



## Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
26 July 2012

Original: English

---

### Economic Commission for Europe

#### Timber Committee

##### Seventieth session

Geneva, 16–19 October 2012

Item 8 of the provisional agenda

##### 2013 Strategic Review of the ECE/FAO Joint Programme of Work

### Results of Teams of Specialists Internal Evaluations

#### Note by the secretariat

##### *Summary*

At their joint session held from 10 to 15 October 2011 in Antalya Turkey, the ECE Timber Committee (TC) and the FAO European Forestry Commission (EFC) adopted the approach, methodology and timeline of the 2013 Strategic Review of the joint ECE/FAO Programme of Work, as contained in document ECE/TIM/2011/9-FO:EFC/2011/9, and authorized the secretariat to implement these, including an internal evaluation to be conducted by the Teams of Specialists. The results of the internal evaluation of all Teams of Specialists is presented in this document.

## I. Background

1. Every four to five years, ECE/FAO examines its integrated programme of work on timber and forestry to ensure that it still reflects the needs and priorities of member countries, and responds to mandates given by the European Forestry Commission and the Timber Committee.
2. For the period 2008 – 2013 seven Teams of Specialists (ToS) have been mandated to contribute to the integrated work programme. Each team is made up of forest experts working for governments, intergovernmental agencies and other specialized institutions and stakeholders. Nominated experts not only participate in an annual meeting of the team, they also to contribute to the work described in the team's mandate which is approved by both the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission.

3. Teams may provide guidance to the secretariat for their respective work areas. They also provide outreach to country-level experts, and have their own specific outputs. All countries may nominate members to the teams.
4. Team leaders are elected at the first meeting of the teams. Further guidance on the functioning of teams of specialists has been issued by ECE in “Guidelines for the establishment and functioning of teams of specialists within ECE.”
5. Teams of Specialists report to the ECE/FAO Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management. Below is the list of 7 active Teams of Specialists until 2013:
  - ToS on Sustainable Forest Products;
  - ToS on Monitoring Sustainable Forest Management;
  - ToS on Forest Policy in Eastern Europe and Central Asia;
  - ToS on Forest Fire;
  - Forest Communicators Network;
  - Joint ECE/FAO/ILO Expert Network to Implement Sustainable Forest Management;
  - ToS on Forest Sector Outlook.

## **II. Questionnaire for Teams of Specialists**

6. At their joint meeting in Antalya in October 2011, the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission approved the methodology and timeline for the 2013 Strategic Review of the joint ECE/FAO integrated programme on Forestry and Timber. The review is usually undertaken every 4-5 years and the current strategic review will determine priorities from 2014 up to 2017.
7. As part of this strategic review, ECE/FAO Teams of Specialists were requested to provide feedback into this process. To this end, and to facilitate internal consultation, the TC and EFC bureaux prepared a set of questions and ToS leaders were requested to seek participation in answering these questions from all their members.
8. Members were asked to submit the questionnaire directly to the ToS leader. However, if respondents wished to remain anonymous, replies could be sent directly to the Forestry and Timber Section and, in that case, the content of the questionnaire was forwarded to the leader without revealing the identity of the respondent.
9. The questionnaire contained both qualitative assessments, e.g. the respondents had to provide written statements, and quantitative assessments, e.g. the respondents were asked to score items on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest ranking and 5 the highest).
10. Based on the replies to the questionnaire, ToS leaders were asked to prepare a note to be presented and discussed at the meeting of the Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management, that took place in Geneva from 27 to 29 March 2012. The reports of the ToS leaders were posted on the ECE website as an information note in support of the discussions that took place at the WP meeting.
11. Short reports of the internal evaluation for each of the ToS are presented in the Annex.

### III. Conclusions of the internal evaluation

12. Despite the time given to respond to the questionnaire and a few reminders, the response rate from ToS members has been very low, ranging from 2% to 30%. The lowest response rate was from the Joint ECE/FAO/ILO Expert Network to Implement Sustainable Forest Management and the highest from the ToS on Forest Fire. This was explained partly by the lack of active participation by many ToS members and by the length of the questionnaire as well.

13. All ToS teams indicated that their main motivations for participating in the work of their respective ToS were the exchange of experience with other colleagues with similar expertise and networking opportunities.

14. Most ToS' members are satisfied with the thematic content of their respective ToS, even if some of them were not able to implement concrete activities.

15. Some teams are functioning well and are well structured with a clear mandate and were able to deliver tangible outputs that contributed significantly to the ECE/FAO Timber and Forestry Joint Programme of Work. However a few ToSs were assessed as having an unclear mandate which was correlated with a low level of participation, activities and outputs.

