6 months with inventories only in the region of Värmland-Örebro; a proof of the possibilities to get political support. The initial skepticism among landowners changed to a widespread interest of traces after their ancestors. Taking care of cultural remains doesn’t normally imply high costs, but will need some planning. The collected data of cultural remains and ancient monuments is implemented in a functional GIS-system that will be available to the forestry sector in a near future.

16. Mr. Mauro Agnolletti presented Italian perspectives on conservation of landscapes influenced by man. A project in the Region of Tuscany involved 12 study areas, with the objectives to build a GIS-database where maps of landscape dynamics and calculations of land-use changes could be produced. The extension of forest land in the period 1832-2004 has led to a massive loss of landscape diversity in the region, where different land uses is the best way to preserve its high biological and cultural values. To avoid further impoverishment of the landscape, one has to protect the complex structures – i.e. mosaics – of the landscape which depends on human interaction. The landscape resources represent means to develop sustainability and there is a need for a thematic area in the conservation policies involving significance, integrity and vulnerability.

17. Mr. Kit Prins presented the characteristics of good indicators and the background of the MCPFE indicators of sustainable forest management. Some new indicators has been introduced to ensure comprehensive coverage and to stimulate research and gathering of data. There have been conceptual and practical difficulties from the start of Indicator 6.11; the number of sites within forest and other wooded land designated as having cultural and spiritual values. The main challenge of the indicator is to know whether we are doing our job concerning the cultural heritage or not and the questions arising concern the definitions and collection of data. Do more sites lead to better management of cultural and spiritual values? The Swedish presentation indicated this, whereas the Italian presentation did not.

Forest management and the cultural heritage (Theme 2)

Moderator: Mr. Kit Prins

18. The following papers were presented under this theme:
Mr. Jari Parvianen (Finland) Forest Management and Cultural Heritage;
Mr. Tim Yarnell (United Kingdom) Approaches to the conservation of the cultural heritage in woods and forests in Great Britain;
Mr. Mark van Benthem (Netherlands) Management of historic elements in Dutch forests;
Ms. Anna Marntell (Sweden) Cultural remains of the forests – a resource in rural development;
Mr. Jesus Garcia Latorre (Austria) The cultural heritage for the future: Forestry in the Austrian alps;
Mr. Chuo Ma (PR China) The current situation on forest management and cultural heritage in China;
Ms. Ana Noriega (Spain) Spanish cultural heritage;
Mr. Alfred Griesthofer (Austria) National report Austria;
Mr. Zhaneta Prifti (Albania) Albanian report: Forestry and Cultural Heritage.

19. In his keynote-presentation, Prof. Jari Parvianen gave an introduction to the human impact on forests in Europe and examples of various forest uses during the history. Our society is urbanized and globalized which has led to that we have lost our contact with the forests. We now need guidebooks and guidelines for management of the forest. The cultural and spiritual aspects are taken into account in the Finnish Forest Certification System, e.g. preservation of ancient monuments and the safeguarding of the Sámi culture. There is a need to define and develop more indicators for cultural and spiritual aspects of sustainable forest management; only one indicator might be a too narrow approach and a multi-disciplinary research is needed.

20. In his keynote-presentation, Mr. Tim Yarnell opened with the question: Is there a place for the past in the woodlands of tomorrow? The presentation gave the answer by showing the rich heritage of the historic environment in UK, and its potential for tourism and other economic uses. The cultural dimensions of sustainable forest management in Europe include archaeology “in” and “of” woods, veteran trees and trees of cultural interest. Ancient monuments are often the only evidence about past societies and an important part of a national identity; while the woodlands were places where past people lived and worked, and therefore contain historical records. One of our tasks is to open up the forest so that one can appreciate the remains of the landscape. It is also most important to place the site in a landscape context.

