

DRAFT: MARCH 2005

**REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
THE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT ON FORESTS
ANALYTICAL STUDY**

Preface

As part of the process for reviewing the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests, member States, CPF members and other relevant organizations and forest-related processes were invited to submit voluntary reports on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and to respond to a voluntary questionnaire about the effectiveness of the arrangement. These reports and questionnaire responses formed the basis for the Report of the Secretary-General on the Review of the Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests (**E/CN.18/2005/6**).

The purpose of this Analytical Study is to give further details of the information contained within these voluntary reports and questionnaire responses.

This non-official draft, prepared by the UNFF Secretariat, is being posted on the UNFF website for information. Member States and organizations who have submitted reports or questionnaires are welcome to provide feedback to the UNFF Secretariat on how their views have been captured and summarized. A revised version will be produced to reflect this feedback, and to incorporate information received from any further reports and questionnaire responses that may be submitted.

Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action	4
A.	Background.....	4
B.	Progress in implementing IPF/IFF proposals for action, according to the 16 thematic elements.....	5
1.	Formulation and implementation of National Forest Programmes	5
2.	Promoting public participation	8
3.	Combating deforestation and forest degradation	11
4.	Traditional forest-related knowledge	16
5.	Forest-related scientific knowledge.....	19
6.	Forest health and productivity.....	22
7.	Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management.....	24
8.	Economic, social and cultural aspects of forests.....	26
9.	Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forest and fragile ecosystems	39
10.	Monitoring, assessment and reporting, and concepts, terminology and definitions.....	43
11.	Rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover.....	46
12.	Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests.....	49
13.	Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs.....	53
14.	Financial resources	56
15.	International trade and sustainable forest management.....	59
16.	International cooperation in capacity-building, and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support SFM.....	62
III.	Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests	65
A.	Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action.....	65
B.	Principal function: Forum for continued policy development and dialogue	73
C.	Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination	80
D.	Principal function: International cooperation.....	84
E.	Principal function: Monitoring and assessing progress through reporting	86
F.	Principal function: Strengthening political commitment	93
IV.	Conclusions	97
Annex I.	Abbreviations used in this Study.....	99
Annex II.	Principal functions of the international arrangement on forests.....	101
Annex III.	List of respondents	102
Annex IV	Questionnaire responses: overall assessment and assessment according to activities...	104

I. Introduction

The international arrangement on forests (IAF)¹ was established in 2000². Its main objective is:

“to promote the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end.”

The IAF has six principal functions, listed in the Annex II to this Study. UNFF was established, as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC, in order to achieve this objective and to carry out these functions. ECOSOC also invited heads of relevant organizations, institutions and instruments to form the CPF³ to support the work of the UNFF.

ECOSOC decided that IAF would be reviewed after five years. At its second session, UNFF decided⁴ to carry out the review in the context of the six principal functions of IAF and accordingly identified 21 specific criteria for the assessment of its effectiveness. At its fourth session, UNFF agreed⁵ a process to facilitate the review: member States, CPF members and other relevant organizations and forest-related processes were invited (i) to submit voluntary reports on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and (ii) to respond to voluntary questionnaires about the effectiveness of the IAF in relation to each of the 21 specific criteria. In July 2004, the UNFF secretariat issued *Guidelines and a Suggested Format for Voluntary National Reports* and a paper with *Baseline Information Relevant to the Specific Criteria*⁶.

By the middle of March 2005, voluntary reports and/or questionnaire responses had been received from 46 member States, the EU, and ten other relevant organizations and forest-related processes⁷. A number of countries requested that their reports to previous UNFF sessions be regarded as constituting a report to UNFF5. In addition, some questionnaires reported on progress on implementing IPF/IFF proposals for action, while some reports commented on the effectiveness of the IAF. Formal responses to the questionnaire were received from the EU, from 14 member States - three of whom are also EU member States - and from five other relevant organizations and forest-related processes. In addition, CPF members submitted a joint report and a joint response to the questionnaire. The following Table shows the geographical distribution of countries that submitted reports and/or questionnaire responses. It is important to bear in mind the fact that this report takes no account of information that might have been provided by countries that did not make reports or submit questionnaires.

¹ All other abbreviations used in this Study are given in Annex I.

² By ECOSOC resolution 2000/35.

³ CPF members are CIFOR, FAO, ITTO, IUFRO, UNDP, UNEP, ICRAF, the World Bank, IUCN and the Secretariats of CBD, GEF, UNFCCC, UNCCD and UNFF.

⁴ By its resolution 2/3

⁵ By its resolution 4/4

⁶ Available on the UNFF website (<http://www.un.org/esa/forests/reports.html>), along with the individual reports and questionnaire responses that were submitted

⁷ A full list is provided in Annex III. Where questionnaire responses provide country-specific information about implementing IPF/IFF proposals (or reports comment on effectiveness of the IAF), this has been taken into account accordingly.

Table: Countries submitting voluntary reports and/or questionnaire responses

	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe	Latin America & Caribbean	Western Europe & other
Total	10	6	9	4	17

This Study analyses the information provided in these reports and questionnaire responses. It is a working draft, which has been used to help in the preparation of a synthesis report, to be considered at UNFF5, namely the Report of the Secretary-General on the Review of the Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests (E/CN.18/2005/6). Part II of the Study deals with the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, giving examples from individual reports, and Part III deals with the effectiveness of the IAF. While the conclusions (in Part IV) are based upon the input from reports and questionnaire responses, some baseline information is included in Part II to help provide the context for understanding particular elements.

II. Implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action

A. Background

Some 270 proposals for action were identified by the IPF and the IFF. In its multi-year programme of work and its plan of action⁸, the UNFF agreed to cluster these proposals for action according to 16 thematic elements, and to focus on particular elements at its second, third and fourth sessions⁹. These 16 thematic elements form the basis of the analysis in this part of the Study.

The 16 thematic elements

1. Formulation and implementation of National Forest Programmes (nfps)
2. Promoting public participation
3. Deforestation and forest degradation
4. Traditional forest-related knowledge
5. Forest-related scientific knowledge
6. Forest health and productivity
7. Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management
8. Economic, social and cultural aspects of forests
9. Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems
10. Monitoring, assessment and reporting, and concepts, terminology and definitions
11. Rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover
12. Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests.
13. Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs
14. Financial resources
15. International trade and sustainable forest management.
16. International cooperation in capacity-building, and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management

The *Guidelines and Suggested Format for Voluntary National Reports* invited countries, CPF members and other relevant organizations and forest-related processes to provide information in their voluntary reports on activities or initiatives undertaken since 1997, progress made, constraints encountered, lessons learned, and issues that have emerged, as well as relevant information related to means of implementation (financing, transfer of environmentally sound technologies, and capacity-building). The *Guidelines* subdivided some of the thematic elements; where applicable, the sub-divisions are used as sub-headings in this analysis.

⁸ Adopted by its resolution 1/1 and resolution 1/2

⁹ The *Guidelines and Suggested Format for Voluntary National Reports* list the thematic issues discussed at previous sessions and also provide cross-references to IPF/IFF proposals for action.

The *Guidelines* also invited respondents to describe the process of preparing their report, including which government agencies and stakeholder groups were involved, and the extent to which they contributed. In 29 cases, the reports state that they were prepared by officials of the forestry department, sometimes in consultation with other relevant departments; in nine of these cases stakeholder groups as well as other government agencies were invited to comment on the draft reports; in a further 13 cases, the report explains that it drew upon existing documents already produced by other government agencies and stakeholder groups.

In addition, the *Guidelines* invited respondents to provide information on their assessment (including of the relevance, priority, status of implementation, planned actions) of the IPF/IFF proposals for action in the national context. Ten countries report that they had carried out one (or more) assessments of IPF/IFF proposals for action in the national context. A further 21 countries state that they took full account of these IPF/IFF proposals for action when developing their nfps, or similar frameworks. A number of respondents note that the number, and detailed character, of the proposals for action have made it difficult to disseminate them effectively. It is suggested that simpler messages are required when trying to explain the concept of SFM, and its benefits, to practitioners in the field, other government agencies, stakeholders and the public¹⁰.

B. Progress in implementing IPF/IFF proposals for action, according to the 16 thematic elements

1. Formulation and implementation of National Forest Programmes

Baseline information

National forest programmes (nfps) are a common item for each Forum session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on National forest programmes (E/CN.18/2002/4), which was considered by the Forum at its second session. This Report summarized the results of the survey, carried out by FAO in 1998-99, which showed the status of nfps in various regions:

Region	<i>Status of national forest programme</i>		<i>Total</i>
	Planning	Implementation	
Africa	21	22	43
Asia	10	14	24
Near East	0	3	3
Latin America & Caribbean	0	33	33
Economies in transition	3	11	14
OECD	0	21	21
Total	34	104	138

The Report concluded (paragraph 63) that:

¹⁰ Paragraph 6 of UNFF resolution 4/3 acknowledges seven thematic elements that offer a reference framework for SFM: these thematic elements are the extent of forest resources; biological diversity; forest health and vitality; productive functions of forest resources; protective functions of forest resources; socio-economic functions; and the legal, policy and institutional framework.

“Countries have made considerable efforts to put in place national forest programme processes that are in line with the general definition and broad principles defined by IPF/IFF...”

It went on to add that (paragraph 65) that:

“Significant challenges are still encountered, especially by developing countries, in overcoming key cross-sectoral constraints, particularly those that require high-level political support. Further efforts are needed to improve linkages with broader agendas and instruments for poverty reduction, in order to secure adequate financing for the implementation of national forest programmes. Governance issues must also be addressed if progress is to be made in the decentralization and devolution of authority.”

Information from countries

The *Guidelines* for voluntary reports requested information on the development and implementation of nfps or similar national policy frameworks for forests. In their reports and questionnaire responses, 44 countries explain their approach to developing nfps, or similar national policy frameworks. Many of these countries also indicate that relevant IPF/IFF proposals have been taken into account during this process.

Typically, the process of formulating nfps, or similar frameworks, involves information gathering, consultation with other parts of government and (in many cases) stakeholder consultation. Many countries stress the importance of consultation; the participation of stakeholders is generally regarded as an invaluable means for building ownership for a nfp process and thus for facilitating its implementation. In Lithuania, for example, stakeholder participation is formally recognized as a strategic forestry development objective, and in Canada the National Forest Strategy was developed through extensive cross-country consultations. Other countries also explain that they have a long tradition of public participation, and some add that the number of stakeholder groups has increased over time with a broadening of interest in forests. The report from Germany notes the need to balance the different strengths and weaknesses of stakeholders and to ensure integration with international objectives where these are not fully understood by national stakeholders. In its report, Turkey states that interested parties (forest villagers, NGOs, academics, the forestry sector, forestry professionals and other Governmental agencies) were included at all stages of the nfp development process, with their views and proposals incorporated into the final report.

Some reports refer to linkages with other policy statements. For example, the report from El Salvador notes that its nfp is in harmony with the Central American Forest Strategy. Reports from Senegal and Lebanon both refer to cross-references between nfps and plans to combat desertification. The report from Senegal also refers to links with its biodiversity strategy, and to the stress laid on forests in its PRSP. The report from Slovakia states that effort is needed to clarify the relationship between the forest sector and other sectors, such as agriculture and environment.

In some countries, operational responsibility for forests lies at the sub-national level and so regional forest strategies, developed within a broad national framework, are of particular importance. The report from Canada outlines the development of forest strategies in a number of provinces and territories, explaining that their forestry ministers have joined a National Forest Strategy Coalition to promote voluntary implementation of the Strategy across Canada. In Italy, the role of nfps is carried out by Regional Rural Development Programmes, drafted and implemented by 19 Regions and 2 Autonomous Provinces, which act as a framework at the local level for all activities related to agriculture and forestry. The report from Senegal gives details of the implications for its nfp of the policy of decentralization, noting that the process of planning has been decentralized since 1999 and that regional forest action plans are drawn up on the basis of actions defined by rural communities. The report from Serbia and Montenegro explains that, in Serbia a project (supported by FAO) is underway to develop an nfp; meanwhile, in Montenegro, some elements of the future policy can be found in the Law on Forestry (2000), but there is no political statement for the forest sector and it is necessary to prepare a realistic nfp. The report from Spain explains that the Spanish Forest Plan provides a framework for the forest plans of different autonomous communities.

A number of countries describe the main elements of their nfp. For example, in Cambodia, the nfp includes strategic measures to strengthen forest resource management and conservation, to promote forestry's

contribution to socio-economic development, to promote forestry's contribution to poverty reduction, and to strengthen capacity and good governance in the forestry sector. In the Republic of Korea, the aim of the nfp is "to build an abundantly green nation with harmony between people and forest"; the fundamental direction is to achieve SFM by categorizing forest policies and mechanisms according to economic, ecological, social functions of forests, whilst great importance is given to public participation and unique local features. The nfp in Colombia includes strategies to improve people's livelihoods through the conservation, management and restoration of forests, to classify forest reserves and water catchments, and to establish plantations for protection and production. The nfp strategy in Cyprus identifies five action areas: State forests and surrounding areas; the wider countryside; special sites; ecotourism promotion; and information, publicity and education. In Switzerland, the nfp includes a long term vision for the desired status of the forest, based on an analysis of problems and trends; twelve quantified objectives for the year 2015; a strategy for achieving these objectives; the necessary instruments and 100 measures: the objectives and measures are prioritized and the necessary resources allocated. In Slovakia there are three main priorities and several aims: the priorities are settlement of forest ownership and forest usage in the process of re-privatisation, SFM and increasing effectiveness. A view on what constitutes an nfp in Europe was developed through the MCPFE *Approach to National Forest Programmes in Europe*, agreed by European ministers in 2003.

In India, where forest policy and planning is a concurrent responsibility of the central government and state governments, forests are treated primarily as environmental and social resources and only secondarily as a revenue or commercial resource. The National Forest Policy 1988 also set a mandate for a 20 year goal of increasing the forest/tree cover in the country to 33 percent of the land.

Sweden has also started a process for further clarification of forest policy through quantifiable targets. Consultations are being undertaken to develop the interpretation of the current national policies on forestry and the environment and to create a favourable momentum to achieve forest sector goals that include quantitative interim targets in key areas, as well as a long term target. Most of the interim targets relate to 2010. Examples of these goals are to increase the amount of dead hardwood by 40% in order to enhance the biological diversity of forests; to halve the level of unsatisfactory regenerations; and to establish agreements between the forest administration and 80% of the municipalities about the long term forest management of urban woods.

Some countries give further detail about the benefits of their nfp. These include its use in Malawi as a mechanism to operationalise the National Forestry policy and Forest Act. The report from Finland notes evidence of strong political commitment and associated budget support since the launch of the nfp. Finland adds, in the context of its international development cooperation activities, that the nfp formulation process can provide a vehicle for improved donor coordination. The benefits identified by Switzerland include the stimulation of discussions (at local, regional or national levels) on forest policy and cross-sectoral issues with other sectors, thus heightening awareness of their linkages with forest policy. A number of countries also refer to the value of nfps as a basis for securing reference to forest-related policies and programmes in high-level government policy statements. For example, in Colombia, some of the nfp goals are now included in the Government's National Development Plan, giving them political acknowledgement as state policy.

Several reports address issues and challenges of implementation. Pakistan has held a national workshop to prioritize first year activities. In Benin, the challenge is to overcome the problems posed by an inadequate institutional framework; weak participation of the population in natural resource management; poor management of the forest resource and of wildlife and its habitat; and a lack of vision for the forest sector. In relation to its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that adequate time must be allowed for effective participation, and the need to emphasise that finance for implementation must come from other stakeholders and not just the government. The report from Serbia and Montenegro explains that the extended period of political instability and constant changes at the governmental level have made planning for the future difficult.

A number of countries explain why they do not consider it necessary to have a nfp, although most of them regard their relevant policy processes as constituting a programme. For example, in Norway, the nfp is

defined as consisting of existing policy processes including a white paper on forest policy (1999), regional forest programmes and the government supported *Living Forest* process (1995-98). In the Netherlands the policy paper *Nature for People – People for Nature (2001)* is considered to adequately cover all the elements of a nfp. The report from the USA explains that the Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act 1974 requires that every five years a program be developed and approved by Congress; this US counterpart to a nfp serves primarily to describe an overall strategy for the management of the National Forests (administered by the US Forest Service) and the research needed to guide cooperative efforts in working with states, local governments and, through them, the private sector; it does not, however, provide direct guidance for the management of other Federal or state lands, or forest lands managed by the forest industry, tribal authorities and small private owners. New Zealand does not have a nfp; its cross-sectoral planning and policy approach to resource management is to control adverse effects on the environment and establish a neutral legislative and economic framework: forestry (both commercial and non-commercial) is seen as a legitimate land use to be treated fairly and equitably with other land uses.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that all CPF members support nfps in a general sense, through their assistance to countries in forest policy development, capacity building and efforts to implement sustainable forest management. The National Forest Programme Facility, hosted by FAO, is a partnership of bilateral donors and international organizations that supports nfps. As of September 2004, 36 countries and two sub-regional entities had received grants to further nfps. PROFOR, hosted by the World Bank, has been working on development and implementation of nfps in Cameroon, Costa Rica, Guyana, Malawi and Viet Nam. FAO supports development and implementation of nfps in 22 countries through its technical cooperation programme, and is undertaking studies on financial strategies and mechanisms to support nfps, initially focusing on Latin America. UNDP supports decentralization and local governance processes by addressing policy reforms and development planning, promoting effective legal frameworks and mobilizing resources for use at the regional and local levels.

Conclusions

Most countries give details of their nfps (or similar frameworks) and explain that IPF/IFF proposals were taken into account during their development. The benefits of nfps, in terms of providing a focus for forest policy development and implementation, are widely recognised. In some countries nfps are developed at sub-national level because significant forest policy responsibilities are decentralised. Important current challenges include the need to ensure cross-sectoral integration with other policies so that nfp priorities are reflected in broader national development plans, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers; the need to gain high-level political support for nfps; and the need (especially in developing countries) to secure adequate financing for their implementation. It is clear from the reports that nfps (or similar frameworks) have helped to bring stakeholders together to develop a common vision for countries' forests and to identify priorities for implementation. CPF members explain that they have facilitated nfps in a number of important ways, including through the National Forest Programme Facility and PROFOR.

2. Promoting public participation

Baseline information

Promoting public participation is a common item for each Forum session and many of the Reports of the Secretary-General on the thematic elements provide baseline information on the subject. In addition, Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues were held at the second, third and fourth sessions of the Forum. Stakeholder participation was also considered at the *Workshop on Decentralization, Federal Systems in Forestry and National Forest Programs*, held in Interlaken, Switzerland on 27-30 April 2004.

Information from countries

The *Guidelines* for voluntary reports requested information on mechanisms or initiatives to facilitate stakeholder participation, including indigenous and local communities, in forest sector planning, decision-making and/or forest management. (This relates primarily to promoting public participation at the national level: the extent to which the IAF has worked in transparent and participatory manner is one of the specific criteria, considered in part III of this Study.)

In their voluntary reports, 38 countries address this issue, explaining how they are facilitating stakeholder participation at different levels, including policy making, through consultation over codes of practice and with respect to forest management decisions.

Some reports emphasise the importance of public participation. For example, the report from Switzerland states that participation of the relevant stakeholders in forest sector planning, decision-making and/or forest management provides invaluable input and gives stakeholders the opportunity to identify themselves with the issues. The report from Sweden attributes the need for continuous development in forestry to changing market demands and to social changes, which themselves reflect new knowledge and changing opinions about how forests should be used. Mutual understanding is enhanced through effective public participation.

A number of countries explain that they have constitutional mechanisms for public participation that apply to all areas of policy. These include, for example, the role of Parliaments in enacting forest legislation and approving government policies, as well as the publication - by governments - of consultation documents. In Switzerland, the law identifies circumstances in which public consultation on regional forest plans is required. The report from Canada describes a recent public debate in New Brunswick on harvesting policies for public forests which took place under a specially appointed all-party Select Committee of the legislature.

Many of the reports describe other mechanisms for participation in forest policy development. Stakeholder groups include forest owners, forest industry, forestry employee organisations, trade unions, hunters, tourist industries, environmental organisations, local and indigenous peoples. Some countries, such as Norway, explain that they have a long tradition of stakeholder participation in relation to forests, but add that the number of interest groups has grown over time. The report from Finland explains that there is a Future Forum on Forests which is a multisectoral and multidisciplinary meeting point supporting the development of national forest policy by identifying expected changes in the forestry environment in the next 10-20 years. The report from Spain gives details of the National Council of Forests, with representatives from different levels of government and other stakeholder groups. In the USA there is a Roundtable on Sustainable Forests, which includes federal, state, tribal, environmental and business interests and has significantly improved opportunity for dialogue and action. The report from Malawi explains that, with the support of the National Forestry Programme Facility, traditional leaders and other stakeholders are critically examining issues of deforestation and environmental degradation. The report from Lesotho explains that the forestry minister regularly meets major group representatives.

Some countries also refer to the challenges they face in developing their approach to public participation. In its questionnaire response, Colombia explains that, while mechanisms were developed to take account of the views of interested groups at different levels during the nfp formulation process, it was difficult to consolidate their views, that there is a need for procedures on stakeholder group representation; there can also be a low level of participation, with some grass-roots organizations being inadequately represented. The report from El Salvador states that nfp development should allow more scope for the participation of diverse stakeholders, adding that C&I should emphasize stakeholder participation and mechanisms that guarantee the social legitimacy of the nfp. The report from Switzerland points out that the adequacy of participatory methods and techniques need to be evaluated and improved in order to enhance the quality and effectiveness of public participation in forest sector planning, decision-making and/ or forest management. It states that an area requiring improvement is the involvement of private (very often small) forest owners, forest industry, weakly articulated groups of interest and the general public (especially in urban areas). Serbia and Montenegro also highlight the problem of motivating private forest owners to create associations with the aim of expressing their interests.

The report from Sweden refers to the importance of assisting people who work outside the forest sector, but wish to participate actively in discussions about forests, by providing them with information – for example through educational work and publications.

In Malawi, decentralisation has also been important and the forestry department has recently devolved some of its key responsibilities to District Assemblies.

Some reports also discuss mechanisms for participation in decisions about forest management. In Malawi, a participatory forest management planning process is building the capacity of field forestry extension staff and communities, to help match community needs with forest resource use. In Venezuela, integrated community forest management aims to encourage the participation of rural settlers in the management of the forests. In Benin, a new law lays particular stress on the integration of the neighbouring populations in the management of forest ecosystems. The report from Lebanon highlights the role of local NGOs, such as the “Friends of the Cedar of God” (which is attracting personal sponsorship of seedlings) and projects such as school tree nurseries. One feature of public participation in the Republic of Korea is the opening up of national forests to allow the public to practice forest tending and to establish recreational forests.

A number of countries distinguish between participation in the management of public and privately owned forests. For example, in the USA, there are legal guarantees securing public participation in forest management planning of public forests, but few direct opportunities for public involvement in the management of private forest lands. Nevertheless, compliance with soil and water protection regulations are scrutinized carefully by the public, and most forest products companies and other major private forest landowners have been sensitive and responsive to public comment. The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), a program of the American Forest & Paper Association, is largely a result of public concern over the management of industrial timberlands, and is intended to provide independent assurance that these forests are now being well managed.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that all CPF members have mechanisms in place to facilitate the input of civil society and involve them in their activities. Furthermore, the CPF has met and shared information with a wide range of partners and stakeholders through the informal CPF Network. Several CPF members are also active in facilitating participation of civil society at the national level. For example, UNDP has a Civil Society Advisory Committee; CIFOR promotes participatory action research to facilitate collaborative management involving local communities; FAO works on integrating participatory processes into nfps; IUCN is supporting projects on public involvement in forest management in the Russian Federation; and ITTO is establishing civil society and private-sector partnerships to promote SFM and certification in the field. FAO frequently brings together experts in stakeholder participation and two expert meetings were organized in 2002 and 2003. FAO is also helping to build capacity for private and community forestry in seven countries in Central and Eastern Europe (in partnership with IUCN), to train forest managers in participatory processes in six African countries, and to help community-based forest enterprise development through a number of projects in Africa, Asia and Latin America. FAO and CIFOR organised a workshop in 2002 in Indonesia on equitable partnerships between corporate and smallholder actors.

Information from major groups

The questionnaire response from representatives of the Children and Youth major group refers to the value of public consultation over forest design plans, stressing the importance of taking account of the needs of youth in urban and community forests, for example by providing safe play areas and organising educational days.

Information from forest-related processes

In its questionnaire response, MCPFE refers to the outcome of the workshop *Exchanging country's experiences in the nfp processes in the practical application of the MCPFE Approach to nfps in Europe*, held in Gdansk, Poland, on 22-24 November 2004. This indicated an overall tendency for a new culture of discussion to take over from the previous traditional top-down forest policy planning. In some countries the activities involve not just information exchange but also active involvement of society in the decision making process. Nevertheless, countries still see the involvement of the public in different ways and frequently there is a need for clarification of the approach. For example, should the approach be representative or participatory? During the discussion at the MCPFE workshop it was stressed that the more powerful stakeholders were often over-represented. A balanced representation is an important precondition for the successful public participation in the nfp process. The participants of the workshop made a number of suggestions for achieving successful participation:

- clear structure and mandates for all stakeholders engaged in the nfp (the procedures should be agreed upon and made clear at the beginning of the process);
- legitimate and balanced representation of stakeholders;
- clearly allocated responsibilities for implementation among all involved;
- increased awareness of the impact, benefit, and relevance of forestry to all stakeholders;
- exchange of knowledge in the process;
- presentation of results and lessons learned;
- address stakeholders' concerns proactively;
- define the public in terms of stakeholders;
- build capacity for stakeholders to enable them to play their role;
- ensure legitimacy of the nfp through defining the limits of participatory democracy.

Conclusions

Action has been taken to promote stakeholder participation, at various levels: in policy making, through preparation of codes of practice, through local consultation on forest management decisions in respect of publicly owned forests and through mechanisms (such as certification) that have increased consultation over management of privately owned forests. Many reports recognise that further efforts are now needed to assist stakeholder groups that have limited capacity or opportunity to participate. Reference is made to the valuable exchange of experiences at the country-led initiative on *Decentralization, Federal Systems in Forestry and National Forest Programmes*, held from 27 to 30 April 2004 in Interlaken, Switzerland. Participatory processes have also been promoted by CPF members in many parts of the world.

3. Combating deforestation and forest degradation

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at UNFF2. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on combating deforestation and forest degradation (E/CN.18/2002/6). The summary of E/CN.18/2002/6 states that:

“... significant progress has been made in implementing the proposals for action. ...Despite such positive trends, total forest area continues to decline in most regions of the world. Although substantial areas of plantation forests have been established, there is little evidence that the deforestation and degradation of natural forests has declined as a result.”

Paragraph 8 of the Report highlights the difficulty of analysing the underlying causes of deforestation, noting that the issue is complex and not readily amenable to analysis. Paragraph 9 goes on to state that:

“The importance of recognizing the direct and indirect causes of forest loss is widely appreciated by countries, together with an understanding that these causes are in most cases political in nature; the successful implementation of the proposals for action at the country level therefore relies greatly on the political will of Governments and civil society...”

The Report then summarises analyses which indicate that deforestation is continuing in most regions of the world:

Change in forest cover 1990-2000

Country/area	Total forest (thousands of hectares)		Forest cover change (1990-2000)	
	1990	2000	Annual change ('000 hectares)	Annual change (%)
Africa	702 502	649 866	-5 262	-0.78
Asia	551 448	547 793	-364	-0.07
Oceania	201 271	197 623	-365	-0.18
Europe	1 030 475	1 039 251	881	0.08
N & C America	555 002	549 304	-570	-0.10
South America	922 731	885 618	-3 711	-0.41
World	3 963 429	3 869 455	-9 391	-0.22

Source: *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000*, FAO

The Report also notes (in paragraph 10) that one of the key proposals for addressing deforestation and forest degradation relates to enhancing the role of planted forests in sustainable forest management. It explains that substantial increases in the area of planted forests have been recorded in many countries, but adds that half of these have been established by conversion from natural forest (see table below), illustrating that the establishment of plantations can in some cases be considered as a cause of deforestation, rather than as a mechanism for reducing it.

Annual change in the area of planted forests, 1990-2000 (millions of hectares)

Domain	Gain, from:		Total
	Conversion from natural forest	Afforestation	
Tropical areas	+1.0	+0.9	+1.9
Non-tropical areas	+0.5	+0.7	+1.2
World	+1.5	+1.6	+3.1

Source: FAO

Summarising the discussions on this item, the Chairman (**E/CN.18/2002/14**, paragraph 24) noted that there had been progress in combating deforestation and forest degradation in recent years, but added that such progress had been constrained in many countries by a lack of professional and institutional capacity, particularly for law enforcement and research. He also commented that wildfires had had a devastating effect on forests in recent years. Following this discussion, the Forum adopted resolution 2/2 (section A).

Preparing diagnostic studies to analyse historical and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, including processes outside the forest sector

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 25 countries provide information on this subject.

Those countries that report problems of deforestation and forest degradation attribute them to a wide variety of factors that differ to some extent between countries. For example, the report from El Salvador highlights the significance of high population density in a relatively small country and associated pressure for agricultural land. The report from Cambodia identifies the direct causes of deforestation or degradation of forests as improper management in concession areas; illegal logging; improper management in protected areas and non-concession areas; conversion of forestlands for agriculture purpose (encroachment on forestlands); and limited reforestation activities. The report recognises that these immediate causes have a number of underlying causes, such as poverty in rural communities.

Sudan attributes deforestation to consumption of forest products and expansion of agricultural land area. The report from Senegal refers to studies carried out within the context of combating desertification and to the significance of demographic pressure and climatic conditions leading to frequent bush fires, demand for forest products (especially fuelwood), overgrazing, mining and clearance for agriculture. The report from Togo notes that causes include conversion of land to grow cacao, coffee and cotton; mismanagement of existing forests; fire and grazing by cattle.

Benin refers to a study of the forest sector which identified the following problems: an inadequate institutional framework (with corruption and non-application of forest legislation); poor levels of public participation; poor management of the forest resource; and a lack of vision for the forest sector. As a result there is itinerant agriculture on burnt forest land; extensive grazing, including that caused by transhumance from neighbouring countries; and selective and uncontrolled felling of valuable and threatened species. At the same time there is high and increasing demand for timber, firewood and charcoal (which is also used for salt production).

In Italy, research is being carried out to investigate the desertification process in the southern part of the country; one factor that is highlighted is fire.

The report from the USA highlights the loss of forest land to development and associated fragmentation: economic growth and the shift in population from rural to metropolitan areas has led to the conversion of about 2 million hectares per decade to development. Forest owners sell land because of high development values, and this is sometimes forced by the need to pay taxes, including those due on death.

The report from the Republic of Korea explains that some deforestation is unavoidable, given that forest covers 64% of its area and land is required for roads, residential sites, construction sites and agriculture; however, the rate of deforestation is now decreasing and some degraded and fallow land is being rehabilitated.

A number of reports state that deforestation is not a problem in their own countries. For example, the report from Switzerland states that its forest area is increasing and that there is no need to take action to promote further increases in the forest area.

Other reports provide a longer-term historical perspective. The report from Cyprus explains that it was once heavily forested (with timber as a major export), but large quantities of wood were used for pyrotechnology from Bronze Age times onwards. Other important factors were drought, overgrazing, misuse of forests, forest fires and the high demand for fuelwood and charcoal to meet basic energy needs. Systematic management of forests started after 1878 when a Department of Forests was established and scientific management of forests began. The main measures taken for the protection of forests were the demarcation of the state owned forests and the institution of forest legislation. Drought and fire remain the major factors affecting deforestation, especially when they lead to increased grazing. There is also pressure on forests for development around human settlements.

