



CHAPTER 3

Does Forest Certification Impact Forest Protection? An Investigation through the Lens of Forest Villagers

*Gonca Ece ÖZCAN¹
Oytun Emre SAKICI²*

Introduction

Considering the ecological, social, and economic benefits of forests, it is important to prioritize sustainable forest management. This approach aims to maintain a high level of product and service continuity without compromising the productivity of forests, which are crucial elements for our future (1). It is emphasized that preserving the benefits provided by forests requires greater attention to social factors within this concept (2,3). Although it is difficult to objectively determine the role of forestry in rural development (4), it is known that forestry contributes to rural economies by playing important roles in the livelihoods of rural people (5-7). Considering the contribution of forestry to rural development, it is important to evaluate local views and attitudes in a multi-dimensional manner in order to make decisions that reflect the preferences of local people in forest management (8). Participatory forest management has emerged as an accepted approach for addressing forestry problems in today's

¹ Kastamonu University, Faculty of Forestry, goncaece@kastamonu.edu.tr, ORCID iD: 0000-0003-0141-1031

² Kastamonu University, Faculty of Forestry, oesakici@kastamonu.edu.tr, ORCID iD: 0000-0003-4961-2991



References

1. Bettinger P, Siry J, Cieszewski C, Merry KL, Zengin H, Yeşil A. Forest management issues of the southern United States and comparisons with Turkey. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry*; 2013; 37(1): 83-96. doi: 10.3906/tar-1202-23
2. O'Brien EA. Human values and their importance to the development of forestry policy in Britain: A literature review. *Forestry*; 2003; 76(1): 3-17. doi:10.1093/forestry/76.1.3
3. FAO. *State of the World's Forests: Enhancing the socioeconomic benefits from forests. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations 2014* (on 16.05.2023 available at <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5588e.pdf>)
4. Elands BH, Wiersum KF. Forestry and rural development in Europe: An exploration of socio-political discourses. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2001; 3(1-2): 5-16. doi:10.1016/S1389-9341(00)00027-7
5. Adedayo AG, Oyun MB, Kadeba O. Access of rural women to forest resources and its impact on rural household welfare in North Central Nigeria. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2010; 12(6): 439-450. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2010.04.001
6. Tumusiime DM, Vedeld P, Gombya-Ssembajjwe W. Breaking the law? Illegal livelihoods from a protected area in Uganda. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2011; 13(4): 273-283. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2011.02.001
7. Barbir CF. Forest's role in the sustainable development of rural communities with reference to particular situations in the area administrated by Podu Iloaiei Forest District, Iași County, Romania. *Journal of Horticulture, Forestry and Biotechnology*; 2012; 16(2): 279-286.
8. Papageorgiou K, Kassioumis K, Blioumis V, Christodoulou A. Linking quality of life and forest values in rural areas: an exploratory study of stakeholder perspectives in the rural community of Konitsa, Greece. *Forestry*; 2005; 78(5): 485-499. doi:10.1093/forestry/cpi049
9. Cantiani MG. Forest planning and public participation: a possible methodological approach. *iForest-Biogeosciences and Forestry*; 2012; 5(2): 72-82. doi:10.3832/ifer0602-009
10. Park M, Lee H. Legal opportunities for public participation in forest management in the Republic of Korea. *Sustainability*; 2016; 8(4): 369. doi:10.3390/su8040369
11. European Commission. *Natura 2000 and forests "Challenges and opportunities" Interpretation guide. Office for official publications of the European communities 2023.* (on 20.04.2023 available at [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/info/pubs/docs/nat2000/n2kforest_en.pdf\(2003\)](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/info/pubs/docs/nat2000/n2kforest_en.pdf(2003)))
12. Nijnik M, Mather A. Analysing institutions and public perspectives to identify the future of British forests. In: Reynolds KM, Thomson AJ, Köhl M, Shannon MA, Ray D, Rennolls K (eds.) *Sustainable Forestry: from Monitoring and Modelling to Knowledge Management and Policy Science*. Wallingford UK: CABI; 2007. p. 171-188.
13. Vierikko K, Vehkamäki S, Niemelä J, Pellikka J, Linden H. Meeting the ecological, social and economic needs of sustainable forest management at a regional scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*; 2008; 23(5): 431-444. doi:10.1080/02827580802284693
14. Pastorella F, Giacobelli G, Maesano M, Paletto A, Vivona S, Veltri A, Pellicone, G, Mugnozza, GS. Social perception of forest multifunctionality in southern Italy:



