



PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
FINLAND



Government Foresight Report
on Long-term Climate and Energy Policy:
**Recommendations and
a Summary of Experiences**

Government Foresight Report
on Long-term Climate and Energy Policy:
**Recommendations and
a Summary of Experiences**

Publisher PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE		DESCRIPTION 8.2.2011	
Authors		Type of publication Report	
		Commissioned by Prime Minister's Office	
		Date of appointment	
Title of publication Government Foresight Report on Long-term Climate and Energy Policy: Recommendations and a Summary of Experiences			
Abstract This synthesis report summarises the external (PMO 3/2011) and internal assessments of the foresight report and related recommendations. The foresight report was submitted to Parliament in autumn 2009. The assessments find the report and the ensuing background material both comprehensive and broad-based in nature. They provide basis for rational public discussion and political decision-making. The foresight report scenarios chart possible paths towards a low-carbon Finland over the next 40 years. The report also suggests a great number of measures with which to make Finland a leader in climate and energy policy. According to assessments, there were deficiencies in the treatment of economic impacts of climate and energy policy, and the connection to the development of the rural areas was regarded as too weak. It would also have been advisable to define in greater detail the possible paths towards long-term goals. Citizen participation in the foresight reporting process was commended. The assessments support the drawing up of foresight reports in the future, too. The recommendations include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a report model comprising two elements should be considered: a long-term visionary, strategic section followed by a section concretising the strategic element, with a focus on short and medium-term implementation • a strong perspective on the future should be ensured by employing scenarios and other futurology methods • the foresight report should be approved in the first half of the government's term in office to make it possible take account of its guidelines in the government's midterm review, while leaving sufficient time for implementation • sufficient resources should be allocated for participatory activities and result utilisation should be planned in advance • regional Future Forums should come up with new and participatory methods 			
Keywords Climate, energy, politics, future			
Other information The report is available in Finnish (Valtioneuvoston kanslian raporttisarja 4/2011) and in Swedish (Statsrådets kanslis rapportserie 5/2011)			
Name of series and number of publication Prime Minister's Office Reports 6/2011		ISSN	ISBN (print)
Number of pages 19	Language English	Confidentiality rating Public	ISBN (PDF)
Publisher Prime Minister's Office Publication as a PDF: www.vnk.fi/english Further information: julkaisut@vnk.fi		Layout Prime Minister's Office/Policy-analysis Unit	

CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	7
2	THE FORESIGHT REPORT AND ITS ASSESSMENT	10
3	PREPARATION OF THE FORESIGHT REPORT	11
4	THE CONTENT OF THE FORESIGHT REPORT.....	13
5	REPORT'S IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS	15
	ANNEX 1: ELEMENTS IN ASSESSING FORESIGHT REPORTS.....	18
	ANNEX 2: FURTHER INFORMATION AND SOURCES USED IN THE ASSESSMENT	19

1 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation of the foresight report process is aimed at supporting the future development of foresight report preparation and the content and implementation of reports. This report by the Prime Minister's Office summarises the feedback received from external and internal assessments of the foresight report and public discussion.

On the whole, the foresight report's **preparation process** was successful. To an extent, the participation of interest groups and citizens can even be considered groundbreaking. However, room for improvement exists, especially in planning the various stages of the report's preparation, as well as communication with the ministries. Leaving the report's publication for the second half of the Government's term in office can also be considered a process shortcoming.

In terms of **content** the foresight report was considered extensive, informative and easily understood by laymen. Its cross-sectional examination of sustainable development, and the scenarios presented, were also commended. However, criticism was directed at inconsistency in the guidelines set out and deficiencies in the treatment of international developments and economic impacts. The connection to the climate and energy strategy was regarded as too weak.

In the case of many of the policy guidelines, **implementation** has already begun, just over a year since the report's publication. The subsequent government negotiations are a decisive phase. International communications and integrating the policy guidelines into governmental work are among the areas requiring further attention. In addition, the format of Future Forums and co-operation with the Parliament's Committee for the Future require more thought.