During the nineteenth century, demographic pressure led to deforestation in Serbia and Montenegro: this led to erosion in mountainous areas and was associated with serious flooding; as a result, regulations were introduced to attempt to control felling. In Luxembourg, forests were overexploited in the eighteenth, and the beginning of the nineteenth, centuries as a result of the need for agricultural land and charcoal, but forest restoration has now been taking place for over 150 years.

Some reports focus on forest degradation. For example, the current degradation of forests in Poland results from continuous and simultaneous impacts of a number of factors, including air pollution, excessive fragmentation of forest areas, conversion of mixed and broadleaved forest into coniferous monocultures for intensive production; and forest fires. In Turkey, the main factors behind forest degradation are urbanization and industrialization; frequent modifications in forestry legislation; clearing of forest areas; illicit cutting; grazing (which itself results from poverty) and ownership problems. Other reports also mention the impacts of invasive species, pests and diseases, and of heavy selective felling for the more valuable species.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that UNEP is undertaking a number of studies: one is assessing vulnerability of boreal forests to climate change in the Barents Sea system; another is identifying areas of risk through scenario building. Meanwhile IUFRO Research Groups have examined the main driving forces and underlying factors of forest degradation in Central Europe within the last 400 years and the adverse impact of clear-cutting on biodiversity of late-successional and old-growth forest types.

Formulating and implementing national policies and strategies, through an open and participatory process, for addressing the underlying causes of deforestation

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 29 countries provide information on this subject. Many refer to the importance of nfps in providing the policy framework. A number of national reports also refer to their support for ITTO Objective 2000, and to linkages with other policies. In Senegal, for example, there are important linkages with the national action plan being developed under the UNCCD to help combat desertification; objectives include regenerating degraded areas; preventing erosion; preventing fires; creating multipurpose village woods; conserving energy and promoting renewable energy. The report from Malawi explains that a multi-sectoral task force is now addressing issues of deforestation and other forms of environmental degradation.

Several reports give details of legislative measures they have developed to help address underlying causes of deforestation. For example, the report from Poland explains that there is a strong legal framework to prevent deforestation: managers of state forests and forest owners are obliged to ensure continuity of forest use, re-establishing the forest after felling, fire or other natural disasters. Timber harvesting in Poland may not exceed forest productive capacity and harvesting of NTFPs must be done in a way that secures biological regeneration and protection of the ground cover. The report from Lebanon states that recent measures have included a decree forbidding the production of charcoal (a major cause of forest fire), although firewood collection by permit is still allowed.

Measures in Cambodia include the development of a *Cambodian Code of Practice for Forest Harvesting*; provisions to preserve the rights of local communities to participate in decision-making with regard to forest concessions and give local communities stewardship over public forest assets within the framework of approved management plans and benefit sharing arrangements; a *Forest Concession Management Planning Manual for SFM* (issued to concessionaires); a model forest concession agreement; measures to prevent forest land clearing and encroachment; strengthening of forest law enforcement to combat illegal logging and other forest crimes; and demarcation of the external boundaries of the permanent forest estate.

Indonesia gives high priority to this issue and has formulated and implemented strategies for Community Based Forest Management, Forest Village Community Development and Industrial Forest Plantation

Development to reduce and alleviate deforestation and forest degradation. There is also an early warning system for forest fires, combined with fire suppression measures, training for local communities and policies for zero burning in forest clearings. The report from Indonesia highlights the need to promote inter-sectoral coordination and integrated action. Since 2002, there has been a Land and Forest Rehabilitation programme involving communities and other stakeholders.

In the Republic of Korea, recent legislation requires that feasibility studies are prepared, with the participation of government bodies and NGOs, before undertaking large scale forest development projects (such as conversion of forest to other uses). Site inspection and guidance on conversion of forest land use is being strengthened. A Forest Land Conservation Association, consisting of civilians, local government and academic organizations, monitors large scale deforestation, conducts researches and studies for forest land protection and provides policy proposals.

The report from Mauritius explains that deforestation has been combated in recent years through re-forestation and rehabilitation of degraded lands, a tree planting campaign, training of forest officers, and the establishment of a tree seed centre.

In its report, Belgium explains that in practice it can be difficult to protect forests from development pressures. The report from the USA states that there have been recent changes in federal estate tax laws aimed at minimizing the tax burdens associated with retaining forest land that has potential development value; it adds that, where conservation values are high, landowners may be able to benefit from conservation easements. NGOs and land trusts in the USA are educating landowners about the use of conservation easements and other mechanisms incentives for keeping family forests intact.

A number of reports, particularly those from developing countries, highlight the difficulties they face in implementation and law enforcement due to lack of necessary resources, including trained personnel, infrastructure and equipment.

Information from CPF members

The joint report from CPF members states that ITTO is implementing the ITTO Objective 2000, supporting countries to move towards a position where all exports of tropical timber and timber products come from sustainably managed forests. The CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity, adopted in 2002, includes activities geared towards reducing deforestation and forest degradation. IUCN has been working in parts of Africa to facilitate participatory processes, strengthen capacity, address the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, and strengthen forest law enforcement and good governance.

FAO, in collaboration with ITTO, is preparing a set of guidelines on *Best Practices for Better Law Compliance in the Forest Sector* for decision makers to follow in reducing illegal operations in the sector. Through the National Forest Programme Facility, FAO is also assisting countries in this endeavour. Other key activities that FAO is involved in include the development of practical guidelines for responsible forest management and environmentally sound harvesting codes, as well as support for model forests.

GEF acts as the financial mechanism for UNCCD and provides funds through Operational Program 15 to support Sustainable Land Management; the majority of the projects funded through this operational program address SFM in the wider context of sustainable land management and therefore include support to sustainable agriculture and rangeland management.

Several CPF members were actively involved in the ministerial meeting of African FLEG process, held in Yaoundé, in October 2003. This is addressing the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation through strengthening forest law enforcement and good governance.

Raising awareness of the importance of issues related to deforestation and forest degradation and the multiple values of forests

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 18 countries provide information on this subject. They recognise the importance of ensuring that people are aware of the serious consequences of deforestation and forest degradation if policies are to be effective. Some refer to the need to ensure that these subjects are covered in school curricula. The report from Cyprus gives examples of other general measures, including lectures to soldiers in the army and other organized groups about the benefits of the forests and the need for protection; articles in newspapers and magazines; and radio and television interviews.

In Sudan, a major objective of forestry extension is to increase public awareness regarding the important multiple roles of forests. This is achieved through organizing village committees and forestry associations, and establishing a dialogue between these bodies and forestry extension staff. In addition, Arbor Day celebrations are held annually where free of charge seedlings are distributed and technical advice is provided. Cambodia also gives examples of such initiatives a National Tree Planting Day, community forest management, extension activities using videos and cooperation with NGOs, as well as use of the media.

The report from Turkey explains that the budget for raising public awareness about deforestation, forest degradation, and multiple-use of forest resources has been increased. It also refers to the importance of cooperation with NGOs.

In its report, Senegal explains that projects promoting the availability of microfinance provide an opportunity to help raise awareness about the insidious impact of forest degradation.

The report from Malawi states, while general publicity and the use of various public forums help raise awareness about deforestation issues, resource constraints have tended to hamper this work.

In relation to its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that the forest sector has traditionally argued against deforestation on environmental grounds, but economic and social arguments often carry more weight. The importance of forests should be presented in terms of their potential contribution to human development and poverty reduction.

Conclusions

Despite some positive trends, there remains a need for continued action to combat deforestation and forest degradation in many countries. Underlying causes of deforestation are complex and varied. For example, pressures to use forest land for agriculture and grazing, and to exploit forest products at an unsustainable level, may themselves be rooted in poverty; and in some places owners may face pressures to sell forest land for building development. Measures to combat deforestation and forest degradation include the development and implementation of nfps (and similar frameworks), management guidelines, financial encouragement, removal of perverse incentives for deforestation, and public information campaigns. Among CPF members, ITTO is implementing the ITTO Objective 2000, which supports countries to move towards achieving exports of tropical timber and timber products from sustainably managed forests; and FAO is developing best practice guidelines, where appropriate in collaboration with ITTO. In order to maintain progress in combating deforestation and forest degradation, further efforts are needed to address underlying causes, to improve cross-sectoral coordination with other sectors (such as agriculture) and to strengthen professional and institutional capacity, particularly for law enforcement.

4. Traditional forest-related knowledge

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the fourth session of UNFF. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on Traditional forest-related knowledge (E/CN.18/2004/7). This Report explains, in paragraphs 11-13, that:

“Ethno-biological knowledge has been extensively documented in many countries. The inventorying and cataloguing of traditional forest-related knowledge related to forest resource management and use is less developed, however, although there are several examples of countries in which significant progress is being made.

“The application of traditional forest-related knowledge for achieving sustainable forest management is particularly well developed in areas with long histories of human settlement. In China, for example, traditional forest-related knowledge plays a crucial role, and there are extensive programmes for cataloguing traditional forest-related knowledge and measures that encourage communities to maintain traditional forest-related knowledge. In India, the programme “People’s Biodiversity Registers”, which operates across 52 localities in eight states, attempts to create formal institutions for the maintenance of traditional knowledge and to document low rural and forest-dwelling communities understand living organisms and their ecological setting. The World Agroforestry Centre Agroforestry Database provides information on the management, use and ecology of a wide range of tree species that can be used in agroforestry systems, most of which are based on traditional knowledge.

“Traditional knowledge registries or databases that include traditional forest-related knowledge have also been developed in Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, Peru, the Philippines, and the South Pacific region...”

The Report goes on to state, in paragraphs 21-22, that:

“The ability of the indigenous people and local communities to maintain and enhance traditional forest-related knowledge relies to a large extent on creating opportunities for them to participate in forest-related decision-making. Effective protection of traditional forest-related knowledge relies to a large extent on government recognition of the rights of forest-dependent indigenous and local people and their contribution to sustainable forest management.

“...[there are] two general approaches to the protection of traditional biodiversity-related knowledge (including traditional forest-related knowledge). On the one hand, many countries believe that the current system of intellectual property rights adequately provides for the protection of traditional knowledge, and that no new system is necessary. On the other hand, a number of countries have pointed to various inadequacies in the system and therefore have either adopted or are in the process of drafting a *sui generis* system...”

Inventorying, cataloguing, and applying traditional forest related knowledge for sustainable forest management and promoting research on TFRK with the involvement of the knowledge holders

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 27 countries provide information on this subject.

A number of reports refer to inventories and catalogues that have been compiled in the past by scientific institutions and by individuals with a particular interest. For example, Venezuela has inventories of plants and animals used by different ethnic groups, including lists of Amazonian plants for medicinal and magical use, nutritional plants, plants used as food containers, fruits, pigments, oils, resins and fibres. The report from India describes the documentation of traditional knowledge and the preparation of Community Biodiversity Registers at village level. These Registers are also a tool to establish claims over knowledge and use of biodiversity resources.

Some countries note that there is still much, potentially very beneficial, traditional forest-related knowledge that has not been captured. In Cambodia, for example, indigenous and local communities have historically depended on forest resources, but there has been little research on indigenous forest knowledge. In the Republic of Korea, traditional forest-related knowledge is rapidly being lost through industrialisation and urbanisation; currently such knowledge can be found only in temple forest management, and in small-scale gathering of NTFPs.

Several reports refer to the application of traditional forest-related knowledge to SFM. Examples include the use of fire as a management tool and techniques for improving the utilisation and conservation of soil and water resources. The report from Senegal explains that local populations have detailed knowledge of the multiple-uses of different trees, including fruit production, and resent it when the forest authorities give permission for the trees to be felled. It also describes the traditional practices of wood working craftsmen who take care only to cut trees in accordance with their own codes of practice.

Some reports note that indigenous peoples may be reluctant to share traditional knowledge with others. Reasons include concern that harm may come from misuse, fear of the knowledge being corrupted when used by individuals not immersed in the associated culture and potential loss of intellectual property rights.

The report from the USA explains that ethnographic studies on NTFPs have identified pharmacological uses previously unknown outside the Native American community. It also states that contemporary interest in gathering of NTFPs has, in some cases, spawned large scale commercial ventures that raise questions of ecological, economic and social sustainability. The report adds that recognized tribes tend to use a combination of Western science and traditional knowledge for managing their forest lands.

A number of European countries point out that their long tradition of scientifically based forest management has gradually incorporated traditional forest-related knowledge, amalgamating it with technical knowledge to develop sound approaches to silviculture and other aspects of SFM.

Information from CPF members

In its report, UNEP states that it is supporting a project on *Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and the Caribbean*. Specific objectives are to assess the conservation status and management needs of medicinal plants; to work with indigenous and local communities to develop appropriate management strategies; and to integrate the conservation and management of medicinal plants with rational use of traditional remedies in primary health care.

Information from major groups

In its response to the voluntary questionnaire, FERN/FPP refers to fifteen case studies on the implementation of international commitments on TRFK in Latin America, Africa and Asia that were prepared for an Expert Meeting on *Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge*, held in Costa Rica in December 2004.

Supporting the application of intellectual property rights and/or other protection regimes for traditional forest related knowledge, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of traditional forest related knowledge, innovations and practices

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 20 countries provide information on this subject.

A number of countries note that they are actively discussing the protection of traditional forest-related knowledge, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of such knowledge, within various international forums. These include the World Intellectual Property Organization's Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and

Folklore as well as the CBD. The report from Pakistan notes that anthropologists have been nominated to represent it in matters relating to article 8(j) of the CBD.

Several countries refer to their general legislative frameworks for the protection of intellectual property. Some also explain more detailed arrangements that apply with respect to traditional knowledge. For example, in New Zealand, Mātauranga Māori (which means knowledge and understanding founded on custom, culture and protocol) asserts group ownership of intellectual property rights in knowledge or the expression of thought that is passed down from one generation to another. A Māori claim relating to this knowledge is currently under consideration. Meanwhile, the government has established funds to increase Māori participation in managing biodiversity in ways that are consistent with customary knowledge and property rights; and to enable it to work with appropriate Māori experts to develop an appropriate framework for the retention and promotion of traditional knowledge, with the intellectual property remaining as the property of the particular local Māori community. In India, patent applications must disclose the source of origin of biological material used in the invention. India has also initiated the preparation of an electronic data base of documented traditional knowledge relating to the use of medicinal and other plants; this data base could be used by patent offices throughout the world for searches to prevent bio-piracy.

Information from CPF members

The CPF joint report refers to Article 8 (j) of the CBD and the CBD working group that is dealing with implementation of this Article, and related provisions. In 2004 the COP adopted a series of relevant decisions relating to the Akwé: Kon voluntary guidelines for the *Conduct of cultural, environmental and social impact assessments regarding developments proposed to take place on, or which are likely to impact on, sacred sites and on lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities* and to the consideration of *sui generis* systems for the protection of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. Traditional forest-related knowledge is also explicitly considered in the CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity (adopted by the COP in 2002).

Conclusions

Countries give details of inventories that have been made to record this knowledge, adding that much (potentially very beneficial) knowledge is still being captured. Some reports explain how this knowledge has become incorporated into contemporary scientific approaches to sustainable forest management. In relation to the issue of intellectual property rights and/or other protection regimes for traditional forest related knowledge, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits, several reports stress the importance of the developments taking place within the frameworks of CBD and the World Intellectual Property Organization's Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore.

5. Forest-related scientific knowledge

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the fourth session of UNFF. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on forest-related scientific knowledge (E/CN.18/2004/9). Following discussion of this item, the Forum adopted resolution 4/1, which highlights the following lessons learned through the exchange of country experiences:

“Science has significantly enhanced knowledge about issues addressed in the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

“In spite of progress made, experience shows that exchange and dissemination of forest-related scientific knowledge and strengthening the interaction between science and policy can increase the use of forest-related scientific knowledge in decision-making.

“Experience has also shown that the involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of forest-related scientific research can enhance the relevance and extension of research to the stakeholders.

“Public funding for forest research has been on the decline and this has limited the contribution of forest science to the advancement of sustainable forest management, especially in developing countries.

“The strengthening of regional forest research networks has enhanced capacity building, cooperation and the promotion of regional research priorities.”

Dissemination of scientific knowledge to all interested parties and strengthening capacity and mobilising funding for national and regional research institutions and networks

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 30 countries provide information on this subject.

Many reports highlight the continuing role of traditional methods of dissemination. These include meetings of various types, professional education and training (at all levels and at all stages in careers), and the use of printed material, such as journals, research bulletins, textbooks, yearbooks, information leaflets and magazines. Target audiences include students, forest and environment professionals, private and community forest owners and the wider interested public. Reference is made to the need to adapt curricula in forestry schools to changing socio-economic conditions and in the light of scientific and technical developments.

A number of reports identify the importance of identifying responsibilities for dissemination, for example by research institutions or as an integral part of research programmes. In some countries, call centres provide an advisory service that complements more traditional extension activities; with either approach, an essential skill is the ability to “translate” scientific results into useful information for practitioners.

Increasing use is made of electronic publication and the internet. In addition to Global Forest Information Service (see *Information from CPF members*, below), other initiatives referred to in reports include the European Virtual Faculty of Forestry (<http://gis.joensuu.fi/viefor/>), based in Finland; Pakistan’s allforesters mailing list; and the Swiss information service on natural resources (including forests) in international cooperation (<http://www.intercooperation.ch/inforest/>). While most reports focus on the dissemination of knowledge by publicly-funded research institutions and universities, a number mention the important role of the non-profit organisations and the private sector, including trade associations, and professional bodies.

There is considerable variation in forest-related scientific research capacity in different countries. For example, the Russian report refers to a wide range of research institutes and academic establishments and the report from the USA states that there is a diverse and well-developed network of public, private and non-profit organisations conducting forest-related research. By contrast, a number of other countries (particularly developing countries) explain that their research capacity is small or minimal.

The most commonly cited sources of research funding are national governments (and the EU), international donors and the voluntary sector. At least one country (Norway) funds research and development by means of a levy drawn from all harvested wood sales. On the other hand, the report from Spain notes that (apart from the paper and board industry) the industrial sector has limited capacity to fund major research, concentrating instead on development projects that make use of existing research findings. Many reports, including some from developed as well as from developing countries, refer to a general decline in funding for forest-related scientific research. The reports from Malawi and Benin stress the problem of underfunding. The report from Guatemala outlines a number of research projects funded by ITTO and other organisations, explaining that the forest research strategy had helped identify research priorities.

The need for collaboration and international cooperation is stressed. This is necessary to prevent duplication and friction between research institutions. It can also bring together complementary sources of funding for integrated projects: for example some funders may focus on high quality basic research while

others focus on near-market research and technology transfer. Other reports mention the value, particularly where research capacity is limited, of drawing upon research findings developed at the regional level and applying them to the local context.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report highlights the CPF joint initiative to establish the Global Forest Information Service (<http://www.gfis.net/>) hosted by the IUFRO Secretariat. The GFIS is an Internet gateway that provides access to information on forest resources at a global scale where users can locate maps, datasets, web resources, journal articles, books and other resources related to forests. The Service currently holds more than 120,000 metadata records. In addition, UNEP activities include a variety of projects contributing to the collection, editing, dissemination of scientific information; particular reference is made to the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) Year Book, where forests is one of the environmental issues studied in depth. FAO publishes UNASYLVA, a quarterly international journal of forestry and forest industries. FAO also collaborates with IUFRO, ICRAF and CIFOR to strengthen forestry and agroforestry research in developing countries. Overall, many CPF members support and collaborate with a variety of research networks that carry out policy relevant research and provide a wide array of forest-related knowledge through publications, information systems and databases.

Enhancing interaction between scientific research and policy processes, including priority setting of research, addressing knowledge gaps and using scientific knowledge to support decision-making

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 28 countries provide information on this subject.

Several reports outline mechanisms for identifying research priorities. These include establishing forest research strategies, within the overall framework of nfps or similar documents, in consultation with the potential beneficiaries from research as well as scientists. By contrast, the report from Italy states that the lack of a unified policy planning framework, such as an nfp, limits fruitful cooperation between scientific research and forest policy.

A number of reports also highlight the value of aligning forest-related research priorities with more general government priorities in order to secure research funding. The importance of effective networking is stressed. The report from Finland cites its Forest Forum for Decision-Makers as a good example of interaction between science and policy processes and between different sectors: it is directed at top-level decision-makers and aims to identify new ways for the forest sector to help resolve wider social problems. The report from the UK describes a recently developed training course on Communication Methods and Science Advocacy, designed to help researchers improve their skills in communicating their findings to stakeholders so as to influence policy and developmental impact: participants have included scientists from Costa Rica, Ghana and Thailand.

Many reports demonstrate a positive approach towards enhancing interaction between scientific research and policy processes and several refer specifically to mechanisms (such as forest science advisory boards) designed to achieve this. They also emphasise the important role of priority-setting in ensuring that research is policy-relevant. Examples are given of how research results have influenced policy-making, for example in relation to the development of nfps, legislation and operational guidelines. A number of reports refer to the contribution that scientists have made to international dialogues on forest-related matters, both at the regional and global level.

Some reports, however, also recognise the complexity of the relationship between scientific outputs and decision-making. They explain that there may be scientific uncertainty or lack of consensus, and that the decision-making process needs to take account of a wider array of economic and social political considerations.

Information from CPF members

The CPF focal agencies, CIFOR, ICRAF and IUFRO, are themselves important scientific institutions or organisations. The joint report from CPF members explains that the IUFRO Task Force on the Forest Science/Policy Interface convened a final workshop in June 2004 to explore strategies and mechanisms for improving communication between forest scientists and policy-makers. In addition, the IUFRO Special Programme for Developing Countries has further developed its activities to strengthen the contributions that science can make to local and regional forest development projects.

Conclusions

Action to disseminate scientific knowledge includes electronic publication, as well as traditional methods, such as meetings, professional education and training, and the use of printed material. The continuing importance of collaboration and international cooperation is highlighted, both to prevent duplication and friction between research institutions and to bring together complementary sources of funding for integrated projects. Several countries, and particularly some of those which face the most difficult challenges in relation to their forests, stress that they lack research capacity. Reports demonstrate a positive approach towards encouraging interaction between scientific research and policy processes. They emphasise the importance of ensuring that research is policy-relevant and recognise the complex relationship between scientific outputs and decision-making. The CPF itself has significant research capability in such members as CIFOR, ICRAF and IUFRO.

6. Forest health and productivity

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the third session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary -General on progress in implementation on forest health and productivity (E/CN.18/2003/5). The summary of this report states that:

“Forest health and productivity are negatively affected by a variety of factors, including air pollution, wildfires, pests and diseases and storm damage. Air pollution was an issue of high visibility and concern at the time of the deliberations of the IPF. IPF agreed upon several related proposals for action, calling for countries to adopt preventive measures to reduce air pollution and for the international community to develop or continue to implement national and international programmes for monitoring air pollution and its effects on forests, and to conduct in-depth studies on causes of forest degradation and deforestation. ...

“The relevant IPF proposals for action have largely been implemented in Europe, where the problem has been most salient. In view of the increasing threat to forests posed by air pollution in many regions of the world, the report stresses the need for countries to monitor the effects of air pollution and other natural and anthropogenic threats to forest health...

“Although IPF/IFF concentrated on air pollution impacts, forest health and productivity are affected by other major threats, including insects and diseases (biotic factors), wildfires, storms, snow/ice and oil spills (abiotic factors) and people (social factors). The report considers those threats as emerging issues and proposes action to prevent and respond to such threats, in particular forest fires and pest and disease outbreaks. The report stresses preventive approaches, regional collaboration, networking and systematically collecting, analysing and disseminating information as critical strategies for effectively dealing with emerging threats to forest health and productivity and reducing reliance on ad hoc responses to such disasters.”

Following discussion of this item, the Forum adopted resolution 3/2.

Information from countries

The *Guidelines* for voluntary reports invited countries where damage to forests from air pollution is a significant problem to provide information on recent national strategies or programmes to minimize damaging air pollution, and to indicate if they are involved in any international cooperation efforts aimed at strengthening scientific knowledge, increasing information access or reducing the impacts of long-range air pollution on forests. Countries were also invited to provide their views on the role of enhanced cooperation at the regional and international levels to facilitate such work.

In their voluntary reports, 35 countries provide information on this subject.

The reports recognise that industrial emissions are the fundamental cause of damage to forests from air pollution. In some parts of the world this has never been a significant problem; in other parts of the world, measures have been taken to reduce industrial emissions. A number of reports refer to the importance of international agreements, such as the International Co-operative Programme on Assessment and Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Forests operating under the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution of the UNECE; the EU Forest Focus Regulation; and the Canada-US Air Quality Agreement. As a part of its international efforts to reduce forest damage caused by air pollution, the Republic of Korea has been conducting a collaborative research with China and other northeast Asian countries since 1996. Although air pollution remains a serious issue in particular areas subject to industrial emissions, and there is a continuing need to monitor forest health, damage to forests has been significantly reduced through progress in reducing sources of air pollution. The report from Germany refers, however, to the potential long-term consequences of air pollution on the acidity of forest soils; and the report from the Czech Republic refers to the use of large scale liming programmes to help neutralise such impacts.

A number of reports highlight the threats to forest health and productivity posed by pests and diseases, and by invasive species. Some emphasise the importance of growth in international trade, with its impact in terms of increased introductions of pest and disease organisms, and the need to meet this challenge. According to its national report, invasive species pose major challenges for forest health and productivity in the USA; it adds that in 1998 nearly 30 million hectares of forested land in the USA were affected by insect and disease infestations. One example of the threat is provided by sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*) which entered the USA and caused widespread mortality of several species of oak in California and the Pacific Northwest; eastward movement could result in additional major ecological and economic impacts on a continental scale. El Salvador reports devastating losses caused by the pine weevil, *Dendroctonus frontalis*. It adds that the governments of Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama are working together, with assistance from FAO, in a joint effort to reduce and to control infestation. A third example of such damage, given in the report from Lebanon, is a new pest (*Cephalcia tannourinensis*) attacking cedar forests. A number of reports also refer to damage by wild mammals, such as deer and moose

Other threats to forest health and productivity referred to in the reports include fire, storms and the impact of climate change. For example, the report from the USA states that in 2002 Federal Agencies spent US\$1.6 billion fighting forest fires and that fire management has become a major focus of US forest policy. The report from Venezuela stresses the ecological impact of fires. In discussing its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that raising public awareness about the harmful effects of fires is key to mobilizing rural communities to manage the fires, adding that women often have a vital role in this respect. It argues that funding from national sources for these campaigns and to provide incentives to rural communities for practical fire management is often a major constraint. An example of storm damage is given in the report from Sweden: a few storms in late 1999 caused comprehensive damage, felling 5-6 million m³.

Several reports explain the complex interaction of different factors, including climatic stress as well as pests, diseases and air pollution, on forest health and refer to the value of adopting silvicultural principles that provide for more stable forests, less sensitive to stress factors.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF reports refers to initiatives that are promoting the participation of local communities in fire management and forest fire prevention and establishing joint regional wildland fire networks for international collaboration between forest fire experts. The report also states that FAO provides direct technical assistance to countries to help solve forest pest problems. FAO is also compiling data for a global information system on insect pest and disease outbreaks and their impact on forests. FAO has played a key role in establishing the Asia-Pacific Forest Invasive Species Network and is also a depository for the International Plant Protection Convention.

Conclusions

Action is being taken to monitor the impact of air pollution where it remains a threat to forest health and productivity. Countries are also addressing the serious implications for forest health and productivity of invasive species, pests and diseases; action includes international collaboration to reduce the risk of infestations spreading through trade and other trans-boundary movements. In addition, countries are sharing experience on how best to prevent and fight fires. The CPF report states that a global information system is monitoring the impact of insect pest and disease outbreaks on forests.

7. Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the fourth session and baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management (E/CN.18/2004/11); the summary of this Report states that:

“Criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management are recognized as an important framework for assessing the state of and trends in forest resources and forest management and to build a common understanding of what constitutes sustainable forest management. Important advances in the development and application of criteria and indicators have been made over the past several years. Currently, 149 countries participate in one or more of nine regional or international criteria and indicators processes. All the processes have identified sets of criteria and indicators for use at the national level, and some have developed sets at the subnational level...”

Following discussion of this item, together with the item on monitoring, assessment and reporting, the Forum adopted resolution 4/3. One of the lessons, learned through the exchange of experiences, highlighted in this resolution is that:

“Criteria and indicators have contributed to a better understanding of sustainable forest management, improved forest policies, programmes, practices and information, stakeholder involvement and partnerships and enhanced collaboration among countries.”

The resolution also:

“Acknowledges the following thematic elements of sustainable forest management which are drawn from the criteria identified by existing criteria and indicators processes and offer a reference framework for sustainable forest management:

1. Extent of forest resources
2. Biological diversity
3. Forest health and vitality
4. Productive functions of forest resources
5. Protective functions of forest resources
6. Socio-economic functions and
7. Legal, policy and institutional framework

and further acknowledges that member states may identify specific environmental and other forest-related aspects within the above thematic elements for consideration as criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, consistent with national priorities and conditions.”

Further baseline information is provided in the Reports of the *Expert Consultation on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management*, held in Rome, Italy, 15-17 November 2000; the *International Conference on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management* held in Guatemala City, 3 –7 February 2003; and the *Expert Consultation on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management*, held in Cebu City, the Philippines, from 2 to 4 March 2004.

Developing and using criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management and participating in regional and/or international C&I processes

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 37 countries provide information on this subject.

Most national reports explain how they are developing national C&I within frameworks provided by regional C&I and that these are an important tool for monitoring progress towards SFM, provided that there are clear links with nfps. Some countries also report the use of C&I as a basis for developing certification standards. Reports note, however, the need for further development and refining of the C&I, to assess their practical impact on forest management, and the need to recognize the resource implications of assembling and publishing the relevant data.

The report from the USA highlights the close linkages between C&I and monitoring, assessment and reporting on forests and describes its experience in producing the *National Report on Sustainable Forests 2003* on the basis of the Montréal Process C&I. It explains that three categories of C&I emerged: C&I for which current data collection is adequate; C&I for which current data collection is inadequate, but techniques for gathering the data are sufficiently well understood to support data collection in the future; and C&I for which suitable data collection techniques are not yet available. Subsequently, efforts have been made to develop cost-effective mechanisms to monitor, assess and report on the full range of ecological, economic and social aspects of forests described in the C&I. The report from the USA adds that the value of the indicators, viewed together, is that they provide a common base of information that all parties can use to inform understanding; but interpretations of the significance of any changes will vary, reflecting individual and collective views on priorities for SFM.

A number of reports emphasise the importance of stakeholder participation in discussions relating to C&I. In Norway, the “Living Forests” project has involved stakeholders in developing standards based on the Pan-European (MCPFE) C&I. The report from El Salvador identifies as one important benefit of C&I their use as a tool for informing the public and interested groups about progress towards sustainability. In 2003, the government of the Republic of Korea produced and distributed information pamphlets on the SFM to enhance the level of understanding of the concept; it also carried out training in C&I for national forest management teams.

Some countries highlight the costs of developing national C&I. Venezuela was able to benefit from ITTO finance in developing its national C&I (at the management unit level and at national level) within the context of the Tarapoto (Amazon Basin) process. In Colombia there is a proposal to assess the financial resources required for the evaluation of indicators, based on ITTO’s *Manual on Application of the Criteria and Indicators for the Sustainable Arrangement of Natural Tropical Forests*. The report from Serbia and Montenegro states that the development and implementation of C&I has been started and will be incorporated within the nfps. The report from Lesotho refers to a national level meeting on national level C&I in the SADC region supported by FAO and UNEP, but states that subsequent implementation has been hindered by lack of capacity due to inadequate financial and other resources.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that several CPF members have been involved in co-sponsoring international conferences and expert meetings on C&I. CPF members provide support to the regional processes, promote the development and use of C&I at the national and forest management unit level, and foster collaboration between countries and between processes. FAO and ITTO were among the co-sponsors of the *International Conference on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management: the Way Forward*, which was held in February 2003 in Guatemala City, with a follow-up expert meeting in Philippines in March 2004. Access to all regional C&I processes is made available through an internet gateway from the FAO website. The CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity contains a set of actions geared at advancing the development and implementation of C&I within the framework of sustainable forest management.