21. Mr. Mark van Benthem presented the history of Dutch forests and the current situation of management of the historic elements. In Holland almost no cultural remains are directly related to, or situated in the forest; which depends upon the fact that there hardly were any forests left in the end of the 19th century. The forests were used for shipbuilding as well as for charcoal and iron production, and a lot of land was needed for grazing. Historical elements can be important from a biodiversity point of view, which were clearly shown by the presentations of trees affected by man. Culture remains are now being destroyed because of lack of knowledge. He expressed a wish to exchange knowledge on a European level and ended with the statement that the activities of today are the cultural heritage of tomorrow. He presented a new book addressed to the Dutch forest sector, written by himself and his colleague Patrick Jansen.

22. Ms. Anna Marntell presented the local pilot-project “Cultural Remains of the Forest – a resource in rural development”. The EU-funded project runs between 2004-2006 with the objective to increase the knowledge about ancient monuments and other cultural remains in
the forest. The project also aims at demonstrating measures to protect and maintain cultural environment and addresses the question whether they can be a resource for rural development. The project is about spreading information and putting the collected data in good use. Main project activities include: guided tours, seminars, establishment of demonstration areas, and cooperation with local entrepreneurs.

23. Mr. Jesus Garcia Latorre started to state that the most important tool for developing a practical use of cultural aspects of the forest is a pair of boots. The presentation gave proof of the statement by showing many examples of the ancestors’ and nature’s legacy in the Alps, visited by himself. The instrumental frame for cultural and biological values in Austria is the Technical Forest Plan, which is a result of the implementation of policies that consider the cultural aspects of forest ecosystem, such as MCPFE and the Alpine Convention. To get input networking is important encompassing the widest possible spectrum of stakeholders. Some years back, the issue of the cultural heritage wasn’t even on the agenda, and there is still a lot of work to be done.

24. Mr. Chuo Ma presented the current situation in China, which is in its initial stages in preserving the cultural heritage. Ancient monuments are still being discovered and reported to the local museums. The protection of the cultural structures are slipping behind because of failure of the legal system; out of 400 000 sites that need protection, so far only 60 000 sites have been taken care of. The attitude among the local public is negative because of the fear for development obstructions; people are however in general interested in the potential of the cultural heritage for tourism income. The work to put the protection of natural and cultural heritage together has begun with new items in the Forest Laws and educational development as well as cooperation between local governments and NGO’s.

25. Ms. Ana Noriega presented the work with cultural heritage in the Spanish forests and gave examples from different National Parks. The database contains 15 000 records, but it is not updated and most sites doesn’t have any coordinates. Different tools to locate the ancient remains do though exist through GPS and GIS-systems. A draft project with the objective of creating a new database with different layers has been discussed. The importance of traditional use around cultural heritage is another characteristic challenge for the conservation of the cultural values.

26. Mr. Alfred Grieshofer presented the Austrian situation, which is in the beginning of a working process were cultural and social dimensions of sustainable forest management are being integrated in the relevant policies, e.g. the Austrian Forest Programme, the Alpine Convention and the programme of rural development. There is a need to link these dimensions to tourism, education and rural development by a planning based on partnership. Of highest priority is to build this development upon motivation and voluntariness; knowledge and awareness of landowners is important for the preservation of the cultural values. The “Network Forest-Culture Austria” offers a new way to develop and encourage change by establishing links between enterprises and authorities.

27. Mrs. Zhaneta Prifti presented the case in Albania; a mountainous country with a forest area cover of 36 %. Management of the cultural heritage includes improvement of legislation and new regulations. Protected areas will be studied and different values will be identified; from historical to ecological and recreational values. Through education and awareness raising among the local community, protection and preservation of these values is going to be enhanced.
28. Summary of discussions – Following the presentations under this theme the moderator, Mr. Kit Prins, led the discussion on the following topics:

a) People and forest  
b) Values change over time  
c) Raising awareness  
d) Money  
e) Bio-cultural heritage  

Research (Item 3)

Moderator: Ms. Elisabeth Johann

29. The following papers were presented under this item:

Ms. Elisabeth Johann (Austria)  
Network Forest-Culture Austria – a new way to develop and encourage social and cultural dimensions of sustainable forest management;

Ms. Eva Svensson (Sweden)  
Cultural heritage of the forest and cultural heritage in the forest;

Mr. Gert Magnusson (Sweden)  
Heritage and forests – land history and the forest landscape;

Mr. Leszeh Chojnacki & Mr. Benedykt Rozmiarek (Poland)  
The Forest Culture Centre in Goluchów: The presentation of 25 years of activity;

Mr. Fredrik Olsson-Hector (EU)  
Human Resources and Mobility - Madam Curie Actions.

