

STRATEGIJA (STRATEGIJE) RAZVOJA

Gledajući televiziju, čitajući dnevni i tjedni tisak, prateći stručne skupove u naravi ili putem medija, stalno čujemo isto “nemamo strategije razvoja”, znači nemamo generalne strategije razvoja na razini Države, a nemamo je niti po svim granama gospodarstva, obrazovanja, znanosti, lokalne zajednice itd., što je razumljivo, jer bi, uvjetno rečeno, zbroj tih strategija ili njihovih značajnijih dijelova, činio tu generalnu strategiju na razini Države. Tako primjerice na okruglom stolu u Hrvatskoj akademiji znanosti i umjetnosti, na temu “Šume, tla i vode – neprocjenjiva prirodna bogatstva Hrvatske” čujemo, kako nema strategije razvoja poljoprivrede. Radi ograničenosti prostora za ovu rubriku, postaviti ćemo samo neka pitanja po našem mišljenju značajna za strategiju razvoja naše struke. Ponajprije, imamo li mi strategiju razvoja? Da li je to možda ona Strategija koju je donijela Vlada RH još 2003. god.? Reći ćemo kako nju okvirno predviđa i osigurava Zakon o šumama, gospodariti i dalje po načelu potrajnosti. Pisali smo i u ovoj rubrici o novom Zakonu o šumama, a i u rubrici Aktualno o potrebi osuvremenjavanja važećeg Zakona. Resorno Ministarstvo osnovalo je Povjerenstvo za izradu novog Zakona, koje je počelo raditi i stalo. Zna li struka zašto se stalo s radom? Da li bi možda neki članci bili u koliziji s onim što smo potpisali u pretpristupnim pregovorima s EU? A što smo to potpisali saznati ćemo navodno tek ovih dana, no, tko je zapravo pregovarao u ime struke, zna li se? Ako imamo krovnu organizaciju struke Hrvatsko šumarsko društvo, logično bi bilo i na toj razini uskladiti stavove i kadrove (ne mislimo političke), i onda izaći s njima i pred Državu i pred EU. No, kod nas, ako se ide po stručno mišljenje, onda se eventualno ide u Hrvatske šume d.o.o., što nije loše, ali u načelu one zastupaju stav trgovačkog društva, koji bi mogao biti vođen samo interesom firme i u mogućoj koliziji s generalnim stavom struke. Što je s posumljavanjem opožarenih površina? Što je sa šumskom biomasom, da li se radi na tome da se ona zaista počme tretirati kao značajan obnovljivi izvor energije na državnoj razini i da li je uključena u program Energetske strategije razvoja, pa i u program zapošljavanja (pisali smo o tome koliko bi to bilo novih radnih mjesta)? Zašto neki sumnjaju u stručno i znanstveno verificirani podatak o mogućim raspoloživim količinama biomase u bliskoj budućnosti od preko 4 mil. tona, što je ekvivalent od oko 2 mil. tona nafte i zbog čega Država „nije sretna“ što ima domaći energent umjesto skupog uvoznog? Da li mi i dalje planiramo samo prodaju sječke ili finalnog proizvoda, energije? Što ćemo s privatnim šumama i kako osigurati istovjetnost poslovanja šumama bez obzira na vlasništvo? Kao što vidimo, mi čak i kada imamo planove, započinjemo ih, ne ispunjavamo ih i ne dovršavamo ih. U ovome broju Šumarskoga lista u članku Domac, J. i dr., možemo saznati nešto više o razvoju domaćega tržišta peleta. U 2009. god. 8 naših proizvođača planiralo je proizvesti 212 100 tona peleta, a proizvelo je 92 000 tone, od čega je 98 % izvoz, a samo je 1 850 tona (2 %) prodano na domaćem tržištu. Osim ušteda i ekološki prihvatljivijeg načina grijanja u odnosu na klasično grijanje ogrjevnim drvom, i ovdje je u pitanju zapošljavanje, posebno u domaćoj metalnoj industriji (peći, cjevovodi i sl.). Gdje je i tu energetska strategija razvoja? Kako stojimo sa strategijom razvoja prerade drva, koliko smo proizvođači poluproizvoda, a koliko i kojih finalnih proizvoda, koji osiguravaju dodanu vrijednost i veće zapošljavanje? Kako i da li tu strategiju povezujemo sa strategijom razvoja domaćih proizvođača alata, ljepila, lakova, okova i dr., što ponovo implicira veće zapošljavanje. Ovo je samo nekoliko pitanja, a ima ih još, pa postavite ih i Vi, kako ne bi zaboravili nešto što bi trebalo ući u Strategiju razvoja (valjda će je Država napokon napraviti) i na posljetku razmislite o tome tko će sve te odgovore na pitanja pretočiti u našu Strategiju razvoja, i napose uz razne lobije „ugurati“ u generalnu, državnu Strategiju razvoja? Pred nama su skoriji parlamentarni izbori, pa će biti interesantno vidjeti koju strategiju nude pojedine političke stranke i imaju li ju uopće.