16. Regarding ToSs membership, country representation was assessed to be good in general. Most members are from government organizations. There is, however, a clear issue regarding the active participation of members from South Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus who cannot access the required funding to attend meetings. The level of members' expertise was found to be adequate in most cases. Language was not mentioned as an important barrier with the exception of one ToS.

17. Procedures for reporting back to the ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section were assessed to be unclear for most ToSs.

18. Support of the Secretariat was in general rated as good to very good especially regarding the organization of events and for reporting on these events. Secretariat guidance was rated as medium to good depending on the ToSs.

19. Collaboration and exchanges between ToSs is basically non-existent. There is, however, no significant interest from ToS members to strengthen inter-ToS exchanges.

### IV. Recommendations

20. The main cross-cutting recommendation, with no exception, was to identify ways to provide funding to support the work of ToSs and, in particular, the participation in ToSs activities of members from South Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus who cannot attend meetings due to financial constraints. Funding is also required to improve the quality of important outputs such as the European Forest Sector Outlook Study and the Forest Products Annual Market Review, and to support capacity building.

21. Although ToSs membership was found satisfactory, it was recommended by a few ToSs to diversify their memberships by including more representatives from academic and research institutions and NGOs. This would ensure more inclusive approaches and definition of objectives that, in turn, would respond better to society's expectations.

22. The mandate of a few ToSs needs to be revised for clarification and to better address the need of the ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Joint Programme of Work.

23. Finally, as highlighted in the evaluation, the relationship between ToSs and the ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section would need to be clarified and improved. Clearer

procedures, e.g. reporting lines and monitoring systems, would significantly improve the contribution of ToSs to the Joint Programme of Work as well as the support provided by the Secretariat.

24. Specific recommendations for each ToS can be found in the individual reports in the Annex.

## **Annex**

### **I. ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Sustainable Forest Products**

#### **A. Background**

1. The current mandate was established at the October 2008 TC/EFC Joint meeting in Rome. The team was established in 2001. The mandate was slightly revised and approved at the TC meeting in 2010. Membership in 2012 reached 49 persons from 29 countries within the ECE region, 4 international organizations, 2 international non-governmental organisations and 8 academic and research institutions. Eight responses to the questionnaire were provided (16% of total members and 24% of member countries).
2. The mandate of the ToS is to:
  - Contribute to the sustainable development of forest products markets in the ECE region;
  - Provide a forum for discussion of forest products marketing in the ECE region. In particular, contribute to the ECE Timber Committee annual market discussions and thereby advise ECE/FAO on forest products market developments;
  - Advise the ECE/FAO secretariat on implementation of Work Area 1, focusing on its products and publications, and undertaking studies as appropriate;
  - Provide assistance in marketing in the ECE region, especially to Central and Eastern European countries, (and CIS countries where possible), through information collection, analysis and dissemination, and capacity building;
  - Maintain and expand the international network and forums for discussion, information exchange and collaboration on forest products markets and marketing.

#### **B. Main comments**

##### **(a) Personal motivation**

3. The respondents indicated that their interest in being a team member was because of (in order of importance): expert exchange of experiences and lessons learnt; input to policy dialogue; contribution to the ECE/FAO programme of work; contribution to the regional input at global level; exchange with other members of the same ToS.
4. Their personal contribution to the team (in order of importance) involved: contributing with own technical inputs/expertise; helping in dissemination of outputs of the ToS; actively participating in the ToS meetings; following the activities of ToS without active participation; leading the ToS.

##### **(b) Organisation of team/leadership**

5. All of the replies indicated that they were not receiving the financial support needed and many mentioned a lack of time as another limitation. Replies as to how to overcome this limitation ranged from: better financial support, expanding private-government partnerships, and better promotion and outreach to government bodies. Most replied that they shared information on the ToS via discussion with their agency, peers and interested parties.

6. Assessment of the team leader/guidance was favorable. However, the range of answers regarding the ToS mandate and procedures for reporting back to the ECE/FAO indicated that their working relationship and reporting procedure need to be strengthened.

**(c) Thematic content**

7. The team felt that the following team activities were successful and should be continued for the 2014- 2017 period, however the feeling was that this should be discussed openly at the next ToS meeting: Forest Products Annual Market Review (FPAMR) and statistics, capacity building workshops, R&D in the forest industry, illegal logging and trade, trade policies, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), certified forest products, market information service, sustainable development in the forest sector, green economy, payment for forest ecosystem services.

8. Regarding the necessary expertise to carry out the work of the team; the answers were divergent and ranged from: all needed expertise is in the present ToS; “No, we lack end use expertise of timber products”.