30. In her keynote-presentation, Ms. Elisabeth Johann presented the network “Forest-Culture Austria” which deals with the relations between forests, forest management and the society. The intention is that it should become a trademark representing high quality with regard to Sustainable Forest Management and the protection of the cultural heritage. The output of the network is, among others, to collect forest history related data, spreading information about historical methods of utilization and management of the landscape and strengthening the cooperation between forest enterprises and tourism. Forest enterprises should have the competence of maintaining and developing cultural interesting sites so that the rural population will be able to get higher revenue and that new jobs can be created.

31. Ms. Eva Svensson discussed the ideology of nature versus culture; an outdated dichotomy that obstruct interdisciplinary research and management. The forest is a product of both cultural and natural processes and is under continuous change. Human impact resulted in both monuments and a new environment. Cultural heritage can either be manifested as human agency of the forest or be situated in the forest. Extraction of different forestry related resources created a heritage of the forest, such as pitfalls and slag heaps. Forests that were transformed to different land use have led to a cultural heritage in the forest. For sustainable development one has to acknowledge history and adopt a regional approach.

32. Mr. Gert Magnusson presented the heritage of forests in the iron ore region and the development of a Swedish governance of ancient monuments. The use of the forest resources has changed over time, which in turn has affected the natural and social environment. For example resulted the iron production in mid Sweden, in exploited forests and new communities. The mines have since medieval times been a production unit and a local society,
and both man and woman were occupied in the hard and dangerous work down in the mines. During the 1600th century the idea to protect the national heritage started to develop; today almost all known ancient monuments are located in a national database and can be used by the forestry sector.

33. Mr. Leszeh Chojnacki and Mr Benedykt Rozmiarek showed a computer presentation of the Forest Culture Centre in Goluchów, situated in west Poland. The centre is established to collect and study the Polish forest heritage and to on a large scale popularize the knowledge of forests and forestry within the society. The renovated buildings offer different kinds of exhibitions and museums, while visitors in the park surrounding the residence can see many unique nature monuments and historical objects. The forest Culture Center also have good educational facilities and publishes a wide range of books and extension materials.

34. Mr. Fredrik Olsson-Hector presented the Marie Curie Actions which are open to researchers in all fields of research – including forestry and the cultural heritage. The Sixth Framework Programme on Human Resources and Mobility has a budget of €1 732 million and is largely based on the financing of training and mobility activities for researchers. These activities are aimed at training and transfer of knowledge, promotion of excellence in European research and career development. It has no thematic priorities, but reward multidisciplinary research and female participation.

35. An evaluation of the seminar following the UN/ECE format was performed. See annex II.

Conclusions and recommendations
36. The seminar approved the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions
37. Nearly all Europe’s forests are shaped by the activities of human generations over centuries and millennia. Social and environmental factors have come together to create the forests of today. They are part of Europe’s identity and our generation’s cultural heritage: we owe it to past and future generations to develop our forests in harmonious relation with the landscape.

38. The cultural heritage is first and foremost vested in the local owners and users of the forest. In addition many other actors may have a role to play. Rural depopulation and the retreat of agriculture, along with other economic and social pressures are changing the composition of forest cultural landscapes. In some areas, this has led to loss of pastures and the biodiversity developed over millennia, and other open spaces in increasingly forest dominated landscapes. The implications of these changes are often difficult to assess and integrate into forest management decisions.

39. Threats to forest cultural heritage include
   - the weakening of the transmission of the knowledge of the forest cultural heritage between generations.
   - damage to cultural sites in forests by inappropriate use of modern mechanised silvicultural and harvesting methods.

