

**ADVANCE UNEDITED VERSION**

## **Ad Hoc Expert Group on Approaches and Mechanisms for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting**

**Report of the meeting held in Geneva, 8-12 December 2003**

### **I. Background**

1. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in resolution E/2000/35, which established the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), decided that the Forum may recommend, as appropriate, the convening of ad hoc expert groups of limited duration, involving experts from developed and developing countries, for scientific and technical advice.
2. UNFF, at its first session adopted its multi-year programme of work (resolution 1/1, paragraphs 23 and 24) in which it recommended the convening of three ad hoc expert groups, one of which would be on approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting.
3. At its third session, held in Geneva from 26 May to 6 June 2003, the UNFF agreed on the establishment of an ad hoc expert group on approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting and to the convening of a meeting of the expert group. This decision was subsequently endorsed by ECOSOC in its decision 2003/299, which decided that the ad hoc expert groups on “approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting” and on “finance and transfer of environmentally sound technologies” would be convened in Geneva from 8-19 December 2003.

### **II. Organizational and other matters**

#### **A. Venue and duration of the meeting**

4. The ad hoc expert group on approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting met at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 8 to 12 December 2003.

#### **B. Tasks of the Ad hoc Expert Group**

5. As decided by UNFF at its third session, the tasks of the ad hoc expert group were as follows:

(a) Assess existing reporting requirements under relevant international conventions, processes, instruments and organizations;

(b) Assess existing monitoring and assessment procedures in international conventions, processes, instruments and organizations related to forests;

(c) Propose ways for the Forum to monitor and assess progress, based on: voluntary reporting by countries, members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and other relevant organizations and international and regional processes on implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action; ongoing work on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management being undertaken at the national, regional and international levels; and existing data and information as well as reporting systems and structures;

(d) Propose an outline for voluntary reporting to the Forum;

(e) Recommend options for drawing upon the reports provided to Forum sessions to identify trends and lessons learned;

(f) Develop recommendations on how to build capacity in countries, including the increase of resources for that goal, for monitoring, assessment and reporting, taking into account the special needs of developing countries.

### **C. Attendance and participation**

6. UNFF agreed that the ad hoc expert group would be composed of 30 experts (six from each of the five UN regional groups and including representatives of developed and developing countries and countries with economies in transition). As was further agreed by UNFF, representatives of UNFF Member States participated in the first two days of the meeting and remained as observers for the last three days. CPF members participated in a resource capacity, and were invited to make scientific and technical contributions.

7. Other intergovernmental organizations and representatives of major groups, with relevant expertise, participated in the meeting, in accordance with the rules and procedures of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council as well as practices established by the Commission on Sustainable Development, the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF). They were invited to make scientific and technical contributions.

8. A full list of participants can be found in Annex 1.

### **D. Election of officers**

9. The experts elected Mr. Benedicto Fonseca Filho as the Chairman of the ad hoc expert group.

10. The experts decided to form a drafting group, consisting of one expert from each regional group, to assist the Chairman in drafting the report of the ad hoc expert group for the consideration of all the experts. The Chairman of the ad hoc expert group invited Mr.

Dudley to act as facilitator of the drafting group. The members of the drafting group included Mr. Dudley, Mr. Garcia, Ms. Malysheva, Mr. Said, Mr. Siswanto and Mr. Rametsteiner.

## **E. Documentation**

11. Two official documents were prepared for the meeting: the provisional agenda with annotations, and a concept paper in the form of the “Note by the Secretariat”. Several background documents were made available to the experts. A list of official and background documents can be found in Annex 2.

## **F. Conduct of the meeting**

### **1. Opening of the meeting**

12. Mr. Pekka Patosaari, Coordinator and Head of the Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests, opened the meeting on the morning of 8 December by welcoming all experts and observers from Member States, CPF member organizations and major groups. In his opening remarks, he provided an overview of the UNFF process and the establishment of the UNFF ad hoc expert groups. Furthermore, he stressed the importance of monitoring implementation, assessing outputs and impacts, and reporting on progress, experiences and lessons learned in the UNFF process. He also highlighted the expectations of the international community that this expert group would effectively and efficiently tackle its tasks and provide concrete and practical recommendations to UNFF.

### **2. Ad hoc expert group discussions**

13. During the first two days of the meeting, the participants had a general exchange of views related to the tasks of the ad hoc expert group. During the third and fourth days, the members of the ad hoc expert group elaborated in more detail their views related to the mandate of the group, based on the outcomes of their initial discussions on the first two days. This enabled the drafting group to put forward a draft report on the morning of the fifth and last day of the meeting, which reflected the productive and wide ranging discussions of the ad hoc expert group. The report was adopted by the ad hoc expert group.

### **3. Closure of the meeting**

14. Mr. Pekka Patosaari said a few words to congratulate the ad hoc expert group for the valuable outputs of its meeting. Mr. Benedicto Fonseca Filho closed the meeting, thanking the experts for their excellent work over the course of the week.

### **III. Conclusions and Matters for the Consideration of the United Nations Forum on Forests**

#### **A. Introduction**

15. For the purposes of its work, the ad hoc expert group referred to the descriptions of monitoring, assessment and reporting provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting, including Concepts, Terminology and Definitions (E/CN.18/2002/8), as follows:

- (a) Monitoring involves periodic quantitative or qualitative measurements or observations of a specific parameter,
- (b) Assessment involves analysis of the monitored data and observations,
- (c) Reporting involves dissemination of the results of assessments.

16. The ad hoc expert group recalled the UNFF decision that defined the Forum's monitoring, assessment and reporting function as consisting of three areas:

- (a) Progress in implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action,
- (b) Progress towards sustainable forest management (measuring conditions and trends on the ecological, social and economic aspects of forests),
- (c) Review of the effectiveness.

17. The ad hoc expert group focused on the first two areas of the monitoring, assessment and reporting function, recognizing the link between its work and the review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests that will take place at the fifth session of UNFF. One of the 21 criteria for the review of the effectiveness is "the extent to which countries, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests and other actors have made progress in implementing the relevant IPF/IFF proposals for action".

18. The ad hoc expert group noted that its work would also contribute to the deliberations at the fourth session of UNFF on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action on the two agenda items on: i) monitoring, assessment and reporting, concepts terminology and definitions; and ii) criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management. It further noted that a number of the IPF/IFF proposals for action address monitoring, assessment and reporting at the national level.

19. The ad hoc expert group focused its conclusions and recommendations on how UNFF would assess and monitor progress in implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action and progress toward sustainable forest management (using criteria and indicators) and how reporting from countries, CPF members, other relevant international and regional organizations and processes, and major groups could contribute to this. It recognized that the primary value of monitoring and assessment activities is at the national level.

20. The ad hoc expert group acknowledged the many potential benefits to countries from reporting for national and international purposes that have been recognized by UNFF

at its second session. It agreed on the following principles to guide its work so as to help capture these benefits:

- (a) Build on existing monitoring, assessment and reporting practices;
- (b) Make optimal use of both existing and collected information for monitoring and assessment purposes so as to limit the need for additional reporting;
- (c) Strengthen links between national and international reporting so as to reduce the reporting burden;
- (d) Design mechanisms for monitoring and assessment and procedures for reporting that take into consideration the varying levels of country capacities.

## **B. Conclusions and recommendations of the ad hoc expert group on approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting**

21. The ad hoc expert group on approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting transmits to the UNFF at its fourth session, for its consideration and appropriate action, the following conclusions and recommendations covering its tasks as envisaged in ECOSOC resolution 2003/299.

### **1. Existing reporting requirements as well as monitoring and assessment procedures under relevant international conventions, processes, instruments and organizations related to forests**

#### **Conclusions**

22. The ad hoc expert group welcomed the Note by the Secretariat, which reviewed existing monitoring and assessment procedures and reporting requirements under relevant international instruments, organizations and processes.

23. In particular, the ad hoc expert group noted some of the key findings related to forest-related **monitoring and assessment**, including:

- (a) Most international forest-related monitoring and assessment is based on national reporting, supplemented by other sources of information.
- (b) Many international and regional organizations, instruments and processes use national, and, in some cases, regional and international indicators for monitoring and assessment purposes. At the same time, many forest-related instruments are developing and are encouraging countries to apply indicators to monitor progress in implementation, as well as impacts on the ground.
- (c) UNFF and many other governing bodies of CPF members have recognized the usefulness of criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management for monitoring and assessment purposes.
- (d) The periodicity of assessments varies by process, the most common being every four to six years.
- (e) The scope of assessments also varies by process, from a narrow focus to more comprehensive coverage.

24. The ad hoc expert group also noted some key findings related to **reporting** to forest-related instruments and organizations, including:

- (a) There are many and extensive requests for national reports related to forests by international and regional organizations, instruments and processes, which represent a burden on countries.
- (b) Countries do not always provide consistent guidance on monitoring, assessment and reporting to the various international forest-related bodies.
- (c) The forest-related information reported to these instruments and organizations falls into two broad categories: i) actions taken to implement international commitments; and ii) situation and trends in ecological, social and economic aspects of forests.
- (d) There are overlaps in the information requested, which provide the potential to streamline reporting and reduce the burden on countries.
- (e) The purpose, scope, timing and periodicity of reporting vary by instrument/organization, and differences in terminology and definitions, among other things, pose challenges for streamlining.

25. The CPF presented the progress in its work to identify overlaps in and opportunities for streamlining forest-related national reporting. The ad hoc expert group expressed appreciation to the members of CPF for the work they have initiated and their efforts to keep countries and other stakeholders informed about these activities at UNFF sessions and at other forest-related meetings.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

26. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:

- (a) Call for greater efforts of international organizations and instruments to identify areas of overlap and redundancy in reporting and inconsistencies in information reported.
- (b) Encourage the CPF members to continue to make information from national reports to international instruments and organizations readily accessible for monitoring, assessment and reporting purposes, including through the development of a common information framework for forest-related reporting to international instruments.
- (c) Encourage the CPF members to explain the benefits of their work on streamlining forest-related reporting, and to further publicize it through all possible means, including to their governing bodies. This could include the possible reduction of overall cost resulting from their work related to monitoring, assessment and reporting.
- (d) Encourage the CPF members to develop a schedule of required forest-related reporting and request the UNFF Secretariat to make this information available to all UNFF Member States, in order to allow for better time management in

countries in the collection of information, consultations with stakeholders and effective compilation and analysis of reports.

- (e) Further encourage the CPF members to continue their efforts to harmonize forest-related definitions, in order to minimize inconsistencies in information and with an aim to reduce the reporting burden.
- (f) Call for increased coordination within countries among national focal points for forest-related instruments.
- (g) Invite the CPF members to communicate the need for their respective focal points to enhance in-country coordination.

## **2. Ways for the Forum to monitor and assess progress**

27. The ad hoc expert group considered ways that the Forum could monitor and assess progress both toward sustainable forest management and in implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, taking into account the seven thematic areas identified by the International Conference on Criteria and Indicators in 2003 and the 16 elements of the UNFF.

### **a. Monitoring and assessment of progress toward sustainable forest management**

#### **Conclusions**

28. The expert group recognized that a great deal of information has already been reported and continues to be reported by countries to international conventions, processes, instruments and organizations related to forests. These sources of information could be used as a basis for assessing progress toward sustainable forest management.

29. An important source of information is FAO's global Forest Resources Assessment, which will be updated in 2005 and will use criteria for sustainable forest management as its organizing framework. The expert group recognized other sources of information, including reports on country progress in the use of criteria and indicators, assessment reports of criteria and indicators processes (i.e., of the Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe, of ITTO, and the Montreal Process) and reports from other global and regional assessments. Valuable information is also available from forest industry and other stakeholders and efforts need to be made to capture such information.

30. The ad hoc expert group concluded that these and other existing sources of information could be used to monitor and assess progress towards sustainable forest management. Thus, national reporting to UNFF would not be necessary.

31. The ad hoc expert group welcomed the opportunity that the agenda item on criteria and indicators at the fourth session of the UNFF presents for criteria and indicator processes to report on their development and progress in the national use of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

32. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:
- (a) Invite FAO and other CPF members, criteria and indicators processes, and other relevant organizations and instruments to cooperate in preparing a document that provides a global overview of progress toward sustainable forest management for the consideration of UNFF at its fifth session.
  - (b) At its fourth session, agree on the nature of the global overview.
  - (c) Recommend that such a global overview should include broader non-quantifiable developments, such as the widespread acceptance of the need for sustainable forest management and various initiatives towards achieving it.
  - (d) Encourage countries that do not belong to a criteria and indicator process to become involved.
  - (e) Further recommend that FAO's global FRA and the criteria and indicators processes that are ready to report be invited to present their assessments at the fifth session of UNFF.
  - (f) Recommend that an appropriate periodicity for subsequent assessments of progress toward sustainable forest management would be about every five years.
  - (g) Recommend that countries support the enhancement of the global Forest Resources Assessment and regional and international criteria and indicators processes in order to improve the information base available for subsequent assessments of sustainable forest management.

#### **b. Monitoring and assessment of progress in implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action**

### **Conclusions**

33. The ad hoc expert group took note that an assessment of progress in implementation of most of the IPF/IFF proposals for action will have been accomplished by the fourth session of UNFF. Past sessions have addressed those proposals for action related to the "UNFF elements" on their agenda. An overall assessment of progress in implementation is due to occur at the fifth session of UNFF as part of the review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

34. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:

- (a) Agree to continue monitoring and assessing progress in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action according to established practices until the fifth session of UNFF.
- (b) Recommend that greater links be made between international reporting requirements and domestic reports on sustainable forest management.
- (c) Recommend that, after 2005, countries could use their national forest programmes or equivalents as one method to demonstrate progress in implementation to the international community.
- (d) Call for each country, as part of its national forest programme process, to continue to prioritize its implementation of action so as to accelerate progress towards sustainable forest management, taking into account the IPF/IFF proposals for action.
- (e) Recognizing the difficulties many countries have in reporting, invite FAO regional forestry commissions and FAO and other CPF members that have regional offices to facilitate the assessment of the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action and the flow of information between UNFF and countries.

### **3. Outline for voluntary reporting to the Forum**

35. The ad hoc expert group addressed issues related to gathering information for the fifth session of UNFF, as the reporting for the fourth session is already underway. The group also discussed in more general terms the nature of reporting in the long-term, beyond 2005.

#### **a) Reporting to the fifth session of UNFF**

#### **Conclusions**

36. The ad hoc expert group recognized that the overall assessment of progress in implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action would be part of the review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests that will take place at the fifth session of UNFF. It noted that UNFF, at its second session, identified 21 criteria for the review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests, some of which (i.e. those listed in para. 4a(i-v) of resolution 2/3) are related to progress in implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

37. The ad hoc expert group took note of the gaps in country reporting on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action reported to UNFF by countries, and considered two ways that this information could be gathered in order to get as comprehensive a view as possible of country implementation for the fifth session:

- (a) The UNFF Secretariat to develop a simple questionnaire, which could include both “tick boxes” for quantitative information as well as space for descriptive information related to implementation. Information would be provided to the UNFF Secretariat through submission of written responses to the questionnaire. A draft outline, which

was briefly considered by the ad hoc expert group, is attached to this report as an example (see Annex 3).

(b) The UNFF Secretariat, assisted by CPF members, collect information through telephone interviews or personal visits, using a simple format.

These were not seen as being mutually exclusive.

38. The ad hoc expert group also recognized that FAO's regional forestry commission meetings in 2004 could provide an opportunity for countries to discuss implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

39. The ad hoc expert group also noted that CPF members, through the CPF Framework, and major groups, both through written reports and the multi-stakeholder dialogues, have reported to the second and third sessions of UNFF and are planning to do so at the fourth session.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

40. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:

- (a) Invite CPF members and major groups to provide comprehensive reporting related to implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action for the fifth session of UNFF.
- (b) Invite the FAO regional forestry commissions to take the opportunity to hold discussions on the relationship between regional priorities and the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action in order to contribute to the overall assessment at the fifth session of the UNFF.
- (c) Request countries that have not already done so to identify a national focal point for UNFF and submit contact information to the UNFF Secretariat by 1 July 2004, in order to facilitate the reporting process leading up to the fifth session of the Forum.
- (d) Recommend that the UNFF Secretariat use, where practicable, the two ways discussed by the ad hoc expert group to gather information in order to obtain the best possible picture of implementation.

#### **b) Reporting over the long-term**

### **Conclusions**

41. The ad hoc expert group agreed that their recommendations regarding future reporting mechanisms should be of a general nature, as the future institutional framework for UNFF would be considered at its fifth session. These mechanisms should facilitate the identification of emerging issues as well as issues that no longer merit attention by UNFF.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

42. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:

- (a) Recommend that there be greater coherence and linkage between reports generated for domestic purposes and international reporting, using, where possible, reports generated domestically on implementation of national forest programmes or their equivalent, reflecting the implementation of international commitments.
- (b) Agree to continue to use, consistently over time, a flexible format for reporting that allows for the identification of issues that warrant the attention of the international community.
- (c) Agree that UNFF sessions will provide opportunities for countries, CPF members and major groups to identify emerging issues that warrant the attention of the international community.

#### **4. How to draw upon the reports provided to Forum sessions to identify trends and lessons learned**

### **Conclusions**

43. The ad hoc expert group discussed the important role of UNFF to identify global trends and to provide opportunities for countries, CPF members, and major groups to share experiences and lessons learned regarding the implementation of SFM and the IPF/IFF proposals for action. Experts recognized that the sharing of these lessons and the highlighting of trends through written reports was further enriched through active exchange of information at UNFF sessions and at country-led initiatives and other inter-sessional activities. The ad hoc expert group therefore welcomed the innovations introduced at the third session of the Forum that facilitated the sharing of experiences and lessons learned that included panel discussions and presentations of experiences at the national and regional levels. The ad hoc expert group also recognized the important role played by side events at UNFF sessions in facilitating interactive exchange of information on both technical and policy issues.

### **Recommendations for the considerations of UNFF**

44. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:
- (a) Agree that UNFF sessions, complementary to country reporting, will further enhance the provision of opportunities to share experiences and lessons learned, including through presentation of experiences at national and regional levels, panel discussions, and side events.
  - (b) Urge the UNFF Secretariat to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the holding of side events, including through suggesting partners among developed countries with similar interests.
  - (c) Recommend that the reports of UNFF sessions seek to capture the lessons learned, trends and emerging issues highlighted during the session, and that the UNFF Secretariat document such information from both the official deliberations and the side events and make it available on the UNFF website.

- (d) Recommend that major groups, CPF members and other organizations and institutions be called upon throughout the UNFF sessions to share their experiences and lessons learned as well as highlight issues with a view to contributing to the identification of action that UNFF can take.

## **5. How to build capacity in countries**

### **Conclusions**

45. The ad hoc expert group noted that country-led initiatives held in support of UNFF's work on monitoring assessment and reporting and other related meetings, such as those that took place in Yokohama, Japan, Guatemala City, Guatemala, and Viterbo, Italy, as referred to in Annex 2 of this report, have produced several recommendations on capacity building that warrant the consideration of UNFF.

46. Monitoring, assessment and reporting for forest-related organizations, instruments and processes have become increasingly technical and complex. In addition, some organizations, instruments and processes requesting information are not always aware of the challenges these demands create for responding countries with limited capacities.

47. In many cases, it is not a question that scientific and technical knowledge is absent in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, but rather that there is a lack of resources to implement effective monitoring, assessment and reporting across a country. Motivating focal points to engage effectively in monitoring, assessment and reporting is also needed. Furthermore, there is often a communication disconnect between the people tasked with responding to reporting requests and the authorities, institutions and personnel that could provide the necessary information. Participation in international meetings of people who produce national reports would help with their motivation and understanding as well as remove this disconnect.

48. Increased resources (human, financial and technical), increased efficiency and a strong commitment to capacity building, both nationally and internationally, are therefore needed for all aspects of monitoring, assessment and reporting. Increasing the capacity of those participating in global forest-related assessments would enhance the value of such assessments.

49. Monitoring, assessment and reporting have to be reflected in national development action plans, poverty reduction strategies, and national forest programmes in order to attract international cooperation for capacity building. Resources allocated to monitoring, assessment and reporting are more likely to increase when benefits of the use of this information are reflected in actions on the ground and become apparent to decision makers.

50. Learning by engaging in monitoring, assessment and reporting processes was identified as one way to strengthen capacity. The criteria and indicator processes were mentioned as an example; they provide countries with the opportunity to share experiences

and with assistance in gathering information. Various activities by CPF member organizations and other intergovernmental organizations, such as FAO, UN/ECE and ITTO, to strengthen capacity for their particular reporting processes were also mentioned.

### **Recommendations for the consideration of UNFF**

51. The ad hoc expert group recommends that UNFF could:

- (a) Invite CPF members, other international organizations, regional institutions and processes, and multi- and bilateral partners to continue to support actions to strengthen national capacity and capability for the various elements of monitoring, assessment and reporting on the implementation of sustainable forest management and IPF/IFF proposals for action through the provision of financial resources, technical assistance and transfer of appropriate technology and know-how to developing countries and countries with economies in transition.
- (b) Suggest that countries make better use of existing resources and also seek additional domestic and external resources to strengthen capacity to monitor, assess and report on the implementation of sustainable forest management and IPF/IFF proposals for action.
- (c) Invite regional and sub-regional organizations, processes and networks, including FAO regional forestry commissions, to discuss common problems and share experiences and expertise regarding capacity building for monitoring, assessment and reporting on implementation of sustainable forest management and IPF/IFF proposals for action.
- (d) Recommend that countries take the opportunity, at the fourth session of UNFF, to exchange experiences in monitoring assessment and reporting related to various forest related instruments, highlight the benefits and value of this reporting and identify specific needs for national capacity building.
- (e) Invite CPF members to organize joint regional workshops of national focal points to build capacity for forest-related monitoring, assessment and reporting.
- (f) Invite the Global Environment Facility (GEF), within its mandate, to provide funds to strengthen national capacities of developing countries and countries with economies in transition for forest-related monitoring, assessment and reporting as a component of its projects in biological diversity, climate change and land degradation.
- (g) Invite CPF members and other international and regional organizations, instruments and processes to support capacity strengthening of those criteria and indicator processes that are at early stages of maturity, and encouraged criteria and indicator processes to exchange their experiences in capacity building efforts.

**Participants List**

**Experts**

H.E. Mr. Francis Butagira, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations at New York  
Mr. Peter Csoka, State Forest Service of Hungary, Hungary  
Mr. Michael Dudley, Forestry Commission, United Kingdom  
Mr. Benedicto Fonseca Filho, Ministry of External Relations, Brazil  
Mr. Mike Fullerton, Canadian Forest Service, Natural Resources Canada  
Mr. Alfonso Garcia Escobar, Consultor de la Gerencia de Geomatica de la Comision Nacional Forestal, Mexico  
Mr. Robert L. Hendricks, United States Forest Service  
Mr. Yuji Imaizumi, Forestry Agency of Japan  
Mr. Joong Myung KIM, Forest Research Institute, Republic of Korea  
Mr. Tomas Krejzar, Forestry Development Department, Czech Republic  
Mr. Atilio Ligrone Greco, Director General Forestal, Uruguay  
Ms. Natalia Malysheva, Research Institute of Silviculture and Forest Mechanization, Ministry of Natural Resources, Russian Federation  
Mr. Jorge Menendez, Secretaria de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable, Argentina  
Ms. Linda Mossop, Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa  
Ms. Luz Stella Pulido Pérez, Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial, Colombia  
Mr. Ewald Rametsteiner, Institute of Forest Sector, Policy and Economics, Austria  
Mr. Nasr Ragheb Said, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Under Secretary for Forests and Environment, Egypt  
Mr. Wandojo Siswanto, Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia  
Mr. Sven A. Svensson, National Board of Forestry, Sweden  
Mr. Hooi Chiew Thang, Forestry Department Headquarters, Ministry of Primary Industries, Malaysia  
Mr. Don Wijewardana, Director of International Forest Policy, New Zealand

**Member States**

Mr. Stjepan Posavec, Croatia  
Ms. Mireya Munoz, Ecuador  
Ms. Leena Karjalainen-Balk, Finland  
Mr. Ade Petranto, Indonesia  
Mr. Noel O'Connor, Ireland  
Mr. Michael Prendergast, Ireland  
Ms. Eva Pizano, Mexico  
Mr. Igor Shapovalov, Russian Federation  
Mr. Dusan Jovic, Serbia and Montenegro

**Representatives of members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests**

Mr. Jinhua Zhang, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, United Nations Environment Programme

Ms. Tiina Vähänen, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Mr. Steven Johnson, International Tropical Timber Organization

**Other intergovernmental organizations, processes and convention secretariats**

Ms. Margarita Astrálaga, Senior Advisor, Ramsar Convention Secretariat

**Major group entities**

Ms. Jaana Kaipainen, Forestry Advisor, Confederation of European Forest Owners

Mr. Francesco Bonavia, International Forestry Student Association

Mr. Edwin Mallory, International Council of Forest and Paper Association / Forest Products of Canada

**List of Official and Background Documents**

Official documents

Provisional agenda and annotations (E/CN.18/AC.1/2003/1)

Note by the Secretariat. Approaches and mechanisms for monitoring, assessment and reporting. (E/CN.18/AC.1/2003/2)

Background documents

Report of the Secretary-General on Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting, including Concepts, Terminology and Definitions, UNFF2 document (E/CN.18/2002/8)

Report of the country-led initiative, “International Expert Meeting on Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on the Progress Toward Sustainable Forest Management”, Yokohama, Japan, November 2001

Report of the country-led initiative on “Lessons Learned in Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Implementation of IPF/IFF Proposals for Action”, Viterbo, Italy, March 2003 (E/CN.18/2003/9)

Report of the “International Conference on the Contribution of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management: the Way Forward”, Guatemala City, February 2003  
Volume 1; and Volume 2, in particular:

- Criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management: Overview of progress and issues, by Markku Simula
- Strengthening institutional capacity and stakeholder partnerships for implementing criteria and indicators and facilitating the exchange of information between all stakeholders, by Ravi Prabhu et al.
- Key issues in the future development of international initiatives on forest-related criteria and indicators related to sustainable development, by Ewald Rametsteiner and Don Wijewardana

Guidelines and suggested format for voluntary reporting to UNFF4 (E/CN.18/2003/\_)

Towards a common information framework for forest-related national reporting to international processes. CPF Task Force on Streamlining Forest-related Reporting. Interim report. 6 December 2003.

**Annex 3**

**An optional draft outline for reporting on the implementation of IPE/IFF proposals for action**

Purpose: Give UNFF5 a part of the basis needed for decision on future proposals for action (PfA) (e.g. no future PfA, keep the existing PfA, abandon the existing and adopting new PfA)

One simple questionnaire to all countries in UNFF and another to international organisations, conventions and processes concerned. Descriptive written or oral reports on specified issues of selected countries in all of the five regions

**Questionnaire**

The countries/international bodies are requested to fill in (tick) the questionnaire showed below.

UNFF Elements / Thematic clusters / PFAs	Relevant to the country/int. body		Action(s) since 19xx (move down to an additional side column)					
	Yes	No	No action taken. Reasons?			Action(s) taken. Progress?		
			Not needed	Not a priority	Other reasons	None / little	Some / Moderate	Significant
(Preprinted)								

A detailed instruction must accompany the questionnaires. For example what is meant by “Not needed” and “Not a priority”?

The questionnaires should not take long to fill in. A target for the overall response rate of the country questionnaire could be minimum 70 % not being less than 60 % in any of the regions. In order to achieve this target the secretariat must make great and repeated efforts using different means. The target for the international body questionnaire must be 100 %.