Foresight reporting has proven an effective tool, worth using in future government terms. Each report's structure and methods should be chosen to suit its theme and situation; formal approaches and structures should be avoided. Based on experience gained from the foresight report on climate and energy policy, where applicable the following recommendations should be observed in future foresight report projects.

The nature and structure of foresight reports

Long-term foresight and its linkage to short and medium-term measures, is challenging. For this reason

- A foresight report should distance itself from topical political affairs. It should also cover a sufficient time-span – in practice until mid-century, or even further if necessary.
- Specific attention should be paid to ensuring a strong perspective on the future. Various possible futures should be outlined, by employing scenarios and other futurology methods.
- Long-term policy guidelines should be connected to short and medium-term goals and measures, by defining paths and milestones towards long-term goals.

- In developing foresight reports, a model comprising two elements should be considered: 1) a long-term visionary, strategic section and 2) a section concretising the strategic element, with a focus on short and medium-term implementation.

Preparation

Preparation should aim at a broad-based approach, using the best expertise available. For this reason

- Resources for the foresight report project should be allocated for the entire term of government.
- An expert group can provide assistance in the report's preparation, but its role should be clarified, members should be selected on the basis of their expertise and they should be able to commit to the group's work.
- Since expert workshops are an efficient and functional way of seeking answers to questions directed at the report's content, they should be continued.
- International expertise should have a stronger role in preparation. Possible study trips should be planned in such a way as to serve the preparatory work more directly.
- The commissioning and utilisation of studies in the report's preparation should be planned holistically.
- The foresight report should be approved in the first half of the government's term in office. In this way, account could be taken of its guidelines in the government's midterm review, while leaving sufficient time for implementation.

Participation

Broad-based participation and active contact with key actors brings added value to the foresight reporting process and fosters commitment. For this reason

- The foresight report work should be as transparent as possible, by means of active communications, dialogue with stakeholders and publication of material. Consideration should be given to publishing draft versions of the report online.
- Sufficient resources should be allocated for participatory activities and result utilisation should be planned in advance.
- Information on opportunities for, and ways of, participation should be provided extensively and participants should be given feedback on how the results of participatory activities have been utilised in the report's preparation.
- New modes of participation, such as citizen panels, should be tested and the experiences gained from pilot projects should be utilised in developing participation models.
- Where possible, public events should be broadcast live online or recorded for later viewing.
- Stakeholder panels can provide a useful channel for participation, but their remit should be clarified, they should be provided with proper background information and sufficient time should be reserved for discussion.

Cooperation with ministries and political guidance

Ensuring political guidance and commitment is crucial. For this reason

- The ministerial working group steering foresight report preparation should include representation from all ministries relevant to the report's theme.
- The commitment of key ministers and the government to the report's preparation should be strengthened, by submitting the topic for consideration during the cabinet evening session, for instance.
- From the outset, ministry officials should be involved in the planning of the report and drafting of the text, through a separate monitoring or management group involving officials, for example.
- Closer dialogue is needed between the preparation process and the Parliament's Committee for the Future; new practices should be developed, such as appointing contact persons from among the Committee's members.
- While political guidance is needed for outlining the preparation, the officials preparing the report should be given sufficient leeway in their work. avainministerien ja hallituksen sitoutumista selonteon valmisteluun on syytä vahvistaa esimerkiksi viemällä aihe hallituksen iltakoulun käsiteltäväksi

The report's content and style

The foresight report should address key future challenges and appeal to as large a slice of the population as possible. For this reason

- Guidelines should be prioritised, with a focus on the most essential ones.
- The text should be as intelligible and easy to read as possible.
- Scenarios are worth utilising as part of the foresight report but, in public discussion, specific attention should be paid to explaining their nature and significance.

Implementation and communications

The implementation of an intersectoral report reaching far into the future requires a connection, across the board, to strategic and operative decisions made by the government. For this reason

- Sufficient time and resources should be reserved for implementation and communications at the Prime Minister's Office.
- The government should commit to actively promoting the implementation of the report guidelines.
- International marketing should be invested in, and the foresight report promoted, through international contacts via the government and ministries.
- Better advantage should be taken of the opportunities offered by the Internet, for instance by publishing an online version of the report, with links to preparatory and background material and to sources of further information.

