



EUROPEAN FOREST INSTITUTE  
CENTRAL-EAST AND SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN  
REGIONAL OFFICE - EFICEEC-EFISEE



# Forest Land Ownership Change in Turkey

COST Action FP1201 FACESMAP Country Report



**COST Action FP1201**  
Forest Land Ownership Change in Europe:  
Significance for Management and Policy  
(FACESMAP)



# Forest Land Ownership Change in Turkey

COST Action FP1201 FACESMAP Country Report

*Authors*

**Hamide Gubbuk**

*Akdeniz University, Faculty of Agriculture  
Department of Horticulture  
07058, Antalya  
Turkey*

**Senay Cetinay**

*Batı Akdeniz Ormancılık Araştırma Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü  
PK: 264, 07002 Antalya  
Turkey*

**Saime Basaran**

*Batı Akdeniz Ormancılık Araştırma Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü  
PK: 264, 07002 Antalya  
Turkey*

**Sadettin Guler**

*Batı Akdeniz Ormancılık Araştırma Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü  
PK: 264, 07002 Antalya  
Turkey*

**Tahsin Etli**

*Antalya Orman Bölge Müdürlüğü  
Sedir Mah. Vatan Bul.  
07010 Muratpaşa, Antalya  
Turkey*

**Recep Balkic**

*Akdeniz University, Faculty of Agriculture  
Department of Horticulture  
07058, Antalya  
Turkey*

The COST Action FP1201 FACESMAP Country Reports are edited by the European Forest Institute Central-East and South-East European Regional Office (EFICEEC-EFISEE) at the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU). The Country Reports are not subject to external peer review. The responsibility for the contents of the Country Reports lies solely with the country author teams. Comments and critique by readers are highly appreciated.

The main parts of these Country Reports will be included in the upcoming EFICEEC-EFISEE Research Report "Forest Land Ownership Change in Europe. COST Action FP1201 FACESMAP Country Reports, Joint Volume", published online on the FACESMAP (<http://facesmap.boku.ac.at>) and EFICEEC-EFISEE ([www.eficeec.efi.int](http://www.eficeec.efi.int)) websites.

#### **Reference:**

Gubbuk, H., Cetinay, S., Basaran, S., Guler, S., Etili, T., Balkic, R. (2015) Forest Land Ownership Change in Turkey. COST Action FP1201 FACESMAP Country Report, European Forest Institute Central-East and South-East European Regional Office, Vienna. 15 pages. [Online publication]

#### **Published by:**

European Forest Institute Central-East and South-East European Regional Office  
(EFICEEC-EFISEE) c/o  
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)  
Feistmantelstrasse 4  
1180 Vienna  
Austria

Tel: + 43-1-47654-4410  
e-mail: [eficeec@efi.int](mailto:eficeec@efi.int)  
Web site: [www.eficeec.efi.int](http://www.eficeec.efi.int)

Papers published in this series can be downloaded in PDF-format from:  
<http://facesmap.boku.ac.at/library/countryreports>

Cover: F. Aggestam    Layout: S. Zivojinovic



COST is supported by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020



COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) is a pan-European intergovernmental organisation allowing scientists, engineers and scholars to jointly develop their ideas and initiatives across all scientific disciplines. It does so by funding science and technology networks called COST Actions, which give impetus to research, careers and innovation.

Overall, COST Actions help coordinate nationally funded research activities throughout Europe. COST ensures that less research-intensive countries gain better access to European knowledge hubs, which also allows for their integration in the European Research Area.

By promoting trans-disciplinary, original approaches and topics, addressing societal questions, COST enables breakthrough scientific and technological developments leading to new concepts and products. It thereby contributes to strengthening Europe's research and innovation capacities.

COST is implemented through the COST Association, an international not-for-profit association under Belgian law, whose members are the COST Member Countries.

*"The views expressed in the report belong solely to the Action and should not in any way be attributed to COST".*



## Background of the project

Forest ownership is changing across Europe. In some areas a growing number of so-called “new” forest owners hold only small parcels, have no agricultural or forestry knowledge and no capacity or interest to manage their forests, while in others new community and private owners are bringing fresh interest and new objectives to woodland management. This is the outcome of various societal and political developments, including structural changes to agriculture, changes in lifestyles, as well as restitution, privatization and decentralization policies. The interactions between ownership type, actual or appropriate forest management approaches, and policy, are of fundamental importance in understanding and shaping forestry, but represent an often neglected research area.