Conclusions

Most countries report that they are developing and/or implementing national C&I within the framework of regional processes. C&I are regarded as an important tool for monitoring progress towards sustainable forest management. Their strength lies in their objectivity (which can assist those responsible for making political judgements) and the fact that there is a gradual convergence towards an internationally agreed framework for C&I. Reference is made to the fact that nearly 150 countries, representing 85% of the world's forests are participating in the nine regional C&I processes. CPF members have played an active role in supporting these processes and the development of C&I within countries. There is now a need for further development of measurable indicators, taking account of resource constraints and recognising the technical difficulties of collecting some of the desirable data.

8. Economic, social and cultural aspects of forests

Economic aspects

Baseline information

The subject of the economic aspects of forests was a substantive item at the third session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on economic aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2003/7), which states (paragraphs 3) that:

“Forests provide numerous goods and services, both market and non-market, that have significant economic importance. Wood and non-wood raw products extracted from forests, and their strong forward linkages to processing industries are significant elements of economic growth, income and employment in many countries, both developed and developing. It has been estimated that 25 per cent of the world's population depends to varying degrees on forests for their livelihood. About 500 million people living in or near dense forest — most of them poor — depend crucially on forests for their subsistence and livelihood. Services provided by forests range from conservation of biodiversity and soil to climate control, and from watershed protection to preservation of spiritual and religious values. These non-market values of forests, some of which are global in scope, affect our everyday life and are increasingly appreciated and estimated.”

The Report concludes (paragraphs 71 and 72) that:

“Economy-wide policy reforms and activities in sectors other than the forest sector can have impacts on forests, which can be even more significant than those from activities within the sector. For example, trade liberalization and agricultural subsidies were mentioned among the issues that may have impacts on the forest sector, and should be taken into consideration in policy formulation. Thus, forests should be in the mainstream of overall development planning for a country; otherwise, the potentially adverse impacts on forests and forest-dependent people originating in other sectors would likely be left unaddressed. In this regard, PRSPs and national forest programmes are promising tools.

“The private sector is a significant — and often the principal — financial actor in forest production, and present global trends indicate that its future importance will increase. Policy reforms must encourage environmentally and socially responsible private investments. The positive incentives need to be supplemented by disincentives to prevent undesirable investments. This indicates that the role of the public sector, while evolving, will continue to be important in creating an enabling environment for the private sector.”

Following discussion of this item, the Forum adopted resolution 3/1, which highlights the following lessons learned through the exchange of country experiences:

“(a) Cross-sectoral policies, both at national and international levels, are necessary measures since policies in other sectors may often impact severely on sustainable forest management; the economic and other benefits of sustainable forest management should be mainstreamed in overall development policies;

“(b) The accurate valuation of goods and environmental services provided by forests is essential for sustainable resource management;

“(c) Clear and secure land tenure, effective forest law enforcement and governance are essential elements for the economic viability of sustainable forest management. Thus, examples and lessons learned in this regard should be effectively shared and utilized;

“(d) Timely and accurate collection and dissemination of information on forest valuation, resources, demand, supply and prices are important elements for well-functioning and transparent markets for products derived from sustainably managed forests, support decision-making and promote sustainable forest management;

“(e) Private sector investments in sustainable forest management are important recognizing that public funding continues to remain critical especially in developing countries. Partnerships between governments, private sector, local communities and other sectors of the society are of importance in sustainable forest management;

“(f) Noting the forest partnership initiatives voluntarily undertaken by some Governments, international organizations and major groups and announced at the WSSD, including forest law enforcement and governance, paid particular attention to the issue of forest law enforcement and governance, and taking into account the relevant decision of the Commission on Sustainable Development at its eleventh session on partnership initiatives in this regard;

“(g) Emphasizing that, in line with the commitments reached at the WSSD and consistent with the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and recognizing the common goal of all countries to attain sustainable forest management, and the importance of the means of implementation to this end, immediate action at all levels to facilitate the provision of financial resources, transfer and development of environmentally sound technologies and capacity building is required to help to achieve the actions listed below, especially for developing countries and countries with economies in transition, to support their efforts to achieve sustainable forest management.”

Valuation of forest goods and services

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 33 countries provide information on this subject. One country (Malawi) states that it has not undertaken much work in the area of valuation of forest goods and services largely because of capacity constraints.

Many countries note that formal statistics relating to the role of forests in the economy often underestimate the full value of forest goods and services. This has serious consequences where it prevents the potential contribution of forest-related outputs from being fully reflected in national policies such as PRSPs. The reasons for these underestimates are the lack of data and/or difficulties in valuing non-market outputs.

One reason for lack of data is where forest-related economic activity, such as the collection of firewood and the use of NTFPs, takes place in the informal sector and so information about forest-related outputs is not collected. The significance of this is reflected in the report from Senegal which notes that according to official statistics the contribution of the forest sector to the national economy is around 1%, but according to other surveys forest resources affect the survival of 54% of the (most disadvantaged) people in the country.

Valuation of non-market outputs, which include the environmental benefits of forests, is very difficult.

Several countries have explored the use of techniques for valuing non-market outputs, through, for example, the travel-cost and contingent valuation methods. It is recognised that these techniques have limitations, and some reports state that there has been little progress in making practical use of them. On the other hand, the report from Spain outlines a methodology that takes account of productive, recreational and environmental aspects of forests to provide a comprehensive assessment of their economic value which is used as a planning tool. Others note that, in practice, the willingness of governments to recognise the value of non-market outputs is essentially a political decision. Such decisions may also reflect socio-economic changes: in the Republic of Korea, for example, the recreational value of forests is expected to increase with changes in working patterns (such as the introduction of a five day week) and urbanization.

Some countries refer to initiatives taken to bring such outputs within the market economy. Examples of this include charging for environmental services, such as water supply, or the development of ecotourism businesses, where people pay to see natural forest and associated wildlife. This is, however, not always possible. First, there needs to be a suitable business opportunity. And, secondly, problems with charging may also arise where it is impossible to exclude people from enjoying the benefit, either for practical reasons or for legal reasons. In some countries, for example, there is a legal right for everyone to enjoy the recreational benefits of all forests. As another example, the report from Turkey explains that the price of NTFPs is intentionally kept low in order to help those villagers who depend upon them.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report refers to a UNEP-WCMC project focusing primarily on economic aspects of sustainable forest use. It is called *Commercialisation of Non-Timber Forest Products in Mexico and Bolivia: factors influencing success* and has assessed the impact of NTFP commercialisation on poverty alleviation, gender equality, access and tenure, and the natural resource base, in 17 communities across Mexico and Bolivia.

The amount, scope and quality of market data and information on for wood and non-wood forest products and their substitutes

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 28 countries provide information on this subject. There is considerable variation between countries, with some reporting on well-developed systems for gathering and disseminating market data, and others explaining that they have limited capacity for such work.

Where this data is available, it is usually derived from a number of sources, including trade and industry statistics (such as information from Customs authorities), specific market surveys, forest inventories, routine returns (for example on wood harvesting and hunting) and agricultural statistics. In general, information about NTFPs is less comprehensive and/or reliable than information relating to wood and wood products. Some reports also note that data is often less reliable in relation to small-scale transactions,

particularly in the informal economy: expert assessments may be used to estimate the size and value of these transactions. In addition there are data limitations that arise from the constraints imposed for reasons of commercial confidentiality, from the incentive to misrepresent forest revenues in official returns and from the difficulty of disaggregating data relating to multi-national companies in the forest products industry.

Market data is made available through official statistics and through specialist publications, including those sponsored by international organisations (such as FAO, ITTO and UNECE), governments, forest owners' associations and commercial organisations. The report from Pakistan highlights the need to provide market information to tree farmers as a high priority.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that FAO has published a field manual for market analysis and development to enhance community-based enterprises. FAO also publishes a *Yearbook of Forest Products* with statistical data on basic forest products (including production and trade) for all countries and territories of the world.

Use of economic and policy instruments to facilitate progress towards sustainable forest management

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 30 countries provide information on this subject. These reports make it clear that the rationale for specific economic and policy instruments in particular countries depends upon priorities for SFM, as set out in nfps or similar frameworks. As priorities change, different instruments may be applied: for example, in Norway, support has shifted away from incentives for afforestation towards encouraging environmental measures and promoting the use of wood as an environmentally friendly material. On the other hand, El Salvador has introduced a forest bond to promote afforestation aimed at countering the adverse impacts of deforestation. In some countries these priorities are determined at local or regional level, and instruments vary accordingly.

The reports also demonstrate that publicly and privately owned forests may require different types of instrument. In publicly owned forest the focus is on rent capture to reflect market prices, and subsequent allocation of financial surpluses generated by forests. It is recognised that inadequate rent capture can act as a perverse incentive, encouraging overexploitation, and cause a loss in potential government revenues and. A number of countries, including Cambodia, Canada, Madagascar, Malawi, Russia and Senegal explain how they are developing market-based systems for establishing rates of payment, tightening up on the collection of revenues and taking account of environmental considerations in both the setting of payments and the application of contractual conditions to concessions. Policies about how much revenue should be reinvested in SFM and how much should be distributed to public authorities at national or local level vary, and change over time, reflecting political priorities. Some reports, such as the report from Russia, note that reductions in forest revenues are making it harder to invest in SFM.

There are also public forests that do not generate a financial surplus but require subsidy. For example, in Switzerland, federal funding is used to 'purchase' public forest services such as the protection against natural hazards, measures to protect biodiversity and measures to maintain forest health and vitality. Public ownership of forests, or of certain rights over forests, can itself be an explicit instrument used to secure desired outputs: the report from the USA refers, for example, to the public purchase of development rights to protect water resources for New York City.

Instruments used to promote SFM in private forests include regulation, financial incentives (including grants and loans) and tax allowances. These instruments may be interrelated: some countries explain that financial incentives and tax allowances are conditional upon agreeing management plans and meeting prescribed norms in relation to SFM. While some countries offer forest owners financial compensation for income foregone in meeting the requirements of SFM, other countries regard at least some of those requirements as legal obligations that owners must meet without compensation. The extent to which owners should be expected to internalise such costs is a political decision. For example, the Polish forest policy provides for a system of paying owners for non-market environmental benefits and there is tax relief for

certain national heritage forests. In some countries, the large number of owners with very small forest holdings presents particular challenges. A number of reports note that forest owners are increasing political pressure for such payments because they are finding it difficult to meet the costs of achieving higher environmental standards against a background of falling wood prices.

Some reports highlight the major significance of alternative land uses, and their relative profitability, on forests. These alternative land uses are themselves affected by economic, trade and other policy instruments. Agricultural subsidies can influence land values of forest land and encourage land conversion. Schemes to promote afforestation must take account of the agricultural alternatives. Thus, the forest bond scheme in El Salvador aims not only to promote afforestation, but also aims to promote agroforestry systems with coffee using timber trees. Pressure may also come from development, and the report from the USA outlines changes in taxation regimes aimed at reducing the demands on forest landowners to pay tax relating to potential development value.

Funding mechanisms vary. While many countries provide central funding for instruments intended to promote sustainable forest management and to “purchase” public services from forests, others rely on levies imposed on harvested timber as a source of funds. Several EU countries refer to co-financing under the EU Rural Development Regulation. The report from the USA highlights the role of funding from voluntary sources, stating that hundreds of non profit land trusts now purchase or accept donations of conservation easements or development rights. A number of other reports also refer to the Clean Development Mechanism, under the Kyoto Protocol, as a potential source of funding for afforestation in developing countries.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report refers to an *International Workshop on Reform of Forest Fiscal Systems* organised by the World Bank in October 2003, and follow-up discussions. Furthermore, relevant economic principles, theories, methods and models were discussed in a comprehensive way at IUFRO’s International Conference on the *Economics of Sustainable Forest Management* in May 2004.

Conclusions on economic aspects

The reports highlight the fact that the contribution of forest goods and services is often much greater than that revealed by official statistics. This is partly because many important outputs (such as fuelwood) form part of the, unrecorded, informal economy and partly because there are non-market outputs (such as many environmental benefits) which can only be valued indirectly. There is also considerable variation between countries in the availability, and quality, of market information on forest products: a number of the least developed countries state that they have inadequate resources to gather data. Many countries report action to improve the use of economic and policy instruments to promote sustainable forest management. Where there are extensive areas of public forest, the focus has been on setting concession rents and royalty rates to reflect market prices. Some countries contribute to the costs that private owners incur when managing their forests to produce non-market outputs (such as nature conservation and recreation) and/or offer incentives to promote afforestation. A number of reports also explain how taxation measures are used to encourage sustainable forest management. While the appropriate use of such economic and policy instruments is important, countries also recognise the often crucial impact on forests of other policies and economic pressures (for example those relating to trade, agriculture and development of human settlements). Fundamental challenges for the future are to ensure that society places a proper value on forests (reflecting their non-market, public good, outputs as well as financial returns) and to ensure that wider national development policies take full account of the potential contribution of forests.

Social and cultural aspects

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the fourth session of UNFF. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8). The summary states that:

“...there has been a notable shift in national forestry policies in most member countries towards more people-oriented forestry. The fundamental problem is the limited scope of the IPF/IFF proposals with respect to social and cultural aspects. The social and cultural aspects of forests need to be placed into a wider context to prevent the further marginalization of forest issues in the global agenda. Reluctance to devolve control over resources to local communities, coupled with an inadequate understanding of devolution mechanisms, as well as lack of financial and human resources, were cited as some of the biggest obstacles to pro-poor forestry initiatives.”

(Further baseline information, relating to specific aspects of this element, is given below.)

Following discussion of this item, the Forum adopted resolution 4/2.

Promoting the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of forest genetic resources and addressing the issue of intellectual property rights, including the identification of the origins of forest genetic resources, taking into account work undertaken by the CBD and other international agreements

Baseline information

The Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8) explains that (paragraphs 17-21):

“Many countries with developing economies and limited scientific infrastructure have not been able to engage fully in and benefit from the rapid scientific and technological advances that make new and varied use of genetic resources. At the same time, many companies and research institutions in developed countries seek novelty in the genetic resources they study and use and many look outside their borders for new leads. The great abundance of forest genetic resources in tropical forests remains valuable in the development of new products and many companies continue to seek access to those materials. Current collection activities and disposition of existing ex-situ collections have raised fears of biopiracy, as most countries lacked the appropriate policy and legal instruments to ensure prior informed consent and equitable benefit sharing.

“Many member countries reported that they were signatories to various international conventions that guide access to and benefit sharing in forest genetic resources. In most such countries, access to and benefits from forest genetic resources is guided by policies, codes of conduct and legal instruments that are consistent with international conventions. In other countries and much of Africa, issues of access to forest genetic resources and equitable benefit sharing are still to be addressed at the policy and legislative levels ...

“Despite having put in place the policies and codes of conduct to promote equitable sharing of forest genetic resources, most countries have found the implementation of these policies to be highly challenging, as this would require detailed management of data on collections in such a way that ex-situ collectors can honour commitments they made in the terms under which they acquired specimens. In most cases, countries have found it very difficult to track or control successive uses of or modifications to the materials collected.

“Forest genetic resources are accessed from the country of origin by the private sector through various routes and they often pass through many hands before the end products reach the markets for consumers. Sometimes the product that is commercialized is not physically linked to the original genetic resources collected, but may have been manufactured based on chemical structures originally found in nature. Ex-situ collections of materials can be kept for hundreds of years and, by the time the material is eventually used, records of where it was collected, and under what terms, may be unavailable. All these factors make it extremely difficult to monitor the exchange of genetic resources and their derivatives and to enforce access

and benefit-sharing agreements. As a result, a flexible and highly informed approach to access and benefit-sharing arrangements at the national level is the most effective.

“Establishing instruments to ensure equitable sharing of genetic resources between source countries and processors has proved to be a daunting task. The problem is even more acute when establishing benefit-sharing mechanisms to channel fair and equitable remunerations to local and indigenous communities that are major stakeholders in the sustainability of such genetic resources...”

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 27 countries provide information on this subject.

Most reports that address this issue outline the development of domestic policy and legislation in terms of international agreements such as the CBD and the voluntary Bonn Guidelines on access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of their utilization.

The report from Venezuela outlines the way in which indigenous organizations have an active role in discussions and the drafting of laws relating to the rights of indigenous villages and local communities in relation to access to the genetic resources and the equitable distribution of the benefits.

Some reports outline their countries' approach to ex-situ and in-situ conservation of forest genetic resources. A number of reports deal with this question from other perspectives, explaining that private forest owners have legal rights to benefit from the use of forest genetic resources and associated intellectual property rights; noting the importance of genetic diversity, referring to initiatives such as the European Forest Genetic Resources Programme; and referring also to legislation concerning forest reproductive materials.

Strengthening the role of women in sustainable forest management, including through capacity building and greater participation in community-based forest management

Baseline information

The Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8) explains, in paragraphs 22-24, that:

“Today, in many countries around the world, rural women are still the major caretakers and users of forests...”

“Activities related to forestry often demand a great deal of women's time and labour in rural areas. In many parts of the world, women's wealth of knowledge on forest resources has either been ignored or undermined, owing to lack of voice, unfavourable land-tenure structures, restrictive cultural practices, low levels of education and limited access to credit. Women are often excluded from decision-making and neglected by development programmes, even when they act as heads of household, which they often do.

“Gender-sensitive community forestry programmes by national forestry departments in many developing countries, in collaboration with international research and development agencies, have achieved high levels of participation by women and have generated many lessons for project managers and implementers. In most of these programmes, there have been reports of various initiatives by women, which not only contribute to the development and protection of their forests, but also establish women and women groups as independent decision makers...”

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 29 countries provide information on this subject.

A number of countries explain that their constitution, or other legislation, guarantees equal rights to men and women and in some cases specifies gender representation on public bodies. Some also point out that there are wider national initiatives promoting equal opportunities for women; for example in Luxembourg the "Gender mainstream" strategy supports social measures to create true equal opportunity rather than simply relying upon legal equality.

Countries also report policies and initiatives to strengthen the role of women in the forest sector and end the view that forestry is a male profession. For example, there is affirmative action in the US Forest Service and deliberate posting of women into decision-making roles at all levels in the forest administration in Malawi. Reports from Austria, Norway, Slovakia and the USA all refer to associations of women foresters that are working to strengthen the influence of women in the forest sector. In Norway, research is also exploring differences in how men and women behave as active managers of their forest properties. Reports from Canada and the UK refer to recent research on the subject, with the UK research identifying parallels, in terms of women's career patterns, between forestry and the heavy engineering and construction industries. Venezuela has a Development Bank for Women offering loans for activities that include processing of forest products. The report from Guatemala refers to a women's association that is a development partnership promoting sustainable management of natural resources (mainly forests) over an area of 600 hectares. In India, guidelines for Joint Forest Management programme provide that 50% of committee members should be women; more than 8.3 million women are now participating in the management of forests at the village level through this programme. Women's participation in Joint Forest Management committees is also encouraged in Pakistan.

The report from Malawi notes the key role that women play in household maintenance, collecting fuel wood and being involved in forestry and agricultural production. In Lesotho, the role and the associated burdens imposed on women are particularly serious given that women head approximately 30% of all households. Women undertake a substantial proportion of agricultural and forestry activities and are extensively involved in the informal sector, coping with the difficulties posed by a seriously degraded environment. The report from Lesotho adds, however, that a major problem is that many women only have access to land through user rights granted to their husbands; they have to circumvent this through strategies such as share cropping and illegal leasing.

Gender equality is an important goal in Finnish international development policy, and all forestry cooperation funded with ODA is geared to address gender issues.

Statistics quoted in the voluntary reports include the following: in Finland 40% of forest owners, 20% of professional foresters and 50% of graduating foresters are women; in the USA 33% of students earning general forestry degrees, 20-30% of forestry PhDs and 12% of professional foresters are women; in Russia 25% of heads and experts in forestry in Russia are women; in Norway 20% of forest owners and 10% of trainees in the Forest Extension Institute are women; in Canada 16% of those employed in the forest sector are women (compared with an average of 45% female employment in all occupations); in the Republic of Korea the proportion of new female recruits to the forest service has increased from 7% (1993) to 32% (2003); in Serbia and Montenegro 18% of employees in the forest service are women; and in Switzerland 1.7% of the forest work force are women.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that IUFRO's Research Group on *Gender and Forestry* has been developing and disseminating knowledge of how management and use of forest resources affect and are affected by gender.

Information from major groups

Representatives of women's groups highlighted the Second World Wide Symposium *Gender and Forestry: Challenges to Sustainable Livelihoods and Forestry Management*, held in August 2004 in Kilimanjaro, Tanzania, as an organization-led initiative in support of UNFF. The focus of the meeting was on women's and men's access to forest resources, as a means of improving livelihoods for the resource poor and SFM, locally and globally. A central issue was to ensure a balance between economic development, social development, and natural forest resource protection as independent and naturally reinforcing and crosscutting components of sustainable development. The symposium also attempted to promote new systems that could empower women forest dwellers to participate effectively in processes of good governance in the forestry industry.

Integrating local and indigenous communities in sustainable forest management programmes, particularly as regards recognition and respect of the customary and traditional rights and privileges of indigenous and local communities

Baseline information

The Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8) explains, in paragraphs 33-34, that:

“Community involvement in forest management over the past decade has ranged from participation to recognition of ownership rights to resources by indigenous groups where local people make the decisions on the management of the resources and the resultant benefits. In many instances where progress has been achieved in terms of access rights or ownership, a number of barriers, such as unsuitable obligations in forest management, regulatory burden and constraints to market entry, still limit the benefits of sustainable forest management.

“Where long-term ownership or access rights traditionally exist, private forest owners have been recognized as key contributors to and supporters of sustainable forest management principles. In addition, indigenous communities in both the North and South are increasingly organizing themselves and taking operational steps and political action to gain ownership or greater control over benefits from protected forests, upland watershed forests, production forests and timber concessions.”

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 20 countries provide information on this subject. Meanwhile, a number of countries indicate that it is not applicable to their circumstances.

The reports reflect widely different historical, legal and cultural backgrounds between countries. For example, the report from Benin highlights the special importance of those sacred forests that provide spiritual safeguard for many lives. The report from Senegal also states that forests occupy a central place in the cultural life of some of its peoples.

The report from Cambodia notes that non-timber forest products are an important safety net for poor people in rural areas and adds that customary user rights are protected in forest concession areas, where for example the harvesting of trees traditionally used by local communities for resin tapping is prohibited. The new forestry law secures customary user rights for local communities (living within or near permanent forest reserves) to collect wood and non-timber forest products for their household consumption.

In Venezuela, legislation gives indigenous communities rights to manage forests in territories traditionally occupied by them; the report also refers to the need to strengthen the organization of those communities, to clarify community rights, and to demarcate the boundary of territories.

In Russia, parts of the state forest estate have been transferred to indigenous peoples for traditional uses and wildlife management.

In Cyprus, forest law offers privileges and rights to inhabitants of certain villages close to forests, allowing them to gather fuelwood according to particular prescriptions. In Turkey traditional rights of forest villagers have long been recognized in the forest law; changes have been made to prevent possible negative effects of price fluctuations on villagers.

The report from Canada refers to a variety of developments, including a memorandum of understanding in Saskatchewan; a land claims and self-government agreement in Northwest Territories; and an Agreement in Principle to establish business relationship in Yukon.

The report from the USA highlights the distinction between local communities and indigenous communities, explaining that the traditional culture, rights and privileges of indigenous peoples has its own complex history. In recent years, federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes have achieved a high degree of autonomy and self-determination in the management of their forests.

In New Zealand, a fund has been established to help Maori develop appropriate frameworks to preserve customary knowledge.

Other reports explain in more general terms that traditional user rights (such as access for recreation, the picking of wild berries and mushrooms and collection of deadwood) are recognised by law.

Integrating local and indigenous communities in sustainable forest management programmes particularly as regards participation in decision making

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 26 countries provide information on this subject. Others state that it is not applicable, or relate it to the wider one of public participation in decision-making.

The reports describe a wide variety of mechanisms for integrating local and indigenous communities in sustainable forest management programmes through participation in decision making. A number of reports also refer to international agreements such as the UN Convention on Civil and Political Rights and the ILO Convention 169. Some reports refer to decentralisation of decision-making to sub-national levels of government.

The report from Venezuela explains that participation of communities is underwritten by the basic legal rights of citizens in a democratic and multiethnic society and there is also legislation which provides for consultation with indigenous communities. This includes official use of indigenous languages and political representation of indigenous people at national and local level.

The report from Malawi states that local communities are legally incorporated as key players in SFM through village natural resources management committees. A major challenge, however, is that there is a large number of these committees, compared with the low capacity of Government and NGO extension services to provide support. In Sudan, some forest managements integrate local communities in SFM.

Another example of action to give local communities greater responsibilities for forest management is described in the report from Senegal. This report also refers to a number of constraints, including lack of technical expertise; insufficient transfer to local communities of the resources necessary to fulfil their responsibilities; the risk that certain local councillors use their position for personal gain; resistance from central bodies to the transfer of competencies to the local communities; and competition with sectors for resources at the local level. Nevertheless, it states that, overall, decentralization has had positive effects in the development of the forest resources, making communities more aware of the full value of these resources and making it easier to manage conflicts.

In Madagascar, the State has transferred part of its competence to village associations and communities.

A contract for the transfer of management is one of the processes aimed at giving responsibility for sustainable management of forests to local stakeholders. The contract transfers competence for managing state-owned forests, but does not transfer property rights. Following such transfers, forest degradation has reduced – with less clearing of forest, less unauthorised felling and fewer wild fires.

The report from India explains that the social functions of forests are very important, with forest fringe villages comprising 28% of all villages in the country. Forests are inseparably linked with the livelihoods of people living on the forest fringes. They support the grazing of nearly 60% of the livestock in the country. Requirements for fuelwood, fodder and small timber, such as house building material, of those living in and around the forests are treated as a first charge on forest produce. Village communities and voluntary agencies are involved in forest management through the Joint Forest Management (JFM) programme, which has now been implemented in 61,000 villages. There are around 85,000 JFM Committees, covering more than 17 million hectares of forests. States have also started to decentralize power in relation to forest development and expansion of forest cover, as well as forest protection.

The report from Pakistan describes recent legislation on Joint Forest Management to devolve decision making processes to the local level. However, much needs to be done to bring indigenous people into the national planning process. Professional anthropologists are helping in the task of achieving greater involvement of local communities in the forestry planning process, including nfp development.

The report from Cambodia explains that the priority of community forestry is promoted through forest legislation and policy. There are some 300-400 initiatives, mainly supported by various NGOs. The community forestry planning process encourages local communities to play a leading role, assisted by local staff from the forestry administration. Local communities that participate in the community forestry projects enter into agreement with the government that offer the right to manage and use forest land in or near their villages, for their own benefit, for up to 15 years.

The report from the USA explains that community-based approaches to forest stewardship are central to many of the current policy debates about SFM on public land. Difficulties in reaching political consensus at the national level have prompted communities to seek consensus at the local level. Federal agencies have begun entering into land stewardship contracts with community groups and Tribes to provide land management services. The report also notes that, where there has been concern over the management of private forest land, conservation NGOs have been able to acquire some environmentally sensitive areas; in addition, federal financial assistance has helped state governments acquire ownership or development interests to protect forest lands.

The report from Sweden highlights the Life -Environment project *Urban Woods for People*, which aims to stimulate and improve recreation for the general public in urban woodlands.

Referring to its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that implementation of joint forest management often faces constraints caused by inappropriate legal frameworks, reluctance of government officials to relinquish control and conflicts over sharing of benefits.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that CIFOR, ICRAF, IUCN and WWF have established the Rainforest Challenge Partnership to enhance the productivity, sustainability and diversity of landscape mosaics in the humid tropics, so as to meet the needs of rural poor people, while maintaining the flow of environmental goods and services and conserving forest biodiversity.

Integrating local and indigenous communities in sustainable forest management programmes particularly as regards the attainment of secure land tenure arrangements

Baseline information

The Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8) explains, in paragraphs 38-39, that:

“At least 60 countries in the developing world have given local and provincial governments greater scope to manage some aspects of natural resource management during the past decade. In a few countries, restitution policies have allowed indigenous communities to successfully claim ownership rights to forests, resulting in them being key decision makers in the management of these forests... It is estimated that local communities and indigenous peoples now own 14 per cent of all forests in developing countries.

“ Where long-term ownership or access rights traditionally exist or have been transferred in a transparent way, communities and private forest owners have without doubt benefited from that empowerment, in addition to the direct benefits they get from the forest...”

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 18 countries provide information on this subject.

The reports describe a variety of land tenure arrangements, reflecting historical factors as well as recent developments. Some note a long tradition of private ownership of forests.

In some countries, land rights are characterized by the coexistence of the traditional regime with modern written codes. For example, in Benin, the law grants user rights to give local people access to deadwood, food, medicinal products and grazing, subject to the requirements of forest management plans. The report also notes that, despite the influence of the customary rules, there are frequent local conflicts over land. In Lesotho, land traditionally belongs to the people as a whole and is held by the King on behalf of the nation, with village councils allocating land to individuals. However the forest legislation grants ownership of trees to those who plant them and empowers the forestry ministry to grant ownership of trees and forests for a period of time, subject to conditions relating to SFM. The Lesotho government has tried to empower local people by helping them secure undisputed access to land and ownership of trees.

Cambodia has arrangements to transfer state land to poor people for residential and family farming purposes, but the area for social land concessions is not yet defined. There are currently serious problems of land grabbing and encroachment by different individuals and groups, including authorities and armed forces.

The report from Guatemala outlines the use of community forest concessions as a novel system of management to help local people benefit from forests. Certification by the Forest Stewardship Council is an explicit requirement of concession contracts.

The reports from Cyprus, Poland and Serbia and Montenegro highlight the very small average size of private forests and the challenges this poses for SFM. The report from Poland adds that owners are obliged to practice SFM, but have the option of entrusting management to state foresters.

In New Zealand, a permanent commission of inquiry provides a mechanism for resolving land-related disputes involving the rights of the indigenous Maori people established under the nineteenth century Treaty of Waitangi.

Integrating local and indigenous communities in sustainable forest management programmes, particularly as regards capacity building and technology transfer for sustainable forest management directed at indigenous and local communities

Baseline information

The Report of the Secretary-General on Social and cultural aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2004/8) explains, in paragraphs 43-45, that:

“From the point of view of the local resource users, lack of secure tenure or sufficient authority to make decisions on the use and management of forest resources can be frustrating. Devolution of authority over resources has often been from central government to local government, and rarely to the resource users themselves. In cases where significant authority to make decisions on forest resources have been devolved to local levels, more powerful local elites have often captured the benefits of collective action, in the absence of appropriate local institutions.

“Transforming local traditional institutional arrangements for managing forestry resources into more accountable and transparent structures is often more elusive than perceived, although building on these institutional arrangements is still the best option in many countries. More still needs to be done to ensure that local institutional arrangements have checks and balances against the capture of all control and benefits by powerful local elites. Much of the effort to decentralize has stopped short of a real transfer of authority and power to communities and, in some cases, has actually decreased local communities’ authority over the resources they have managed traditionally.

“Other setbacks to active participation by local people include the long-term nature of most forestry investments, which discourages people from participating in production and management; disputes over such resources as water and land, which undermine collective action; and the nomadic lifestyle of some indigenous communities.”

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 14 countries provide information on this subject.

Some reports refer to the support that governments provide to forest owners’ associations to facilitate capacity building and technology transfer. The report from New Zealand provides more detail on forest-related education and training, which is the primary tool for technology transfer; it also refers to programmes to help indigenous people practice SFM.