- Participatory methods, applicable with reasonable effort to all Future Forums, should be developed.
- Social media should be utilised in communications.

2 THE FORESIGHT REPORT AND ITS ASSESSMENT

In October 2009, the Government adopted the Foresight Report on Long-term Climate and Energy Policy. As part of international cooperation, the report set the target of cutting emissions by at least 80 per cent by 2050. The foresight report examines long-term climate and energy policy challenges, charts possible paths towards a low-carbon Finland and outlines the necessary measures for achieving this.

The foresight report was prepared at the Prime Minister's Office, under the leadership of a climate policy specialist. During this process, consultation was provided by an expert group, and over a hundred experts and stakeholder representatives who participated in workshops and theme discussions. In political terms, the preparation work was steered by the ministerial working group for the report, chaired by the Minister of the Environment.

Evaluation of the foresight report process is aimed at supporting the development of the reporting procedure, its content, and the ensuing implementation and communications. Hopefully, some of the conclusions that emerged during the assessment process will also prove useful more generally, in long-term policy making and central government activities.

This report, prepared by the foresight report team at the Prime Minister's Office, summarises the insights and conclusions drawn from the foresight report's external and internal assessments. The summary is based on the following elements in particular (references included in Annex 2):

- A report by the Parliament's Committee for the Future, and comments on the report
- An assessment report 'Towards a Pioneering Status?' by Markku Wilenius (PMO 3/2011)
- A country review by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
- The results of a survey conducted with those who participated in the report's preparation
- Feedback obtained from Future Forum participants
- An internal evaluation by the foresight report team at the Prime Minister's Office
- Feedback obtained in public discussion and consultation with stakeholders

An earlier report on foresight reporting, 'Improving the Government Foresight Reporting Procedure' (Prime Minister's Office Publications 3/2007) was used as an aid in the assessment process, since its conclusions can still be considered valid. When compiling the summary, the outcome was also measured against the guidelines defined in the early stages of the foresight report process (Annex 1).

3 PREPARATION OF THE FORESIGHT REPORT

On the whole, the foresight report's preparation process was successful. To an extent, the participation of stakeholders and citizens can even be considered groundbreaking. However, room for improvement exists, especially in planning the various stages of the report's preparation, as well as communication with the ministries. Leaving the report's publication for the second half of the Government's term in office can also be considered a process shortcoming.

Assigning overall responsibility for the foresight report to a **climate policy specialist** clarified the preparation process. Also useful were the specialist's understanding of, and networks related to, the political setting. According to the team's self-assessment, the policy-analysis unit's small foresight report team, based in the Prime Minister's Office, functioned rather well. In practice, the work was sometimes complicated by the climate policy specialist continuing in his duties as a Member of Parliament while leading the project. There were also several changes of project secretary, which brought challenges of its own.

Assigning project **appropriations** and personnel resources for the entire term of government facilitated the preparatory work. For a public sector project, two full-time employees and a modest budget for other expenses can be considered reasonable in the current economic situation. However, the appropriations were insufficient to cover several needs identified during the preparatory work, such as assessing the impacts of a low-emissions approach to the economy and employment, encouraging closer participation, or maintaining more active contact with other actors.

According to the **schedule** presented by officials preparing the report, it was to be completed during 2008. The Government, however, decided to postpone the report's publication until the spring of the following year. Due to the climate and energy strategy's late completion, and Parliamentary timetables, the foresight report was further delayed until the autumn of 2009.

On the one hand, publication over two years from the project's initiation enabled sufficiently comprehensive preparation. On the other, the report's completion during the latter half of the Government's term left less time for the report's implementation, preventing the Government's mid-term review from taking account of the report. Parliament only responded towards the end of the parliamentary term, too late to have any impact on the activities of the Government of the time. The chosen schedule also meant that, somewhat inconsistently, long-term objectives (the foresight report) were adopted only after the short and medium-term policy (climate and energy strategy) had been defined.