The European COST Action FP1201 FOREST LAND OWNERSHIP CHANGES IN EUROPE: SIGNIFICANCE FOR MANAGEMENT AND POLICY (FACESMAP) aims to bring together the state-of-knowledge in this field across Europe and can build on expertise from 30 participating countries. Drawing on an evidence review across these countries, the objectives of the Action are as follows:

- (1) To analyse attitudes and constraints of different forest owner types in Europe and the ongoing changes (outputs: literature survey, meta-analyses and maps).
- (2) To explore innovative management approaches for new forest owner types (outputs: case studies, critical assessment).
- (3) To study effective policy instruments with a comparative analysis approach (outputs: literature survey, case studies, policy analyses).
- (4) To draw conclusions and recommendations for forest-related policies, forest management practice, further education and future research.

Part of the work of the COST Action is the collection of data into country reports. These are written following prepared guidelines and to a common structure in order to allow comparisons across the countries. They also stand by themselves, giving a comprehensive account on the state of knowledge on forest ownership changes in each country.

The common work in all countries comprises of a collection of quantitative data as well as qualitative description of relevant issues. The COUNTRY REPORTS of the COST Action serve the following purposes:

- Give an overview of forest ownership structures and respective changes in each country and insight on specific issues in the countries;
- Provide data for some of the central outputs that are planned in the Action, including the literature reviews;
- Provide information for further work in the Action, including sub-groups on specific topics.

A specific focus of the COST Action is on new forest owner types. It is not so much about “new forest owners” in the sense of owners who have only recently acquired their forest, but the interest is rather on new types of ownership – owners with non-traditional goals of ownership and methods of management. For the purpose of the Action, a broad definition of “new forest owner types” was chosen. In a broad understanding of new or non-traditional forest ownership we include several characteristics as possible determinants of new forest owners. The following groups may all be determined to be new forest owners:

- (1) individuals or organizations that previously have not owned forest land,
- (2) traditional forest owner categories who have changed motives, or introduced new goals and/or management practices for their forests,
- (3) transformed public ownership categories (e.g., through privatisation, contracting out forest management, transfer to municipalities, etc.), and
- (4) new legal forms of ownership in the countries (e.g. new common property regimes, community ownership), both for private and state land.

This embraces all relevant phenomena of changing forest ownership, including urban, absentee, and non-traditional or non-farm owners as well as investments of forest funds or ownership by new community initiatives, etc. Although the COST Action wants to grasp all kinds of ownership changes it has to be noted that the special interest lies on non-state forms of ownership.

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Methods</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1. General approach.....	3
2.2. Methods used.....	3
<b>3. Literature review on forest ownership in change</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1. Research framework and research approaches .....	4
3.2. New forest ownership types .....	4
3.3. Forest management approaches .....	4
3.4. Policy change / policy instruments .....	4
<b>4. Forest ownership</b> .....	<b>5</b>
4.1. Forest ownership structure.....	5
4.1.1. National data set.....	5
4.2. Unclear or disputed forest ownership.....	5
4.3. Legal provisions on buying or inheriting forests .....	5
4.3.1. Legal restrictions for buying or selling forests.....	5
4.3.2. Specific inheritance (or marriage) rules applied to forests.....	5
4.4. Changes of the forest ownership structure in last three decades .....	5
4.4.1. Main trends of forest ownership change.....	5
4.5. Gender issues in relation to forest ownership .....	6
4.6. Charitable, NGO or not-for-profit ownership of the forests.....	6
4.7. Common pool resources regimes .....	6
<b>5. Forest management approaches for new forest owner types</b> .....	<b>8</b>
5.1. Forest management in Turkey .....	8
5.2. New or innovative forest management approaches relevant for new forest owner types .....	8
5.3. Main opportunities for innovative forest management.....	8
5.4. Obstacles for innovative forest management approaches .....	8
<b>6. Policies influencing ownership development / Policy instruments for new forest owners</b> .....	<b>10</b>
6.1. Influences of policies on the development of forest ownership .....	10
6.2. Influences of policies in forest management .....	10
6.3. Policy instruments specifically addressing different ownership categories .....	10
6.4. Factors affecting innovation in policies.....	10
<b>7. Literature</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>8. Annexes</b> .....	<b>12</b>
8.1. Tables with detailed description of 4 most important publications .....	12