9. The Team felt that their major outputs of the team and their impacts were: the FPAMR, the most important and useful output from the Timber Committee; Capacity building workshops, primarily in Eastern Europe and the western Balkans, have been highly successful and should continue; the marketing experts database; the ToS web site; and holding meetings in conjunction with other organizational conferences around the world.

10. There was no clear view as to whether or not feedback and comments concerning the dissemination of outputs was sufficient, indicating that perhaps this is an area that needs to be explored further for suggestions.

**(d) Structure of the Team**

11. The consensus was that the team was fairly represented in terms of the countries of the ECE region, however, there is a lack of NGOs, too many passive members, a lack of industry expertise and also a lack of researchers.

**(e) Support from the Secretariat**

12. In general the Team felt that the level of support from the Secretariat was sufficient, however, there were several cases where financial and organizational support (i.e., Illegal Logging Workshop) was lacking.

**(f) Impact of ToS/Communication**

13. All comments were positive with emphasis put on the Forest Products Annual Market Review as the example.

**C. Conclusions**

14. The Team struggles with financial and institutional support and is unsure of its role and responsibilities as they relate to the ECE/FAO. They rely highly on their own personal motivation and interest in sustainable forest products. Overall they are pleased with the outputs and achievements that they have accomplished, despite being a bit unsure of their mandate and their abilities to communicate their achievements. They find the geographical representation of the team to be proper, but feel that representation from forest industry and NGOs would add to the Team. In general, they approve of the support given to them by the Secretariat, however, there have been cases where they felt unsupported.

## **II. ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Monitoring Sustainable Forest Management**

### **A. Background**

15. The ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on monitoring SFM (Team) was established by the joint session of the ECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission, Rome, 23-24 October 2008. The Team continues the work of its predecessors that had been acting under different names and mandates since 1995. In general, the Team is expected to provide advice on the implementation of activities in Work Area 2 “Forest Resources Assessment”, with regard to data collection, validation and dissemination.

16. The overall Team’s role is to strengthen the strategic discussion of the monitoring of sustainable forest management, maintain and expand the international network and forums for discussion on forest resources and the monitoring of SFM and contribute to institutional cooperation on monitoring of forests.

17. The work of the Team should result in improving coordination of reporting on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management by Forest Europe and Montreal process countries. Furthermore the group should support the regional contribution to the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). It is anticipated that the activities undertaken by the Team should improve countries’ reporting capacities and support the development of national systems of forest monitoring.

18. The expected major outputs for the 2008-2013 Programme of Work are:

- Regional contribution to Global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA) 2010 and 2015;
- Assistance in the preparation and review of the next report on the State of Forests in Europe, for the Sixth and Seventh Ministerial Conferences: including advice on enquiries, definitions etc., covering quantitative indicators;
- Improved reporting capacity of countries weak in reporting on criteria and indicators for the State of Europe’s Forests Reports (SoEF);
- Guidance on the implementation of the forest type classification.

19. The questionnaire for Team’s assessment was sent to 90 members from 35 countries and 16 international organisations. The ratio of response was 10%; however in terms of number of countries participating in the evaluation the ratio was higher and exceeded 30%.

### **B. Main comments**

#### **(a) Personal motivation**

20. “Exchange of experience”, “Exchange with other members of the same Team” and “Receiving input/guidance for implementation at national level” were regarded as highest categories in personal motivation; the replies were consistent on this point. In several replies “Contribution to the ECE/FAO programme of work” was regarded as high (score 4, in 1-5 scale) while in some other replies “Input to policy dialogue” received high notes. “Capacity building (training of trainers)” was regarded as the least important motivation in most replies.

#### **(b) Organisation of team/leadership**

21. The Team has been operating as follows:

- Four regular meetings have been organised since the approval of the current mandate, in which 64 experts from 28 countries and 39 specialists from 12 organisations or institutions took part.
- The work of the group is coordinated by the leader (Finland) and three deputy leaders (Austria, Lithuania and the United States). When debating on major steps, the leaders might be supported by the leaders of thematic sub-groups.
- The membership in the Team is based on the official nomination by a country (Head of Delegation) or invitation from the Secretariat. Depending on the needs and topics addressed, individual experts can be invited to a particular meeting. With a few exceptions, members (countries or organisations) cover costs of their contributions and participation. Two out of four meetings were organised with significant involvement of a host country (Russian Federation) or organisation (JRC Ispra).
- The main method of work include plenary meetings, however work in thematic and regional groups is receiving increasing importance. The vast majority of activities are focused on the preparation of the FRA and the State of Europe's Forests (SoEF) reports. The Team participates in the organisation of thematic workshops/seminars dedicated to specific issues that cannot be resolved or addressed through regular meetings of the Team.