Further examples of capacity building and technology transfer for SFM directed at indigenous and local communities is provided in the Cambodian report. This is achieved through training, workshops, the preparation of manuals, demonstration sites and extension work that is undertaken by NGOs and local forestry officers as a part of community forest projects. The process of community forestry provides an enabling environment for indigenous and local communities to exchange knowledge and information, for example through study tours.

In its report, Venezuela highlights the more general importance of the strengthening general education for indigenous peoples.

In Guatemala, capacity building is a central part of the community forestry strategy. Its objectives include helping communities to strengthen their organisations and their ability to make joint decisions, also improving the interaction and distribution of power between communities and other interest groups. The programme also provides technical and financial assistance to help communities understand, plan, execute and evaluate actions required for SFM.

The report from Cyprus refers to the prospect of financial assistance for capacity building and technology transfer under the EU Rural Development Plan.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that FAO, together with CIFOR, had published *Towards Equitable Partnerships between Corporate and Smallholder Partners*. This is a synthesis of a workshop to develop joint proposals

for an action learning programme among farm foresters, private companies, and research and extension agencies and includes a revised set of principles on mutually beneficial relationships.

Conclusions on social and cultural aspects

Action to promote fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the utilization of forest genetic resources has generally been taken within the framework of guidelines under CBD. Many of the reports give examples of policies and initiatives aimed at strengthening the role of women, and a number refer to the development of women's forestry organisations. Notable developments in the integration of local and indigenous communities have included the establishment of community-based management and ownership initiatives intended to generate income for local use and promote local responsibility for sustainable forest management. The importance of forest resources for the daily livelihoods of many people, and the need to safeguard customary use rights, is also stressed in several reports.

9. Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forest and fragile ecosystems

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the second session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary -General on forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems (E/CN.18/2002/9). The summary of this Report states that:

“... substantial progress has been made in establishing protected area networks in all regions of the world. Approximately 10 per cent of global forest area is currently under some form of protection, although the degree of protection varies significantly between different regions. However, current assessments of forest-protected areas fail to provide detailed information on the status of different forest types, except in a very general sense. Unique forest types of particular local or national importance are therefore poorly represented in global or regional analyses of protection...”

The Chairman's summary of the discussion of this item is in E/2002/42(E/CN.18/2002/14), paragraph 24, sub-paragraphs A. 2. 10-19. Following this discussion, the Forum adopted resolution 2/2 (section B).

Creating or expanding protected areas to safeguard forest and related ecosystems and their full range of values and, developing and applying criteria and methodologies for assessing the conditions and management effectiveness in protected forest areas

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 32 countries provide information on this subject.

Most reports refer to action taken within the framework of international agreements, including CBD, the work of UNESCO and IUCN categorisations. EU member states also refer to EU legislation concerning the Natura 2000 network of protected areas in Europe. Another regional initiative is the Central American Biological Corridor, which will help strengthen national systems of protected areas.

The national reports from Finland and Norway both refer to recent evaluations of their networks of protected forest areas, and the need to ensure that they have a sound scientific basis in order to cover the full range of habitat types and threatened species. They also note the funding implications of achieving this, especially where there is a need for active management to restore special features of natural forests, to carry out scientific inventories and to provide visitor facilities.

The report from Serbia and Montenegro also notes that lack of funding poses the greatest threat to maintenance of protected areas. National parks as public utilities are increasingly forced to sell timber from their forests in order to meet financial needs. In some national parks, the pressure of increased tourism

is threatening biodiversity. Municipalities are contributing to this through liberal land-use planning and construction permits in order to increase economic activity in the depressed rural communities.

In its report, Russia refers to the long tradition of valuable scientific research in protected areas, but adds that the scientific departments in the reserves now suffer from lack of resources. The report from Poland highlights the importance of fragile mountain forest ecosystems and the threats they face from air pollution, weather conditions, insects and fungi.

The report from the USA notes that the protection and conservation of a representative range of forest ecosystems must include private forest lands as well as public land. It states that, over the past decade, there has been a significant increase in efforts by NGOs, forest industry, and private landowners to protect forests of high conservation value on private lands, complementing conservation efforts in protected areas on public lands.

The report from Cambodia explains that 1.5 million hectares of protected forest have been created following the cancellation of concessions where the appropriate conditions were not fulfilled. Valid concession areas have also been designated as protected forest or community forest due to their social, environmental and biodiversity importance.

The report from Senegal gives details of protected forest areas and states that ten new reserves have been created since 2001 to help achieve the 12% target; however, the problem of bush fires is a major concern.

In Malawi, the area of gazetted forest reserves has increased by 20% over the past five years. Meanwhile, effective management is becoming more difficult as a result of encroachment and illegal exploitation of forest resources, especially in the densely populated areas where land holdings are small (less than 1 hectare per family). The report notes that the challenge is to identify innovative ways of sustainably managing these areas while at the same time meeting the growing wood needs of the adjacent populations.

There have also been substantial increases in the area of protected forest in Sudan. However, problems have included the high cost of surveying and registering this land (including complexity of procedures) and encroachment for agricultural, residential and industrial purposes.

Information from CPF members

The joint report from CPF members states that ITTO is currently implementing 10 transboundary conservation projects that cover 10.3 million hectares of tropical forests. ITTO and IUCN jointly organized the *International Workshop on Increasing the Effectiveness of Transboundary Conservation Areas in Tropical Forests* in 2003 in Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand, catalyzing interest in these issues in more than 25 countries. FAO is developing, with major nature conservation organizations, a Forest Conservation Strategy for Asia-Pacific. FAO has also carried out, together with UNEP and IUCN, a regional review on Latin American protected areas in 2003, is supporting Central American countries in defining a sub-regional strategy for the protection of native forests, and is promoting forest protection activities in the Southern Cone. GEF, the World Bank and UNDP are also involved in the Meso-America forest conservation project; and there is a World Bank corridor project in rainforest regions in Brazil. In 2004, IUFRO sponsored an international workshop on *Balancing Ecosystem Values – Innovative Experiments for Sustainable Forestry*. ITTO, in collaboration with the UNEP, FAO and others, is currently updating the World Mangrove Atlas.

Developing and implementing partnership mechanisms to engage forest owners, private sector, indigenous people and local communities in the planning and management of forest conservation areas and developing and implementing a range of innovative mechanisms for financing and encouraging forest conservation

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 28 countries provide information on this subject.

Some reports highlight the importance of consultation prior to the designation of forest conservation areas and mechanisms for stakeholder participation in the development of management plans. For example, in Spain, the nature conservation legislation provides for public hearings during the development of plans; and, in Finland, the establishment and management planning of protected areas always include the broad participation of all relevant stakeholders.

A common approach, where forest conservation areas are privately owned, is to promote conservation measures through public-private contracts that provide subsidies to landowners to carry out appropriate work; some countries also consider compensating owners for losses incurred due to restrictions on forest management activities in protected areas. Some reports also state that, increasingly, NGOs are acquiring forest conservation areas and either managing them themselves or donating them to the state.

The report from Finland outlines a number of innovative approaches to conserving valuable forest habitats while also allowing forests to be commercially utilised to the benefit of rural economies and livelihoods. These include competitive tendering, whereby landowners offer to rent or sell ecologically valuable areas of forest to the authorities at an agreed price – with tenders being selected according to financial costs and ecological benefits. This report also identifies a case where a paper company donated land to the state to enable the establishment of a national park.

In the USA, the forest industry has worked with voluntary conservation bodies to identify and map forests of exceptional conservation value; land trusts have also been established to purchase or accept the donation of development rights on important tracts of private land.

The report from the Republic of Korea states that, due to the long-term nature of forestry and low income, forest owners are avoiding investment and proper management of their properties. The government is developing mechanisms to have the private properties entrusted from the owners and implement proxy tending activities. “A Day with Forest Owners” was held in July 2004 to raise commonality and awareness on the importance of private forest management among the private owners.

In Pakistan, the National Forest Programme Facility encourages the involvement of forest owners, indigenous people and local communities in the planning and management of forest conservation areas and proposes a range of innovative mechanisms for financing and encouraging forest conservation. A recent Forest Ordinance provides a legal basis for the involvement of the local communities in the management of the forest areas.

A number of reports address the issue of potential conflict with neighbouring communities:

- the report from Benin highlights the importance of participative management in helping to prevent conflict;
- in Indonesia, there are 23.2 million hectares of protected areas, but there is a need to promote community involvement and poverty alleviation programmes in order to help overcome the difficulties arising from the problems of poverty in neighbouring communities. Collaborative management is applied to develop and implement partnership mechanisms involving local and traditional communities in the planning and maintenance of protected areas;
- a number of partnerships between government, local communities, NGOs and the private sector have been developed for managing forest reserves in Malawi; however, the country report states scope for further partnerships is constrained by finance and staff capacity. Another initiative in Malawi was a National Forestry Week in 2004 during which all stakeholders were encouraged to help rehabilitate degraded forests through tree planting and proper forest management practices;

- in Venezuela, the government has created a unit to manage environmental conflict and it is developing technical guidelines for involving communities.

The report from Cambodia stresses that there are considerable challenges in developing the national economy, alleviating poverty and, at the same time, ensuring sustainability of the forest resources for future generations. Since the government does not have sufficient capacity on its own, it requires support from stakeholders and local people, and collaboration with other countries (especially neighboring countries) to share resources and experience.

Information from CPF members

The joint report from CPF members states that UNEP's current activities include a project on *Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use in Fragmented Landscapes* that is investigating human impacts on biodiversity in the fragmented forest landscapes of Chile and Mexico.

Giving high priority in national forest programs to the rehabilitation and sustainable management of forests and trees in environmentally critical areas, recognising the linkage between forest protection and sustainable development and improving the coordination among such policies and programmes

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 26 countries provide information on this subject. Most explain how their nfps, and related biodiversity strategies, give priority to the rehabilitation and sustainable management of forests and trees in environmentally critical areas. In some countries this process has involved multi-stakeholder working groups.

The report from Russia explains that the concept of SFM has removed forestry from a narrow industrial framework, broadening it to embrace the ecosystem approach. Accordingly, there has been substantive revision in forest policy, shifting from a simple focus on exploitation of forest resources to an ecosystem approach. This balances the needs of forest resource use and economic efficiency with the long-term conservation of forest habitats, including their biodiversity, ecological functions and global role in carbon storage. The report recognizes that, given its impact on local economies and employment, much practical work is needed to achieve this transition.

In its report, Denmark outlines the development of operational guidelines for SFM at management unit level based on the MCPFE criteria and indicators; these include guidelines based on near-to-nature principles for forest management. Though the guidelines are strictly voluntary, they are expected to provide the basis for future Danish forest management.

Changes in Lithuanian forestry policy will lead to reduced clear-cutting in order to restore ecologically stable forest stands; considerable attention has been paid to the preparation of the scientifically-based norms for establishing and managing protected areas.

In Cyprus, the nfp includes provisions for the protection and restoration of degraded land, watershed protection, the maintenance of ecosystems and biodiversity and the conservation of the flora and fauna; high priority has been given in the Rural Development Plan to protect and restore woodlands and single trees in environmental critical areas or of important ecological value.

The report from Turkey notes that even if forests do not have formal protection status, their importance in protecting, for example soil and water, can be recognized in management plans.

Some reports stress the multifunctional nature of forests, providing for conservation, production and social needs. For example, the report from Algeria explains that the distinction between production forests and protection forests is not well defined: production forests in good ecological condition contribute to protection and conservation.

Several reports highlight the challenges they face in implementing their plans. The report from Lesotho explains that the small area of natural forest is a valuable resource for many rural people, providing fuel, timber, medicines for both humans and livestock, sites for traditional ceremonies, grazing and shelter for livestock. Despite the existence of management plans backed by regulatory measures, the loss of this natural vegetation continues. In Malawi, high population levels mean that more innovative ways are urgently required in order to balance the day to day needs for food and energy with the requirement to manage environmentally critical areas of forest sustainably. In relation to its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that forest conservation often faces resource constraints because the returns seem to be intangible and long term.

Information from CPF members

The joint report from CPF members states that UNDP is working on 29 GEF-funded projects on forest conservation in 27 countries through its Operational Program on Forest Ecosystems and its other biodiversity Operational Programs, including the Operational Program on Mountain Ecosystems. During 2003, UNDP analysed UNDP-GEF experiences and lessons learned in implementing 40 forest conservation projects around the world. UNEP's current activities include an assessment of the vulnerability of forest ecosystems to environmental change, analyzing pressures on forest ecosystems and identifying unique forest types; a Mountain Cloud Forest Initiative established with IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management and UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme; analyses of distribution of forest bamboo species; a programme of restoration using threatened trees as part of a joint Global Trees Campaign; and a *World Atlas of Great Apes and their Conservation* to provide information on great apes and tropical moist forests. FAO is working with many countries on innovative approaches for the conservation and sustainable development of watersheds, especially in mountains; and on best forestry practices to conserve water resources in lowland landscapes.

Conclusions

Many countries have significant areas of ecologically important forest under some form of legal protection. Action has been taken to secure effective conservation of these areas, for example by addressing potential conflicts that arise where land is also important to the livelihoods of local populations. This has included consultation, at all stages of the process, on designation and on management plans, the offering of financial incentives and the use of partnership mechanisms. Nfcs, and related biodiversity strategies, are giving increasing emphasis to conservation and the management of environmentally critical areas, although several reports from least developed countries stress the problem of resource constraints. ITTO is currently implementing 10 transboundary conservation projects that cover 10.3 million hectares of tropical forests, and ITTO and IUCN jointly organized an *International Workshop on Increasing the Effectiveness of Transboundary Conservation Areas in Tropical Forests*.

10. Monitoring, assessment and reporting, and concepts, terminology and definitions

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the second and fourth sessions. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on monitoring, assessment and reporting, including concepts, terminology and definitions (E/CN.18/2002/8); in the Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Approaches and Mechanisms for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting (E/CN.18/2004/2) and in the Report of the Secretary-General on Monitoring, assessment and reporting, concepts terminology and definitions (E/CN.18/2004/10). Following discussion of this item at its second session, the Forum adopted resolution 2/2 (section E), and following discussion at its fourth session the Forum adopted resolution 4/3.

Resolution 4/3 highlights a number of lessons learned through the exchange of experiences, namely that:

“(a) forest-related monitoring, assessment and reporting are not ends in themselves but a means to facilitate informed decision-making, and many countries are using or considering use of criteria and indicators to monitor and assess forest conditions and trends and progress towards sustainable forest management, including through implementation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests proposals for action, that (b) criteria and indicators have contributed to a better understanding of sustainable forest management, improved forest policies, programmes, practices and information, stakeholder involvement and partnerships and enhanced collaboration among countries, that (c) despite progress made, many countries lack capacity for forest related inventory, monitoring, assessment and reporting, and enhanced domestic and external financial and technical resources, collaboration at the regional levels and among criteria and indicators processes, cross-sectoral coordination and research are needed for that purpose, and that (d) national forest-related reporting to international fora is placing a heavy burden on countries and needs to be streamlined, and further harmonization of forest-related definitions and terms is also desirable to clarify reporting requests and minimize inconsistencies in information provided.”

Further baseline information is available in the reports of *the International expert meeting on monitoring, assessment and reporting on the progress toward sustainable forest management*, held in Yokohama, Japan on 5-8 November 2001; and the meeting on *Lessons learned in Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Implementation of IPF/IFF Proposals for Action*, held in Viterbo, Italy on 17-20 March 2003.

Improving information on national forest resources, making the information widely available, assisting other countries in their related efforts

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 38 countries provide information on this subject.

Most countries outline the basis of their forest inventory systems. For the majority, these have been established for many years. However, developments in some countries are more recent: for example, the report from El Salvador describes proposals for a forest inventory, Guatemala published a map of forest cover in 2000, Lebanon is carrying out its first national forest and tree inventory, Togo has just begun a forest statistics project and Venezuela began a national forest inventory in 2002.

Apart from data relating to trees and wood production, information collected includes ecological condition, biological diversity, tree health, fires and data on recreation and non-timber forest products. Countries also explain that they contribute data to international agencies, including C&I processes. A number of reports refer to the challenges of harmonisation: for example, the report from Slovakia explains that the traditional Central and Eastern European method of inventory is not compatible the sampling methods used in other European countries.

The report from Sweden describes a new and innovative inventory concept that has been developed to complement the traditional sample plot system. It is called the National Inventory of Landscapes in Sweden. Instead of a grid of many small size sample plots this landscape monitoring consists of 5 km x 5 km squares. During the first years, this programme will be developed further to include methods for monitoring insects, meadows, pasturelands and alpine scree as well as parts of the EU Natura 2000 monitoring programme.

Several reports highlight the role of new technological developments, including the use of Geographic Information Systems. For example, in New Zealand a spatial data database is being created that will also reconcile forest locations and owners with the farm-based database. The report from India states that the introduction of advanced digital image processing systems has helped in reducing the time lag between the presentation of the reports and that of the underlying satellite data, adding that India has the technology to assist other developing countries with respect to capacity building and training.

Some reports also describe means of disseminating information, not only for policy making, professional and scientific purposes but also for schools and more general public information. For example, the report

from Switzerland states that a version of its data was made available for the general public in the form of a “walk through the Swiss forest” website.

On the other hand, a significant number of countries report difficulties with monitoring, assessment and reporting. For example :

- the report from Algeria explains that the work of land register on forests has not progressed well since the National Land Register (upon which it depends) has other priorities. The national forest inventory suffers from lack of expertise in inventory methodology and tree mensuration, and lack of technical aid;
- the report from Benin states that the exact situation regarding forests remains unknown; some studies have been carried out under particular projects, but the National Centre of Remote Sensing and Monitoring of Forest Cover suffers from staffing difficulties which make it difficult to take advantage of investments in terms of equipment and training. Another problem is that this Centre has been privatised, but is still expected to give priority to public work;
- the report from Malawi states that information on forest resources is generally outdated, being based on the land map drawn up in 1992; forest plantation resource/stock maps are also old and require updating.

In relation to its international development cooperation activities, the report from Finland notes that national forest inventories are often constrained by lack of technical capacity and funding. Despite use of modern remote sensing technologies, the inventories always involve significant, and time-consuming, fieldwork.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report explains that there are major joint activities of CPF members related to this element. These are the work of the CPF Task Force on Streamlining Forest-related Reporting and the work to harmonize forest-related definitions.

FAO’s global FRA provides a comprehensive report on forest resources, their management and uses every 5-10 years. FRA reports have been issued since 1948. The next update is scheduled for 2005, to be carried out through country participation and reporting, and building linkages with C&I by using thematic elements of SFM (acknowledged by UNFF 4) as a reporting framework. As part of preparations, FAO and ITTO, with participation from UNEP, co-sponsored a meeting of some 120 national FRA correspondents in November 2003. FRA is refining reporting tables and definitions in all FAO languages for the 2005 update, in order to respond to calls from various expert meetings; use of thematic elements of SFM to structure reporting; and to harmonize with reporting requirements of other reporting processes, such as UNFCCC.

In 2000-2001, UNEP and its partners conducted a comprehensive study on the assessment of the status of the World’s remaining closed forests. Recently, new datasets such as Global Land Cover 2000 and updated protected areas have become available.

FAO has recently increased its effort to build capacity for national forest assessments and to improve the forest information base. Currently projects are underway in seven countries and being considered in 15 others. ITTO, UNECE, FAO and the UN Statistical Office collaborated in the further development of the Joint Forest Statistics Questionnaire to enhance accuracy and reliability of information on forest products production and trade. UNEP is working on several projects focusing on the assessment of the state of forests and the improvement and reporting of information on natural forest ecosystems and biodiversity. FAO, IPCC, ITTO, CIFOR, IUFRO and UNEP organized two expert meetings in 2002 that resulted a number of recommendations for harmonizing forest-related definitions; UNFF, UNFCCC and CBD were requested to continue the harmonizing process. A third meeting was held in January 2005 on the harmonization of definitions related to biophysical constitutions of forest resources, and human interventions to manage forests for various purposes. Work is underway to harmonize core terms in

Spanish and French, and to clarify terms related to the naturalness of forests, planted forests and low forest cover.

Conclusions

Many countries have well-established forest inventory systems that are being further developed to collect a wider range of data, relating not only to trees and wood production, but also to ecological condition, biological diversity, tree health, fires, use for recreation and non-timber forest products. While a number of developing countries report difficulties with monitoring, assessment and reporting, largely due to lack of expertise and funding, the joint CPF report refers to the efforts of its members to help build capacity for national forest assessments. The joint CPF initiative on stream-lining forest related reporting aims to relieve the burden placed on countries by international bodies for forest-related reports. In addition, CPF has a joint initiative on harmonisation of forest-related terms and definitions.

11. Rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover.

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the second session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary -General on Progress in the rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover (E/CN.18/2002/7). The summary of this report states that:

“The precise definition of a low forest cover country is still uncertain; here, a threshold of less than 10 per cent of land area covered by forest has been adopted, giving a total of 67 low forest cover countries. The expert meeting held in Tehran in 1999 helped greatly to provide clearer guidance on the issues that are most important for forest management in low forest cover countries. The launch of the Tehran Process and the founding of its secretariat represent additional steps forward. However, progress has been slow in establishing the full capability of the Tehran Process and its secretariat, and additional resources and personnel are needed from a number of international sources.

“In general, low forest cover countries appear to have made limited progress towards implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. Despite some growth in the recognition of the importance of forests in low forest cover countries, progress in enhancing forest cover has been limited. There is little evidence that restoration of degraded forests or re-establishment of native forest landscapes has been given any priority. It is also difficult to assess what progress has been made in forest conservation among low forest cover countries...”

Paragraph 11 of the Report also includes a table (see below) which shows that while some low forest cover countries have successfully expanded their forest cover, many more have continued to lose forest or have seen no change in cover:

Change in forest cover among low forest cover countries, 1990-2000			
	<i>Increasing forest Cover</i>	<i>Decreasing forest cover</i>	<i>No measurable change</i>
Number of low forest cover countries	17	15	35

The Chairman’s summary of the discussion is in E/2002/42 (E/CN.18/2002/14), paragraph 24, subparagraphs A. 3. 20-26. Following this discussion, the Forum adopted resolution 2/2 (section C).

Expanding forested area, establishing and managing plantations to enhance production of forest goods and services, while avoiding the replacement of natural ecosystems, and recognizing the role of imports in satisfying the needs for forest products and services

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 13 countries provide information on this subject.

The report from Russia, referring to parts of the country with low forest cover, confirms that trees have an important role in areas of low forest cover in terms of helping to improve the water balance. It explains that the primary goal of the government in areas of low forest cover has always been the maintenance of the many natural functions of forests, including water-security and anti-erosion as well as a wide range of other social and ecological functions.

The report from Algeria states that implementation of the national reforestation plan began in 2000, including the establishment of a green belt (*barrage vert*) of 3 million hectares, 1,200 kilometres long and 25 kilometres wide. The plan has also led to useful research on nursery improvement. The report explains, however, that, despite its importance greater financial support is needed for implementation.

In its report, Sudan explains that plantations have been established with both indigenous and exotic species, but annual areas of planting are far below strategic and policy targets because of funding constraints.

In Lesotho trees have been planted by government, individuals, communities and associations in an attempt to rehabilitate degraded lands, as well as ensuring adequate wood supply.

The report from Pakistan refers to the value of establishing irrigated plantations as a means of reducing pressure on natural forest ecosystems, but adds that acute shortages of irrigated water are a major impediment in establishing new plantations and maintaining existing ones.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that UNDP implements a number of GEF-funded forest conservation projects in countries with low forest cover. In addition, UNDP has assisted many countries in the development and implementation of national action plans under the UNCCD.

Promoting the regeneration and restoration of degraded forest areas including through partnerships and building capacities to promote effective participation in decision making, and development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 6 countries provide information on this subject.

The report from Russia explains that, since 1997, the Forest Code has included substantive provisions relating to water-security and protective functions of forests, as well as other properties. Detailed regulations relate to felling control, including selective felling and felling in mountain forests; they also deal with other details such as loading areas, safety and avoiding damage to other trees in the parent stand. Ecological criteria, which assess changes in the forest environment following felling, help determine appropriate felling systems and harvesting methods, following ecological examination of the project.

The report from Lebanon states that, in order to face the challenge of combating desertification, the government has made funds available for reforestation/afforestation of 18,000 hectares of abandoned land. Other plans will be later developed to cover a total area of 200,000 hectares to be planted in 30-40 years. Priority is given abandoned land, not suitable for agriculture and prone to desertification; wooded lands with less than 10% crown cover; abandoned lands around forests and other wooded lands; and land with

environmental, tourism or aesthetic value. The plan stresses the importance of coordination with all the concerned stakeholders.

The report from Pakistan states that no major technology for reforestation, afforestation or regeneration of natural forests or the establishment of new irrigated plantation has come forth since 1997. It suggests that the terminology of environmentally sound technologies needs further elaboration and that there is a need to prepare inventories of all such technologies. It also adds that there has been concern about the negative environmental impacts of eucalyptus and about the use of polythene bags in forest nurseries. Eucalyptus plantations are now restricted to degraded and saline lands, but no viable alternative to the polythene bags has yet been found.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that some Partnership members are supporting land degradation assessments. FAO and UNEP, with funding from the GEF, are implementing the global project on land degradation assessment. UNEP and the UNCCD secretariat are collaborating on a project on land degradation assessment in drylands, aimed at providing standardized information and methodologies for land degradation assessment at the national, regional and global levels.

Improving the efficiency of international cooperation to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and building capacity to monitor forest resources

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 11 countries provide information on this subject.

The report from Sudan states that following an earlier withdrawal of almost all the international organizations cooperating with the forestry service, there has been increased international cooperation in more recent years.

The Republic of Korea facilitates regular bilateral cooperation with China, Mongolia, Myanmar, Indonesia and other countries. This includes expert exchange and joint researches on rehabilitation technology, reforestation and ecosystem analysis of degraded land. The report also refers to training courses on combating desertification for government employees of affected countries.

The report from Switzerland describes its support for forest-related activities in countries with low forest cover. It explains that these form a part of wider programmes with more general objectives, such as the reduction of water supply problems in regions and countries affected by desertification and drought.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report explains that the Tehran Process provides an important framework for CPF members' cooperation and collaboration among low forest cover countries. Through its Dryland Development Centre, UNDP has assisted many countries in the development and implementation of national action plans under the UNCCD. UNEP, FAO, ICRAF and the secretariat of the Tehran process organized an international workshop for low forest cover countries in the Near East and Africa in Mali, in January 2004, with the theme of how to translate proposals for action into implementation. FAO, in collaboration with UNEP and others, completed case studies (on Ethiopia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mali, Namibia, Oman and Tunisia) for the meeting and conducted three regional workshops (two in the Near East and one in Africa) to develop proposals to enhance the role of planted forests, trees outside forests and urban and peri-urban forests in achieving sustainable forest management in low forest cover countries.

GEF serves as a financial mechanism for UNCCD; through Operational Program 15, Sustainable Land Management, the GEF is providing approximately US\$ 177 million to support forest management in the wider context of sustainable land management. The focus of the Global Mechanism under UNCCD is the mobilization of financial resources for co-funding projects on land degradation, including those related to

the GEF Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management. In 2004, the COP to the CBD welcomed the joint work programme with the UNCCD on dry and sub-humid lands.

Within the framework of the IUFRO's support to GFIS in Africa, a scientific networking initiative on *Rehabilitation of degraded lands in Africa* aimed at demonstrating the added value of scientific output that can be achieved through enhanced collaboration and information sharing among scientists working in different countries and environments. The results of this thematic networking have been published as scientific synthesis in 2004.

Conclusions

Action taken includes afforestation programmes, and the implementation of detailed operational guidelines aimed at conserving the protective functions of forests in areas of low forest cover. Further progress will depend upon the priority that is given forest restoration in these countries. The Tehran process remains important: the joint CPF report explains that it provides a framework for CPF members' cooperation and collaboration among low forest cover countries. Rehabilitation and conservation is being taken forward in certain regions by UNCCD and through GEF's operational programme on sustainable land management.

12. Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests.

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the second session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary -General on the rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands and the promotion of natural and planted forests (**E/CN.18/2002/3**). The summary of this Report states that:

“An estimated 2.6 billion people are affected by land degradation and desertification in more than one hundred countries. Forces contributing to this situation include climatic variations and unsustainable land use practices. International collaboration and funding to rehabilitate and restore degraded lands and develop forest lands are increasing, however, developing countries still have limited capacity to formulate and implement sound plans to address these problems and experience difficulties in accessing information technology and networks.

“The lack of reliable information on planted forests and secondary tropical forests is a serious constraint, limiting ability to detect trends accurately and to develop future scenarios regarding these resources. Many tools to sustainably manage natural and planted forests are available, including codes of harvesting, criteria and indicators, management and operational planning guidelines, voluntary certification schemes, environmental and social impact assessment and participatory planning guidelines. However, their application is not yet sufficiently widespread, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.”

The Chairman's summary of the discussion is in **E/2002/42 (E/CN.18/2002/14)**, paragraph 24, subparagraphs A. 4. 27-36. Following this discussion, the Forum adopted resolution 2/2 (section D).

Further baseline information is available in the Report of the *Expert Meeting on the Role of Planted Forests in Sustainable Forest Management* held in Wellington, New Zealand, on 24-28 March 2003; and on the website of the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration (www.unepwcmc.org/forest/restoration/globalpartnership/).

Promoting the creation of new forest resources through plantations and recognizing their role in rehabilitation of degraded lands and forests in environmentally critical areas

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 32 countries provide information on this subject, some noting that the need to promote the creation of new forest resources is not an issue for them.

Several reports focus on the establishment of plantations. For example, the report from New Zealand notes that it had long been recognized that felling of natural forests, for agricultural development and to meet wood needs, would eventually lead to the clearance of all accessible areas. Consequently, action was taken and New Zealand now has a substantial plantation-based wood resource which has taken the pressure off the natural forests.

The report from Serbia and Montenegro gives a longer-term historical perspective, explaining that afforestation began on sandy land in the early eighteenth century, and that this has provided continuing benefits. Current challenges include barren mountainous areas where there is large-scale soil erosion. Twentieth century afforestation programmes have been interrupted by wars, but effort is continuing because of their importance in soil conservation and because of their hydrological function. The report also states that, through their positive role in environmental conservation and protection, forest ecosystems will contribute to the revitalization of settlements in the hilly and mountainous region, to the development of tourism, and other types of utilization of the newly established forest resources, based on the principles of sustainable development.

In Russia, natural means are used for forest restoration in taiga forests, while in other areas (such as the zone of mixed forests) the basic method of restoration is through plantation establishment.

The report from Spain states that one of the objectives of the nfp is the promotion of fast-growing plantations in ecological zones that will produce quality wood. This will reduce the deficit in wood production and help the economy of depressed rural areas, meeting wood needs without exerting pressure on areas of protective forest.

The report from the UK explains that land degraded by former industrial and urban activity, including open-cast mining, makes an increasingly important contribution to the expansion of woodland. Trees planted on such sites offer considerable social benefits in addition to offering the possibility of economic activity on formerly unproductive land.

The report from Lebanon explains that the plantation programme, using mainly indigenous species, was interrupted by civil war. Nurseries are now being rehabilitated, and seedlings distributed to municipalities and community based organisations.

In Sudan there has been establishment of plantations for the restoration of the fertility of exhausted agricultural lands in rain-fed areas. Through foreign aid and general support from the national development budget, much afforestation and replanting was achieved, but performance declined following disruption of foreign aid and the halt of federal support starting from 1996.

The report from Malawi states that new forest resources are being created through distribution and sale of tree seed (for example, to village level communities, schools and associations); reforestation of public land by the forestry department; and encouraging agricultural estates to plant trees to meet their future wood needs on site. The rate of reforestation, however, is still low relative to forest resource use and depletion because it is constrained by resource availability.