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

COST	European Cooperation in Science and Technology
CPR	Common property regimes
FACESMAP	Forest Land Ownership Changes in Europe: Significance for Management and Policy
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FRA	Forest Resource Assessment Programme
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NWFP	non-wood forest products
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
PFO	Private forest owners
RO	Regional Organizations

## 1. Introduction

Turkey's forest area in 2012 was 21.7 million hectares (ha) and covers 27.6% percent of the total area of the country. Forest areas include seven geographical regions in the country: Black Sea 5.4 million ha, Mediterranean 4.2 million ha, Aegean 3.6 million ha, Marmara 3 million ha, Central Anatolia 2.6 million ha, South Eastern Anatolia 2.4 million ha and East Anatolia 462 thousand ha. Almost all forest lands in Turkey belong to the state and are managed by the General Directorate of Forestry. Private forest ownership is still below 0.1% (about 18 thousand ha) of total forest area. The statistical data related to forest areas were obtained from forest management plans. These plans are renewed every 10-year period (Anonymous 2012).

Sixty-one percent of Turkey's forest areas consist of broad leaves (oak, beech, alder, chestnut, hornbeam etc.) tree species and 39% of this area is covered with coniferous species (pine, larch, pine, fir, spruce, cedar, etc.) (Anonymous 2012). Forests are generally natural and semi-natural, the vegetation is located on mountains and having high biodiversity. The forests in Turkey contain 9000 plant species, of which 3000 are endemic to the country. Deciduous forests are common, almost uninterrupted and grown at average elevations in Northern Turkey. Depending on the species and locations, coniferous forests are found at varying altitudes. The forests include species belonging to different floristic regions such as Irano-Turanian, Mediterranean and Euro-Siberian. Approximately 800 woody taxa occur in the country's forest and the predominant species are *Pinus brutia*, *Pinus nigra*, *Pinus silvestris*, *Abies* spp. (*A. cilicica*, *A. nordmannia*, *A. equi-trojani* are unique), *Picea orientalis*, *Cedrus libani*, *Juniperus* spp., *Pinus pinea*, *Cupressus sempervirens*, *Pinus halepensis*, *Fagus orientalis*, *Quercus* spp., *Alnus* spp., *Castanea sativa*, *Carpinus betulus* (Anonymous 2014).

Almost all the forest areas of Turkey are under state ownership. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey; ownership of state forests, albeit unregistered or registered with cadastral process cannot be transferred to any other owner. However,

there are some exceptions: For instance, some areas of the state forests are leased out to local inhabitants for their use. This exception usually refers to natural areas which are harvested for non-wood forest products (NWFP) and include species like stone pine, carob, laurel, strawberry tree etc. Another example is private afforestation (in areas which belong to the state) approved by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry regarding projects that are prepared for degraded forest lands, waste forest lands, state lands and areas in the ownership of real and legal persons. In this context, propagation materials, technical knowledge and financial support are provided by the Ministry.

Village legal entities, town-city-metropolitan municipalities, public offices and corporations, agricultural development cooperatives, associations providing services to villages, chambers, associations, foundations, any kind of commercial companies, and people can take advantage of the private afforestation projects. All the above have equal rights related to land use, choice of plant species, duration of land use etc. (Anonymous 2013). Another option is the utilization of qualified natural NWFP species in State forests by local people who pay a very low tariff to the Directorate General of Forest. The harvested plants are used in national and international industries. The above-mentioned options are expected to contribute to the private forestry sector (Anonymous 2012).

The minimum land size is 0.5 ha in forest areas or owned areas and 2.0 ha in state areas for private afforestation applications. Whereas the maximum land size for real and legal entities in state and owned lands, and for village legal entities, municipalities, public offices and corporations, associations for providing services to villages in forest areas is 300 ha. In this context, the private forest ownership include: Marmara Region 23.7 ha, Aegean region 17 ha, Mediterranean region 14 ha, Central Anatolia region 4.9 ha, South Eastern Anatolia 2 ha, Black Sea region 1.5 ha and Eastern Anatolia region 0.6 ha (Anonymous 2013).