**(c) Thematic content**

22. Contributing to development of Criteria and Indicators on SFM and support provided to reporting on SoEF and FRA are regarded as the main responsibilities of the Team, which should be seen as a strategic contributor to the main outputs in this area, which are:

**(i) Global and regional reports on the state of forest resources:**

- Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010, FAO, Rome 2010; work on next cycle has already started;
- State of Europe's Forests 2011, Forest Europe/ECE/FAO, Oslo, 2011; work of the new reporting cycle has been launched at the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Team.

**(ii) International seminars and workshops**

- Four regular meetings of the Team, in 2009, 2010 (x2) and 2012, each with 40-50 participants;
- Technical workshop "Reporting using the new European forest types" May 19-21, 2010, Bordeaux, France;
- Seminar "State of forests and forest management in the ECE region in the context of current and future needs and challenges", 21 March 2011, Geneva, Switzerland.

**(iii) Quality standards and analysis; the Team (in cooperation with partner organisations and experts) developed or contributed to several outputs, prepared for the purpose of reporting, that serve as informal standards for statistics on forest resources**

- Terms, definitions and classifications for SoEF and FRA processes;
- Advanced version of the European Forest Types and guidelines for their application;
- Experimental method for assessment of SFM in Europe.



23. In general, responding members were satisfied with the thematic content of the Team's work, although a few comments suggested areas to be improved. An area of concern is the lack of activities relevant to specific regions, in particular North America and the Caucasus and Central Asia.

**(d) Structure of the team**

24. The overall level of expertise is rated as quite high (4.5), with reservations concerning areas of SFM (socio-economic indicators, nature conservation) where improvement is sought. Participation and representation in terms of affiliation was evaluated as not biased. Areas of possible concern refer to participation of experts from the southern-eastern part of the ECE region.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

25. Support of the secretariat was ranked as very high, with a score of 5 or 4 for almost every item and every reply. Furthermore, some respondents mentioned the shortage of financial sources/support, and the need to pay more attention to capacity building at a regional level; the majority of respondents did not identify any shortfalls. Combining the work of ToS with other related projects or programmes was proposed as a solution to the lack of resources.

**(f) Impact of ToS**

26. As only a few respondents addressed the issue of the impact of the Team, an objective assessment of this aspect is difficult. From the replies received, a positive conclusion could be drawn, mainly based on the results of evaluations of the flagship reports (SoEF and FRA) that are developed with the active participation of the Team. For example, this assessment seems to be supported by the results of the survey on State of Europe's Forests 2011 report, where 60% of respondents were fully and 30% of respondent partly satisfied with the role the Team played in production of the report.

## **C. Recommendations**

27. The overall work, structure, involvement and impact of the Team were evaluated as being generally appropriate. At the same time, several important issues of a rather technical/operational nature were identified; it is foreseen that they will be resolved in the course of the regular work of the Team and with available resources and capacities. The recent review, as well as other analysis of the Team's functioning revealed or confirmed the existence of several issues, which may require considerable attention, significant rearrangement and/or mobilisation of additional resources. These are the following:

- Current membership of the Team provides little expertise on social and economic indicators. There is little prospect of this changing much in the future, so it is recommended that other approaches be adopted for this area. This could include organizing a separate workshop(s) or studies on social and economic indicators that could attract different participants. This need was confirmed by the relatively weak information received for the SoEF2011 for this group of indicators;
- There has been little progress on improving the reporting capacity of countries weak in reporting on criteria and indicators for the State of Europe's Forests. This objective is unlikely to be satisfactorily achieved, because those who participate in regular meetings of the Team or email correspondence are unlikely to include many from the target group. Outreach activities would require additional resources. Further opportunities could be realized by enhancing cooperation with other projects, like the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST), the

European Forest Institute Criteria and Indicators (EFI C&I) and use all opportunities delivered by the process for collaborative global reporting (2015);

- A decreasing involvement of the Team in important issues relevant to North American countries has been observed and activities undertaken brought only limited success. A new approach, putting more emphasis on working with that region through global, collaborative reporting and closer cooperation with the Montréal Process has been implemented. Further results can be expected from the meeting, which will be organised in the USA, in August 2012; it is too early for the evaluation of this approach.