In Lesotho there has been a lack of funds and other resources for reforestation and for tending existing plantations; other problems include poor access due to deterioration in the condition of roads, illegal felling, drought, fire and grazing. Emphasis is now being given to models of forestry development that focus on individual ownership, rather than larger communal activities, where uncertainty regarding allocation of future benefits acts against people's willingness to protect and manage the resource. Efforts

have also been made to integrate trees fully into farming and livelihood systems. The report stresses that forest development policies must recognize the reality of limited land resources and alternative land uses.

Experience in Togo shows that people only engage in forest protection when they find that this is in their interests; a pilot participative project is aiming at a consensual approach towards SFM, afforestation and agroforestry. The report also notes the role of NGOs in helping to promote this work.

The report from El Salvador states it faces the challenge of increasing production from plantations, noting that there are only a few plantations at present and that management regimes aimed at conserving the ecological value of natural forest areas will limit their use. Areas suitable for plantation establishment have been identified, but the report also notes the potential impact of demand for land for growing coffee.

In Indonesia, the Government has launched a national programme for land and forest rehabilitation targeting approximately 3 million hectares of forest within 5 yrs up to 2007. Seed centres have been established in several provinces; these include villages where there is an emphasis on community forestry. There is ecosystem restoration in production forest areas, conducted through natural and plantation forest management. Constraints include limited logistical support, limited seed, lack of effective mechanisms for involving communities in land rehabilitation and restoration, poor budgeting and delayed funding. There is a need actively to involve local governments. The promotion of NTFPs (such as honey and silkworm production) is being used as a means of providing incentives to farmers. The report also notes that once land is degraded it is difficult to recover and restore.

In the Republic of Korea, there has been some successful forest restoration, and a further 1 million hectares is planned for the next 5 years. Particular benefits referred to in the report include the promotion of cleaner water supplies around the five major rivers.

The report from Cambodia refers to the "Cambodia Tree Seed Project" which aims to conserve endangered and rare tree species; a national gene ecological zonation has been developed as a tool for planning of gene conservation and seed use. Tree planting with indigenous species will be extended, particularly in the areas where socio-economic, environmental and wildlife conservation is given high priority.

Information from CPF members

FAO provides status and trends in the development of planted forests; and technical support, definitions and guidelines to countries (public and private sectors) to select appropriate germplasm and implement afforestation and reforestation programmes for both protection and production purposes. In 2004, FAO carried out a study on the impact of incentives on the development of forest plantation resources in the Asia-Pacific region, which emphasized enabling investment climate and the removal of structural impediments. FAO also provides technical advice in the use of treated waste water in irrigation of forest plantations in the Near East region. In addition, CIFOR, FAO and collaborators have issued a publication on partnerships between corporate and smallholder partners, primarily related to planted forest development; practical guidelines on plantations are currently being developed.

The joint CPF report states that ITTO will be conducting a market study on tropical plantation timber in 2004. IUFRO has organized an International Meeting on *The Economics and Management of High Productivity Plantations*, which examined plantation wood demand, supply and prices, as well as related social and environmental considerations.

Several CPF members are also actively engaged in agroforestry. The fourth Africa-Asia Forum on Combating Desertification was organized in Cotonou, in June 2003, to stimulate interregional cooperation between Africa and Asia, particularly in agroforestry and soil conservation. Following the Forum, the UNCCD secretariat, in collaboration with others, organized regional workshops in Botswana, India and Peru. ICRAF, with many partners, convened the first World Agroforestry Congress in Orlando, Florida, United States, 30 June 2004. A partnership has been agreed between UNEP-WCMC and ICRAF, and funding is being sought, to support preparation of land degradation maps to assist the strategic targeting of agroforestry and ecological restoration interventions to encourage sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation.

Promoting policies to meet increasing demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services, through sustainable forest management.

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 24 countries provide information on this subject. In some countries, the challenge is one of meeting increasing demand; in others it is that of stimulating demand and encouraging owners to raise their levels of timber harvesting.

The report from Malawi explains that key policy strategies to meet the increasing demand for wood and NTFPs include working with NGOs to involve communities in SFM and agroforestry projects; enlisting the support of other sectors, such as water, energy, and agriculture, in order to incorporate forest related interventions in their programmes; and supporting private sector participation in forest resource creation.

The report from Sudan explains that two-thirds of the population is rural and largely depends on fuel wood as the main source of energy and on round timber for roofing and building of thatched huts. When sizable portions of the country were heavily forested the rural population was able to obtain wood easily; use forests for grazing, wildlife hunting and gathering food in the form of tree leaves, fruits and tubers; and benefit from shade. The rural people traditionally value the forest as a divine gift and have deep religious convictions with regard to trees which call for tree planting and non-removal of trees where they have no rights to them. Nevertheless, the forests experienced severe destruction. This is not because of the lack of appreciation of trees; it is because the increased population needed fuel wood, grazing and land for cultivation in order to survive. In order to help meet the fuelwood deficit, energy alternatives have been promoted, for example by encouraging the use of other biomass alternatives, through the distribution of gas cylinders, and through encouraging the use of brick ovens and traditional bakeries using gas and kerosene instead of firewood and charcoal.

The report from Cambodia states that demand for forest products is increasing as the rural population continues to grow and rapid urbanization is also leading to increased demand for charcoal and other wood products such as furniture and construction material. The recently initiated Forest Management Plans aim to promote SFM while meeting demands for forest products in the country. Since 1999, the Cambodian *Code of Practice for Forest Harvesting* and a number of guidelines have been used to complement the forest policies and regulations. A long-term forest concession management planning and implementation cycle has also been introduced to ensure a more sustainable concession management system.

On the other hand, the report from the Netherlands explains that the government is encouraging forest owners to harvest more timber from woodlands, because increment exceeds yearly harvests. There are also various initiatives to encourage maximum utilisation and minimum wastage of wood; such initiatives include the re-use of construction timber and improved utilisation of small timber grades, for example by gluing, and the recycling of waste paper.

In its report, Turkey explains that production of industrial wood could be increased without threatening its sustainability. There is less information about NTFPs and in recent years more priority has been given to their sustainable production.

The report from Russia states future development of the forest sector in Russia requires investments in transport and industrial infrastructure. Despite the apparent availability of forest in Russia, its industrial development is not always economically viable: most of the processing capacity is concentrated in the European part of Russia (where much forest is already subject to felling plans); the main stocks of forest are beyond the Urals where the wood processing industry is underdeveloped, except for individual regions. Accordingly, there are high, and increasing, costs of transport.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that several CPF members are partners of the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration. This Global Partnership is a network of Governments, organizations, communities and individuals and is organizing a workshop on forest landscape restoration, to be held in early 2005; several regional workshops were held in 2003 under the umbrella of the Global Partnership. IUFRO organized the international Conference on Restoration of Boreal and Temperate Forests in April/May 2002.

In relation to secondary forests a number of CPF members collaborated with other partners to organize a workshop on *Tropical Secondary Forest Management for Francophone Africa: reality and perspective*, held in Douala, Cameroon, in November 2003. In 2002, FAO organized a workshop on tropical secondary forest management for anglophone Africa in Kenya; and a conference on forest rehabilitation *Bringing back the forests: policies and practices for degraded lands and forests* in Malaysia. ITTO, in collaboration with others, has prepared the ITTO Guidelines on the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests, and also convened six sub-regional workshops to promote their use. A second phase of the work will develop a field manual for restoration practitioners and conduct ten national-level workshops to introduce the manual and to further promote the implementation of the Guidelines.

Conclusions

Action taken in countries where this is an issue includes forest restoration through natural regeneration, the establishment of plantations and agroforestry projects. There are many examples of successful establishment of plantations that can take the pressure off natural forests, without causing undesirable social or environmental side-effects, provided suitable land is available and there are the necessary financial and human resources for effective establishment and maintenance. Innovative approaches have included working closely with communities to develop solutions, such as agroforestry systems, which can help meet future needs for wood and non timber forest products within the context of broader livelihood requirements.

13. Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs

Baseline information

This was a substantive item at the third session. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Secretary-General on maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs (E/CN.18/2003/8).

The summary of this Report states that:

“The [IPF/IFF] proposals for action ... concerning maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs are directed towards assessing long-term trends in forest goods and services and national efforts to develop policies and strategies for sustained production of a wide range of forest products and services.

“There has been a steady development of forest sector planning efforts at the national level, complemented by regional and global outlook studies for the forest sector. National forest programmes in many countries increasingly are reflecting a wide range of forest values. Similarly, there has been an evolution in the approach to long-term forest sector projections and outlook studies, incorporating a broad array of forest goods and services and emphasizing countries’ ability to shape their future through the policy decisions made today. While there has been significant progress in regional and global forest sector outlook studies, thorough long-term sector analyses are less developed at the national level. The degree to which long-term, comprehensive forest sector assessments contributes to sustainable forest management will depend on their further development at the national level and the extent to which the relevant results of regional and global studies can be incorporated into national planning processes. Effective implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action can be enhanced by improving the information base for effective forest sector planning, strengthening institutional structures and planning capabilities, and devoting adequate financial resources to planning and implementation....”

Following discussion of this item, the Forum adopted resolution 3/3.

Harmonizing or making compatible policy frameworks that collectively address the full range of forest values

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 35 countries provide information on this subject.

Most reports stress the importance of cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation, and several of them state that maintenance of forest cover to satisfy present and future needs can only be achieved only by taking account of the interests of wide range of economic, ecological and social interests. These need include the needs of those whose livelihoods depend upon forest-products (both wood and NTFPs) as well as other interests, such as conservation and recreation. However, this is not always easy, especially where forests are of relatively little direct economic and political importance. Decentralisation policies can further complicate matters. It can also be difficult to address the full range of forest values in a single process because forest policies can have complex and interlinked economic, social and environmental implications. For example, the report from El Salvador highlights linkages with energy strategy: fuelwood accounts for about 50% of energy needs, but it is in increasingly short supply – but the option of promoting use of propane gas has major implications in terms of economics, infrastructure and distribution networks.

Many of the reports also refer to the importance of taking account of international commitments, for example in relation to the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. To take one example from many, the report from Malawi explains how various recent policy frameworks and strategies address the full range of forest values; the main ones are the National Forestry Programme (2001), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2004), UNCCD Country Reports and Action Plans, the Malawi National Strategy for Sustainable Development and the Environmental Policy.

Some reports discuss the institutional arrangements for achieving cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation and the difficulties associated with bringing together the different policies. To some extent, the linkages are influenced by administrative arrangements; for example, in Denmark the same Ministry handles both forest and nature policy. The report from Indonesia states that an Interdepartmental Forum on Forests was established in 2001 to improve coordination in handling policy priorities in forest-related matters, but it needs a proper secretariat to support and facilitate its work plan.

Many reports highlight the importance of the process of developing nfps as a critical tool for promoting dialogue that can help harmonise and make compatible policy frameworks that collectively address the full range of forest values. For example, the report from Togo identifies the different priorities of the nfp, the plan to combat desertification, the biodiversity strategy, the strategy for agricultural and rural development and public health, energy and industrial development policies. The report from Senegal highlights the importance of decentralisation in coordination of planning at the regional level, within the context of national policies on forests, environment and poverty reduction. The report from Mauritius illustrates how governments may set the strategic direction for forest development by having a clear view of the role of forests: in this case, timber production on the island is being gradually phased out in favour of recreation and eco-tourism within the island's forests.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that there has been a steady development of forest sector planning efforts at the national level, complemented by regional and global outlook studies for the forest sector. There has been an evolution in the approach to these studies, reflecting concern for a broad array of forest goods and services.

Recent efforts to assess long-term trends in national supply and demand for wood, non-wood forest products and services

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 29 countries provide information on this subject.

Some countries, including for example European countries, Canada, the USA and New Zealand, have well-developed methods for forecasting long-term trends for national supply of wood, and have been broadening their approach to encompass NTFPs. At the same time, sophisticated methodologies have been developed to long-term trends in demand, taking into account a wide range of economic and social variables. Reports from these countries also acknowledge the importance of trading relationships to deal with national surpluses or deficits. The Republic of Korea, for example, expects self-sufficiency in timber to rise from 6% to 30% (by 2030) but will rely on imports to meet the balance in demand.

A number of countries (including, for example, Benin, El Salvador and Malawi) refer to studies that highlighted the implications of serious current or future wood shortages.

There are also countries (such as Cambodia and Lesotho) that have not carried out any assessment of long-term trends in the supply and demand of wood and non-timber forest products, or state that their assessments have been limited. Pakistan is currently undertaking studies to collect and analyze baseline data on demand and supply of wood and wood products.

Some particular challenges are identified in the reports. One is the impact of external factors: examples given included changing patterns of demand for tourism and landscape development; and the effect on wood fuel demand of the availability and price of alternative fuels. Another is the problem of poor financial returns from the sale of wood, leading to lower wood production and lower revenues, and so threatening the capacity to manage forests for other benefits.

Some reports refer to proactive work being undertaken to stimulate demand through wood promotion campaigns. In Finland the government has launched programmes to increase the consumption of wood based products as environmentally friendly and sustainably produced products, and the report from the UK refers to a similar initiative.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that some CPF members are involved in preparing outlook studies for the forest sector, such as the FAO global forest sector outlook studies (including the Global Forest Products Outlook Study, the Global Fibre Supply Model and the Global Woodfuel Outlook Study) and the UNEP Global Environmental Outlook. FAO also assists developing countries through regional forest sector outlook studies, regional C&Is processes, and, along with other partners, through the National Forest Programme Facility. In 2003, FAO published the Forestry Outlook Study for Africa and is conducting similar exercises in Europe (2004) the Near East and Western Asia region and Latin America and the Caribbean. FAO also publishes the *State of the World's Forests*, the *Yearbook of Forest Products* and market reviews. In collaboration with FAO, the UNECE Timber Committee produces European Forest Outlook Studies and reviews of markets for forest products.

Conclusions

Nfps have become vital tools for promoting dialogue with other sectors and increasing understanding of the benefits that forests bring. Several reports highlight the importance of this in developing national strategies that reflect the full range of forest values, including their contribution to the livelihoods of forest-dependent people. Emphasis is given to the role of cross-sectoral integration and the need for reliable data. While many countries have well-developed methods for forecasting long-term supply and demand trends, other countries are yet to carry out such assessments. Generally, the existing mechanisms for assessing long-term trends are most sophisticated in those countries where the problems are least acute. The reports note the need to take account of external factors, such as changing patterns of demand and the impact of substitutes, when assessing future needs. In addition, some reports highlight the proactive work that has been undertaken to stimulate demand for wood as a sustainably produced, renewable, raw material through wood promotion campaigns.

14. Financial resources

Baseline information

Finance is one of the means of implementation, and was on the agenda of the second, third and fourth sessions of the Forum. Financing for sustainable forest management was addressed during the high-level ministerial segment of the second session (see **E/2002/42 (E/CN.18/2002/14)**, paragraph 46, subparagraphs 25-32) and in paragraphs 12-17 and 52-54 of the Report of the Secretary-General to UNFF3 on Economic aspects of forests (**E/CN.18/2003/7**). Paragraphs 52-54 of **E/CN.18/2003/7** state that:

“Global investment trends indicate that the volume of ODA financing is at a level of about US\$ 1.5 billion and may rise to US\$ 1.75-US\$ 2 billion, but will still be in significant shortfall in respect of the figure of US\$ 5.67 billion estimated by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Direct public sector investments in forestry (though still a fairly large proportion of the total) are generally on a declining trend in most countries. Moreover, though private sector investments (both domestic and foreign direct investments) in forests are on the increase, this investment is targeted at a relatively small number of countries.

“A long-term strategy to meet financing requirements for sustainable forest management, therefore, is to encourage *responsible* private investment flows into the forest sector by creating a favourable climate for such investments. At the same time, investments leading to poor management or use of illegally sourced timber should be discouraged. This can be done by addressing issues such as poor legislative and policy frameworks, inefficient institutions, excessive regulation, corruption, and unstable macroeconomic regimes. In addition, there is a need to develop a wide range of innovative financing and incentive mechanisms to give the private sector more investment options.

“In order to avoid underproduction of public goods, collective actions are called for in developing and putting into effect market-based tools to foster the private provision of public goods. This can be done through public-private partnerships. However, the private sector may not always be in a position to provide for the sustainable production of public goods, and the role of public funding will remain important.”

Paragraphs 12-16 of **E/CN.18/2003/7** state that:

“Inadequate rent capture decreases government revenues, poses as a disguised subsidy and increases inefficiency...

“Even though there have been attempts to increase rent capture ... a recent World Bank estimate suggests that the failure to collect taxes and royalties from legal forest operations amounts to US\$ 5 billion per annum worldwide. This is more than three times the level of official development assistance (ODA) financing for sustainable forest management.

“Development of proper forest resource accounting and development of proper forest valuation systems are necessary measures towards improving rent capture, increasing efficiency, removing concealed subsidies and preventing windfall gains ...

“Recent years have seen an increasing trend towards developing market-based instruments for environmental protection and production of ecosystem services. A survey suggests that, worldwide, there are close to 300 ongoing cases of actual and/or proposed payments for environmental services. Promising schemes — for example, tradable development rights in Brazil, payments for carbon, water and biodiversity in Costa Rica, conservation concessions to protect biodiversity in Guyana, and protection of the Catskill Mountains to conserve the water supply of New York City in the United States of America — are emerging at all levels.

“The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC and the CBD have been instrumental in highlighting the issue of “payments for environmental services from forests” through the emphasis on the role of forests in sequestering carbon. Also, the GEF, including its recently launched Operational Programme for Integrated

Ecosystem Management, offers opportunities to promote SFM by augmenting financial flows for ecosystem services.”

Further baseline information is provided in the Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on the Finance and Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies (E/CN.18/2004/5); following discussion of this Report, at its fourth session, the Forum adopted Decision 4 /2. Baseline information on finance is also provided in background documents considered by the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Finance and Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies, including the Note by the Secretariat on Financing for sustainable forest management: current challenges in the changed financial environment (E/CN.18/AC.2/2003/2); the Report of the Secretary -General on Implementation of and follow-up to commitments and agreements made at the International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, Mexico, in March 2002 (A/58/216); the report of the *International workshop on financial mechanisms and sources of finance for sustainable forestry*, held in Pretoria, South Africa on 3-7 June 1996; the report of the *Workshop on Financing of Sustainable Forest Management*, organised in Croydon, United Kingdom from 11-13 October 1999; and the report of the *International Meeting of Experts on Financing Sustainable Forest Management*, held in Oslo, Norway on 22-25 January 2001.

Information from countries

The *Guidelines* for voluntary national reports did not include any separate sections on financial resources, but countries were invited to provide relevant information on finance (as well as other means of implementation) in relation to implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

Many of the reports from the least developed countries and countries in transition stress the adverse impact of financial constraints on the implementation of their strategies to promote SFM. Some emphasise the difficulties arising from falling revenues as timber prices have fallen. For example, the report from Russia stresses the low income from timber revenues, stating that as a whole income from forestry in Russia does not cover costs and adding that the financial condition of the timber industry complex and is closely interconnected with the ability to finance SFM. A primary goal is to increase the profitability of forestry increasing revenues. Other reports point to the reduced flow of ODA to the forest sector.

Countries also identify positive ways in which they are responding to the challenge of financing SFM. Hungary refers to an NGO initiative on low input silviculture. Lithuania explains that its forest policy promotes investments in more efficient forest products production, marketing and export of wood products. Other approaches include forest fiscal reform to generate increased harvesting revenues; charging for environmental services; developing new business opportunities such as ecotourism; and the use of more innovative mechanisms such as debt-for-nature swaps and use of the Clean Development Mechanism to pay for carbon sequestration through afforestation. The importance of providing the right enabling environment for private sector investment is also recognised.

A number of countries benefiting from international support give details of individual projects, but note that – in general terms - donors have been relatively unwilling to support projects relating to the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. The situation is particularly difficult in some countries; for example, the report from Togo explains that the implementation of campaigns to combat forest degradation has been handicapped by the suspension of cooperation from most financial partners.

More generally, the emphasis of ODA has shifted away from individual sectoral support, towards broader programmes linked with national priorities. The report from the UK states that for many years its international development programme has focused on the need to ensure that forests are managed and developed in ways that support sustainable development and poverty eradication; over time, the nature of this support has changed and primary attention is now given to addressing policy, institutional, legal and governance issues. The report from Finland notes that some 6% of Finnish ODA is allocated to the forest sector and that from Germany states that implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action is one of the focuses of its economic cooperation and development policy. It is also noted that projects are often selected according to geographical priorities and other factors such as good governance, democracy and human rights.

The importance of funding from NGOs and other voluntary sources such as trust funds and foundations is also recognised, although some reports state that their ad hoc nature can make it difficult to plan their effective use. A number of reports state that ODA is often channelled through NGOs, community based organisations, schools and other development partners.

Information from CPF members

In their joint report, CPF members highlighted the development of a *Sourcebook on Funding for Sustainable Forest Management*. The Sourcebook is intended to facilitate information dissemination on available funding to assist developing countries. It is an interactive on-line database containing several hundreds on sources of external financing (including bilateral and multilateral development agencies and foundations).

The CPF joint report also explains that GEF is the financial mechanism for the CBD, the UNCCD and the UNFCCC, with UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank serving as GEF implementing agencies. As at June 2004, GEF had provided US\$ 822 million in support of projects that address threats to forests through its Operational Program on Forest Ecosystems. This funding leveraged nearly US \$1.2 billion in co-financing. Additional financing is directed to forest conservation through projects supported under other GEF biodiversity Operational Programs, particularly the Operational Program on Mountain Ecosystems which has received US\$ 440 million of GEF support. Through Operational Program 15, Sustainable Land Management, the GEF is providing approximately US\$ 177 million to support forest management. The Global Mechanism under the UNCCD will focus on the mobilization of financial resources for co-funding projects on land degradation, including those related to the GEF Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management. GEF and the World Bank are the Focal Agencies for the thematic element of financial resources.

Since the adoption of its revised forest strategy, World Bank Group lending for forest management, conservation and development has grown from US\$61 million in 2001 to an estimated US\$619 million for 2005.

ITTO continues to mobilize financial resources for the sustainable management of tropical forests through its policy work and project activities. Since its establishment in late 1986, ITTO has mobilized some US\$250 million to fund more than 500 projects and activities through its own mechanisms, including the ITTO Special Account and the Bali Partnership Fund.

Between 2002 and 2003, FAO contributed \$31 million to forest activities through its regular programme and \$62 million through its field programme, including trust funds and technical cooperation and emergency projects. FAO's normative work on forest finance examines the ways that forestry policies can use financial and economic forces to improve forest management. At the national level, FAO provides technical guidance, tools and analyses, for example on forest valuation; economic analysis of forestry policies; trends in costs and prices; and forest revenue systems. At the local level, FAO helps analyze costs and benefits of forestry projects and policies and valuation of non-market goods and services; provides training and guidelines for economic appraisal; and helps establish community-based enterprises for revenue generation in Africa and Latin America. FAO also supported a workshop on financial mechanisms for SFM in Southern Cone countries held in March 2004, leading to a project for the whole Latin America and the Caribbean region.

Conclusions

CPF members, such as FAO, ITTO and the World Bank continue to mobilize financial resources for the sustainable management of forests. Information about sources of finance has been made available through the CPF *Sourcebook on Funding for Sustainable Forest Management*. Several countries explicitly recognise the need to provide an investment climate conducive to attracting funds, and some report on innovative approaches to financing sustainable forest management, including securing access to funds from the voluntary sector. A number of countries identify other responses to financial challenges, for example through efficiency improvements and adopting low input silviculture. Some reports note,

however, that poor financial returns from forests can threaten the capacity to manage them for other benefits. It is clear from many reports that financing of sustainable forest management, and payment for non-market outputs, remains a critical factor for achieving successful implementation of IPF/IFF proposals. Furthermore, reports note that in future access to official development assistance is likely to depend increasingly upon the identification of forest-related programmes as national priorities within broader national development plans.

15. International trade and sustainable forest management

Baseline information

Trade is a common item at sessions of the Forum. Baseline information is provided in the Note by the Secretary-General on trade and sustainable forest management (E/CN.18/2002/5), considered at the second session. It was updated in the Report of the Secretary-General on economic aspects of forests (E/CN.18/2003/7, paragraphs 20-30) considered at the third session, which states that:

“The global value of trade in forest products (roundwood, sawnwood, panels, pulp and paper) is currently US\$ 133 billion, with paper products accounting for about half of the total...

“Forest products exports account for less than 10 per cent of industrial roundwood production, while about 30 per cent of paper and paperboard produced is exported. However, international trade is concentrated in a few (mostly developed) regions...

“Market access for forest products has improved considerably in recent years as a result of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, which reduced tariffs and tariff escalation on forest products. However, non-tariff barriers such as restricting imports of so-called unsustainably produced forest products, especially at the subnational level, may affect market access for many forest products. Furthermore, consensus has yet to be reached on issues such as the removal of unilateral measures (for example, export bans imposed by producer countries and boycotts imposed in consumer countries) to the extent that they are inconsistent with international agreements...

“Promoting the use of lesser-used species can be a powerful way to increase the value of forest resources, reduce reliance on traditional species, put incomes into the hands of the poor, and foster sustainable forest management in general...

“As market-based tools to promote sustainable forest management and to promote trade in forest products from sustainably managed forest resources, voluntary certification of forest management and labelling of forest products have made considerable progress in recent years. To date, the area of forests certified under various schemes worldwide is estimated at about 130 million hectares, compared with a mere 5 million hectares in 1998. Of this, tropical forest countries account for about 10 million hectares.

“However, the existence of a number of certification schemes calls for efforts towards their harmonization, and there are several ongoing processes aiming at compatibility of different schemes, such as the Mutual Recognition Framework. Ongoing certification initiatives with provisions for group certification and proposals for introducing stepwise or modular certification (to provide more time to achieve best practices) are especially important in enabling small and medium-sized enterprises and indigenous peoples’ producer groups to participate fully in certification schemes.

“The problem of illegal trade in forest products was raised at IPF, and has become predominant in various international forums in the last few years. Illegal harvest and trade of forest products often involve unsustainable forest practices, increase the cost of forest management and accentuate market failures. At the global level, the World Bank has estimated that the annual market value of losses from illegal cutting of forests exceeds US\$ 10 billion, eight times the total ODA flows into sustainable forest management.”

Following discussion of this item at the third session, the Forum adopted resolution 3/1.

Efforts to reduce negative impacts of trade

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 18 countries provide information on this subject.

A number of reports point out that international trade is regulated through WTO by a well-established legal framework, with market access for forest products. Some also support further liberalisation of the multilateral trading regime, and multilateral efforts to make trade and environment mutually supportive. Some reports also called for the removal of forestry tariffs and of non-tariff barriers to trade.

A number of countries express concern about trade in forest products from potentially unsustainable sources. In addition to noting the environmental consequences, they explain that this means that their domestic industry has to compete with lower priced imports derived from unsustainable harvesting operations. Reference is made to voluntary labelling and voluntary declarations of origin as a mechanism for countering such negative impacts of trade. A number of reports from exporting countries explain that they have taken measures to ban or restrict the export of certain forest products in order to promote SFM. Several countries stressed the importance of taking action through internationally coordinated and harmonised approaches

Another potentially negative impact of trade arises from the risk of unintentionally importing damaging pests and diseases. Those countries that refer to this issue also note, however, that this issue is being addressed through existing mechanisms.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that ITTO and FAO are collaborating on several initiatives related to trade and sustainable forest management, including an *Impact assessment of forest products trade in the promotion of sustainable forest management*, which aims to identify the dynamics between trade and forest management and to analyze market forces in order to work more effectively towards sustainable livelihoods and to sustain the forest resource base. FAO also organized an expert consultation *Trade and sustainable forest management: impacts and interactions* in Rome in February 2003.

Participation in forest certification and labelling schemes and work toward mutual recognition and comparability of such schemes

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 29 countries provide information on this subject.

Countries emphasise that certification is a voluntary market-based tool and refer to a number of different certification programmes, including the American Forest and Paper Association's Sustainable Forest Initiative, the Canadian Standards Association's National Sustainable Forest Management Standards, Forest Stewardship Council certification, ISO 14001 and Pan European Forest Certification. Several countries also refer to the development of a national certification standard. In addition, several countries give details of the forest area certified under one or more of these programmes and of associated chain of custody certification.

Certification can help exporting countries to demonstrate that their forest products come from sustainably managed sources; for example, the report from New Zealand states that certification is an important step for future marketing and for providing markets with the assurance that New Zealand forest management is ecologically sound and socially beneficial while maintaining economic viability.

Some countries also explain that they have launched guidelines on public procurement aimed at ensuring that wood products are sourced from sustainably managed forests. For example, recent Danish guidelines on public procurement of tropical timber recommend the use of internationally agreed criteria for SFM as providing the basis for assessing compliance. The UK has established an advisory service to help government buyers to evaluate evidence about the legal origin of supplies and claims of SFM.

Other points noted in reports include the importance of commitments by major retailers to sell wood and wood products with particular certification labels; the potential variation in the way in which standards are applied by auditors; the increasing costs of certification (including the process of certifying the forests themselves, the chain of custody certification and the costs of work needed to address the issues raised during the certification process); concern that only a comparatively small percentage of wood and wood products are certified; and concern that efforts to achieve mutual recognition of certification schemes have so far proved unsuccessful.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that ITTO has conducted three regional workshops on phased approaches to certification and has finalized a study on the potential role of phased approaches to certification in tropical timber-producing countries. Follow-up work on phased approaches to certification is being undertaken. In addition, FAO has facilitated dialogue between international organizations and forest certification schemes.

Efforts to reduce illegal trade in wood or non-forest products

Information from countries

In their voluntary reports, 29 countries provide information on this subject. These countries view illegal trade as a serious problem and most refer to the FLEG/FLEGT processes, stressing the need for international collaboration to tackle illegal trade.

The FLEG/FLEG processes were initiated by the international community in recognition of the seriousness of the problem of illegal trade and the fact that, like international terrorism, money-laundering and corruption, it has no national identity. The basic activity of the FLEG/FLEGT processes is to strengthen and harmonise practice and apply international and national law correctly.

The report from Russia states that the growth of illegal timber cutting (estimated at about 7% of all felling) is causing significant damage to the national economy, as well as its forests. Such illegal activity includes discrepancies in harvesting volumes, incorrect procedures for allocating and demarcating harvesting sites, over-cutting, understating prices, fraudulent documentation and by-passing check points on the border. It is concentrated in the frontier regions of the Far East, the Northwest and Siberia. Institutional reform, begun in 2002, is aimed at strengthening the federal authority. The report adds that the fight against illegal timber cuttings, and associated corruption and money-laundering, has been a constant item on the agenda of G8 sessions since 1997. It refers to a WWF study which has shown that illegal felling, transportation and trade occurs in more than 70 countries of the world (both advanced and developing), and at all levels of economic life, from global down to regional, national and local. The report also suggests that a global monitoring system for forest trade obligations could help curb the growth of illegal timber cuttings.

Another country giving details of illegal trade is Cambodia, which has made strong efforts to prevent illegal forest and wildlife activities since 1998 and whose law enforcement agencies have logged nearly 4000 cases. Both Russia and Cambodia report the murder of officials employed in tackling illegal activity.

A number of reports refer to the importance of effective administration systems in controlling illegal activity, but note that this depends also on the human factor – the responsibility of officials at all levels – and resources. Malawi reports, for example, that export licences are the main tool for reducing illegal trade, but that this system requires strengthening, which is difficult in a country with extensive borders that cannot be adequately manned or monitored.

Several countries describe the tracking systems they have in place to verify the source and legality of imported timber, stressing the importance of building long-term business relationships with known partners, and avoiding long supply chains with several middlemen. Some distinguish between large-scale commercial operations and smaller-scale illegal activity, stimulated by high levels of unemployment and economic desperation, suggesting that, in these latter cases, rural development measures may be more effective than the imposition of repressive controls.