Established private forests contain qualified woody species (Eucalyptus, Poplar etc.) and NWP (Walnuts, Almonds, Carob, Bay, etc.). The specific area includes: Stone pine in 15.6 ha, Almond in 13.5 ha and Walnut tree in 10.5 ha has been planted since 1984 (Anonymous 2012).

NWFP in Turkey includes wild food plants (pine, walnut, almond, chestnut, locust, etc.), aromatic and medicinal plants (anise, sage, thyme, mint, goat grass, rosemary, etc.), flowering and colouring plants (saffron, east

plane, hibiscus , spurge, etc.), bulbous plants (yogurt flowers, snowdrops, lake onion, black crocus, inverted tulip-crying bride, Adıyaman tulip etc.), edible mushrooms (cedar, blooded mushroom, bolete, morel etc.) lichens and mosses (Balci 2013).

The 2010 yield of NWFP in Turkey was 56.300 tons with a monetary value of about 95 million dollars. The top species were: Thyme 28.1 million dollars; Laurel 25.6 million dollars and plants suitable for knitting 233.000 dollars (TUIK 2010).

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1. General approach**

According to the aims of the country report which is to give a comprehensive overview of forest ownership issues in the country, a mix of methods is applied. They include a literature review, secondary data, expert interviews as well as the expert knowledge of the authors.

Data include quantitative data (from official statistics and scientific studies) as well as qualitative data (own expert knowledge, expert interviews and results from studies). A literature review explicates the state-of-knowledge in the countries and contributes to

a European scale state-of-art report. Case examples are used for illustration and to gain a better understanding of mechanisms of change and of new forest owner types. Detailed analyses of the collected data and case study analyses are done in subsequent work steps in the COST Action.

### **2.2. Methods used**

The country report was prepared based on statistical data from the National Forest Department and other sources listed in literature.

### **3. Literature review on forest ownership in change**

The COST Action national representatives aimed to review and compile information on changes in forest ownership in their countries based on scientific and grey scientific literature, including reports and articles in national languages and official statistics, formal guidance or advisory notes from official websites, etc.

The scope of the literature review is as follows:

- Forest ownership change (with a specific focus on new forest ownership types), private forest owners' motives and behaviour, management approaches for new forest owner types, and related policies and policy instruments.

The literature review consists of the following three steps: collection of all literature as defined relevant, detailed description of 10 most relevant publications, and a 1-3 pages summary according to the structure given in the guidelines. The full list of literature includes grey literature, i.e. literature not easily accessible by regular literature search methods (unpublished study reports, articles in national languages, etc.). These references are listed at the end of the report. The 10 detailed descriptions of publications are found in the Annex. The literature review contains the following questions: Which research frameworks and research approaches are used by research? What forms of new forest ownership types are identified? Which specific forest management approaches exist or are discussed? Which policies possibly influence ownership changes in the country and which policy instruments answer to the growing share of new forest owner types?

#### **3.1. Research framework and research approaches**

Private ownership of the forests is a new subject for Turkey and there is no study regarding this subject. We are making the first steps in this subject and plan to study European approach and practices in order to assess their application in Turkey.

#### **3.2. New forest ownership types**

Almost all the forest areas of Turkey are under state ownership. Namely, 99,5% of the forest land is owned by the States. At present, degraded land, unused land, treasury and real-legal person's lands are subjected to private cultivation in accordance with the regulations of the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs project. Olive, almond, carob, walnut, laurel etc. are widely used in the private afforestation study.

#### **3.3. Forest management approaches**

Turkey forests are managed by General Directorate of Forestry. There is still no private forest ownerships. However, some exceptions do exist. For instance, in the rural areas some state owned forests are allocated to local inhabitants for their use and benefit and can be regarded as private forestry.

#### **3.4. Policy change / policy instruments**

We intend to increase our knowledge on various aspects of forest ownership changes at member countries and will share our knowledge with governmental authorities.

## 4. Forest ownership

The aim of this chapter is to give a detailed overview of forest ownership in the country. The most detailed information on national level is often structured in different ways in different countries. In order to show the most accurate information, it was decided to use the national data sets in the country reports. In order to make this information comparable still, the information is also collected in an international format which is used in the Forest Resources Assessments by FAO. The transfer from national data sets to international definitions is, however, not always easy. This report therefore critically assesses in how far the national categories and definitions may be transformed into the international FRA data structure or in how far there are inconsistencies between them.

