

*Forest*

*Knowledge*

*Know-how*

**METLA**

*Well-being*

# **Strategic Review of the Joint ECE/FAO Integrated Programme on Forestry and Timber: Summary of the Questionnaire replies on ToS Monitoring SFM**

**Kari T. Korhonen /Metla**

**Geneva 27.3.2012**

# Information on the respondents

- The questionnaire was sent to 90 members from 35 countries and 16 international organisations .
- **In total, 8 members, each from different country replied with at least partially filled questionnaire form (FI, CZ, BG, LT, IT, SK, CH, GE) by the extended deadline. One reply arrived after the final deadline.**
- **Non of the representatives of the international organisations replied**

# Personal motivation/inputs

## Motivation

- **Exchange of experience with other members of the same ToS and receive input/guidance for implementation at national level were regarded as highest in personal motivation (Exchange with other ToS???)**
- Contribution to the UNECE/FAO programme of work was regarded high (score 4) in several replies
- Input to policy dialogue in some replies.
- Capacity building (training of trainers) was regarded as least important motivation in most replies.

## Personal contribution

- All respondents are actively participating
- 6/7 are contributing with their own technical inputs/expertise and helping in dissemination of results (at least at national scale).
- Only 2 respondents are following the activities without active participation, obviously, most members that belong in this category did not reply to the questionnaire at all.

# Organisation of team/leadership

- Organisation at national level: **several respondents mentioned communication with specialists and authorities from their own institutes, some mentioned also other national societies.**
- **6/8 respondents get sufficient support from their own country or organisation**, some mentioned insufficient funding, few also lack of interest. 2 mentioned international funding to support participation and one mentioned providing stronger support and advocacy from UNECE.
- **Sharing of information from the ToS within respondents own countries is mainly via personal communication, meetings and seminars.** Some respondents mentioned articles in national media.
- The question of the resource implications was mainly not replied or misunderstood, results not worth analysing.
- **None of the respondents regard language as a problem.**
- 5/7 regarded team leadership/guidance very high (score 5 or 4 for every item), 2/7 good (3) for some items and very good for the remaining
- **7/7 regard the ToS mandate clear, one did not reply this question. Also, the procedures reporting back to UNECE are regarded as clear.**

# Thematic content of the ToS

- **Developing the C&I and supporting reporting to SoEF and Global FRA are regarded as successful points of the ToS. The respondents were very unanimous on this.**
- **The coverage of expertise within the ToS is regarded as good.** One respondent regards that the ToS even too many members. One respondent proposes that the ToS would pay greater attention to contributing institutional cooperation on forest monitoring, improving countries capacities and supporting developing national systems. More expertise related to nature conservation was proposed for the team.
- **All respondents regard exchange and discussion within ToS useful.**
- Main deliverables and outputs: Preparation and review of the SoEF report
- 2/3 respondents replied not receiving feedback, one replied that email is used for communication.

# Structure of the Team

- **respond rate low to this theme**
- **4/4 respondents regard the composition of the team as representative region-wise, 4 did not reply this question.**
- **4/5 respondents regard the level of representation fair and satisfactory, 3 did not reply this, 1 proposed identifying the real members of the team.**
- **None of the respondents find bias in respect to regions or affiliation. All respondents (that replied this specific question) regard the team as well balanced in respect to affiliation.**
- **Average score for level of expertise was 4.5**

# Support from the secretariat

- **Support was ranked very high**, score 5 or 4 in almost every item and every reply. Two respondents gave score 3 to technical inputs/advice, the rest either 5 or 4 also for this item.
- Two respondents mentioned the shortage of financial sources/support, one mentioned paying more attention to capacity building at regional level, the rest did not identify any shortfalls. **Combining the work of ToS with other related projects or programmes was proposed as a solution to lack of resources.**

# Impact of ToS/Communication

- **poor response rate to this theme**
- 3/3 respondents consider that the outputs of the ToS are used well
- 3 /4 respondents consider the communication of the work of the ToS good or sufficient, one respondent doubts that a smaller team would communicate more efficiently, 4 did not reply.
- 3/4 respondent regard the impact of the work/results of ToS successfully, at least inside forest sector. One respondent give score 3 and 4 respondents did not reply to this question. Only one respondent provide example: “the materials/publications are well known and widely used in elaborating national policy documents, decision making and comparing forestry between countries. Outside the forest sector they serve in asserting the justified interests of forestry in cross-sectoral relations.”
- To share and to discuss the reports of the ToS in the annual meetings of the Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management
  - 3 respondents provided proposals: 1) reports must be short, concise and accurate 2) active dissemination at national level before meetings 3) documents must be disseminated early.