EDITORIAL

DEVELOPMENTAL STRATEGY (STRATEGIES)

When we watch television, read daily and weekly press, attend specialist gatherings or follow them via the media, we keep hearing the same: “we lack developmental strategies”; in other words, we lack a general developmental strategy at the State level, as well as at the level of economy, education, science, local community, etc. This is only understandable, since, conditionally speaking, the sum of these strategies or of their more important parts, would form a general strategy at the State level. Thus, for example, the round table held in the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts on the topic of „Forests, Soils and Water – Invaluable Natural Resources of Croatia“ states that there is no agricultural developmental strategy, either. The limited space of this column does not allow us to ask more than only a few questions that we consider important for the developmental strategy of our profession. First of all, do we have a strategy of development at all? Are we perhaps talking about the Strategy passed by the Croatian Government in the distant 2003? Suffice it to say that it is endorsed by the Forest Law, which advocates management according to the principles of sustainability.

The new Forest Law has already been discussed in this column, while the need to modernize the valid Law has been dealt with in the Current Topics column. The Ministry has formed a Commission for the new Law, but after the initial start, it ceased with its activities. Does the profession know why its work has stopped? Would some articles perhaps be in collision with what we have signed in the pre-accession negotiations with the EU? Allegedly, the public will be informed about what we have signed in several days, but do we know who has conducted the negotiations in the name of the profession? Since the forestry profession has its roof organisation, the Croatian Forestry Association, it would be only logical that the attitudes and the cadres (we do not mean the political ones) should be coordinated at this level and then presented to the State and the EU. Yet, if a professional opinion is required, then it is generally sought from the company Hrvatske Šume. We have nothing against it, but in principle, Hrvatske Šume represents the interests of a company, which might be guided only by their own interest and might be in collision with the general opinion of the profession. What about afforesting burned areas? What about forest biomass? Are any efforts being taken in order for this important renewable energy source to be finally considered at the state level? Has it been included in the Energy Development Strategy programmes, as well as in employment programmes (we have already written about how many new work posts this would open)? Why are there doubts about the scientifically verified date on the possible available biomass quantities in the near future of over 4 million tons, which equals about 2 million tons of oil? Why is the State “not happy” with a domestic energy source instead of an expensive imported one? Do we continue to plan the sale of chips or do our plans extend to the final product, the energy? What about private forests and how do we guarantee equal business conditions regardless of ownership? As we can see, even when we have plans, we get on with them but we do not finalize them.

In this issue of the Forestry Journal, the article by Domac, J. et al. discusses the development of the domestic palette market. In 2009, eight Croatian manufacturers planned to produce 212,100 tons of pellets, but in reality they produced 92,000 tons, of which 98% were exported, and only 1,850 tons (2%) were sold on the home market. In addition to savings and to the ecologically more acceptable heating method in relation to classical heating with fuelwood, there is also the question of employment, especially in the home metal industry (furnaces, pipelines, etc.). Where is the Energy Development Strategy now? What about the developmental strategy in timber processing; what is the extent to which we produce semi-products, and what quantities and kinds of final products that we manufacture ensure added value and higher employment? Do we link this strategy to the developmental strategies of domestic manufacturers of tools, glues, varnishes, and other products, which again implies higher employment?

These are only some of the questions, but there are many more. You are invited to ask other questions and to raise issues that should be part of the Developmental Strategy (hopefully, the State will do the same). Finally, think about who will include the answers to these questions into our developmental strategy and, with the help of various lobbies, “force” them into the general Developmental Strategy at the state level? Parliamentary elections are approaching, and it will be interesting to see what strategies particular political parties advocate and indeed, if they have any strategies at all.

Editorial Board