### 4.1. Forest ownership structure

#### 4.1.1. National data set

In Turkey, 99,5% of forest land (21,59 million hectares) is owned by the state and 0,5% of forest land is owned by other types of ownerships (110 thousand hectares).

### 4.2. Unclear or disputed forest ownership

There are no unclear or disputed situations.

### 4.3. Legal provisions on buying or inheriting forests

#### 4.3.1. Legal restrictions for buying or selling forests

Almost all of the forest areas of Turkey are under state ownership. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, ownership of state forests, albeit unregistered

or registered with cadastral process cannot be transferred to another owner by time out or another ways.

#### 4.3.2. Specific inheritance (or marriage) rules applied to forests

There are no specific inheritance rules applied to forests.

### 4.4. Changes of the forest ownership structure in last three decades

There were no changes regarding ownership structure in the last three decades

#### 4.4.1. Main trends of forest ownership change

Across Europe, the following drivers for ownership changes had been identified in the COST Action:

- Privatization, or restitution, of forest land (giving or selling state forest land to private people or bodies)
- Privatization of public forest management (introduction of private forms of management, e.g. state owned company)
- New private forest owners who have bought forests
- New forest ownership through afforestation of formerly agricultural or waste lands
- Changing life style, motivations and attitudes of forest owners (e.g. when farms are given up or heirs are not farmers any more)

Assessment for Turkey is following:

Trends in forest ownership: New forest ownership through...	Significance*
• Privatization, or restitution, of forest land (giving or selling state forest land to private people or bodies)	0
• Privatization of public forest management (introduction of private forms of management, e.g. state owned company)	0
• New private forest owners who have bought forests	0
• New forest ownership through afforestation of formerly agricultural or waste lands	1**
• Changing life style, motivations and attitudes of forest owners (e.g. when farms are given up or heirs are not farmers any more)	0
• Other trend, namely:	

\* 0 (not relevant); 1 (to some extent); 2 (rather important); 3 (highly important)

\*\* Afforestation according to regulations of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry projects

#### 4.5. Gender issues in relation to forest ownership

There is **no gender disaggregated data** for Turkey.

#### 4.6. Charitable, NGO or not-for-profit ownership of the forests

This section is concerned with forests owned by organisations such as conservation and heritage NGOs, self-organised community-based institutions and other philanthropic (“Characterized or motivated by philanthropy; benevolent; humane” OED) organisations. The management objective for these forests is usually to deliver social or environmental

aims with maximisation of financial or timber returns as a secondary concern. Most owners are corporate and may invoke at least an element of group or participatory decision-making on management objectives and high ethical standards. It is possible for such ownership to be entirely private. However, the provision of public benefits (services (e.g. biodiversity, amenity, recreation etc.) which are free for everyone to enjoy or provide benefits to local communities (employment for disadvantaged people etc.) are sometimes recognised in the form of charitable registration. This in turn puts restrictions on the rights of the owners to use profits and to dispose of assets in exchange for tax exemptions and access to charitable funding. There is **no any charitable, NGO or not-for-profit owners** of forest in Turkey.

Forests owned by ...	Yes	No	Uncertain
• Foundations or trusts		x	
• NGO with environmental or social objectives		x	
• Self-organised local community groups		x	
• Co-operatives/forest owner associations		x	
• Social enterprises		x	
• Recognized charitable status for land-owners		x	
• Other forms of charitable ownerships, namely:		x	

#### 4.7. Common pool resources regimes

Commons - forest common property regimes (CPR) are resource regimes where property is shared among users and management rules are derived and operated on self-management, collective actions and self-organization (of rules and decisions). Examples of traditional CPR regime are pastures, forest land communities in Sweden, Slovakia, Romania Italy and other European

countries or irrigation systems in Africa or Asia. The number of new common property regimes is growing and it is challenge of this Action to transfer knowledge and skills of traditional CPRs to new CPRs and vice versa. Example of new CPR regime is community woodlands in UK, established in last 20 years mainly in Scotland, Wales. Our interest in” traditional” and “new” common pool resources regimes (CPRs) in European forest, is based on the understanding that robust resource regimes are critical for sustainable forest

management regardless of the property rights. Ongoing practice shows that local land users (without ownership share) leased use agreement may also be CPR regime if they have the rights to determine management rules typical for commons (e.g. self-organisation and shared rights and

responsibilities). Thus proper rules on management (harvesting, decision making and conflict resolution mechanism, cost/benefit sharing, sanctioning etc) are key for sustainable use of CPR regimes.