### **III. ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Policy in Eastern Europe and Central Asia**

#### **A. Background**

28. The mandate of the ECE/FAO Team of Specialists Forest Policy in Eastern Europe and Central Asia was approved by the Timber Committee and the European Forestry Commission in Rome on 23-24 October 2008. The ToS was established to identify priority issues in countries in the region and to promote a transparent regional discussion of priorities and best practices in reforming policies and institutions to support and contribute to the sustainable development of the forest sector in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

29. Membership in 2012 reached 55 persons from 27 countries within the ECE region, 5 international organizations, 3 international non-governmental organisations and 4 academic and research institutions. Only 3 responses (from Austria, Macedonia and Russian Federation) to the questionnaire were provided (5% of total members and 11% of member countries).

#### **B. Main comments**

##### **(a) Personal motivation**

30. The main reasons for members to participate are the expectation to exchange information with other members of the ToS, in particular on lessons learnt and inputs to policy dialogue as well as to contribute to capacity building and to policy relevant publications. There were lower expectations regarding the exchange with other ToSs or with receiving guidance for implementation at a national level. Similarly there was only a moderate interest in contributing to the ECE/FAO Programme of Work.

##### **(b) Organisation of team/leadership**

31. It was felt that the mandate of the ToS was not clear enough and has been considerably hampered by the lack of funds. The reporting procedure to ECE/FAO is not known and no report was prepared.

32. The language barrier (English-Russian) has been identified as a problem.

33. Despite a good start during its first two years, after this period the ToS didn't function anymore as it seemed that members lost interest and guidance on future work remained limited. As a result no activities were undertaken during the last two years.

##### **(c) Thematic content**

34. Only a very few activities were carried out, therefore, there was no follow-up for most of the themes foreseen in the mandate.

35. It was felt that some of the ToS members have little expertise in forest policy and the selection of the ToS' members could be improved.

36. With the exception of the first meeting in Budapest, which produced tangible results (a roadmap), the second meeting in Istanbul was disappointing and was not followed up by other meetings. However, one useful output was mentioned: the production of a glossary of forest policy terms in English and Russian.

**(d) Structure of the team**

37. The team composition at its onset was rated to be good, with good potential, but this potential was not realized. One respondent indicated that the members' expertise in forest policy was weak.

38. In general the representation of countries was considered to be fair and not biased. Most members are from government administrations. Non-governmental representatives were invited to attend the meeting in Istanbul. It was suggested to improve the representation of NGOs and academic and research institutions.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

39. The support of the secretariat was ranked very good to good for the organization of events and preparation of minutes but respectively lower for the distribution of ToS results and the guidance on reporting. It was suggested to provide more resources for the organization of meetings and to support the participation of members. A more strategic choice of themes could generate additional funding and sponsorship.

**(f) Impact of ToS**

40. The impact of the ToS was assessed as being unsatisfactory and very limited. This poor achievement was mainly explained by the lack of clarity of the mandate, specific targets, commitments and management of the ToS as well as the lack of funding for members to participate in meetings.

41. In addition other constraints were identified, such as language, with just about 50% of members speaking English; the high fluctuation of participants; the very different national forest policy contexts and the lack of expertise of the ToS' members which contributed further to the low level of achievements.

## **C. Recommendations**

42. The ToS members formulated a set of recommendations to improve the work of the ToS. These include:

- The need to identify and nominate individuals that are involved in forest policy development and implementation and that have the mandate and authority to make forest policy related decisions;
- To develop annual work plans as well as a monitoring and reporting system;
- To identify funding for the participation of members from countries with economies in transition as well as to provide translation services during the meetings.

## **IV. ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Fire**

### **A. Background**

43. The Team of Specialists on Forest Fire works in close cooperation with other global and regional organizations and processes (e.g. the UNISDR Wildlife Fore Advisory Group/ Global Wildland Fire Network, FAO, UNISDR, the Council of Europe) to provide guidance to member States on forest fire management and policies and to foster cooperation in fire management within the ECE region. Membership in 2012 reached 34 members from 21 countries within the ECE region and 3 international organizations. A total of 10 answers to the questionnaire were received (30% of members) from 12 member countries (57% of the total).

### **B. Main comments**

#### **(a) Personal motivation**

44. The main reasons for members to participate in the work of this group are related to exchanges that can be made with other members of the team, including the exchange of experiences and lessons learnt between experts. The contribution that can be made to the regional policy dialogue and input that can be taken from the group to the national level are also important factors. The exchanges with other ToS were assessed as less important for the work of the team.

#### **(b) Organization of team/leadership**

45. All replies confirmed that team members are actively engaged in reporting back at the national level within the relevant agencies and offices and, according to the majority of the replies, general support is provided to the team members to participate in the work of the group. Lack of financial support, however, remains a challenge and the main impediment to full or more active engagement for 75% of the respondents. It should be noted that the main funding for the work of the ToS is provided by the team leader through the Global Fire Monitoring Center. Commitment and time dedicated to the work of the team comes from most members from outside their working hours and their regular job. As far as the leader is concerned, all team members rated his guidance and leadership very highly. According to the responses received, both the ToS mandate as well as the procedures to report to the Secretariat are clear.