Many kinds of effort were made to ensure contact with the **ministries**. Participation of the ministries, and their political leadership, in the report's preparation was pursued through the ministerial working group for the foresight report; by involving ministry representatives in the expert groups; through bilateral meetings with key ministries; by presenting the project to the ministries' climate policy network, the Government Foresight Network and a meeting of permanent secretaries; and by inviting ministry-based specialists to the workshops.

Despite these efforts, project information did not reach all key people within the ministries. Of course, this is common in such extensive projects. However, this meant that feedback was not obtained as extensively and early as would have been ideal. Ministries may also have received the impression that they lacked the opportunity to influence the process. Some would have preferred greater opportunities to become involved, at an earlier stage. Clearer ways and more-official processes for maintaining contact might also have been preferred. This would probably have enabled the coordinated preparation of comments by the ministries.

The Ministry of Employment and the Economy (MEE), which is responsible for the climate and energy strategy, occupied a special position. In addition to the means described above, efforts were made to ensure active dialogue with the MEE by holding regular bilateral meetings at the level of officials involved in the preparation. The Minister of Economic Affairs' absence from the ministerial working group for the foresight report hampered the gathering of feedback, on foresight report drafts, from the Ministry's political leadership.

The **expert group** for the foresight report provided assistance in steering the preparatory work, formulating ideas and preparing the draft versions. However, some members felt that the group's role was left unclear and its expertise was under-utilised during preparation activities. There was also the feeling that international expertise could have featured more strongly in the preparation process. Members had a varying level of commitment to the work.

The **ministerial working group** for the foresight report ensured support and political guidance at various stages of the report's preparation. However, the group did not include ministers from all key ministries, as would have been required to ensure political representation. Some feedback also arrived late from the point of view of preparation.

Over ten **studies** were commissioned in support of the report's preparation. Considering the limited appropriations, these studies succeeded fairly well in sparking public debate and addressing key challenges. Doubts remain, however, on whether these studies were sufficiently well connected to content production for the report.

As part of the preparation process, the climate policy specialist completed **study trips** to Germany, Belgium, Holland and the United States. These meetings yielded useful contacts, spread the word on the foresight report project and assisted in the collection of material and ideas for writing the report. On the other hand, the trips' connection to preparing the report's content was less substantial than anticipated.

Numerous efforts were made to ensure the **participation** of stakeholders and citizens in the report's preparation. The aim of encouraging participation was to inform people of the foresight report project, gather leads contributing to the content, test ideas drafted in the preparation process, spark discussion on report themes and commit actors to the climate protection efforts advocated by the report.

In general, opportunities for participation were commended and even considered groundbreaking in the field of climate and energy policy. Participation by stakeholders and citizens not only brought additional value in terms of substance, but also created ownership of the report objectives. On the other hand, a clearer and more organised participation

process – what is expected of the participants and how – was hoped for. Better feedback, on how account was taken of the insights gained through participatory activities, was also sought.

At the beginning of the preparation process, insights were sought by establishing 13 **stakeholder panels**. These helped to define a direction for the report and to generate ideas. The panels also managed to involve parties not traditionally active in climate discussion. Nevertheless, some panel participants hoped for better background information for their work, as well as more time for cultivating ideas.

Citizens' views on a low-carbon Finland were collected through two **online surveys**. In the early phase of the preparation process, the open-ended otakantaa.fi survey produced rather general comments. A more targeted online survey for comments on the scenario drafts received a commendable number of replies. These added to the understanding of how acceptable the various alternatives would be. However, sufficient use was not necessarily made of the survey results, in drafting the report and outlining the scenarios. In addition, the Finland Futures Research Centre conducted two online surveys of experts. The results of these surveys were used in preparing the scenarios.