There is **no forest common property regimes** of forest in Turkey.

## 5. Forest management approaches for new forest owner types

The Action is interested if there are any new forest management approaches that specifically address new forest owner types, or that could be particularly relevant for new forest owner types. We are aware that there is not much awareness for this and that there is not much literature available, however, we are convinced that this is an issue: if owners have different goals for their forests there must be new kinds of management, if they have not the skills any more to do it themselves then there must be new service offers, etc. There are assumingly implications in silviculture, technology, work organisation, business models, etc. Such new approaches may be discussed under the key word of new ownership types but often not.

### 5.1. Forest management in Turkey

General Directorate of Forest is managing state forest land. General Directorate of Forestry managed the forest land with 27 Regional Directorates, 218 sub-regional directorates and 1340 regional chieftaincy. The other 0,5% forest land is rented to other types of ownership category by General Directorate of Forest.

### 5.2. New or innovative forest management approaches relevant for new forest owner types

There are no new or innovative forest management approaches in our country. Some semi new approaches are listed below:

- Some areas of the state forests in the rural areas are allocated to local inhabitants for their use and benefit.

- Private afforestation according to regulations by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry projects (the most popular one).
- Utilization of qualified non-wood forest product species in state forest by local people at a very low cost.

### 5.3. Main opportunities for innovative forest management

Presently, degraded land, unused treasury lands are leased to real-legal person's for private afforestations by the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs. Olive, almond, carob, walnut, laurel etc. are widely planted in these areas. Furthermore, in the frame of private afforestation, forests lands owned by the General Forest Directorate are leased to real and legal persons for 49 years. However, the state keeps the ownership of these areas. Plant species are determined on the basis of feasibility studies after which an afforestation Project is prepared and submitted for the approval of the Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs.

### 5.4. Obstacles for innovative forest management approaches

According to our opinion, the private ownership is not attractive for enterprisers in our country because, rotation of forest tree species takes a long time. For instance, Pinus brutia species needs around 70-80 years. In addition, the yield per hectare is very low. Thus, we assume that there shall be no demand for private ownership.

**CASE STUDY 1: AFFORESTATION APPLICATION PROJECT (TOKAT, 2010).**

The afforestation area is located within the boundaries of 58 no. compartment of Pamukkale circle management plan with 295 and 334 no. compartment of Çal circle management plan. Pamukkale and Çal are district of Denizli city in Turkey. Total amount of the allocated area for the purpose of private afforestation is 10.03 ha (100,338 m<sup>2</sup>).

The private afforestation area consists of degraded forests according to the Pamukkale and Çal management plans. The area has been allocated as private afforestation area on behalf of CANAN TOKAT for 49 years with permission of Denizli Regional Forest Directorate according to article 57 of Forest Law No. 6831 in 12.05.2010.

The primary objective of the private afforestation project is Walnut growing as a non-wood forest product (NWFP) with industrial afforestation purposes and economic input in the early years. The secondary objective of the private afforestation project is production of building timber and fuel wood at the end of the rotation age. The third objective is to provide recreational, hydrologic, revegetation and erosion control functions.

The rotation of Walnut is 100 years. The private afforestation / plantation will be operated as higher forests. A site of 2.44 hectares of the project area is an open space in the forest and a site of 7.59 hectares having the other deciduous forest type. Open space in the forest is covered with *Quercus coccifera* (90%) and *Juniperus oxycedrus* (10%) species.

The average altitude of the project area is 1240 m with an average annual rainfall 547 mm, lowest temperature - 11.6°C, maximum temperature 41.2°C and average temperature 15.8°C. Grafted seedlings were used as planting material. Spaces were 8m between the plants and 8 m between the rows (156 plant per hectare). The total project cost was 36.897,05 TL by year 2010.

*Contact Person: Canan Tokat*

*Address: Siraevler District, No: 1 Alibaba Farm, Uzunpınar Town, Denizli / Turkey*

## **6. Policies influencing ownership development / Policy instruments for new forest owners**

Policy and ownership are related in various ways: Policies directly or indirectly influence ownership development or even encourage or create new forms of ownership; and policy instruments are emerging that answer to ownership changes, including instruments addressed to support new types of owners e.g. through advisory services, cooperative or joint forest management, etc.