- The case of Calabria Region. *Journal of Forest Science*; 2016; 62(8): 366-379. doi:10.17221/45/2016-JFS
15. Newton P, Miller DC, Byenkya MAA, Agrawal A. Who are forest-dependent people? A taxonomy to aid livelihood and land use decision-making in forested regions. *Land Use Policy*; 2016; 57: 388-395. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.05.032
 16. Chao S. *Forest peoples: Numbers across the World*. United Kingdom: Forest Peoples Programme; 2012.
 17. FAO. *Global Forest Resources Assessment Main Report 2020*. (on 18.02.2023 available at <https://www.fao.org/3/ca9825en/ca9825en.pdf>)
 18. TSI. *Turkish Statistical Institute 2020*. (on 05.05.2020 available at <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Adrese-Dayali-Nufus-Kayit-Sistemi-Sonuclari-2020-37210>)
 19. GDF. *General Directorate of Forestry, Forestry Statistics 2020*. (on 05.05.2020 available at <https://www.ogm.gov.tr/tr/e-kutuphane/resmi-istatistikler>)
 20. Güneş Y, Coşkun AA. *Trends in forest ownership, forest resources tenure and institutional arrangements: Are they contributing to better forest management and poverty reduction? A case study from Turkey*. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome; 2008.
 21. Solmaz E. Muğla orman köylerinin kalkınmasına yönelik uygulanan politikaların yoksulluk düzeyi ve orman kaynaklarının kullanıma etkisi. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*; 2007; 19: 1-21. (in Turkish)
 22. Alkan H, Kilic M. Forests and forestry organizations from the forest villagers' perspective: A case study from Turkey. *iForest-Biogeosciences and Forestry*; 2014; 7(4): 240. doi:10.3832/ifer0999-007
 23. Şenyaz A, Sülüşoğlu M, Yılmaz E. *Akdeniz ormancılığı açısından Mersin ili, Tarsus ilçesi bazı orman köylerindeki sosyo-ekonomik yapı ve ormancılık faaliyetlerinin değerlendirilmesi*. T.C. Çevre ve Orman Bakanlığı, Doğu Akdeniz Araştırma Enstitüsü; 2005. (in Turkish)
 24. Zengin H, Yeşil A, Asan Ü, Bettinger P, Cieszewski C, Siry JP. Evolution of modern forest management planning in the Republic of Turkey. *Journal of Forestry*; 2013; 111(4): 239-248. doi:10.5849/jof.11-103
 25. Yurdaer, M. Forest and water resources of Turkey 2009. In: *Sustainable Forest Management and Influences on Water Resources -Coordinating Policies on Forests and Water, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, 12-14 May 2009, Antalya, Türkiye*, (p. 14-15).
 26. Elliott C, Schlaepfer R. Understanding forest certification using the Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2001; 2(3-4): 257-266. doi:10.1016/S1389-9341(01)00043-0
 27. Mikulková A, Hájek M, Štěpánková M, Ševčík M. Forest certification as a tool to support sustainable development in forest management. *Journal of Forest Science*; 2015; 61(8): 359-368. doi: 10.17221/16/2015-JFS
 28. Butterfield R, Chapela F, Fuge P, de Freitas AG, Hayward J, Jansens J. W, Jenkins M, Madrid S, Martin A, Azevedo TR, Ridder M, Smith P, Soza C, White, A. *Forest certification and communities: Looking forward to the next decade*. Washington, DC; 2003.
 29. Perera P, Vlosky RP. *A history of forest certification*. Louisiana Forest Products Development Center: 2006.



30. Paluš H, Krahulcová M, Parobek J. Assessment of forest certification as a tool to support forest ecosystem services. *Forests*; 2021; 12(3): 300. doi.org/10.3390/f12030300
31. Durusoy İ, Özdemir O. Price premiums for certified roundwood: Evidence from auction sales in Turkey. *Journal of Forest Research*; 2021; 26(6): 395-399. doi:10.1080/13416979.2021.1940664
32. Rametsteiner E, Simula, M. Forest certification—an instrument to promote sustainable forest management?. *Journal of Environmental Management*; 2003; 67(1): 87-98. doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4797(02)00191-3
33. Bass S, Thornber K, Markopoulos M, Roberts S, Grieg-Grah M. *Certification's impacts on forests, stakeholders and supply chains, Instruments for sustainable private sector forestry series*. Nottingham, UK: Russell Press; 2001.
34. Sivacioğlu A, Öner N. Forest management assessment as to FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) certification system in Turkey. In: *International Scientific Conference "Forest Research Institute at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences 85th Anniversary"*, 1-2 October 2013, Sofia, Bulgaria, (p.12).
35. Means PT. Forest Stewardship Council certification of public forests: five case studies. Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 2007.
36. Cashore B, Van Kooten K, Vertinsky I, Auld G, Affolderbach J. Private or self-regulation? A comparative study of forest certification choices in Canada, the United States and Germany. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2005; 7(1): 53-69. doi:10.1016/S1389-9341(03)00011-X
37. Pattberg P. Private governance and the south: Lessons from global forest politics. *Third World Quarterly*; 2006; 27(4): 579-593.
38. Humphries S S, Kainer KA 2006. Local perceptions of forest certification for community-based enterprises. *Forest Ecology and Management*; 2006; 235(1-3): 30-43. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2006.07.027
39. Galati A, Gianguzzi G, Tinervia S, Crescimanno M, La Mela Veca DS. Motivations, adoption and impact of voluntary environmental certification in the Italian Forest based industry: The case of the FSC standard. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2017; 83: 169-176. doi: 10.1016/j.forpol.2017.08.002
40. Piketty MG, Garcia Drigo, I. Shaping the implementation of the FSC standard: The case of auditors in Brazil. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2018, 90: 160-166. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2018.02.009
41. Pezdevšek Malovrh Š, Bećirović D, Marić B, Nedeljković J, Posavec S, Petrović N, Avdibegović M. Contribution of forest stewardship council certification to sustainable forest management of state forests in selected Southeast European countries. *Forests*; 2019; 10(8): 648. doi:10.3390/f10080648
42. Türker MF, Durusoy İ. Devlet orman işletmelerinde halkla ilişkiler ve sertifikasyon. In: *II. Ulusal Karadeniz Ormançılık Kongresi*, 15-18 May 2002, Artvin, Türkiye (p. 395-404). (in Turkish)
43. GDF. *General Directorate of Forestry, Forestry Statistics 2016* (on 05.06.2020 available at <https://www.ogm.gov.tr/tr/e-kutuphane/resmi-istatistikler>)
44. TSI. *Turkish Statistical Institute 2019*. (on 15.03.2022 available at <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=tr>)



45. Lilley R, Feyer AM, Kirk P, Gander P. A survey of forest workers in New Zealand: Do hours of work, rest, and recovery play a role in accidents and injury? *Journal of Safety Research*; 2002; 33(1): 53-71. doi: 10.1016/s0022-4375(02)00003-8
46. Güneş Y. Türkiye’de orman işçilerinin sosyal güvenlikleri konusunda hukuksal incelemeler. MSc Thesis, İstanbul University, Türkiye, 1989. (in Turkish)
47. Engür MO. *Ağaç kesim teknikleri ve iş güvenliği*. Ankara: OR-KOOP Türkiye Ormancılık Kooperatifleri Merkez Birliği Eğitim Yayınları Dizisi; 2006. (in Turkish)
48. Enez K, Nalbantoğlu SS. Comparison of ergonomic risk assessment outputs from OWAS and REBA in forestry timber harvesting. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*; 2019; 70: 51-57. doi: 10.1016/j.ergon.2019.01.009
49. Ünal HE, Birben Ü, Elvan OD. Public perception of forest crimes: The case of Iğaz Province in Turkey. *Crime, Law and Social Change*; 2021; 75(5): 487-506. doi.org/10.1007/s10611-021-09951-4
50. Kalonga SK, Kulindwa KA. Does forest certification enhance livelihood conditions? Empirical evidence from forest management in Kilwa District, Tanzania. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2017; 74: 49-61. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2016.11.001
51. Yılmaz A. Orman, köylü ve devlet: ormandan faydalanma, koruma ve orman suçları bağlamında orman köylüsü ve devlet ilişkileri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*; 2018; 20(4), 665-690. doi.org/10.16953/deusosbil.420833 (in Turkish)
52. Atmış E, Çil A. Sustainable forestry in Turkey. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*; 2013; 32(4): 354-364. doi:10.1080/10549811.2013.767210
53. Türker MF, Öztürk A, Durusoy İ, Pak M. Socio-economic, cultural and demographic structures of Turkish forest villages and development approaches. In: *XII World Forestry Congress*, 21–28 September 2003, Quebec, Canada.
54. Dewi S, Belcher B, Puntodewo A. Village economic opportunity, forest dependence, and rural livelihoods in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *World Development*; 2005; 33(9): 1419-1434.
55. Demir M, Kucukosmanoglu A, Hasdemir M, Acar H, Ozturk T. Assessment of forest roads and firebreaks in Turkey. *African Journal of Biotechnology*; 2009; 8(18): 4553-4561.
56. Nebel G, Quevedo L, Jacobsen JB, Helles F. Development and economic significance of forest certification: the case of FSC in Bolivia. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2005; 7(2): 175-186. doi:10.1016/S1389-9341(03)00030-3
57. Kaya Z, Raynal DJ. Biodiversity and conservation of Turkish forests. *Biological Conservation*; 2001; 97(2): 131-141. doi:10.1016/S0006-3207(00)00069-0
58. Dragoi M, Popa B, Blujdea V. Improving communication among stakeholders through ex-post transactional analysis — case study on Romanian forestry. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2011; 13(1): 16-23. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2010.08.007
59. GDF. *General Directorate of Forestry, Forestry Statistics 2010*. (on 06.09.2023 available at <https://www.ogm.gov.tr/tr/e-kutuphanesitesi/istatistikler/Ormanc%C4%B1l%C4%B1k%20%C4%B0statistikleri/Ormanc%C4%B1l%C4%B1k%20%C4%B0statistikleri%202010.pdf>)
60. GDF. *General Directorate of Forestry 2015*. (on 11.05.2022 available at <https://www.ogm.gov.tr>)
61. Birben Ü. Cibal-i mübaha. In: *II. Ormancılıkta Sosyo-Ekonomik Sorunlar Kongresi*, 19-21 February 2009, Isparta, Türkiye, (p. 395-404). (in Turkish)



62. Contreras-Hermosilla A. *Law compliance in the forestry sector: an overview*. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2002.
63. Mondiale B. *Strengthening forest law enforcement and governance: Addressing a systemic constraint to sustainable development*. Washington: The World Bank; 2006.
64. Güneş Y. Orman suçlarının ceza hukuku açısından incelenmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*; 2004; 54(1): 143-164. (in Turkish)
65. Türker MF, Yazıcı K, Öztürk A, Pak M. Extent of illegal fuelwood consumption from Turkish state forests: economic and welfare effects. *New Medit*; 2002; 3: 54-59.
66. Eckerberg K, Sandström C. Forest conflicts: A growing research field, special issue. *Forest Policy and Economics*; 2013; 33: 3–7. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2013.05.001
67. Can T. *Ormanın kitabı*. İstanbul: Ofset Yapımevi; 2013.
68. Tolunay A, Korkmaz M. Orman köylerinin orman kaynaklarından yararlanma haklarının tarihsel gelişimi. In: *1. Çevre ve Ormanlık Şurası*, 22-24 March 2005, Antalya, Türkiye, (4: 1559-1566). (in Turkish)
69. Özcan G, Sakici OE. Evaluation of forest villagers' perceptions about protection activities in Kastamonu region and their integration possibilities to forest planning. In: *International Forestry Symposium*, 7-10 December 2016, Kastamonu, Türkiye, (p. 363-374).