#### **(c) Thematic content**

46. All replies to the questionnaire confirmed that this Team of Specialists considers that this thematic area addresses very relevant and appropriate issues that are worth continuing to address, including in upcoming meetings or events. Moreover, members consider exchanges within the team to be very useful and beneficial to their respective work. For instance, the US member of the team stressed that 'the exchanges of knowledge and information between North America and the European countries is a key benefit of our participation'. As far as final products/deliverables and main outputs of the ToS are concerned, countries highlighted a series of different outcomes. A comment by one country, however, highlighted the need to further disseminate the outcomes, not only via the website of the team but possibly also by other means (e.g. by e-mail).

#### **(d) Structure of the team**

47. The main emphasis of the work of the Team is in assisting countries of the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) region in building national capacity in fire

management, development of national policies and addressing the specific problems in the region, including transboundary cooperation in fire management. This regional focus is intended not to overlap with the ongoing work of the European Commission through its European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS) in the Western part of the ECE region, notably in the Euro-Mediterranean region (in conjunction with the Silva Mediterranea Fire Group) and the North American Forestry Commission's Fire Management Working Group. In general, all replies received express satisfaction with the current composition and representativeness of the team. However, wildland fires are an important challenge also for other countries, not yet represented in the team. For instance, the South Caucasus region, is represented in the ToS only by Azerbaijan. In addition, other countries which are not registered as members are often participating in the outreach activities of the team and in the regional Wildland Fire Networks.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

48. Lack of financial resources to support further participation in the work of the ToS is seen as a shortfall also from the side of the Secretariat. Additional resources and personnel should ideally be provided to support the ToS work.

**(f) Impact of ToS/Communication**

49. The question pertaining to cooperation with other ToS reveals the lowest rating / interest concerning the need for cross sectoral work between the different ToS. Given the regional priorities of the work of the ToS in the EECCA region, however, the intent to closely cooperate with the ToS on Forest Policy in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) has been expressed by the team leader on different occasions.

50. No specific comment was provided on impacts outside the forest sector. However the team leader informed that, as stated in the ToS' objectives, the Team "will continue to address all vegetation fires ("wildland fires"), including fires in the agricultural sector and in peatland/wetland biomes." In all countries of the ECE region land use, land-use change, fire use and wildfires in the open landscapes (agricultural lands, pasture lands and other non-forest ecosystems) are strongly impacting forests and forest fires. Thus, assistance provided by the Team to countries for the development of national fire management policies and /or strategies includes these "external sectors". Fire problems arising at the interface between naturally vegetated lands on the one side, and residential, industrial and otherwise anthropogenically impacted or modified vegetation on the other side (often referred to as "wildland-urban interface") are the focus of the work of the Team – see activities listed in the review 2009-10 and 2011-12 of the Team.

**C. Recommendations**

51. The ToS noted the importance of also addressing forest fire prevention (in particular through a participatory and bottom-up approach), and it was suggested that the ToS mandate be modified to specifically cover this issue.

**V. Forest Communicators Network**

**A. Background**

52. The ECE/FAO Forest Communicators' Network (FCN) was established by the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission (EFC) with the overall objective of improving the ability of the forest and forest products sector to communicate effectively, within and outside the sector, by providing a forum for international interaction

and cooperation in forest related communications and developing the professionalism of forest communicators by introducing and encouraging state of the art communication approaches.

53. There are 42 officially nominated members from 27 countries and an additional 92 people who have joined the network upon invitation of the FCN Leader. Participation in the FCN is open to all those sharing common objectives and tasks.

54. The questionnaire was sent out twice to all FCN members (134 people). A total of six responses (4% of members) to the questionnaire were received.

## **B. Main comments**

55. The number of replies received might not provide a full representation of the membership. Nonetheless, the answers provided useful information on the current situation. The picture drawn of the FCNs performance and achievements is generally quite positive. Questionnaires also point to areas of concern. The FCN will look closely into the results of the questionnaire at its meeting in June 2012 in Antalya, in order to identify potential room for improvement.