### **6.1. Influences of policies on the development of forest ownership**

The management plans are prepared for operation by the General Forest Directorate according to Law No. 6831. Forest management committees were established for this purpose by the General Forest Directorate.

The size of a forest management plan varies between 5000 to 10,000 hectares. Different parts of the forest are divided into classes according to the administration's objectives, rotation age, forest type, tree species, site and more.

The size of the compartments varies between 50 to 100 hectares and sub-compartments are up to 1 ha. Compartment boundaries are usually limited according to natural lines such as forest roads, main and side ridges. Management plans are prepared for 10 years periods.

Commercial forests are divided to enterprise types:

#### **A. High forest (seed forest)**

- 1) Evenaged and compartmental high forest
- 2) Unevenaged high forest or selection high forest

#### **B. Coppice forest**

- 1) Clear felling system coppice
- 2) Selection coppice

#### **3) Pollard coppice**

We are still at the beginning of considering various types of forest ownership. According to our opinion, industrial forest plantations should be developed.

### **6.2. Influences of policies in forest management**

The forest management plan was prepared in order to take into consideration wood production (neo-classical European forestry school). However, today's forest management plan has already begun to change. The plan is starting to use ecosystem-based planning, functional planning and linear programming models in order to be more holistic and sustainable (Baskent et al., 2002).

### **6.3. Policy instruments specifically addressing different ownership categories**

All of the forest areas of Turkey are under state ownership.

### **6.4. Factors affecting innovation in policies**

All of the forest areas of Turkey are still under state ownership. First forest law no. 3537 was prepared on the 18.02.1937. Second forest law no. 6831 was prepared on the 31.08.1956. The task of managing forests is given to General Forest Directorate by article 6 of Forest Law No. 6831. This article states: "All the activities in state forests or other forest's owners which are executed by the General Forest Directorate are controlled by the General Forest Directorate" (Eraslan, 1971).

## 7. Literature

Anonymous, 2012. Forest Areas of Turkey. Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs, General Directorate of Forestry, Ankara.

Anonymous (General Forest Directorate), 2013. The data of Afforestation Department of General Directorate of Forestry, Ankara.

Anonymus (General Forest Directorate) 2014. <http://www.ogm.gov.tr>

Başkent, E.Z., Köse, S., Yolaşğmaz, H.A., Çakır, G., Keleş, S., 2002. Orman Amenajmanında Yeni Açılımlar Çerçevesinde Planlama Sürecinin Değerlendirilmesi ve Yeniden Tasarımı. Orman Amenajmanında Kavramsal Açılımlar ve Yeni Hedefler Sempozyumu, p. 58-74, Bahçeköy-İstanbul, 2002

Eraslan, İ., 1971. Türkiye’de Orman Amenajman Metotları. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Orman Fakültesi Dergisi, Seri A, No: 1, p. 23-57, İstanbul.

Tokat, C., 2010. Canan Tokat Özel Ağaçlandırma Projesi. Onaylayan: Orman Genel Müdürlüğü, p. 40, Denizli, Türkiye.

TUIK (Turkey Statistical Institute), 2010. [www.tuik.gov.tr](http://www.tuik.gov.tr)

## 8. Annexes

### 8.1. Tables with detailed description of 4 most important publications

SELECTED REPORTS/PUBLICATIONS	
Anonymous (2012)	<b>Forest Areas of Turkey. Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs, General Directorate of Forestry, Ankara.</b>
English language summary/abstract	The total forest areas of Turkey, distribution of forest areas according to geographical regions, trees and other plant species and their portions, wood and non-wood forest products.
Language of the study/publication	English
Type of organization conducting the study (in case of multi-institutional studies multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> University <input type="checkbox"/> Public Research Institute <input type="checkbox"/> Private Research Institute <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please name below) <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;">Governmental Organizations</div>
Type of funding used (multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Industry <input type="checkbox"/> Private other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Public Sub-National <input type="checkbox"/> Public EU/cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public International beyond Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public other
Regional scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Sub-national <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> International beyond Europe
Theoretical approach	Inventory, botany, political sciences, silviculture and economy.
Methodical approach	Literature reviews and national statistical data
Thematic focus	<input type="checkbox"/> ownership change (incl. on changes in quantitative terms, emerging new ownership types, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> motives and behaviour of ownership types <input type="checkbox"/> new management approaches <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> policy instruments addressing ownership
Weblink	<a href="http://www.ogm.gov.tr">http://www.ogm.gov.tr</a>