To obtain support for preparing the report's contents and the scenarios, some ten **expert workshops** were organised. A broad range of experts from research institutions, ministries, the private sector and NGOs were invited to attend the workshops. These workshops assisted in preparing topics identified as central and challenging during the preparatory process. Most of the participants found the workshops an effective and efficient way of working.

Efforts were made to ensure the open provision of information and broad-based participation, by maintaining active **contact with the stakeholders** in several other ways. Officials preparing the report spoke on it in dozens of public seminars, bilateral meetings and media interviews. Had resources allowed for even more active communications, the preparation process and commitment would have been further bolstered.

4 THE CONTENT OF THE FORESIGHT REPORT

In terms of content, the foresight report was considered extensive, informative and easily understood by laymen. Its cross-sectional examination of sustainable development, and the scenarios presented, were also commended. However, criticism was directed at fragmentation of the guidelines set out and deficiencies in the treatment of international developments and economic impacts. The connection to the climate and energy strategy was also regarded as too weak.

The content of the foresight report was acknowledged as being balanced and **extensive**. In addition to energy, the report examined other emission-producing sectors. Factors influencing the climate, besides carbon dioxide, were also discussed, as well as adaptation to climate change and global developments, alongside Finland's situation and efforts to combat climate change. Many people considered the background information provided by the report as a useful, concise review of the central issues involved in climate and energy policy. Also,

the report adopted by Parliament's Committee for the Future, and consequently, Parliament in general, unanimously supported the foresight report and its guidelines.

However, the feedback did identify **gaps** in terms of content or areas deserving more extensive treatment. These include

- The connection of carbon sinks, the bioeconomy and natural resources policy to climate protection.
- Global linkage of national policy and the course of action to be taken, should international policy be delayed or fail.
- Assessment of the impacts of a low-emissions approach on the economy and employment.
- Investment needs, market outlook and the connection of climate policy to industrial policy.

The report's visionary approach and mid-century, or even longer-term, **time span** were considered valuable. Nevertheless, forecasting far into the future proved challenging to all parties. In addition, the report would have benefited from an even stronger future orientation.

A key objective of the foresight report was to make Finland a **leader** in climate protection. For the first time, a long-term emissions reduction target was set for Finland, with supporting complementary targets. In international comparisons, these targets are top-ranking. Finland's position in climate protection gained strength from the outlining of its policy direction, low-emission scenarios and the public debate sparked by the foresight report.

Substantial efforts are still required and the foresight report alone is not capable of generating a pioneering approach. Some feedback was of the view that the ambition to lead the way should have been given more prominence in the report, by defining more-specific interim goals, investment needs and policy measures on the path to a low-carbon society.

The report also aimed to position climate protection within the wider context of **sustainable development**. The linkage between climate policy and sustainable development was examined, both in a separate chapter and throughout the report. However, the report was criticised for discussing the economic dimension of sustainable development at too general a level.

Generally speaking, the report's **guidelines** were considered to include the correct contents. However, many criticised the abundance of policy guidelines presented, coupled with the confusion between significant and subsidiary ones. More concrete, new departures would have been welcomed among the guidelines. The foresight report's role, as a document outlining long-term future strategic choices, was not always either understood or agreed with.

Many questions were posed on the relationship between **the climate and energy strategy** and the foresight report. Although each report had its own, distinct purpose, their roles could not be clearly distinguished in every respect. Confusion arose from the foresight report's

completion, along with its long-term objectives, in the wake of a strategy focusing on short- and medium-term policy. Both reports could have had an even clearer focus, as complementary texts, linked in terms of content and time-scale.

The scenarios on a low-carbon Finland were considered important and observant starting points for debate. In forecasting, the use of scenarios was generally viewed as a valuable, innovative approach for Government reports. Their continuance and development was deemed important.

However, individual scenarios were criticised for either being utopian or lacking visionary quality. Some people felt that the scenarios were too narrow in general, particularly as paths from a current to desired state of affairs. It was also felt that some scenarios lacked internal consistency, or that none corresponded to the reader's own views. The lack of a risk scenario was regretted, as was the tenuous linkage of national scenarios to international development. On the one hand, the role of scenarios within the foresight report was often misunderstood as prescriptive rather than illustrative, on the other some disliked the secondary position accorded to scenarios by their relegation to the appendices.