56. Some of the main findings included:

- Exchange of experiences and lessons learnt, building a professional network and access to tangible outputs are the main motivations mentioned for participating in the FCN. This is followed by the expectation of receiving inputs and guidance for national and local implementation and for the policy dialogue. The regional input provided by the FCN to global forest communications was seen to also be important.
- In most cases FCN members integrate FCN activities and outputs in their domestic agendas and institutional set up.
- Decreasing financial support is seen as a major concern with regard to FCN participation and activities.
- Keeping the issue of forest communication high on political agendas, organising attractive meetings and producing useful outputs are mentioned as responses to the resource constraints.
- Leadership and guidance for the Team are qualified as being fairly good.
- As for more interaction with other ToS, the possibilities seem to be limited due to the general resource constraints.

### **(a) Personal motivation**

57. The exchange of national experiences and initiatives undertaken at a regional level were often mentioned as an incentive to become part of the team. Most respondents found that the contribution of the FCN towards the ECE/FAO programme of work was not a priority to their participation in the team. Some rated the input/guidance for implementation at the national level as poor and noted the need to reinforce capacity building in general.

### **(b) Organisation of team / leadership**

58. The mandate of the Team is quite clear. However, reporting requirements to ECE/FAO need to be clarified.

### **(c) Thematic content**

59. All topics under the current mandate are seen as relevant, some are seen as particularly successful and making an impact, in particular the work done for the Strategic

Framework, for the International Year of Forests (IYF) and for the EU. Several mandated topics are seen as being relevant for continuation beyond the current mandate, but should be supplemented by specific projects and initiatives. This, however, will also depend on the availability of resources.

60. Stronger involvement by some countries, including Russia, The United States, Canada and Eastern European countries, is seen as desirable. As for Eastern Europe, travel support for participants might solve the problem. As for North America, there seems to be a lack of interest in Europe-centered communication issues.

61. The mix of governmental, non-governmental and private sector participation is seen as balanced and fruitful.

**(d) Structure of the team**

62. Leadership and guidance of the Team was rated as good. The regional coverage was seen as uneven, with the under-representation of countries from North America, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia. More involvement of the private sector would be beneficial to tailor messages for a wider range of audiences and to understand the forest sector's needs from a business perspective.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

63. Respondents were satisfied with the support and guidance from the secretariat.

**(f) Impact of ToS**

64. The impact FCN work makes at different levels depends on circumstances and the activities of individual members. In general, FCN expertise and concepts are sought after by a number of institutions and organisations, in particular the UNFF Secretariat, FAO, ECE, the FOREST EUROPE Process and the European Union.

**C. Recommendations**

65. It was recommended that the reporting lines be clarified. The lack of funding for participating in meetings and the lack of resources, in general, was seen as a barrier to expanding the geographic and substantive reach of this work.

**V. ECE/FAO Joint Expert Network to implement Sustainable Forest Management**

**A. Background**

66. The ILO/ECE/FAO Joint Expert Network (JEN) to implement Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) was established by the joint session of the ECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission, Rome, 23-24 October 2008. It succeeded the ILO/ECE/FAO joint Committee on Forest Technology, management and training, which was created in 1954.

67. The focus of the network's activities is the implementation of sustainable forest management in Europe and North America, in particular relating to social, cultural and environmental aspects, on the basis of the broad policy objectives established by the parent bodies and Forest Europe. It concentrates on a limited range of topics, for instance training, workforce issues, private forestry, contractors, occupational safety and health, and the social dimension of forestry (SFM), i.e. on the human resource aspects. While all countries

benefit from international cooperation, the Experts Network recognizes the special needs of some countries of the CIS and Southeast Europe, as identified in the integrated programme of work.

68. The expected major outputs for the 2008-2013 Programme of Work are:

- A regular exchange of information and advice on best forest practice and technology transfer allied with the use of innovative information technology and communication systems;
- International seminars and workshops which are primarily intended for forest specialists and practitioners;
- Quality standards and analysis.

69. According to the official designation procedure, which occurred in 2008, the JEN has 43 members. The majority of the JEN work is accomplished by a steering committee consisting of four members.

70. Only one answer to the questionnaire, which was provided by the JEN leader, was received.

## **B. Main comments**

### **(a) Personal motivation**

71. The main motivations of the JEN leader are (1 lowest motivation, 5 highest motivation)

1. Contribution to the ECE/FAO programme of work;
2. Contribution to the regional input made at a global level;
3. Tangible outputs such as publications/reports/strategies;
4. Expert exchange of experiences and lessons learnt;
5. Capacity building.

### **(b) Organisation of team/leadership**

72. The JEN steering committee establishes the work programme which consists of practical actions and a seminar. The steering committee members and relevant partners raise funds, mainly through the European Union programmes, in order to implement the practical activities. It identifies countries to host meetings. However, the JEN has to face a lack of funding for preparatory meetings, an impediment which has not yet been solved.