40. The cultural heritage includes the bio-cultural heritage, which is the biological manifestation of human activity in the landscape, e.g. traditional farming and forestry practices. These have contributed in most cases both to harmonious cultural landscapes and to
enriched biodiversity. Currently, only a few countries have started to investigate the complex processes underlying the forest bio-cultural heritage and to propose conservation methods and principles.

41. Vienna Resolution V3 lays down the broad lines of action for the cultural and spiritual heritage, but these general principles need to be translated into more specific and action oriented guidance. There is also a need to raise awareness of these issues, inside and outside the sector, including among policy makers, so that the actions taken have broad support from a wide range of stakeholders. Whereas some issues, such as the need to protect tangible signs of the cultural heritage in forest areas (e.g. archaeological sites), are relatively well understood in many countries, others, such as the intangible elements, are not well understood, and therefore receive insufficient attention. MCPFE Indicator 6.11 on Cultural and spiritual values will provide objective but simplified information on one aspect of these issues (protection of cultural sites), but does not cover the whole domain.

42. In many cases, actions concerning the forest cultural heritage would make an important contribution to sustainable rural development.

43. Site specific strategies, based on multi disciplinary consultation, and mobilising resources and political support from a wide range of stakeholders, can promote the sustainable development of rural landscapes. Such strategies could be based on rural tourism and the rediscovery of rural lifestyles and crafts, but must be socially, ecologically and economically viable.

44. Cultural and spiritual issues related to forests should be approached in a cross-sectoral perspective. In addition to the forest sector, many other actors can contribute, including local authorities, heritage authorities, rural development, tourism and biodiversity conservation agencies, environmental, cultural and social NGOs and the scientific community.

45. In many countries, the location, type and number of cultural heritage sites are not well known: a necessary precondition to action is a good knowledge of the size of the issue. Concepts and definitions are also not clear.

**Recommendations**

*For the international and pan-European level*

46. The MCPFE Expert Level Meeting in September 2005 should set up an advisory group to prepare proposals for guidance to countries on implementing Resolution V3.

47. Other agencies, notably UNESCO and Council of Europe (CoE) and IUFRO, should be invited to take part in future international activities on cultural and spiritual dimensions of sustainable forest management; care should be taken to avoid duplication of activities and learn from the experience of these organisations.

*For the national and regional/local level*

48. Forest agencies and authorities should strengthen their capacity to define and achieve goals in the cultural and spiritual fields, including the commitments of resolution V3, notably by assessing their strategies and priorities in this area and by engaging relevant specialists.

49. The full and active support of all stakeholders, notably the forest owners, should be obtained at the initial stages of preparing national, regional or local strategies.
50. There is a need for awareness raising, education and research in several areas, including the bio-cultural heritage and conservation of the intangible cultural heritage (oral traditions, traditional forest related knowledge etc.). Targeted communication strategies may be necessary.

51. Forest authorities and agencies should clearly define their research and development needs in the field of cultural and spiritual dimensions of sustainable forest management.

52. Cooperation and dialogue between forestry and heritage authorities should be strengthened and put on a regular basis.

53. All actors concerned should work towards a better understanding of the linkages between cultural and biodiversity conservation issues.

54. Conservation and sustainable use of the bio-cultural heritage should be included in forest and landscape management strategies. More countries should investigate the complex processes underlying the forest bio-cultural heritage and propose methods and principles.

55. Countries should take measures to enable them to provide information for MCPFE indicator 6.11 by 2006. In this context, those responsible for providing the information to MCPFE should consult widely in their countries.

56. Governments should carry out an inventory or gather information in another way on their forest related cultural sites, in a practical and usable form (GIS, GPS, databases) which can help machine operators avoid cultural monuments in forest areas.