The report's **writing style** was invariably commended as intelligible, fluent and easy to read.

5 REPORT'S IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

In the case of many of the policy guidelines, implementation has already begun, just over a year since the report's publication. The subsequent government negotiations are a decisive phase. International communications, integrating the policy guidelines into governmental work, format of the Future Forums and cooperation with the Parliament's Committee for the Future are among areas requiring further attention.

The Prime Minister's Office **is responsible** for coordinating the report's implementation and communications. However, practical implementation is divided between the competent ministries, and in a wider sense, other societal actors. To assess the report within a year of its publication is may be immature.

Efforts to facilitate the **implementation of the report's guidelines** were made by holding bilateral discussions between officials within all ministries and with many other key public actors, such as the Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra, Tekes and the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities. Responsibilities were assigned for all guidelines and a chart was prepared for follow-up purposes. Prioritised guidelines were projectised, so that their implementation could be given a specific focus.

Already, just over a year since its publication, it seems that the foresight report in general, and many of its policy guidelines in specific, have been **taken into consideration** in the state administration and society. New research programmes and research institution plans have taken note of information needs identified in the report. Moreover, the policy guidelines

laid out in the foresight report are reflected in the report on natural resources, for instance, and in some future reviews by ministries.

At the same time, the report's rapid and effective implementation has been restricted by lack of time and resources at the ministries, the large number of government reports, and the small size of the foresight report team at the Prime Minister's Office. Ministries often tend to react to the implementation of guidelines by referring to projects already under way. Thus far, only a few measures have been initiated as a direct consequence of the foresight report. Some of the feedback suggested the need for a separate action plan, to accompany the report's general guidelines.

Because the foresight report policy guidelines span several decades, a key aspect of its implementation lies in providing instructions for **Government Programme negotiations**. All negotiators representing Parliamentary parties, and those involved in the preparation of the negotiations, were briefed on elements based on the report guidelines and considered central to the next parliamentary term. Material was also provided for the ministries' future reviews.

Communications on the foresight report were successful, in the sense that its publication was widely and extensively reported in the Finnish media. Many of the background studies also evoked public interest. Some of the press did not, however, cover topics deemed essential from the report's perspective. Social media were not yet utilised in communications. In order to achieve broader change in society, continuous attention to, and public debate on, the foresight report's themes is required.

International attention for the report was pursued by publishing a press release in English, organising an event at which the report was presented to foreign embassies in Helsinki, providing information on the report to Finnish embassies abroad, and by organising events and distributing material at the Copenhagen climate conference. In addition, an abstract of the report was translated into Chinese. However, communications with the international public generally remained modest.

At regional level, the message was spread by way of **Future Forums** organised at seven different locations. These events attracted over a thousand participants from municipalities and regions, companies, organisations and higher education institutions. The participation of ministers was particularly appreciated. Based on feedback, the forums were mainly considered useful and successful. They also succeeded in distributing information on the foresight report and themes related to emission reduction. Participatory methods were successfully tested at the forum organised in Espoo. The themes brought to the fore at forum discussions have been summarised in the memorandum 'A summary of Future Forums 2009–2010'.

In some areas, however, the forums received scant publicity. With few exceptions, the events were rather traditional in form, although the need to develop new, participatory models was highlighted in the experiences collected on previous foresight reports. Not all forums were broadcast online, and one of the forums was not recorded for later viewing. Some participants would have liked more opportunity for discussion.

Dialogue was held with the parliamentary **Committee for the Future** at several stages. Those in charge of preparation presented the project's progress to the Committee and its officials. Representatives of the Committee for the Future participated in events organised for the report and, correspondingly, representatives of the Prime Minister's Offices participated in Committee events. Addresses by Committee members were scheduled in Future Forum programmes. Notwithstanding these efforts, the work would still benefit from closer dialogue.