Information from CPF members

The joint CPF report states that ITTO has been taking the lead on trade issues within the CPF and continues to promote international trade in tropical timber, including trade from sustainably managed sources. In 2004, FAO concluded a comprehensive analysis on *Impact Assessment of Forest Products Trade in the Promotion of Sustainable Forest Management*. Several CPF members, including the World Bank, IUCN, CIFOR, ITTO and FAO, have also been actively involved in FLEG processes.

Conclusions

Actions to combat illegal trade have included the initiatives taken under the various FLEG processes. Reports also recognise the important role of the WTO and the continuing need for multilateral efforts to make trade and environment mutually supportive. Forest certification can help exporters demonstrate that their forest products come from sustainably managed sources and many countries report considerable progress, often associated with the development of national certification standards. Some countries have also published guidelines on the public procurement of timber from sustainably managed forests.

16. International cooperation in capacity-building, and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support SFM

Baseline information

Capacity building and the transfer of environmentally sound technologies are amongst the means of implementation considered at each session of the Forum. Baseline information is provided in the Report of the Ad Hoc Expert Group on the Finance and Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies (E/CN.18/2004/5), considered by the Forum at its fourth session. Relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the Forum include resolutions 2/2, 3/1, 3/2, 3/3 and 3/4 and decision 4/2.

Baseline information on the transfer of environmentally sound technologies is also provided by the Reports the *Workshop on the Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies for Mangrove Forests*, held in Managua, Nicaragua 3-5 March 2003; the report of the *Conference on Technology Transfer and Capacity Building* was held in Trondheim, Norway, 23-27 June 2003; and the *Global Workshop on transfer of environmentally sound technologies and capacity building for sustainable forest management*, held in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo, 24-27 February 2004.

Information from countries

The *Guidelines* for voluntary reports invited respondents to provide information on international cooperation, including development and implementation of partnerships.

In their voluntary reports, 30 countries provide information on this subject. Most reports refer to countries' involvement in international processes, including that of UNFF itself, the work of other CPF members and (at the regional level) partnerships such as the Amazonian Cooperation Treaty Organisation; the Andean Community of Nations; the Asia Forest Partnership; ASEAN; the Central American Alliance for Sustainable Development; the Baltic 21 process; the Convention of Central American Forests; the EU; the

G8; MCPFE; SADC and other C&I processes. A number also highlight their involvement in country-led and organisation led initiatives held in support of UNFF and mention their support for participation of representatives of developing countries at UNFF events. In its report the Russian Federation states that, on the international scene, it supports the prompt development and agreement of a convention on forests, to regulate the international relations with regard to forests, and to strengthen and facilitate efforts to promote SFM through existing international agreements.

Collectively the reports also give numerous examples of bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation projects. Examples include:

- in Benin, cooperation with Germany on teak management; and with Japan on remote sensing to monitor forest cover;
- in Brazil, cooperation with Finland to support nfp implementation, to promote SFM and rural development strategies, to support small and medium size forest owners, and to promote research and forest information systems; and with Italy on emergency fire control in tropical forests;
- in Bulgaria, cooperation with Germany on forest restitution and management; with Switzerland on a Bulgarian-Swiss Forestry Programme; and with Germany, Switzerland, FAO, UNDP and the World Bank) on the establishment of the Bulgarian nfp and strategy;
- in Burkino Faso, cooperation with Finland on integrated forest fire management;
- in Cambodia, cooperation with Germany on forest cover assessment, nfp development, consultation processes, community-based management and integrated planning approaches; with Belgium on participatory natural resource management for agroforestry; with Denmark on tree seeds; and with Japan on capacity building;
- in six Central African countries (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo), cooperation with the USA and other partners through the Congo Basin Forest Partnership, launched at WSSD, aimed at promoting SFM, economic development and improved local governance;
- in Central American countries, cooperation with the USA (CONCAUSA) inter alia to promote conservation of biodiversity, to prevent and fight forest fires, to strengthen reforestation programs, to establish woodfuel plantations, and to form associations between the systems of national forests of Central America and the USA;
- in China, the Green China Project, also involving Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Austria, Poland and Hungary; cooperation with Finland on forest certification, environmental education, the effect of afforestation on carbon sequestration and nurseries; cooperation with New Zealand; and a bilateral memorandum of understanding between China and Sweden;
- in Colombia, cooperation with Germany; and with the Netherlands;
- in Indonesia, cooperation with Finland on forest industry development;
- cooperation between the Republic of Korea and China, Indonesia, Mongolia, Myanmar and Vietnam on restoration of degraded forest; China and Mongolia on preventing yellow dust storms and combating desertification; with Indonesia on combating illegal logging;
- in Lao PDR, cooperation with Finland on community forestry;
- in Lesotho, cooperation with Germany on forest development; and with Kenya on social forestry;

- in Liberia, cooperation with the USA to support post-conflict evaluation to reform and rehabilitate the forest sector;
- in Lithuania, cooperation with Sweden on woodfuel, woodland habitat inventory and advisory services for private forest owners;
- in Madagascar, cooperation with Germany, Switzerland and the USA on community management of state-owned forests;
- in Mexico, cooperation with Finland on preparing and implementing a Strategic Forestry Plan 2005;
- in Mozambique, cooperation with Finland on national forest inventories and integrated forest fire management;
- in Namibia, cooperation with Finland on nfp development, national forest inventories, forest conservation, community forestry and integrated forest fire management;
- in Pacific Island states, cooperation with New Zealand;
- in Peru, cooperation with Finland on forest conservation and community forestry; and debt reduction supported by the USA to fund tropical forest conservation;
- in Russia, cooperation with Finland on SFM and biodiversity conservation (including education of employees in forest organisations); and with Sweden on forest sector cooperation;
- in Serbia and Montenegro, cooperation with Canada on development of a public relations strategy and expertise; with Norway on development of the Serbian forest sector; and with Luxembourg on forest management and planning, and seed and nursery production, in Montenegro;
- cooperation between Sweden and a number of African countries on *Lessons learned on SFM in Africa*;
- in Tanzania, cooperation with Denmark on agroforestry and the development of sustainable strategies for the forestry sector based on open and participatory dialogue; and with Finland on nfp development, forest conservation, community forestry and joint forest management involving rural communities in the conservation of protected forest areas;
- in Turkey, cooperation with Finland on trade in forest products and forest sector technology, on nfp implementation and to support joint commercial projects;
- under the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, the USA has also provided debt reduction to provide funds for tropical forest conservation in Panama, El Salvador, Belize, the Philippines and Bangladesh. The USA also launched the Global Conservation Program as a partnership with six leading conservation organizations to protect forests with globally significant areas of biodiversity.
- in Venezuela, cooperation with Canada, the USA, Chile, Spain and France on forest fires;
- in Vietnam, cooperation with Finland on nfp development and community forestry;
- in Zambia, cooperation with Finland on nfp development.

This list is of course incomplete and simply gives a flavour of current activity. The report from Germany states for example that the German government supports about 310 forest projects in 66 countries.

Information from CPF members

The joint report from CPF members states that international cooperation in capacity-building and the transfer of technology is an essential part of member organizations' work in support of sustainable forest management; a number of country reports refer, for example, to actions supported by GEF. Other capacity building projects and activities currently being undertaken by CPF members include UNDP's Capacity 2015 support to developing countries in capacity-building related to socio-economic development; and UNEP support, in partnership with FAO and IUCN, for developing countries on technical issues related to the UNFCCC negotiations on modalities for forest Clean Development Mechanism projects.

In addition, FAO, CIFOR and IUCN have collaborated on a series of capacity-building workshops on forests and climate change, especially in Latin America. In 2004, the COP to the CBD adopted a programme of work on technology transfer and cooperation in 2004. This programme aims to promote and facilitate the transfer of and access to technologies from developed to developing countries, in support of the target to achieve a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level by 2010 and also of the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

Some CPF members work on forest extension and supporting research capacity in developing countries. For example, CIFOR and ICRAF help disseminate the results of forest-related research; IUFRO and FAO support regional research networks, and the strengthening of forest education and extension systems.

Conclusions

Reports give numerous examples of bilateral and multilateral cooperation, also noting the significant role of non-governmental organisations and of Partnerships established following the WSSD. In addition, reports make it clear that, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, there is a continuing priority need to address issues of capacity-building and transfer of environmentally sound technologies. While some donor countries still offer specific support for forest-related projects (sometimes within the context of the IPF/IFF proposals), there is a general trend away from this approach. Increasingly, support for forest-related projects is likely to depend upon clearly demonstrating their benefits in terms of achieving broader development goals and contributing to objectives identified in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and similar national programmes.

III. Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests

This part of the Study considers the effectiveness of the IAF in terms of its six principal functions, drawing primarily on the responses to the questionnaire, but also taking account of relevant comments in voluntary reports. For each of the 21 specific criteria, the questionnaire had four sections:

- an overall assessment of the role of the IAF (ranked as “none”, “limited”, “moderate”, “high” or “not applicable”);
- a remarks section;
- an invitation to suggest possible quantifiable benchmarks;
- an assessment of individual activities of the IAF (according to the same ranking scheme as the overall assessment).

Annex IV shows the responses to the quantitative sections of the questionnaire. These responses reveal that, while there is a range of views and it is difficult to draw firm conclusions, particularly as the number of responses is relatively small, the most common assessment is “moderate”.

The following paragraphs summarize, for each specific criterion, the main points made in the remarks section of the questionnaire and record suggestions for quantitative benchmarks. The full text of the remarks and suggestions made in the questionnaire responses is available, in their original languages, on the UNFF website.

A. Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action

Specific criterion (a)(i): The extent to which countries, the CPF and other actors have made progress in implementing the relevant IPF/IFF proposals for action.

Remarks made by countries and EU

In their remarks, the EU and individual countries made the following points:

- National reports to UNFF illustrate that significant activities have and continue to take place regarding IPF/IFF proposals. (Canada)
- The UNFF process, including the proposals for action, has established a frame of reference for developing national forest policy and has encouraged politicians to recognise its importance and relevance. (Colombia, Switzerland)
- There is a good link between the 16 elements and the nfp, so this can form a good basis for evaluating progress. (Colombia, Romania)
- Implementation of different elements depends on internal institutional, legal, political and budgetary factors; it takes time to make necessary changes especially those involving other sectors or sociocultural processes. (Colombia)
- UNFF Sessions on implementation and promotion of IFF/IPF proposal for action from 2002-2004 gave a good opportunity to gather current information on implementation of IFF/IPF proposal for action from leading countries like EU and Australia. (Republic of Korea)
- CPF has done much to support implementation, including the Sourcebook on Financing SFM. (Senegal, Turkey)
- There are still major differences between regions and results in Africa are limited: challenges include provision of information, reporting, public awareness and capacity building. (Senegal).
- Progress has varied greatly: it has been considerable in some areas (for example, nfps; C&I; monitoring, assessment and reporting; concepts and terminology), but more limited in others. The work done by Australia and PROFOR to assist national implementation of proposals for action and to show linkages with the CBD work programme on forest biological diversity is valuable. (Switzerland)
- The resolutions negotiated during UNFF sessions have had very limited impact on the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action, and the UNFF sessions did not prompt action (although they provided opportunity for informal discussions on implementation). (Switzerland)
- Progress has been made in planning, programming, policy development and participative management. (Togo)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF members have made good progress in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals directed to them. Significant progress has been made jointly by CPF in a number of areas specifically addressed by the UNFF and highlighted in several IPF/IFF proposals for action, including: streamlined forest reporting among CPF members to reduce the reporting burden on countries (see (e)(i) for more details); information on sources of funding for SFM to promote establishment of new partnerships and increased funding opportunities for SFM projects in developing countries; the GFIS project, an internet gateway that provides access to information on forest resources at a global scale where users can locate maps, datasets, web resources, journal articles, books and other resources related to forests through a metadata search facility;- harmonization of forest-related definitions (see (b) (iv) for more details).

In addition, many CPF members assist countries directly in implementing IPF/IFF proposals for action. Details of progress in this regard can be found in the annual CPF Frameworks (progress reports), as well as CPF members' individual reports on implementation to IPF/IFF proposals. CPF members appreciate the support of the UNFF Secretariat, which is also servicing as CPF's secretariat.

Remarks made by major groups

The following remarks were made by representatives of major groups:

- Awareness of the proposals for action among young professionals and forest related higher education bodies is low. There is more awareness of forest certification. (Children and Youth)
- Nfps are a constructive tool to translate relevant proposals for action to national level. If carried out in a sound way, nfps give forest owners a useful platform to communicate with stakeholders. While CPF members have shown commitment to work towards common goals, there is need to connect CPF expertise with on the ground problems for effective implementation of the proposals for action. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- There has been limited progress in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action at the national level. Only a few countries have undertaken participatory and systematic assessments of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and other international forest commitments to prioritise them and determine the gaps between the proposals and existing national policies and programmes. Though some countries have compiled (or are formulating) nfps, elements from the IPF/IFF proposals for action are lacking or only given a passing mention and are not integrated into the actionable components of the policy. Evidence of this failure to implement the proposals for action and address the forest crisis is contained in a series of draft country and regional case studies prepared for the UNFF International Expert Meeting on Traditional Forest Related Knowledge, held in December 2004 in Costa Rica. In a number of countries, participation of key rightsholders has been seriously deficient or late in the policy making cycle, and proposals from indigenous and civil society groups have not been addressed. This failure contravenes at least 9 IPF/IFF proposals for action. There is also a disconnect between international forest principles and proposals and national policies and laws, mainly because of lack of national level awareness of international forest principles and commitments resulting from very weak linkage between national and international processes. Furthermore, there are no readily accessible official translations of the IPF/IFF proposals for action into Spanish and French. Lack of effective implementation is demonstrated by the failure of international agencies and countries to coordinate forest policies with other sectoral policies. In many cases, mining, energy, transport and infrastructure policies continue to cause forest loss and degradation. This absence of an effective cross-sectoral approach to forests is in direct contravention of at least 16 IPF/IFF proposals for action which promote a holistic approach. (FERN/FPP)
- More progress was made than is reported, but it has been uneven and cannot be tracked directly to UNFF intervention, even if in fact it was directly a result of UNFF intervention. This leaves UNFF open to charges of being a "talk shop". Other venues which avoid this are smaller, less structured, and seen overall as less powerful (and thus receive less attention). Another problem is that, while forestry experts attend the expert level meetings, more diplomats attend the Forum creating a disconnect - sometimes even within own country delegations - and discontinuity. UNFF has been on the cutting edge of social forestry issues; this is only partly reflected in official outputs, but the nature of the debate and the time dedicated to content represents a major "sea change" in terms of social forestry with consequences in other forums such as MCPFE and ITTA/ITTO. Change occurs only after those involved have become comfortable with a new paradigm. UNFF plays a role in defining the new paradigm. (Workers and Trade Unions)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- MCPFE members have made progress in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals. This progress varies among the European countries and details can be found in national assessment reports. An assessment of the relation between work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF proposals was carried out in the autumn 2000. The assessment identifies the priority issues both for IPF/IFF and by the MCPFE, and consequently also points towards the areas which have not so far been taken up at the pan-European level. This assessment provides a useful tool for action at the national level in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals; it also contributes to the facilitation of global dialogue on forests by pointing out the areas, which have been successfully addressed at the regional level in Europe and in which the MCPFE could contribute by introducing expertise and experiences. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of IPF/IFF proposals for actions implemented. (Romania)
- Number of governments that have instituted capacity building and awareness programmes for their forest department staff regarding the IPF/IFF proposals for action and related international principles and standards on forests. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (a)(ii): The extent to which countries have developed and started to implement national forest programmes or equivalent processes.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- All EU Member States have national forest policy processes though not all are termed national forest programmes. In order to achieve a common view in Europe, there is a *MCPFE approach to National Forest Programmes in Europe*, and European ministers have signed a resolution to strengthen synergies for SFM in Europe through cross-sectoral co-operation and nfps. Most nfps have been reviewed in the past 6 years, taking account of relevant IFF/IPF Proposals for Action and referring to the international dimension beyond national borders. In a number of EU countries operational responsibility for forests lies at the sub-national level. The nfp concept was developed in IFF-IPF: while it has been further developed by governments and CPF members it has not been discussed to any great extent at UNFF sessions. (EU)
- The work of PROFOR and the NFP facility have been critical in preparing and implementing nfps. (Senegal)
- The existence of the IAF may have contributed by legitimising and generating political commitment to develop and implement nfps. The IAF also made possible the establishment of the NFP Facility. (Switzerland, Turkey)
- Financial constraints have severely limited implementation of the nfp. (Togo)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Increasingly, in many countries, the national forest programmes are seen as an effective tool for cross-sectoral and participatory policy making and for translating international forest-related commitments into practice. While most countries have embraced the concept of a nationally-led, stakeholder oriented process of dialogue, implementation of actions oriented to SFM remain constrained by limited domestic financial support and technical capacities.

Some CPF members work directly with countries to support their national forest programme processes. Furthermore, the National Forest Programme Facility, hosted by FAO, currently supports 36 countries in their nfp process by promoting participatory and multi-stakeholder national process; helping integrate SFM into poverty reduction strategies and broad intersectoral processes; and by helping to translate commitments at the international level into national forest policy and planning. PROFOR, hosted at the

World Bank, is working with a number of countries to strengthen national capacity in planning, implementing and financing sustainable forest management and generating knowledge on nfp processes on critical issues.

CIFOR, ITTO, World Bank/PROFOR, FAO and UNFF Secretariat also supported a UNFF Country-and Organization-Led Initiative, the Workshop on Decentralization, Federal Systems in Forestry and National Forest Programmes (May 2004, Interlaken, Switzerland).

Remarks made by major groups

- Most European countries have nfps. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- Many nfps do not include social aspects or aspects relating to trade, consumption and production patterns. Few nfps are easily accessible by the public. (FERN/FPP)
- Only three countries are known to have involved children/youth in the process of developing nfps. (Children/youth)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- The *MCPFE Approach to National Forest Programmes in Europe* was adopted by the MCPFE signatories at the Vienna Ministerial Conference in 2003. A survey of nfps in Europe was conducted in 2004: of 23 countries which responded to the questionnaire, 11 countries are currently formulating their nfps, 13 are implementing and 3 countries are evaluating. The results of the survey were presented at a MCPFE workshop *Exchanging country experiences in the nfp processes on practical application of the MCPFE Approach to nfps in Europe*, held on 22-24 November, in Gdansk, Poland. Participants recognised that the full value of the nfp process is now being recognized and more and more stakeholders are getting familiar and engaged in the nfps. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of countries with nfps prepared in a fully participatory, transparent and cross-sectoral manner, with policy priorities and components consistent with the IPF/IFF proposals for action and other international commitments; a possible benchmark is that 80% of all countries participating in the UNFF process complete an nfp. (FERN/FPP, Switzerland)
- Total area under SFM. (Romania)
- Development of the state and private forest sectors, rural development, afforestation, nature conservation in forests, modern forest protection, sustainable wildlife management, rational development of forest based industries, forest research, education, administration, communication focusing people, forests and forestry. (Hungary)

Specific criterion (a)(iii): The extent to which participation of stakeholders in those programmes and processes has been enhanced.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- The IFF/IPF proposals for action (and other national policies) have had a positive influence on stakeholder participation. Forest owners and users, business entities and environmental and locality-based ngos have been empowered to participate in nfp planning, implementation and review processes in many member States. (EU)
- The MSD allows different groups to offer their perspectives on themes of major importance, and the NFP Facility has supported participation. (Colombia)

- Although the IPF/IFF proposals for action regarding the requirement of multi-stakeholders participation are somewhat limited, they have greatly contributed in institutionalizing stakeholders' participation in nfp and policy formulation processes . (Republic of Korea)
- CPF members promoted stakeholder participation in nfps at national and local level. (Senegal)
- Participation has been unsuccessful, partly because lack of information for stakeholders, failure to disseminate the proposals for action and traditional prejudices to the participatory approach. A broader context for UNFF will facilitate participation. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Many CPF members actively support participatory approaches and effective involvement of civil society in national decision-making. According to information obtained from countries by CPF members, the general trend towards more civil society participation in policy processes has gained momentum, especially with the recently reinforced international commitment to strengthen the role of forest sector in poverty alleviation and rural development. Nonetheless, there are variations in the extent to which countries have managed to effectively include and engage all stakeholder groups throughout the entire national forest programme process, from development to implementation.

Remarks made by major groups

- The MSD is a trustbuilding and highly useful experience; support by the UNFF secretariat is encouraging. The MSD network is overrepresented by the Northern hemisphere. It would be helpful if Southern hemisphere stakeholder representatives could be encouraged to contribute their knowledge and expertise to the MSD network. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- A review undertaken in preparation for the organisation-led initiative in support of UNFF5 on *Traditional Forest-related Knowledge and the Implementation of Related International Commitments* has revealed that in most countries reviewed, participation of rightsholders and other interested parties such as indigenous peoples, local communities and civil society organisations in IPF/IFF implementation processes or nfp processes has been seriously defective, perfunctory, late or minimal. (FERN/FPP)
- One outstanding problem is the near-absence of women in policymaking roles and processes. Although there are some hints that this may be beginning to change, there is still a long way to go. The importance of having women play significant roles in programmes and implementation is now well recognised in many countries, yet few still provide spaces for their voices to be heard in forestry institutions. Positive examples are coming from Canada, Scandinavian countries and with rare cases from other countries such as Portugal and Brazil. (Women)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- At a an Expert Level Meeting, held in Gdansk, Poland, on 22-24 November 2004 an overall tendency was noted of a new culture of discussion taking over from the previous traditional top-down forest policy planning. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Establishment of consultative bodies; (EU)
- Number of stakeholders identified as participants in these programmes and processes, including the determination of priorities and their own contribution to implementation. (Colombia, Romania)

- Number of nfp and related processes that are endorsed as genuinely participatory by representative organisations of indigenous peoples, local communities, civil society and by NGOs. (FERN/FPP)
- Number of national draft nfps made available for public comment (with adequate time for informed scrutiny) on websites and through pro-active dissemination of hard copies of the relevant documents in the correct languages. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (a)(iv): The extent to which the IAF has facilitated and promoted countries' implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, focusing on the means of implementation (finance, transfer of environmentally sound technologies and capacity-building) as well as the relevant common items.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- The primary influence of the IAF has been on forest policy, and – indirectly - on means of implementation of forest policy (for example through EU financing of forest-related rural development measures requires proposed actions to be coherent with nfps). UNFF has yet to consider the AHEG report on FINTEST substantively. (EU)
- While the IAF focuses much of its attention on impediments to implementation in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, means of implementation (such as financial and human resources, technology, knowledge and know how) are important in all countries. Resource allocation among public goals must reflect overall national priorities, and the allocation of resources for forests is a political decision. (Canada)
- UNFF sessions (and the resolutions and decisions) have made no significant contribution. (Norway, Switzerland)
- Priorities in Africa include transmission of information and the reinforcement of intellectual and human capacity. (Senegal)
-
- UNFF meetings should give more emphasis to FINTEST. The role of CPF is important in helping to identify financial resources. (Venezuela national report).

Remarks made in joint CPF response

UNFF has facilitated a dialogue on the means of implementation in order to promote countries' implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. CPF members have supported and actively participated in some the avenues for this dialogue, including the UNFF AHEG on FINTEST in December 2003, as well as at the country- and organization-led initiatives in support of UNFF, such as on *Financing Sustainable Forest Management* (January 2001, Oslo, Norway) and *Global Workshop on Transfer of Environmental Sound Technologies and Capacity Building for Sustainable Forest Management* (February 2004, Brazzaville, Congo). Capacity building is an integral and extensive part of many CPF members' work, especially those that work in the field.

Remarks by major groups

- Implementation of most proposals for action is limited and it is unclear to what extent the IAF has facilitated or promoted implementation. At UNFF4, most governments agreed that the main problem with implementation is the lack of necessary mechanisms. (FERN/FPP)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- The current MCPFE Work Programme embraces education, training and safety; MCPFE is contributing to capacity building process through its involvement in two international events,

namely a seminar on safety in small-scale private forestry and an international conference of forest training centres. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of implemented projects. (Romania)

Specific criterion (a)(v): The extent to which countries have made progress in assessing the IPF/IFF proposals for action in order to determine their relevance in their national context.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Many EU Member States and the European Commission have made these assessments, either through formal studies or more informally. In some cases the number and detailed character of the proposals for action and implications for time required have impeded widespread participation in these assessments. (EU)
- There is no agreed methodology for such assessments. (Colombia)
- The IPF/IFF proposals for action reflect the diverse positions of many UNFF parties and there are too many items. Since many of these proposals are abstract and repetitive, there are some difficulties in understanding them and in assessing national implementation. (Republic of Korea)
- There is no overview on how many countries have made or are in the process of undertaking an assessment. The work done by Australia and PROFOR has facilitated such assessments. (Switzerland)
- The preparation of voluntary reports for UNFF sessions provides an opportunity for carrying out an assessment. (Togo)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Workshops and in-session seminars, such as those organized by FAO in conjunction with regional forestry commissions; efforts by many other regional processes, e.g. MCPFE; as well as the work of the National Forest Programme Facility and the World Bank/PROFOR have demonstrated that a number of countries have undertaken a systematic assessment of relevance of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. They are used as a check-list to analyse the compatibility of national activities with international guidance, often within the context of the national forest programme.

CPF members have collaborated with each other and with partners from government and non-governmental organizations to 'translate' the IPF/IFF proposals for action into terms that are more readily understandable in the national and regional contexts through such activities as workshops, analysis of synergies between the proposals and other relevant instruments and policy frameworks. Expressing the IPF/IFF proposals for action in more accessible terms has made their relevance to countries and various stakeholders more apparent, thereby facilitating the assessment of progress in implementation and the identification of priorities for future action.

Remarks made by major groups

- Insufficient effort has been made at communication with respect to the international forest dialogue. (Children/youth)
- Many countries have not prepared voluntary reports, and those that have do not necessarily assess progress in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action or their national relevance. (FERN/FPP)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- A report on the implementation of the commitments made by the signatory states and the European Community gives information about progress and achievements in the implementation of MCPFE commitments since 1998, the obstacles that have been faced and the gaps in implementation as well as further needs. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of country assessments (with a possible benchmark that 50% of all countries participating in UNFF process have IPF/IFF proposals for action assessed). (Switzerland/Romania)

B. Principal function: Forum for continued policy development and dialogue

Specific criterion (b)(i) The extent to which the IAF, including, inter alia, Forum sessions, intersessional work and the MSD, and the related work of the CPF and its members, as well as country- and organization-led initiatives, have enhanced forest policy development and dialogue.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Formal forest policy development at the global level has been limited due to a lack of participation from national forest policy levels at UNFF sessions, and due to the fact that UNFF does not have a policy implementation instrument. UNFF is more based on information exchange and an understanding it should focus on the implementation of existing commitments through voluntary action. Forest policy dialogue has been most successful in the more technical format of country-led initiatives and AHEGs. Individual CPF members have made substantial contributions to forest policy development. (EU)
- The importance and role of other bodies, such as CBD, FAO, UNFCCC and (in Europe) of the MCPFE should be emphasised. (Bulgaria, Hungary, Switzerland, Turkey)
- The influence of the IAF on domestic forest policies has been limited; a key reason is that the international arrangement is not legally binding and has not attempted to set international priorities, standards or guidelines pertaining to sustainable forest management. It is difficult to establish a direct link between the IAF and new international policy development - to a large extent, this is understandable given the large number of international agreements, bodies, organizations and processes addressing forest-related issues, and the fact that much of the policy development dates back to the Rio Earth Summit and before. Moreover, many cross-sectoral issues affect forests. As a result, it is rare that any one forest-related issue is under the exclusive jurisdiction of one international body. This is among the reasons that many countries have called for a single legally binding agreement that would deal with forest issues in a comprehensive and integrated manner. (Canada)
- The UNFF process has helped develop conceptual elements for demonstrating the importance of national initiatives and so resources have been made available for priority SFM activities. It has also stimulated international debate, but a better mechanism is needed for allowing others (particularly at regional and local level) to participate in this dialogue. (Colombia)
- The country- and organization-led initiatives, UNFF sessions, related work of CPF and its members have played an important role in enhancing forest policy development and dialogue. In particular, the provision of global forest information and expert recommendations from the CPF members could be considered as one of the most significant achievements of UNFF. However because of the legally non-binding characteristics of IAF, some limitations are shown in assessing the implementation of resolutions and decisions in each country. (Republic of Korea)

- The IAF has enhanced policy development and dialogue at the international level. The global process has also contributed to European collaboration on forest policy. Domestically, the effects of the IAF on policy development and dialogue is less obvious. (Norway)
- The IAF has helped deepen discussion on SFM, but more needs to be done in Africa to promote understanding of the principles and support implementation. (Senegal)
- At the national level the proposals for action relating to nfps and C&I had an effect on forest policy development and dialogue. Country-led initiatives have been noteworthy in developing understanding of forest relevant concepts like "decentralization" that did not appear in the IPF/IFF proposals for action. (Switzerland)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

The IAF has enhanced forest policy development and dialogue. The UNFF sessions have offered opportunities for an open dialogue on a wide range of forest policy issues with a number of resolutions and decisions as a result. CPF members actively participate in UNFF sessions and support the policy dialogue by providing expertise and advisory services to UNFF, including by preparing documentation for UNFF sessions and supporting intersessional activities.

The country- and organization-led initiatives in support of UNFF have provided significant expert inputs and clarification to many complex forest issues. CPF members have jointly organized with governments and non-governmental organizations a number of such initiatives, and played active and supportive role in most of them.