**Adoption of the report**

57. The seminar adopted the conclusions and recommendations prepared by the secretariat with a number of modifications.
Annex I  
Report of the study visits

Study visit Tuesday, 14 June 2005
Seminar participants visited the Nordmarksberg mining environment in the westernmost pits in Sweden’s central iron ore region. A sudden appearance of a bull elk was obviously much appreciated by participants. Information was provided on the history of the mine and discussions were held around the topics of the bio-cultural heritage and strategies for preservation. In particular strategies concerning the management of the trees were discussed on the site. Should the objectives be to maximize the aesthetical, biological and/or historical values; and to what extend should practical issues be taken under consideration?

The mine owners supplied iron ore to the iron industry in western Värmland, from the 15th century until year 1962. Some silver, asbestos, and limestone have also been mined in the area. The land and extraction rights were owned by the state, which allotted mining rights to the various mine owners. When the mines were closed, the deepest mine was 360 meters. Today the Värmland Industrial Heritage Foundation owns the area surrounding the mines and the appurtenant buildings.

In earlier periods the mines were worked in opened pits and it was first during the 16th century when the mines became deeper and sub terrain working technique were developed. The miner were in old days both men and women. They lived in small huts in the neighbourhood of the mines. The mines has since medieval times been both a production unit as well as a social unit and a local society.

Study visit Wednesday, 15 June 2005
The study tour was organized to the abandoned shieling Sågtorp north of Sunne. Shielings were used primarily for grazing, but also for hay-making and cultivation. This practise, to let the cattle during the summer graze on a site more or less distant from the farmstead, has been established already during the Iron Age.

Seminar participants also visited a bloomery furnace of a later type. This relative big furnace, built above ground, can tentatively be dated to medieval times or later. Furnaces of this kind are unusual in Värmland. The bloomery iron-production reaches its peak during late Viking Age and early medieval period, and the core area for this production is situated north of the visited area.

Skog & Historia (Forest & History) is an inventory project where unemployed laymen, together with antiquarians, search and documents ancient monuments and other cultural remains. The project is cooperation between National Board of Antiquities and the Swedish forest administration. The project has its background in the threat modern forestry constitutes against the cultural heritage.

The participants were also shown example of the intangible cultural heritage related to shielings. Two strong female voices were heard over the old grazing pastures; a tradition known as kulning (herding-calls). Kulning has been used since at least the Middle Age, and functions primarily as a means of communication between the shepherdess and the animals.

Mr. Armas Jäppinen, from the Swedish Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications, discussed the development and situation of modern forestry.
Annex II

Evaluation of the seminar

1. Overall evaluation

Number corresponds to the number of seminar participants evaluating items at this level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Poor (0)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format &amp; Organization of meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format &amp; organisation de la réunion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the meeting meet your objectives?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vos objectifs ont-ils été atteints?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité des documents présentés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité des discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group effectiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacité des groupes de travail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field excursions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visites d'étude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MEETING QUALITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITE GENERALE DE LA REUNION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What aspects of the meeting did you like best?
   Quels aspects de la réunion avez-vous préférés?

- Presentations, discussions
- Statements of national positions
- Broad range of topics, esp. issues related to inventory of forest cultural heritage sites
- The excursion, meeting people

3. What improvements would you suggest?
   Quelles améliorations suggérez-vous?

- More time for conclusions and recommendations, group discussions and exchange of views.
- Statements from countries that didn’t present or attend
- Less/shorter presentations per day
4. **What percentage of the information presented was new to you?**
   Quel est en pourcentage la somme d'informations nouvelles que vous avez pu obtenir durant la réunion?
   
   Average: 61% (range from 30 – 95%)

5. **What percentage of the information will you be able to use?**
   Quelles sont en pourcentage les informations que vous serez en mesure d'utiliser?
   
   Average: 76% (range from 30 – 100%)

6. **What follow-up do you suggest should be given to this meeting?**
   Quelle suite proposeriez-vous de donner à cette réunion?
   
   • MCPFE Expert meeting, other meetings on this topic
   • Set up a Team of Specialists
   • Exchange of experience and information
   • A statement of changes made to national strategies since this or any succeeding seminars
   • Proceedings
   • As indicated in conclusions and recommendations

7. **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**
   OBSERVATIONS SUPPLEMENTAIRES: