

WP4 – Products of animal origin

Not all animals – just those that are
“hunted” i.e. consumptive use

Summary presentation made at Krakow 20-21 Feb 2014



European NWFPs network | Action FP1203 | www.nwfps.eu



Key features

- Animals are *mobile*
- Range greater than individual forest holdings
- Need to be understood and managed at landscape scale
- Forest owners do not generally have the right to hunt
- Generally there is little return of income to forest owners from owners of hunting rights

Management systems

- Voluntary co-operation between multiple owners
- State control (wildlife or conservation dept)
- Forest owner control mostly only in larger holdings

Co-production – wild animals

- Wild animals and trees are antagonistic
- Management seeks a compromise between production of each
- Models commonly used to achieve this (MSY, PVA etc.)
- Needs to be *socially acceptable*
- Number and variety of stakeholders influence/constrain decision making

Intersection with TFs

- TF1 – ID not a problem: Ecology at landscape scale
- TF2 – Many models available
- TF3 – Co-production is the norm
- TF4 – Good figures for game production; less on multiplier

Co-production – semi-feral animals

- Domestic animals (usually hardier breeds) used as management tools in forestry e.g. Highland cattle in Netherlands, Pigs in UK
- Often marketed with ‘woodland’ and/or ‘wild’ credentials

Co-production – domesticated animals

- Forest (or forest land) used to rear domestic animals e.g. goats, chickens, pheasants etc.
- Some hunted
- Some marketed with ‘woodland’ credentials
- Some illegal
- Some woodland aspect is not recognised

What to do?

- Explore the “conflicts” between animals and trees and the ways they are addressed (or not)
- Bees – agreements rather than conflicts
- Explore stakeholder interest in resolution of co-production targets