Remarks made by major groups

- Participation of young people at UNFF successfully raised their awareness of the international forest policy dialogue; the delegates are passing on this knowledge at local level. Government delegates are now more aware of youth needs, and contacts made through IAF have stimulated more dialogue at local level. (Children & Youth)
- Much progress has been made, from major groups participating only in the outskirts or from observer seats to the day-long MSD and direct interventions from the plenary. Within the constraints of UN rules, UNFF is doing its best to achieve a partnership approach between major groups and country delegations. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- The quality of forest policy dialogue at the UNFF falls far behind other forest-related policy dialogues at the UN and other forums, e.g. CBD, World Parks Congress. UNFF has largely focussed on process issues (e.g. terms of reference for AHEGs) rather than on constructive dialogue on improving implementation of existing commitments. It has been reluctant to deal adequately with critical social and rights issues and has not advanced international forest policy making because such issues are still not accepted by the many delegations as being central to forest policy making. CPF has also failed to promote constructive dialogue on forests (and the new World Bank Forest Strategy does not offer adequate protection for indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities); and the usefulness of the current CPF network is highly questionable. (FERN/FPP)
- Forest policy development has been enhanced and expanded well beyond traditional forestry policy issues as a result of UNFF. New ideas introduced at UNFF are rapidly transmitted to country level; this has great value for major groups who advocate change since the Forum and the related events serve to legitimate new policy ideas. While countries may not react quickly, this promotes enabling conditions change. (Workers and Trade Unions)

- There has been regular dialogue on policy related gaps for gender sensitive forestry development through UNFF and the major groups. There have been several recent country-led initiatives on gender and forestry, with another one planned for Uganda in March 2004. (Women)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- Since 1990, MCPFE has enhanced forest policy development and dialogue, intensifying political and scientific communication in Europe and establishing close and successful co-operation. MCPFE Expert Level Meetings, Round Table Meetings, ad-hoc working groups have offered opportunities for an open dialogue on a wide range of forest policy issues. This dialogue involves government representatives of the participating countries, and also a variety of stakeholders, including environmental and social NGOs, forest owners' associations, the forest industry and inter-governmental organizations. MCPFE members also participate actively in the UNFF sessions and in a policy dialogue. Furthermore, the MCPFE contributes to the global and regional work of UNFF, CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD by means of framework programmes for co-operation, side event sessions, presentations and publications. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of Member States represented. (Romania)
- Diversity of the actors intervening in the execution of the forest projects. (Togo)
- Number of policy outcomes fully endorsed and commended by indigenous peoples, community-based organisations, and environmental and social NGOs. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (b)(ii) The extent to which the international arrangement on forests has worked in a transparent and participatory manner, including through the involvement of major groups.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- participation of major groups has improved, but ECOSOC accreditation remains a constraint for participation of all relevant stakeholders such as the private sector, NGO's and Forest owner's associations, the process of initial drafting of resolutions is sometimes perceived as non-transparent and the plenary format can constrain participation. Despite their obvious interest in forests, opportunities for the participation of representatives of indigenous peoples have been limited. On the other hand, the UNFF website is good and the Secretariat appears to have been supportive to major group participation. There is no clear guidance on major group participation in country-led initiatives. (EU)
- The IAF has worked in a transparent and participatory manner, information arising from the IAF is broadly distributed and all interested parties and groups are encouraged to participate. Regarding the UNFF, however, there are limitations to the participation of major groups imposed by UN rules and procedures and by budgets. (Canada)
- There is a need to develop procedures for stakeholder participation. Participation has been identified as high priority through the NFP Facility and in forest projects supported through international cooperation. (Colombia)
- The UNFF website is a valuable information hub. During the UNFF sessions, involvement of major groups was enhanced. However, the involvement of the major groups didn't contribute as much to concluding on an agreement during the short period of UNFF sessions. (Republic of Korea)

- The IAF has worked in a transparent and participatory manner. Support for participation from developing countries is one important element of this. The MSD is important, but there is a question about the representativeness of participants: well-organised major groups may have their voice heard, at the expense of other relevant stakeholders. Involvement of stakeholders has been enhanced significantly through the CPF Network. (Norway)
- The UNFF website and the newsletter contribute to transparency. (Romania)
- There is a concerted and transparent process in the regional and sub-regional dialogue within the IAF framework, but language can be a problem. (Senegal)
- UNFF sessions provided a forum for stakeholder participation, there was insufficient time for discussing lessons learned. (Switzerland)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF members have recognized the benefit of efficient and effective participation of civil society in IAF work. The MSD has provided a useful mechanism. Furthermore, significant progress has been made in the engagement of major groups and other civil society groups in intersessional work, where their representatives have been involved in all aspects from co-sponsoring events to participation in drafting committees.

The informal CPF Network has also provided a useful platform for engaging and informing stakeholders. For example, network participants have contributed to the development and dissemination, through their own networks, of the CPF Sourcebook on Funding for SFM. However, attracting the participation of a range of non-governmental organizations is challenging. The recommendation of the CPF Network meeting held during UNFF4 to undertake an assessment of challenges and possible solutions would improve the functioning of the CPF Network in future.

For transparency, all CPF documents and meeting reports are available on the CPF's website (www.fao.org/forestry/cpf).

Remarks made by major groups

- Dissemination of information is insufficient and there needs to be more promotion at local level; major groups, with support of CPF and governments, can serve as excellent channels. (Children and Youth)
- Effective participation of major groups in the UNFF sessions is blocked by a number of institutional and attitudinal obstacles; the MSD has not resulted in any major group issues being taken up by the governments at the UNFF sessions and (in contrast to other UN forums) major groups are not permitted to participate in meetings to negotiate text. Civil society members are not allowed to attend, or observe, formal meetings of the CPF and the CPF Network has not promoted transparency. (FERN/FPP)
- Women in forestry is still a new and relatively un-recognised topic amongst the forestry professionals and agencies. Numbers are small in comparison with other major groups. The marginalisation of women within forestry related organisations makes it difficult to identify them, and secure their participation in meetings and UNFF sessions. Governments and other major groups can assist in the identification of these women. The preparation of inputs to UNFF sessions relies heavily on email contact. (Women)
- Given the limitations of the UN rules considerable progress has been made; but this is still a byzantine structure not conducive to discussion or debate. Perhaps there should be less focus on negotiating text. (Workers & Trade Unions)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- MCPFE provides a platform for open and transparent international dialogue involving governments and stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, social NGOs, forest owners' associations, the forest industry and intergovernmental organizations. The MSD at the Ministerial Conference in Vienna in 2003 provided a useful mechanism for the involvement of major groups. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Comparison to processes such as FLEG Ministerial Meetings, FAO COFO, CBD. (EU)
- Major groups participation in the sessions and identification of focal points. (Romania)
- Number of amendments to UN rules and procedures and accepted informal modalities that ensure informed participation by major groups (e.g., speaking to text in contact groups and negotiations generally). (FERN/FPP)
- Number of international meetings praised for level of informed participation by major groups. (FERN/FPP)
- Extent to which intersessional and expert international meetings led by major groups are incorporated in the deliberations and outcomes of policy dialogue of the IAF. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (b) (iii): The extent to which the CPF members have responded to the guidance of the Forum.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- While CPF members are constrained by the mandates given by their governing bodies and limited resources for collaborative action, they are addressing some priority issues requested by UNFF. In general, CPF is one of the most promising and innovative aspects of the IAF. (EU)
- The CPF has responded well to the Forum's guidance to the extent that it has been coincident with the guidance of the governing bodies of CPF member organizations. Untapped potential still remains for CPF members and their organizations to increase coordination to help countries, notably developing countries and countries with economies in transition, achieve their forest management goals and objectives. (Canada)
- CPF capacity and experience has helped build institutional capacity for implementation and CPF actions have facilitated operational work; but CPF has not had a major impact in terms of the primary aims of the Forum. (Colombia)
- In response to UNFF guidance, CPF has carried out notable activities such as preparation of the Sourcebook, collection of forest terms and streamlining reporting. CPF will play a positive role in coordinating common aspects of different agreements by comprehensively managing the international forest-related issues. (Republic of Korea)
- CPF is a success and several of its activities are major achievements. CPF members have responded well to the guidance from UNFF. But there is room for improvement: countries must provide consistent messages and guidelines to the governing bodies of CPF member organisations. (Norway)
- While CPF members have in general responded well to the guidance of the UNFF, in future more political guidance is needed to make full use of the potential. The fact that UNFF was not been

involved in the preparation of the Viterbo meeting shows that the full potential of the CPF in terms of cooperation and seeking synergies has not yet been used. (Switzerland)

- CPF was established with high hopes, but members have not made enough contribution and FAO, as the head of FAO, is inadequate. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF seeks guidance from UNFF so that it can better serve the process. However, it is made up of individual members, each with its own mandate, priorities and limited budgets. Throughout the last few years the CPF has encouraged governments to send consistent messages on the importance of working collaboratively to promote national implementation of sustainable forest management worldwide. So far, CPF members have or are in the process of implementing a majority of the invitations from the Forum, including:

- support for UNFF intersessional activities;
- supporting preparation of Secretary-General's reports for UNFF sessions;
- facilitating implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action;
- enhancing a common understanding of forest-related terms and definitions;
- enhancing cooperation and coordination among CPF members;
- reducing duplication in forest reporting through streamlining;
- producing the Sourcebook on funding for SFM.

Individual CPF members also seek to respond positively to the invitations made in resolutions of specific programme elements of the UNFF. Details are reported in CPF's progress report (CPF Framework) prepared for each UNFF session.

Remarks made by major groups

- The CPF website is relatively useful for those with access to computers. (FERN/FPP)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Major joint CPF activities in comparison to UNFF Resolutions. (EU)

Specific criterion (b) (iv): The extent to which progress has been made in reaching a common understanding of forest-related concepts, terminology and definitions.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Progress has been rather slow, with notable "gaps" in relation to the discussion on forest sinks in UNFCCC. Some progress has been made on concepts, particularly on C&I. FAO leads within the CPF the work on harmonizing forest-related definitions and benefits from the expertise of the CPF members. The decision at UNFF4 on the seven thematic elements for SFM was significant. However, UNFF failed to respond to CBD's request for clarification of the ecosystem approach and SFM. (EU)
- Good progress has been made since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 on forest-related concepts, terminology and definitions. The importance of this progress is mirrored in the broadening of the use of forest concepts and terms across multiple international, regional, national and local agreements, organizations, bodies and processes. Examples of such concepts and terms that are now used globally include: sustainable forest management, criteria and indicators, deforestation and forest degradation, forest certification and related chain of custody. Considerable work remains on harmonizing concepts and terms and needs to be taken in selecting the concepts and terms to be harmonized. (Canada)

- Relevant activities have contributed to the C&I processes and understanding of SFM and forest-related functions. Further discussions are needed before the terminology or concepts can be validated or fully adopted in other binding processes or in forest-related initiatives. (Colombia)
- The agreement on the seven thematic areas of global level SFM during UNFF4 was very meaningful. The CPF led by FAO is putting effort into researching inconsistent terms of each country and deciding on the common term and definition. However, there was failure to attain agreement on the understanding of SFM, CBD ecological approach methods, and UNFCCC forest sink. (Republic of Korea)
- IAF has contributed to more awareness of the inconsistencies and ongoing activities on harmonization of concepts, terminology and definitions are valuable. (Norway)
- FRA 2005 includes a harmonised, unitary terminology for forests. (Romania)
- Progress has made through international meetings and dialogue on improving the harmonization of concepts, terminology and definitions of the forests, but more needs to be done. (Senegal)
- Initiatives taken by CPF members (in particular FAO, CIFOR, IUFRO, IPCC, UNEP) to organize expert meetings in order to harmonize forest-related terms and definitions are appreciated. It is noted with regret that UNFF4 failed to respond to the CBD as far as the conceptual linkages between ecosystem approach and SFM. (Switzerland)
- Work on forestry concepts, terminology and definitions has slowed down for last two years and almost stopped, with unable to solve disagreements. But efforts to date are appreciated and the work must continue. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Technical work over the last few years by many CPF members has gone a long way to foster a common understanding of forest-related concepts, terms and definitions. For example, two expert meetings have been held on harmonization of definitions, organized by FAO in collaboration with IPCC, CIFOR, IUFRO, UNEP and ITTO (a third meeting is planned for in January 2005), as part of CPF's joint initiative on this issue. Furthermore, IUFRO recently developed an online multilingual glossary of carbon-related forest terminology (see www.iufro.org). Definitions are also an integral part of the global FRA process led by FAO, in collaboration with the UNECE, ITTO, the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre and a number of convention secretariats. However, despite of the catalytic role of UNFF and progress at the technical level, some CPF governing bodies continue to develop their own forest-related definitions, adding to complexity of terms and definitions and in some cases adding to the reporting burden on countries.

Remarks made by major groups

- Progress has been made in reaching common understandings of the scientific concepts, terminology and definitions, but in many cases, the social aspects remain confused, as exemplified by the discussions concerning Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge during UNFF4; other key definitions such as plantations and forest cover remain unresolved. (FERN/FPP)
- Progress has been made. While the translation into the various languages contributes to complexity there is growing consensus. (Workers & Trade Unions)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- In 2004 an ad hoc working group developed a pan-European understanding of the linkages between the ecosystem approach (as defined by CBD) and SFM (as defined by the MCPFE). In 2003 ministers responsible for forests in Europe endorsed the *MCPFE Approach to National Forest Programmes in Europe*. MCPFE has participated in global level initiatives on harmonizing of definitions and reporting on the global forest resources; this involvement creates the opportunity for the implementation of pan-European specificity in the global solutions and helps transmit understanding of globally harmonized terms to the regional level. One result from this cooperation is the use of FRA definitions in the MCPFE report *State of Europe's Forests 2003*. MCPFE also participated in COST E27 on *Protected Forest Areas - Analysis and Harmonisation*, which aims to describe, analyse and harmonise a wide-range of Protected Forest Areas categories used in the European countries within the context of existing international systems of protected forest areas. The COST E27 has also focused on clarification of some other concepts such as naturalness. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Extent to which similar terms are used and understood as having equivalent meaning in different international conventions and processes. (EU)

C. Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination

Specific criterion (c) (i): The extent to which partnerships relevant to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action have been advanced.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Major forest related Type II partnerships appear to have been formed more as a result of WSSD than UNFF. (EU, Switzerland)
- UNFF has not been very attractive for either private sector organisations or donor organisations. EU donors have supported nfps through bilateral and multilateral cooperation. (EU)
- Partnerships can be formal (e.g. contractual) or informal (e.g. collaborative), and with a limited number of participants or open-ended. Successful partnerships need mutual respect among participants and mutual commitment to follow-up and report on a set of predefined, time-bound actions. In many cases, partnerships are not explicitly linked to the IPF/IFF proposals for action. However, due to the breadth of the proposals for action, links can be made between the growing number of partnerships in support of sustainable forest management and one or more of the proposals for action. Internationally, drivers of partnerships include the IAF, the G 8, WSSD, and the decisions/resolutions of forest-related agreements, organizations, bodies and processes. (Canada)
- Regional processes have made progress through having specific objectives and their dynamism has influenced national management. UNFF should strengthen these partnerships as instruments of regional level cooperation. (Colombia)
- After the WSSD, Japan and Indonesia led the operation of Asia Forest Partnership in order to prevent trade of illegally harvested timber. Currently, Republic of Korea is also actively taking part in AFP activities. (Republic of Korea)
- There is a need is for more international exchange of information and expertise. (Lithuania)
- The most important partnership is CPF. Partnerships on specific topics and/or in regions as well as at national levels have also been advanced. (Norway)

- Examples include the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration, partnerships between CPF members, the International Model Forest Network, regional partnerships (Asia Forest Partnership, New Partnership for Africa's Development, Latin America Model Forest Network, Congo Basin Forest partnership) and many national partnerships. (Romania)
- Much progress has been made through partnerships; but they still need support implementation. (Senegal)
- The Interlaken workshop demonstrated remarkable cooperation in the sharing of experience and deepening understanding of the concept of decentralization as a main element of forest governance. (Switzerland)
- Exchange of information and reinforcement of capacities through the workshops and UNFF sessions is valuable. (Togo)
- Forestry is seldom attractive to donors and UNFF cannot be considered as successful in mobilizing resources and attracting the private sector. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF members work in partnership with governments, international organizations, non-governmental groups, the private sector, communities and individuals. CPF members also provide training to advance participatory approaches at the national and local levels. This new breed of partnership arrangements have significantly increased at all levels over the last few years and they are often seen as an effective and efficient way of implementing international commitments and agreements, such as IPF/IFF proposals for action, to concrete action on the ground. CPF members play an important role in many of these new partnerships that have been established over the last few years, including Congo Basin Forest Partnership, Asia Forest Partnership, Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration, Rainforest Challenge Programme and the NFP Facility.

Remarks made by major groups

- Partnerships between government and youth representatives have been initiated. An International Partnership for Forestry Education could raise the profile of international forest politics in higher education. (Children & Youth)
- One constructive partnerships is recent UNFF support for an indigenous peoples led initiative on TFRK. (FERN/FPP)
- The IAF provides women with a unique opportunity to identify strategic partners within governments, NGOs, donors and other major groups. The planned meeting in Uganda on gender and forestry grew out of a partnership developed at UNFF4; other partnerships are in the process of development. It would be desirable to develop partnerships at the national and regional levels through the organisation of multi-stakeholder dialogues that include rural women. (Women)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- Cooperation with all relevant organisations, institutions and processes involved in the MCPFE process is an important prerequisite for the successful implementation of its Work Programme. More particularly, the MCPFE Work Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000 is being implemented in co-operation with the European ministers responsible for the environment, the Ministerial Process Environment for Europe and the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy. This Work Programme has been a useful tool for collaboration on forest biodiversity issues. Priority themes for cooperation include clarification of the relationship between the Ecosystem Approach and Sustainable Forest Management; work on protected forest areas, making a link between the

concepts of protected forest areas and protected areas in general; forest law enforcement with regard to biodiversity conservation; and the elaboration of recommendations for site selection for afforestation in the context of UNFCCC decisions. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of proposals for actions which have been included in partnerships. (Romania)
- Number of joint initiatives between indigenous peoples and civil society and other actors which are commended by all parties involved. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (c)(ii) The extent to which the IAF has facilitated and promoted coordination and cooperation among other forest related organizations, instruments and processes.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Not aware of significant impact on cooperation and coordination with or amongst non-CPF members. The CPF itself appears to have operated in an effective and low-cost way. (EU)
- While many international agreements, organizations, bodies and processes deal directly or indirectly with forest management, the international forest regime is not yet adequately addressing the persistent problems undermining the world's forests and the well-being of those who depend on them. Lack of cooperation and coordination throughout a fragmented international forest policy regime, is among the reasons for the call by many countries for a dedicated, comprehensive and effective legally binding international agreement on forests. (Canada)
- UNFF has increased the visibility and positioning of forest-related issues at the global level by developing activities in relation to other processes. (Colombia)
- Voluntary MCPFE commitments have major influence. (Hungary)
- Despite the endeavours of IAF, there still are limitations in expanding coordination and cooperation between other forest related organizations and processes compared to coordination and cooperation between CPF members. (Republic of Korea)
- Coordination and cooperation among forest-related organisations has been facilitated through the CPF and the CPF network. CPF work on information and communication may help further through raising the awareness of existing institutions and mechanisms. Panel discussions on regional cooperation at UNFF are promising ways to strengthen the coordination between global and regional levels. (Norway)
- There is cooperation and coordination are promoted between major forest-related organisations, instruments and processes: WSSD, ECOSOC, CBD, FCCC, CCD, CITES, FAO, UNECE and other regional commissions, GEF, WTO, MCPFE and other regional bodies and forest-related processes. (Romania)
- There are numerous mechanisms and international processes; efforts to develop synergies remain insufficient for effective coordination. (Senegal)
- The output of proposals for action, activities and resolutions has started to cause an increasing fatigue among those responsible for the implementation The proliferation of bodies dealing with forest-related issues has reached a level that causes great concern. CPF has a key role in promoting coordination and cooperation among the various forest-related international organizations and processes. The full potential of the CPF does not seem to be used, yet. Clear political guidance from UNFF could aid in strengthening the CPF. The definition of global

tangible goals could provide better direction to CPF, aligning the implementing agencies and increasing the concerted efforts towards SFM and sustainable development. (Switzerland)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF was formed as part of the international arrangement on forests and consists of 14 major forest-related international organizations, institutions and convention secretariats. The CPF provides an informal and effective mechanism for its members to facilitate and promote coordination and cooperation on forest issues. The CPF has embarked on a number of joint initiatives and other collaborative activities between two and more members. In these initiatives and activities, CPF has significantly increased coordination and cooperation among its members. The CPF members meet regularly, share relevant information and have adopted a focal agency system of shared responsibilities. All of this has helped foster synergies and trust among its members.

Remarks made by major groups

- The MSD of the UNFF has been an excellent meeting point for the main stakeholders, leading to cooperation between major groups. (Children & Youth)
- The improved coordination and cooperation between major groups is but one example, demonstrated through e.g. the elaboration of Synthesis papers for the MSD. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- The CPF has helped coordination among CPF members, but more is needed at national and regional level. There is reluctance at UNFF sessions to comment critically on CPF member policies that are contradictory (such as problems with GEF operational programmes and World Bank Forest Policy and implementation.) (FERN/FPP)
- The MSD has been excellent and process of formulation and planning has encouraged major groups to seek consensus and work together. This work has been significantly enhanced by the excellent assistance and coordination provided by the Secretariat. (Women)
- Major groups have extended their cooperation, moving in 3 years from individual statements, to non-consensual synthesis statements, to partial consensual statements to a complete consensus statement at the most recent AHEG. (Workers & Trade Unions)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- MCPFE is a high-level political initiative for co-operation involving around 40 European countries for the purpose of addressing common opportunities and threats related to forests and forestry. MCPFE is enriched by other countries and international organizations which are invited to participate as observers. The MCPFE Liaison Unit participates in meetings of other processes, including UNFF. (MCPFE)

No quantitative benchmarks were suggested.

D. Principal function: International cooperation

Specific criterion (d)(i): The extent to which the international community, including bilateral and multilateral donors and organizations, CPF members and international and regional processes, have facilitated the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, inter alia, through the provision of financial, technical and scientific resources and capacity-building.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Initiatives supported by EU donors include PROFOR and the NFP Facility; EU donors have also supported nfp processes in a number of countries. EU (including Member State) policies for development cooperation in the forest sector have incorporated many of the IPF/IFF proposals for action or the underlying concepts. Opportunities are often constrained by a failure to link nfps with broader macro-economic planning processes used by governments and donors to determine priorities for development cooperation. (EU)
- Following the establishment of UNFF, many new country-led initiatives and partnerships have been established. CPF has significantly contributed in promoting implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action in developing countries and economies in transition by providing research information on forest-related issues. However, provision of financial resources to developing countries and countries with economies in transition was limited compared to technology transfer and capacity building. (Republic of Korea)
- Reductions in bilateral support to forest-related projects are an example of inconsistency between the recommendations from IPF/IFF/UNFF and the actual provision of resources and capacity-building. PROFOR and the NFP Facility are excellent examples of activities which contribute to the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. (Norway)
- Given the many new initiatives, it appears that efforts are being made to address the urgent need for financial, technical and scientific resources and capacity-building. There is no general overview of how much money is actually spent on forest-related activities, technical and scientific resources and capacity-building; on how much money would be available but is not picked up; or on how much money would be available for forest issues in funds such as 'poverty reduction', but which can only be accessed if countries choose to include forests in their poverty reduction strategies and plans. The legal status of a international body has an effect on political willingness to donate funds; in this respect there is a difference between CBD, UNFCCC and the IAF. (Switzerland)
- UNFF can be criticized for the problems and incapacity of financial mechanism. There are too few opportunities and there is discrimination both between countries and between organizations in a country. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Many CPF members provide direct technical assistance and/or scientific advice to countries. A handful of CPF members work directly with and in countries for solutions for increasing financing for forest sector and making forests pay. Some CPF members (GEF, World Bank, FAO and ITTO) provide direct financial support for forest projects. Convention secretariats provide incentives through their work programmes and special mechanisms such as CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity and its access to GEF; Clean Development Mechanism of UNFCCC/Kyoto Protocol; and the Global Mechanism of UNCCD.

Remarks made by major groups

- Donors and other international/national processes are increasingly focusing on forest-related projects in developing/transition countries. These initiatives cannot be strictly or reliably attributed to the deliberations and activities of the IAF. (FERN/FPP)
- The 2nd Worldwide Symposium on Gender and Forestry, held in Tanzania in August 2004, focussed on women's and men's access to forest resources, as a means of improving livelihoods for the resource poor and SFM, locally and globally. The symposium also attempted to promote new systems that could empower women forest dwellers to effectively participate in processes of good governance in the forestry industry. (Women)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- MCPFE assures participation of representatives from countries with economies in transition at its expert level meetings by the means of financial support. MCPFE cooperates with other organizations in order to support participation of representatives from countries with economies in transition in other MCPFE meetings. In 1993 resolution H3 was adopted on *Forestry Cooperation with Countries with Economies in Transition* and to monitor implementation of Resolution H3 a Team of Specialists was established under the auspices of UNECE/FAO. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- All funds available per year from bilateral and multilateral donors and organizations, CPF members, international and regional processes are accessed and used. (Switzerland)

Specific criterion (d)(ii): The extent to which the IAF has promoted efforts by the international community to facilitate the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action through, in particular, North-South cooperation and public-private partnerships, as well as through South-South and North-North cooperation.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- The NFP Facility in particular aims to foster South-South cooperation. Regional work may need more attention as conditions for forestry vary significantly between eco-regions; regional interessionals, such as the Swedish-African Initiative with FAO and UNFF on SFM in Africa, are also important. (EU)
- Since the IAF was established, the international community has endeavoured to advance understanding and accelerate implementation of a range of IPF/IFF proposals for action through country-hosted initiatives; through the initiatives of international organizations and bodies; through the private sector, under the banners of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and the International Council of Forest and Paper Associations; and through civil society. (Canada)

- The implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action is promoted through regional cooperations such as NFP Facility which promotes South-South cooperation and Swedish-African Initiative which is supported by FAO and UNFF. (Republic of Korea)
- PROFOR and the NFP Facility contribute to the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. (Norway)
- IAF has given a new dynamic to North-South co-operation and public-private sector partnerships; but they will have to be better developed for the benefit of the African countries which are less advanced in these fields. (Senegal)
- while UNFF has had a limited impact on the promotion of efforts to facilitate the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action through cooperation and partnerships, CPF members such as ITTO and CBD and FAO (through its NFP Facility) have been an important catalyst for such efforts. (Switzerland)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

The IAF has supported many efforts to implement SFM, including beyond the specific focus on IPF/IFF proposals. While there are increasing efforts to support the implementation of the proposals, there are also increasing calls for further action from the UNFF, overwhelming implementing agencies at all levels, especially in developing countries.

Remarks made by major groups

- the meeting in Tanzania (see (d i)) was attended and funded by organisations from both the North and the South, and by both public and private organisations. (Women)

No quantitative benchmarks were suggested.

E. Principal function: Monitoring and assessing progress through reporting

Specific criterion (e)(i): The extent to which countries, regions, organizations and processes respond to the call from Forum and Collaborative Partnership on Forests members for voluntary reports, with a focus on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Few countries, including developed countries, have consistently produced voluntary reports. The quality of reports varies from excellent (and frank) to routine (and defensive). The number of proposals for action makes reporting on them very difficult and time-consuming. The limited use which seems to be made of the information can be a disincentive for countries to invest resources in reporting. The AHEG on MAR has recently reported progress in terms of international forest-related reporting, but decisions need to be taken for effective implementation. (EU)
- Many countries are not in a position to prepare voluntary thematic national reports for the sole use of the UNFF. (Canada)
- Reports allow countries to provide information nfp implementation; they contain descriptive information, but there is no single methodology for analysis for the Forum. More must be done to identify model experiences and exchange information. The effectiveness of this activity can be evaluated by the number of reports presented and the utility of the information they contain. (Colombia)
- Because many countries have not yet submitted national reports, there are limitations in assessing implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action on the global level. There is a need to simplify the

- format of the National Report so that each country can easily prepare and submit the report according to its national state. (Republic of Korea)
- The number of countries providing voluntary national reports, has increased from UNFF 2 (only 14 countries) to UNFF 4 (37 countries). Most countries did not provide any information, and the low response rate limits the value of reporting. (Norway)
 - The average number of countries reporting to UNFF has been clearly unsatisfactory. Means must be found to simplify reporting, through harmonization of the reporting requirements to different relevant institutions. (Switzerland)
 - Countries have shown limited interest in voluntary reporting. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF members seek to respond to all requests for reports, to the extent possible. Each year CPF provides the UNFF with a progress report, the CPF Framework, which has a focus on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. In an effort to reduce the reporting burden on countries, the CPF set up a Task Force on Streamlining Forest-Related Reporting. Members include FAO, ITTO, UNEP- WCMC and the secretariats of the CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC and the UNFF. The Task Force has developed an Internet portal that provides easy access to information countries submitted to international forest-related processes. The portal is available in English, French and Spanish at www.fao.org/forestry/cpf-mar. The Task Force has also reviewed current international reporting requirements and processes to identify potential areas to streamline reporting. Building on the portal and the thematic elements of SFM, the Task Force is currently developing a joint CPF Information Framework for Forest Reporting that aims at assisting countries, regions, organizations and processes to respond to forest-related information requests and process the reports, including on commitments and agreements, such as the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

While CPF members (through the CPF task force) are working for technical solutions to facilitate reporting and to reduce reporting request, governments are asked to pay further attention to the information needs of every process and send consistent messages in the governing bodies and to their secretariats, to avoid long questionnaires and overlaps and to encourage the use of existing information. Increased coordination efforts are needed both at the national level (among different ministries) and among CPF members.

Remarks made by major groups

- Many countries have not completed any voluntary reports. Up until UNFF4, only eight countries have reported to all 4 sessions of the Forum and only 52 countries have reported to any of the UNFF meetings. Reports seldom provide a systematic account of obstacles to effective implementation (except for financial ones) or of problems encountered in formulating and applying national forest policies. Many forested countries have never reported to UNFF. (FERN/FPP)
- Several countries submitted remarks about women in forestry and/or gender equity in their reports to UNFF4. (Women)
- While the number of country reports has risen, the nature and scope of these is not especially useful. This is perhaps a dilemma of limited resources. (Workers & Trade Unions)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- MCPFE seeks to respond to requests for reports to the extent possible. In 2003, the MCPFE published a report on the implementation of the commitments made by the signatory states and the European Community *Implementation of MCPFE Commitments - National and Pan-European Activities. 1998-2003*. The report contains two level of analysis - national and pan-European. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of reports submitted per country (EU, Romania)
- Number of countries who have handed in a qualitative report (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (e) (ii): The extent to which trends, lessons learned, emerging issues and actions are identified and become apparent through those voluntary reports.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Trends are hard to detect without improved quantitative and qualitative information. Sometimes emerging issues are more readily identified by think tanks or research-oriented organisations than by national administrations compiling reports. The IAF has provided some useful opportunities to document and exchange lessons learnt, but many involve complex processes of institutional change that are difficult to summarise in short interventions at UNFF. (EU)
- Reports of the Secretary-General to earlier UNFF sessions present informative synopses of trends, lessons learned, emerging issues and actions related to the IPF/IFF proposals for action. However, they were not based solely on the member states' national reports, but reflect consultation with a wide range of sources. These Reports should be made available as early as possible in all official UN languages. (Canada)
- Information contained in the reports is often very basic. It tends to emphasise priority actions for that country, according to its own circumstances, with relatively little on trends and lessons learned. (Colombia)
- Although it is based on the reports submitted by a limited number of countries, the UNFF website provides a lot of useful information on trends, lessons learned, emerging issues. However, there are limitations in collecting information on concrete implementation methods and the extent to which it was implemented. (Republic of Korea)
- The most important emerging issues mentioned in voluntary reports are rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands and combating of deforestation and forest degradation. (Romania)
- While UNFF has provided a valuable forum for sharing experiences, insufficient time has been available for developing lessons learned. (Switzerland)
- The UNFF process has provided countries with opportunities to evaluate their own policies, programs and activities that further the Proposals for Action, and to consider these in a global context rather than in isolation. Nevertheless, the primary value of this analysis and the voluntary reports presented to UNFF has been to provide forest resource managers, policymakers, and concerned citizens in the country itself with a comprehensive look at the current management of our forests—both public and private—and identify specific needs and opportunities for improving management in the near term, and achieving sustainability in the long term. (USA voluntary national report)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

UNFF country reports increasingly describe trends and lessons learned, although synthesizing and analyzing them is not always easy, especially without clear targets. In addition, the reporting content and formats vary significantly among different processes. In its work on streamlining forest-related reporting, CPF members propose to make country information accessible according to thematic elements of SFM, to facilitate preparation of future reports by countries and to facilitate preparation of syntheses and analyses by the secretariats.

Remarks made by major groups

- While reports generally discuss the general status of the national forests and ongoing projects/programmes, they seldom cover trends, lessons learned and emerging issues. (FERN/FPP)
- National reports and the IUFRO Gender and Forestry Research Group report provide extremely useful and geographically specific information. (Women)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Ecological, cultural and social benchmarks (Romania)
- Number of reports which describe the lessons learnt. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (e)(iii): The extent to which major groups have been encouraged to participate in developing voluntary reports.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- Major groups have been encouraged to present reports on key themes of UNFF meetings but not to report on implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. (EU)
- Provincial and territorial governments, federal departments and other interested parties are requested to provide updated information for the national report; based on the views and information that is submitted, together with other recent reports, a draft report is then prepared circulated for comment. (Canada)
- The process of stakeholder dialogue is relatively new; there is a low level of participation and no procedures about how represent stakeholder groups or define positions on forest-related themes. Nevertheless, progress is being made. (Colombia)
- Major groups are recommended to state their position on main issues through participation in UNFF sessions and through UNFF website. (Republic of Korea)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

All CPF members are supporting the efforts of countries to broaden and deepen the involvement of civil society and other stakeholders in the process of forest policy development, implementation and reporting. Indirectly, and through the CPF Network, the CPF encourages major groups to participate in national efforts of voluntary reporting to UNFF and other bodies.

Remarks made by major groups

- Participation is seldom initiated by governments and needs to be requested by stakeholders themselves. (Children/youth)
- Less than 50% of reports have been developed in consultation with stakeholder groups; even where there is consultation, participants are often frustrated that issues they raise are not reflected in the reports. Indigenous peoples have rarely participated, especially in developing countries. This shows serious shortcomings. (FERN/FPP)
- The voluntary paper presented by Women to UNFF4 was strongly encouraged by the UNFF secretariat coordinator for major groups. (Women)

- There is a dynamic tension here. Major groups are usually advocates, reporting what advances their agenda and tending not to report what is against it. Support for the preparation of reports by major groups has been limited. (Workers/Trade Unions)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Number of national reports developed on the basis of meaningful consultation with major groups. (FERN/FPP)
- Number of activities carried out on basis of recommendations by major groups. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (e)(iv): The extent to which CPF members have worked to strengthen countries' abilities to monitor, assess and report progress in the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- CPF members have not assisted EU countries in this respect - which is logical since their activities are oriented to developing countries. (EU)
- the main CPF outputs have been documents aimed at simplifying the presentation and dissemination of information; but there is no analysis that shows a real increase in country capacity to undertake these tasks. (Colombia)
- CPF members have worked to strengthen national ability to monitor, assess and report progress through mutual cooperation and researches, and by providing relevant information. (Republic of Korea)
- the CPF task force on streamlining forest-related reporting is particularly appreciated. (Norway, Switzerland)
- CPF should give more support to countries in the follow-up and the evaluation of progress, through capacity building and financing. (Senegal)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

Some CPF members supported the two UNFF country- and organization-led initiatives related on MAR, namely the *International Expert Meeting on MAR on the Progress towards Sustainable Forest Management*, November 2001, Yokohama, Japan) and *Lessons Learned in MAR on Implementation of IPF/IFF Proposals for Action*, March 2003, Viterbo, Italy). The workshops and in-session seminars organized in conjunction with four FAO regional forestry commissions in 2004 provided other venues for country experts to discuss how to assess the relevance of the proposals, implement them and evaluate and report on progress. Capacity building for collection, analysis and dissemination information on SFM is a key component of work by FAO and ITTO.

No quantitative benchmarks were suggested.

Specific criterion (e)(v): The extent to which Forum sessions provide opportunities to voluntarily report progress and lessons learned.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- UNFF session themes provide opportunities for discussion, but the plenary format (with its formal, prepared statements) does not lend itself to interactive discussions. Side events have provided a better format, but are not linked to the plenary debates. There have been too many themes and too little time for discussion of particular issues. The limited number of in-depth reports, with analysis

- of progress and lessons, seriously weakens the representiveness of information and prevents UNFF from providing policy guidance based on updated knowledge. Reporting to UNFF has suffered from a lack of participation by forestry staff from countries who are directly involved in national implementation. Session venues promote participation by diplomats rather than practitioners. (EU)
- Forum sessions provide an opportunity to member states and major groups to submit voluntary reports highlighting actions taken in support of sustainable forest management and related lessons learned. In addition, through interventions on agenda items, multi stakeholder dialogues and side events, Forum sessions enable an exchange of views and experiences. There is a broadly held view, however, that there is an untapped potential to improve the extent of voluntary reporting and the communication among the member states themselves as well as between the member states and the UN major groups. (Canada)
 - While UNFF sessions have information about countries that have made reports (and some side events give specific examples of progress made and lessons learned), the UNFF agenda is long and complex and leaves no time for voluntary reports on progress. At UNFF4, there was an event on *National Forest Programs - Instruments for governance of the sector*, where experiences of the Latin American Region were presented. (Colombia)
 - During UNFF sessions there was no discrimination against nations in presentation of experiences and progress reports. It was an opportunity to gather useful information; the side-events and special day also provided information that is difficult to communicate during the official sessions. (Republic of Korea)
 - Sessions provided opportunities for exchange during thematic discussions, side-events or special days such as SIDS or African Day. While some exchange proved beneficial, this is rather limited because most statements are prepared in advance and no real discussion takes place after they statements are read out. During side-events the exchange is more spontaneous and thus often closer to ground. Informal exchange of experience in corridors is valuable. (Switzerland)
 - The synthesis reports and MSD are valuable. (Togo)
 - There is too little reporting on practical implementation and some countries tend to dominate joint sessions. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

The UNFF has provided opportunities for countries, CPF members and major groups to present their voluntary progress reports and to share their lessons learned, both during official meetings and side events at the sessions of the Forum. The intergovernmental policy meetings are often complemented with seminars and workshops that provide a platform for sharing lesson learned. The CPF members deem this type of dialogue to be effective and lead to innovative solutions when held in small groups and/or at the regional or sub regional levels, where countries have more similar conditions.

Remarks made by major groups

- There are opportunities for this in plenary sessions during the first week and side events. However, the government statements in the plenary sessions rarely comment on progress or lessons learned concerning the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. (FERN/FPP)
- The outline of the voluntary paper to UNFF4 was circulated amongst women on the listserve to elicit their comments and inputs. The opportunity to provide their perspectives and examples of some initiatives with positive outcomes for women in a formal way at UNFF was viewed very

positively by women. It is seen as a very valuable space for women's voices in what is otherwise a very male dominated environment. (Women)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- The sessions provide opportunities for exchanging views during thematic discussions and side-events. Also, informal exchange of experience is valuable. (MCPFE)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Reports made on action in support of sustainable forest management at Forum sessions. (Canada)
- Number of voluntary reports. (Romania)
- Time spent at UNFF sessions critically discussing the voluntary national reports, progress made and lessons learnt. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (e)(vi): The extent to which countries make progress in monitoring, assessment and reporting through, inter alia, applying criteria and indicator processes or similar tools in their efforts to achieve sustainable forest management.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- The continuing, though uneven, development of C&I is one of the more successful aspects of the IAF. Within Europe the MCPFE process has provided the framework. Monitoring through forest inventories is well established in Europe, but increasingly the trend is to take factors other than timber production into account; for instance there is a well established EU-wide programme of monitoring of the impact of fires and air pollution on forests and monitoring of biodiversity is increasing. To what extent these developments are the result of the IAF and to what extent they reflect changes in society is difficult to determine. (EU)
- SFM progress requires development of C&I. The IAF has facilitated opportunities for expert interchange on conceptual elements and this forms a basis for internal work in countries. This must be taken forward with greater force as some donors do not recognize C&I as a useful instrument and do not support initiatives that would facilitate implementation. (Colombia)
- Despite making reports according to MCPFE C&I at regional level, the C&I are not applied in a systematic and holistic way in national policy formulation, implementation or evaluation. (Norway)
- Most countries, representing 85% of the world's forests, are participating in indicator processes or similar tools in their efforts to achieve sustainable forest management. (Romania)
- The existence and further development of the 9 C&I processes and the number of countries (150) associated with them is a success story. The fact that seven common thematic themes could be identified at the global level without compromising the bio-regional differences in the various C&I processes; and the work done by CPF members on harmonisation of terms and definitions to facilitate reporting are also success stories. The CPF, its members, country-led initiatives and the AHEG on MAR have been the main catalysts. (Switzerland)
- UNFF has taken important steps on C&I, but more work is needed particularly at country level. (Turkey)

- Convergence around a few generally accepted principles of sustainable forest management, such as the C&I, has created new opportunities for a range and diversity of forest interests to reach consensus on current forest conditions and trends, and begin a more factual and productive dialogue regarding potential future actions and priorities.

Remarks made in joint CPF response

FAO and ITTO helped organize and some other CPF members participated in the *International Conference on the Contribution of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management: the way forward* (February 2003, Guatemala City, Guatemala). This initiative sought to broaden the understanding and appreciation of C&I for SFM. From the outcome of this meeting, it is clear that some countries are making effective use of their C&I process to strengthen the basis for monitoring progress towards SFM, for policy development and for dialogue with multiple stakeholders at the national level. In this regard, some CPF members are actively encouraging and collaborating in the incorporation of C&I (as a monitoring and reporting tool) into nfps (as an implementation mechanism) and as tools for measuring progress towards outcome-oriented sub-targets (e.g., within the framework for assessing progress towards achieving the 2010 global biodiversity target of the CBD). Regional collaboration has strengthened significantly through the nine on-going C&I processes.

Remarks made by major groups

- Without national reports it is impossible to see if countries have made progress and available reports do not provide enough information to assess progress in this area. (FERN/FPP)

Remarks made by forest-related processes

- The MCPFE C&I are one of the key tools that provide a basis for monitoring, assessing and reporting on progress made by countries towards SFM. The process of creating and developing the pan-European C&I began immediately after the endorsement of the definition, and the general guidelines for SFM, in 1993 and it is still under way. It resulted in the first MCPFE set of C&I, adopted at the technical level in 1994. Countries at the third ministerial conference in Lisbon in 1998 adopted six pan-European criteria and endorsed the related indicators for SFM. The improved set of MCPFE C&I was elaborated as a consequence of the Lisbon commitments (Resolution L2, 1998) and the subsequent work was followed by wide consultations. Finally, the improved set of the MCPFE indicators was endorsed by the European ministers at the Fourth Ministerial Conference in Vienna (2003). The development of the pan-European C&I comprises the implementation at both the national level (e.g. as a basis for elaboration of national sets) and the international level (e.g. as a frame for common, harmonized reporting). Subsequent reports on the state of European forests were elaborated on the basis of the MCPFE C&I. The reports are an important source of information for drawing conclusions on the implementation of political commitments. (MCPFE)

No quantitative benchmarks were suggested.

F. Principal function: Strengthening political commitment

Specific criterion (f)(i): The extent to which high-level engagement furthers political commitment to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action by countries.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- High level engagement has been useful in increasing commitment and awareness of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, but political engagement requires simpler messages. High level UNFF segments should be more oriented towards policy guidance and should preferably include direct interaction between ministers and heads of CPF member organizations. (EU)

- The high-level segment at UNFF 2 resulted in a clearly worded Ministerial Declaration in support of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and the need to strengthen international cooperation to achieve sustainable forest management. Globally, however, the levels of deforestation and forest degradation remain unacceptably high. A high level of engagement at Forum sessions does not, in and of itself, translate into political commitment to take greater action in support of forests. An effective, dedicated legally binding international agreement on forests would have the potential to improve the international governance of forests worldwide and, in a related manner, the level of political commitment to take greater action at all levels in support sustainable forest management. (Canada)
- Participation in UNFF has helped raise awareness of the importance of considering forests within broader development policies. (Colombia)
- Until a comprehensive IAF is established, the high level engagement in UNFF sessions and the decisions made on political commitments will strongly enforce the implementation of SFM on the global level. (Republic of Korea)
- High-level engagement helps to further political commitment, but is not sufficient by itself. One main challenge is to transfer the high-level decisions into activities on the ground. The IAF has not resulted in much progress on this. (Norway)
- High-level engagement helps guarantee implementation of the proposals for action. This engagement can be strengthened through participation of Ministers at UNFF and other important meetings. (Senegal)
- High-level engagement and high-level political commitment are key to implementation work at national level. Resources (human, financial) are allocated by ministers to those areas that are perceived as important for the community, society and the entire country. UNFF high-level ministerial segments are a step in the right direction, but participation at ministerial level was very limited at UNFF2. In order to raise the political commitment and thus international attention, it is worth considering having ministers agree to a few tangible global goals that are easy to communicate. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the legal status of an international body has an effect on the body's attractiveness to a minister. (Switzerland)
- High level engagement is important and cannot be secured through technical discussions by experts. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

CPF members are convinced that high-level political commitment is vital and needs to be strengthened to support countries' efforts to achieve sustainable forest management, including through implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action.

Remarks made by major groups

- The limited progress over the past four years shows either that high level engagement does not further political commitment to implementation, or that there has been insufficient high level engagement. (FERN/FPP)
- UNFF5 will reveal the interest in high-level engagement. (Workers & Trade Unions)
- Women have seen through participation in the MSD that some governments have pledged action to further the involvement of women in forest related activities and organisations. UNFF sessions

also provide women with opportunities to meet country delegates informally and lobby for their concerns. (Women)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Attendance of ministers and Director Generals at UNFF sessions. (FERN/FPP)
- Number of speeches made by Ministers and Director Generals. (FERN/FPP)

Specific criterion (f)(ii): The extent to which the IAF succeeds in enhancing the positioning of forests on the international agenda.

Remarks made by countries and EU

- UNFF had some success agreeing a contribution on forests to the WSSD Plan of Implementation. The CPF partnership has also been a positive development in enhancing the position of forests on the international agenda. However, in general the UNFF has had limited success due to a perception that legally binding conventions (such as CBD, UNFCCC, CITES) carry greater "weight" than UNFF, and the limited progress in positioning forests in relation to the achievement of the MDGs. The IAF also has a very small constituency of support amongst civil society organisations. Some argue that the legal status of the IAF may influence the level of political commitment. (EU)
- Arguably, the position of forests on the international political agenda is weaker today than at the time of the creation of the international arrangement on forests in 2000. Forest issues were not a key focus of attention at WSSD and as yet they are not seen outside of the forest community as integral to achieving the MDGs. Forest issues do not have the same international political profile as security issues. Nor do they have the same profile as certain environmental issues such as climate change and biodiversity. While the presence of the IAF may have helped to slow this decline, it cannot easily be said that it has elevated the position of forests on the international agenda. (Canada)
- The fact that the MDGs include forests reflects the importance of this resource in the global context and the need to consolidate implementation through UNFF and through the work on the eradication of poverty. The MDGs constitute an urgent challenge and there is a need to identify links between the forest sector and other sectors to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of those whose lives depend on forests and forest resources in general. (Colombia)
- The IAF significantly contributed in enhancing the position of forestry issue on the international agenda, allowing comprehensive discussion of forest-related issues and having a great impact in highlighting them. (Republic of Korea)
- The message from ministers at UNFF2 to WSSD helped enhance, or at least maintain, the position of forests on the international agenda. It is difficult to predict how the situation would have been without the IAF as opposed to an arrangement of a different nature. A legally binding instrument might well enhance the position of forests on the international agenda. (Norway)
- By its mere existence, the IAF contributes to the positioning of forests on the international agenda. Without the UNFF there would be no international body dealing with forest issues in an encompassing way at the global level. Without the CPF there would not be regular scheduled meetings of the major implementing agencies to deal with forest issues. The IAF also provides a framework for country-led Initiatives addressing forest-related aspects. However, success is moderate. Legally binding instruments (such as the CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD and CITES) are by their nature positioned higher on the international agenda than UNFF. Despite the important role

that forests play in communities, societies and countries, there is insufficient political commitment to ensure that forests are adequately integrated into national sustainable development plans, PRSPs or other policy and programmes. It is essential to have a UN body addressing forest issues in an encompassing way, but full use must be made of its potential. (Switzerland)

- To some extent IAF has been successful in enhancing the position of forestry issues in the international agenda (for example in relation to WSSD). The role of forestry in alleviating rural poverty is also appreciated. Nevertheless, UNFF decisions were overshadowed by Conventions, CBD, UNFCCC, CITES at WSSD, partly because it is not legally binding. (Turkey)

Remarks made in joint CPF response

The IAF aims at promoting sustainable management of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end. UNFF and CPF members have promoted forest issues on the international agenda. Global conferences and summits, such as the Millennium Declaration and the WSSD have recognized SFM as integral part of the international agenda.

The alarming rates of deforestation are only one of many pressing issues on the international agenda, including poverty, HIV/AIDS, malnutrition, illiteracy, inequity, peace and human rights. The high-level segment at UNFF5 represents an opportunity for Ministers responsible for forests and Heads of CPF members to reaffirm their commitment to SFM, build stronger linkages between forests and the internationally agreed development goals and strengthen the international arrangement on forests. This course of action would ensure that forest will remain on the international agenda in the future.

Remarks made by major groups

- Maybe this is the task for UNFF in the future. The problem of positioning forests on the international agenda lies in the complex nature of sustainable forest management. It is much easier for single issue driven processes to highlight their narrow concerns than it is for a process like UNFF to position the holistic view on an international agenda that is overloaded with war, health and natural disaster crisis. (Confederation of European Forest Owners)
- Forests are much lower on the political agenda than even five years ago and certainly than 10 years ago. Therefore the IAF has not succeeded in keeping forests high on the political agenda. Other issues that are currently high on the agenda, such as water, debt relief, environmental degradation and security all link to forests but no attempt has been made to include forests in these discussions. The costs and low outcome of UNFF has also led to press articles portraying it as a talk shop with no action, while forests are disappearing. Arguably, UNFF has had a negative impact in positioning the forests on the international agenda. (FERN/FPP)
- IAF success in this depends on its abilities to relate forests to the larger social issues at play in the world. The focus on poverty alleviation and the MDGs is a move in the right direction. Its abilities to engage the multiple stakeholders in a significant way, allowing fresh ideas and perspectives that are sometimes critical, is also key to its success. (Women)
- It is difficult to see enhancement outside of the IAF itself and other forestry forums. Outwork with international financial instruments and other donors does not seem to have been positively affected. The IAF seems not to have the global status required to command attention from a busy world. (Workers and Trade Unions)

Suggestions for quantitative benchmarks

- Visibility of the forest sector on the international agenda. (Romania)

IV. Conclusions

Reports and/or questionnaire responses were received from 46 countries, from the EU, from ten other relevant organisations and forest-related processes and (jointly) from CPF members. While care must be taken to recognise this limitation when drawing conclusions, the reports nevertheless provide valuable information on a cross-section of experiences relating to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

The reports and questionnaires suggest that greatest progress has been made in relation to the development and implementation of national forest programmes (or similar frameworks); in extending stakeholder participation; and in the development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management. They also highlight areas where there is scope for further effort. It is clear that there are still serious challenges in many parts of the world, particularly in terms of combating deforestation and addressing the problems associated with illegal forest activities. Moreover, the countries that struggle most to secure adequate means of implementation are often those which face the severest challenges in pursuing sustainable forest management, with a complex interaction of difficult social, economic and environmental factors. There is also a need to recognise the often crucial impact on forests of other policies and economic pressures (for example those relating to trade, agriculture, energy and development of human settlements).

A fundamental challenge for the future is to ensure that society places a proper value on forests, reflecting their non-market, public good, outputs as well as financial returns. Other priorities identified in the reports include the need to develop effective institutional frameworks, with good governance; to safeguard the rights of those people whose daily livelihoods depend on forests; and to establish stronger cross-sectoral links with other parts of national policy processes (such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers).

The questionnaire responses suggest that the international arrangement has done a good deal of useful work, against a background of many competing priorities on the international agenda, but that the full potential of the international arrangement on forests is yet to be realised. Some responses also express views about the benefit of a legally-binding instrument, in terms of raising the status of forest-related issues on the international agenda.

The review suggests that the original mandate of the international arrangement remains valid, but there is a need to strengthen the arrangement. Recurrent themes in the voluntary reports and the questionnaire responses include the need to:

- secure political commitment. To achieve this, it must be clear to decision-makers, and the people they represent, why sustainable forest management is relevant to the broader global agenda (including, for example, that set out by the Millennium Declaration);
- strengthen the horizontal cross-sectoral linkages between the forest sector and other sectors, at the global, regional, national and local levels. This will require analysis, and networking to develop linkages between forest policies and wider social, economic and environmental policies; forward looking, to identify and examine emerging issues; and making better use of the Forum's position to contribute to debates taking place in other international forums;
- strengthen the vertical linkages between forest policy development and dialogue at the global, regional, national and local levels. This will help in the identification of emerging issues and also help ensure more rapid transfer of knowledge and experience. Well thought out country-led initiatives and regional meetings can be particularly valuable in this respect;
- create a stronger enabling environment for implementation of forest policies. This depends on securing political commitment and requires more emphasis on the means of implementation (finance, transfer of environmentally sound technologies and capacity-building);

- build on the potential of the CPF, which is widely recognised for its important role in promoting coordination and cooperation in support of sustainable forest management among a large number of forest-related international organizations and processes;
- improve monitoring, assessment and reporting through processes that are perceived as worthwhile and relevant to countries' needs. Criteria and indicators (and the seven thematic elements of sustainable forest management) can provide a sound framework, provided that countries have the capacity to collate the necessary information.

Annex I. Abbreviations used in this Study

ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
C&I	Criteria and indicators
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity*
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research*
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
COP	Conference of the Parties
COST	EU sponsored programmes on scientific and technical cooperation
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests*
ECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations*
FERN/FPP	FERN/Forest Peoples' Programme
FLEG	Forest Law Enforcement and Governance
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FRA	Global Forest Resources Assessment
GEF	Global Environment Facility*
GFIS	Global Forest Information System
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre*
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
ISO	International Organisation for Standardisation
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation*
IUCN	World Conservation Union*
IUFRO	International Union of Forestry Research Organizations*

MAR	Monitoring, assessment and reporting
MCPFE	Ministerial Conferences on the Protection of Forests in Europe
nfp	National Forest Programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NTFP	non-timber forest products
ODA	official development assistance
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SADC	Southern African Development Council
SFM	sustainable forest management
TRFK	traditional forest-related knowledge
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification*
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme*
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme*
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests*
WTO	World Trade Organisation

* CPF members are CIFOR , FAO, ITTO, IUFRO, UNDP, UNEP, ICRAF, the World Bank, IUCN and the Secretariats of the CBD, GEF, UNFCCC, UNCCD and the UNFF.

Annex II. Principal functions of the international arrangement on forests¹¹

(a) Facilitate and promote the implementation of Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF) proposals for action, as well as other actions that may be agreed upon, including through national forest programmes and other integrated programmes relevant to forests; catalyse, mobilize and generate financial resources; and mobilize and channel technical and scientific resources to this end, including by taking steps towards the broadening and development of mechanisms and/or further initiatives to enhance international cooperation;

(b) Provide a forum for continued policy development and dialogue among Governments, which would involve international organizations and other interested parties, including major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, to foster a common understanding on sustainable forest management and to address forest issues and emerging areas of priority concern in a holistic, comprehensive and integrated manner;

(c) Enhance cooperation, as well as policy and programme coordination on forest-related issues among relevant international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments, as well as contribute to synergies among them, including coordination among donors;

(d) Foster international cooperation, including North-South and public private partnerships, as well as cross-sectoral cooperation at the national, regional and global levels;

(e) Monitor and assess progress at the national, regional and global levels through reporting by Governments, as well as by regional and international organizations, institutions and instruments, and on this basis consider future actions needed;

(f) Strengthening political commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests through ministerial engagement; developing ways to liaise with the governing bodies of international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments; and the promotion of action-oriented dialogue and policy formulation related to forests.

¹¹ From Economic and Social Council resolution 2000/35

Annex III. List of respondents

<u>Name of Respondent</u>	<u>Voluntary report</u>	<u>Questionnaire response</u>
Algeria	yes	no
Austria	yes	no
Belgium	yes	no
Benin	yes	no
Bulgaria	no	yes
Cambodia	yes	no
Canada	yes	yes
Colombia	no	yes
Cyprus	yes	no
Czech Republic	yes	no
Denmark	yes	no
El Salvador	yes	no
Finland	yes	no
Germany	yes	no
Guatemala	yes	no
Hungary	yes	yes
India	yes	no
Indonesia	yes	no
Italy	yes	no
Korea, Republic of	yes	yes
Lebanon	yes	no
Lesotho	yes	no
Lithuania	yes	yes
Luxembourg	yes	yes
Malawi	yes	no
Madagascar	yes	no
Mauritius	yes	no
Netherlands	yes	no
New Zealand	yes	no
Norway	yes	yes
Pakistan	yes	no
Poland	yes	no
Romania	no	yes
Russian Federation	yes	yes
Senegal	yes	yes
Serbia & Montenegro	yes	no
Slovakia	yes	no
Spain	yes	no
Sudan	yes	no
Sweden	yes	no
Switzerland	yes	yes
Togo	yes	yes
Turkey	yes	yes
UK	yes	no
USA	yes	no
Venezuela	yes	no
EU	no	yes

CPF (joint)	yes	yes
CPF member: FAO	yes	no
CPF member: ITTO	yes	no
CPF member: IUFRO	yes	no
CPF member: UNEP	yes	no
Forest-related process: MCPFE	no	yes

Major group representatives:

Children and Youth	no	yes
Confederation of European Forest Owners	no	yes
FERN & Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)	no	yes
Women	no	yes
Workers and Trade Unions	no	yes

Annex IV Questionnaire responses: overall assessment and assessment according to activities.

1. Overall assessment

Specific criterion	Responses from member States and EU ¹²					Responses from representatives of major groups ¹³				
	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i		4+EU	9	1			1	2		
a ii		6	3+EU	4				1	1	
a iii		3	6+EU	2			1		2	
a iv		8+EU	3	1			1			
a v	2	1	5+EU	3			1			
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i		4	4+EU	5			1		2	
b ii		1+EU	7	3			1	1	1	
b iii		4	3	2+EU			1			
b iv		4+EU	3	6			1		1	
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i		6+EU	4	3			1			
c ii		3+EU	4	4			1		1	
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i		3	4+EU	3			1	1		
d ii		3+EU	6	2						
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i		7	2+EU	2			2			
e ii		4	4+EU	1			2			
e iii		9+EU	1	1			1	1		
e iv		3	5	1			1			
e v		4+EU	4	2			1			
e vi		3	8+EU	2			1			
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i		1	4+EU	5		1		1		
f ii			9+EU	1		1			1	

¹² Some countries stated that effectiveness was (eg) both moderate and high for a particular criterion; in these cases both assessments are recorded here.

¹³ Confederation of European Forest Owners; FERN/Forest Peoples' Programme; and Workers & Trade Unions

2. Assessment according to activities¹⁴

Specific criterion	Forum sessions					Forum decisions and resolutions				
	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i		4	7	2		1	4	2	2	
a ii		3	4	1		1	3	2	2	
a iii	1	3	3+EU	1		2	4	1	1	
a iv		4	3	1		1	4	3	1	
a v	1	2	1	2		2	1	3	1	
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i		4	3+EU	1		1	2	3		
b ii		3	3+EU	2		2	2	1	2	
b iii		3	1	3			2	3		
b iv		5+EU		1		1	2	2	1	
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i		4	2	1		1	2	2	1	
c ii		5	3	1		1	4	3	2	
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i	1	3	2	1		1	3	2	1	
d ii		3	3	1		1	1	5		
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i	1	4	2	2			4	2	2	
e ii	1	4	2	1		1	2	1	1	
e iii	1	3	4	1		1	3	1	1	
e iv	1	2	1	1		1	3		1	
e v		2	5	2		1	2	1		
e vi		5	1	1		1	3	2		
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i		3	3	4		1	3	1	3	
f ii	1	2+EU	4	3		1	1	3	1	

¹⁴ Representatives of three major groups (the Confederation of European Forest Owners, FERN/FPP and the Workers and Trade Unions) responded to this part of the questionnaire; their responses are amalgamated with the responses from countries and the EU. The assessment according to activities is noted Report of the Secretary-General on the Review of the Effectiveness of the International Arrangement on Forests where there appears to be a common view, among at least six respondents, that effectiveness of a particular activity is other than “moderate” – that is, where (for example) six respondents consider it limited, and no respondents consider it “high”.

	<u>Panel discussions at Forum sessions</u>					<u>Country- and organization-led initiatives</u>				
Specific criterion	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i		3	5	1		1	3	2	4	
a ii		3	4			1	2	2	3	
a iii		3	2	1			3	2	1	
a iv	1	5	2	1			2	3	3	
a v	1	3	1				2	2	2	
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i		2	4	1			2	3	3+EU	
b ii		4	1+EU	2			2	2	3	
b iii	1	1	3	1			1	3		
b iv		4	3	1		1		1	4	
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i	1	3	3				3	2	3	
c ii		4	3	2			1	5	2	
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i		2	3	2			1	3	3	
d ii		4	1					3	3	
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i	2	3				1	4			
e ii	1	3	1			1	1	2		
e iii	1	4	1			1	3	1		
e iv	2	2				1	2			
e v		2	5+EU				2	2	1	
e vi	1	4		1			2	2+EU	2	
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i	1	1	4				1	3	3	
f ii	1	3	1				2	2+EU	2	

	<u>Ad hoc expert groups</u>					<u>Partnership initiated activities¹⁵</u>				
Specific criterion	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i	1	2	4	4		1	1	5	2	
a ii	1	3	1	1		1	2	2	5	
a iii	2	2	2			1	2	3	3	
a iv		3	3			1	3	2	2	
a v	1	3	1			2		5		
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i		3	2	1		1	2	3+EU	3	
b ii		6+EU	1				3	6	1	
b iii		2	1				4	3	1	
b iv		2+EU	3	3		1	1	4	4	
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i		4	1				2	4	3	
c ii		3	3	1			4	1	6	
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i		3	1	1			1	4	7	
d ii		3	1	1			4	3	2	
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i	1	2	3	1		2	3	3		
e ii	2	1	1				5	1		
e iii	1	2	3	1			5	2		
e iv	2		3	1			2	6		
e v		2	2			1	3			
e vi		3	1+EU	2			4	2	1	
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i	1	2	1			1	2	6	1	
f ii		4		1			2	4+EU	3	

¹⁵ Some responses use this category to cover CPF, but the EU, and two countries (Russia and Switzerland) scored CPF and actions by CPF members separately. Details of the individual responses are on the UNFF website.

	<u>Contacts at Forum sessions</u>					<u>Actions by the Forum secretariat</u>				
Specific criterion	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i	1	2	4	2		1	4	2	3	
a ii	1	1	2	3		1	5		1	
a iii	1	5	3			1	3	1	1	
a iv	1	2	3			2	1	2	1	
a v	1	2	2			1	4			
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i	1	1	4			1	3		1	
b ii		2	5				2	7+EU		
b iii		1	3				4	1		
b iv	1	3		1		1	2	2		
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i		3	2	1			3		2	
c ii		2	3				3	2		
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i	1		3	1		1	2	3		
d ii	1		4			1	2	3		
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i	1	5					4	1	1	
e ii	1	2	2			1	3	2	1	
e iii		5					5	1		
e iv		4				1	1	3	1	
e v	1	1	2	1			2	3		
e vi	1	2	3			2	2	2		
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i		4	1	1		1	2	5		
f ii	1	1	4			1	2	3		

	<u>Multi-stakeholder dialogues</u>					<u>Other activities (as specified in footnotes)</u>				
Specific criterion	None	Limited	Moderate	High		None	Limited	Moderate	High	
<u>Principal function: Implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action</u>										
a i	2	1	3	3						
a ii	2	1	1	4						
a iii	2	2+EU	3	2				EU ¹⁶		
a iv	2	1	2	1						
a v	2	3	2	1				EU ¹¹		
<u>Principal function: Policy development and dialogue</u>										
b i	2	1	2	1						
b ii		1	6+EU	4						
b iii	1	2		1						
b iv		3	2	1						
<u>Principal function: Cooperation and policy and programme coordination</u>										
c i	1	2	2	1						
c ii		3	1	1						
<u>Principal function: International cooperation</u>										
d i	3	1	1	1						
d ii	2	1	1	2						
<u>Principal function: monitoring and assessing progress through reporting</u>										
e i	3	2		1						
e ii	1	1	3							
e iii	1	4	1	1						
e iv	1	2	1							
e v	1	3	3	1					EU ¹⁷	
e vi	3		1							
<u>Principal function: Strengthening political commitment</u>										
f i	1	2	2	2						
f ii	1	3	2	1						

¹⁶ Reporting

¹⁷ Side Events