Although the preparatory work aimed to achieve the widest **participation** possible, such participation played a rather minor role at the implementation and communication stage. Companies and NGOs could have had a stronger role in promoting joint efforts to combat climate change.

A year after its publication, the report's **impact** can be assessed to only a limited degree. However, the entry into public discussion of concepts used in the report provides some indication of the report's influence. Ministers have repeatedly referred to the report's policy guidelines, while the objectives defined in the report are used as a basis for preparing local and regional climate programmes. Indeed, the report has succeeded in increasing general acceptance of transition to a low-carbon society as an objective.

Government decisions taken since the foresight report's adoption can be considered largely in line with the report. The report's guidelines have been promoted by three major energy-related decisions in particular: the renewable energy package, the green tax reform and the decision-in-principle on additional nuclear power construction. It is peculiar, however, that the justifications for these Government proposals make little reference to the foresight report.

ANNEX 1: ELEMENTS IN ASSESSING FORESIGHT REPORTS

Conclusions from the report 'Improving the Government Foresight Reporting Procedure'

1. Use of foresight reporting as a tool to promote dialogue between Parliament and the Government, and to foster public discussion, should be continued.
2. The foresight report should serve as an outline for long-term policy and should guide decisions in the short term.
3. The foresight report should handle its themes on a sufficiently broad, bold and concrete basis.
4. The foresight report should be submitted by the autumn of the Government term's second year at the latest; consideration should be given to submitting the report in two parts.
5. In terms of knowledge base and methods, the report's preparation should be versatile, innovative, open and flexible, taking advantage of international expertise.
6. The report should be prepared in close co-operation with the ministries, the Committee for the Future and stakeholders.
7. Regional actors should be involved in the discussion, but the method for achieving this requires reform.
8. The foresight report should be actively publicised, the follow-up should focus on the main outlines and the follow-up process should be light.
9. Foresight work conducted by the ministries should be utilised in the report's preparation.
10. Resources should be allocated for the foresight report's preparation, over the entire parliamentary term.

Guidelines for foresight reporting

1. The report should be based on the best information available.
2. The report should be policy-relevant.
3. The report should influence decision-making.
4. The report should have a sufficiently long time span.
5. The report and strategy should complement each other.
6. The report should be extensive.
7. The report should be intelligible.
8. The report should evaluate various alternatives.
9. The foresight report process should be participatory.
10. The report should examine global development.
11. The report should support sustainable development.
12. The reports should aim at a pioneering approach.

ANNEX 2: FURTHER INFORMATION AND SOURCES USED IN THE ASSESSMENT

A country review by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change:

<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/idr/fin05.pdf>

A report by the Parliament's Committee for the Future, and comments on the report:

(in Finnish)

http://www.eduskunta.fi/valtiopaivaasiakirjat/TuVM_1/2010

(in Swedish)

http://www.eduskunta.fi/faktatmp/utatmp/akxtmp/frub_1_2010_p.shtml

The results of a survey conducted with those who participated in the report's preparation

(in Finnish): <http://www.vnk.fi/yhteiset/tulevaisuusselonteko/pdf/tulosten-kooste.pdf>

Summary on Future Forums:

http://www.vnk.fi/yhteiset/tulevaisuusselonteko/pdf/Foorumien_aineisto/Kooste_tulevaisuusfoorumien_annista_en.pdf

Prime Minister's Office publications:

Government Foresight Report on Long-Term Climate and Energy Policy: Towards a Low-carbon Finland. 30/2009.

Improving the Government Foresight Reporting Procedure. Summary. 3/2007.

Towards a pioneering status? Assessment of the Foresight Report on Long-term Climate and Energy Policy. 3/2011.

<http://www.vnk.fi/julkaisut/julkaisusarja/en.jsp>



PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
FINLAND

SNELLMANINKATU 1, HELSINKI
PO BOX 23, FI-00023 GOVERNMENT, FINLAND
Tel. +358 9 16001, +358 9 57811
Fax +358 9 1602 2165
julkaisut@vnk.fi
www.vnk.fi/english