SELECTED REPORTS/PUBLICATIONS	
Anonymous (2013)	<b>The data of Afforestation Department of General Directorate of Forestry, Ankara.</b>
English language summary/abstract	The report describes: minimum-maximum land sizes, and ownership types of private afforestation applications in Turkey and their distribution in various geographical regions.
Language of the study/publication	Turkish
Type of organization conducting the study (in case of multi-institutional studies multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> University <input type="checkbox"/> Public Research Insitiute <input type="checkbox"/> Private Research Institute <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please name below) <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;">Governmental Organizations</div>
Type of funding used (multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Industry <input type="checkbox"/> Private other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Public Sub-National <input type="checkbox"/> Public EU/cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public International beyond Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public other
Regional scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Sub-national <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> International beyond Europe
Theoretical approach	Inventory and silviculture
Methodical approach	Literature reviews and national statistical data
Thematic focus	ownership change (incl. on changes in <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> quantitative terms, emerging new ownership types, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> motives and behaviour of ownership types <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> new management approaches <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> policy instruments addressing ownership
Weblink	<a href="http://www.agm.gov.tr">http://www.agm.gov.tr</a>

SELECTED REPORTS/PUBLICATIONS	
Anonymus (2014)	<b>Forest Areas of Turkey. Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs, General Directorate of Forestry, Ankara.</b>
English language summary/abstract	In this report, biodiversity and plant species of Turkey forests are mentioned.
Language of the study/publication	Turkish
Type of organization conducting the study (in case of multi-institutional studies multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> University <input type="checkbox"/> Public Research Institute <input type="checkbox"/> Private Research Institute <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please name below) <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;">Governmental Organizations</div>
Type of funding used (multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Industry <input type="checkbox"/> Private other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Public Sub-National <input type="checkbox"/> Public EU/cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public International beyond Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public other
Regional scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Sub-national <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> International beyond Europe
Theoretical approach	Botany
Methodical approach	Literature reviews and national statistical data
Thematic focus	<p>ownership change (incl. on changes in quantitative terms, emerging new ownership types, etc.)</p> <input type="checkbox"/> motives and behaviour of ownership types <input type="checkbox"/> new management approaches <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> policy instruments addressing ownership
Weblink	<a href="http://www.ogm.gov.tr">http://www.ogm.gov.tr</a>

SELECTED REPORTS/PUBLICATIONS	
<b>TUIK (2010)</b>	<b>Turkish Statistical Institute</b>
English language summary/abstract	In this report, harvested capacity of non-wood forest products and export values are mentioned.
Language of the study/publication	Turkish
Type of organization conducting the study (in case of multi-institutional studies multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> University <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Research Institute <input type="checkbox"/> Private Research Institute <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please name below) <input type="text"/>
Type of funding used (multiple answers allowed)	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Industry <input type="checkbox"/> Private other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Public Sub-National <input type="checkbox"/> Public EU/cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public International beyond Europe <input type="checkbox"/> Public other
Regional scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Sub-national <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-national Europe <input type="checkbox"/> International beyond Europe
Theoretical approach	Inventory and statistic
Methodical approach	Questionnaire survey
Thematic focus	<p>ownership change (incl. on changes in quantitative terms, emerging new ownership types, etc.)</p> <input type="checkbox"/> motives and behaviour of ownership types <input type="checkbox"/> new management approaches <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> policy instruments addressing ownership
Weblink	<a href="http://www.tuik.gov.tr">http://www.tuik.gov.tr</a>





EUROPEAN FOREST INSTITUTE  
CENTRAL-EAST AND SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN  
REGIONAL OFFICE - EFICEEC-EFISEE

European Forest Institute Central-East and South-East European  
Regional Office (EFICEEC-EFISEE) c/o  
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)  
Feistmantelstrasse 4  
1180 Vienna, Austria

Tel: + 43-1-47654-4410  
[eficeec@efi.int](mailto:eficeec@efi.int)  
[www.eficeec.efi.int](http://www.eficeec.efi.int)