73. Apart from funding issues, the members and partners provide in kind contributions ("time and efforts"), which are as difficult to measure as crucial.

### **(c) Thematic content**

74. The social aspects of SFM are at the heart of the JEN work. However, the link between social and environmental aspects is more and more important. Below are examples of outputs, that are presented according to the mandates:

#### **(i) Regular exchange of information and advice on best forest practice and technology transfer:**

- EU project WETNet: facilitating harvesting and processing of wood to produce wood energy in optimal conditions (productivity, forest management, security). This project was initiated thanks to the JEN, following the ECE/FAO workshop on Wood Mobilization in June 2009, in Grenoble France.



- EDUFOREST (Network of European Forestry Training Centres): giving the opportunity to forestry training centres to speak with one voice at Forestry relevant events in Europe. This network was launched at the last conference of forestry training centres (see below).

**(ii) International seminars and workshops**

- Conferences of Forestry Training Centres: attracting new, skilled workers and promoting the training of forest workers who have not had yet the chance to be trained. The third conference was organized in June 2011 in Ossiach, Austria, under the auspices of the JEN.
- Impact of climate change on forest work: assessing the consequences of climate change for forest workers and proposing practical adaptation solutions (to be held in 2013).

**(iii) Quality standards and analysis**

75. The JEN supported the launch of European competence certification schemes such as:

- ConCert (certification of competency for forestry entrepreneurs);
- ECC (European Chainsaw users' Certification).

76. It also supported the initiative to enhance the quality of forestry work at a pan European level with the European Forestry and Environmental Skills Council (EFESC). These certificates will promote the mobility of European forest workers as well as safety during forestry work.

**(d) Structure of the team**

77. The level of expertise is rated as quite high (5). However, the coverage should be improved by involving more JEN national focal points.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

78. The role of the secretariat was assessed as follows (ranking: 1- lowest quality to 5- highest quality):

1. Distribution of ToS results,
2. Providing timely information and documents,
3. Preparation of minutes,
4. Organisation of events,
5. Excellent platform for communication between the Network and ECE/FAO.

79. The lack of Secretariat funds available to support the JEN work (beside the above mentioned tasks) has been mentioned. However, the JEN developed its own strategy to raise funds.

**(f) Impact of ToS**

80. The information and tools that are the results of EU projects supported by the JEN are used. The direct and indirect impacts of these projects are difficult to measure. The recent launch of EDUFOREST and the first implementation of the competence certification schemes are promising, but need to be monitored.

## **C. Recommendations**

81. The JEN leader recommended the following:

- To inform regularly by email ToS members on the work of all ToS.
- To suggest that every ToS identify one cooperation project with one or several other teams (for example with the Forest Communicators Network: how to attract and keep young professionals to work in the forest sector?).

## **VI. ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Outlook**

### **A. Background**

82. The ToS on Forest Sector Outlook has the objective of providing advice and support to the ECE/FAO secretariat on the methodology, implementation and follow-up of regional outlook studies. Since its inception it has contributed substantially to the production of two main deliverables: the European Forest Sector Outlook Study II (EFSOS II) and the North American Forest Sector Outlook Study (NAFSOS).

83. Eight members (9% of members) provided replies to the questionnaire. Total membership is 93, not all of whom are active.

### **B. Main comments**

#### **(a) Personal motivation**

84. The main reasons for members to participate in the work of this group are related to sharing of experiences and the production of tangible outputs, such as EFSOS II and NAFSOS. The contribution that can be provided to policy dialogues was also an important factor. Exchanges with other ToS were assessed as less important for the work of the team.

#### **(b) Organization of team/leadership**

85. All replies confirmed that team members are actively engaged in sharing the results informally with colleagues within and outside their organisation. Some members also disseminate the results through presentations upon request.

86. Commitment and time dedicated to the work of the team mainly comes from outside working hours. The team leader and his deputy devoted a significant amount of time and resources to the EFSOS II and NAFSOS projects they respectively led. ECE/FAO funding was not sufficient to cover their efforts which meant that they had to devote a significant amount of their own time to the project.

87. General support is provided to the team members to participate in the work of the group. Most core team members and specialists reported insufficient resources, depending on their level of involvement and the support received from their institutes/countries, as a major constraint to participation. Travel expenses could be reduced through video conferencing, whereas wider dissemination of results could attract more donor funds.

88. Lack of financial resources is seen as a shortcoming. EFSOS II, in particular, was produced on a shoestring budget integrating existing approaches and models in a patchwork. However, these models were not designed to be used together. Additional resources and personnel should be provided to support the ToS work and allow the

development of a cohesive modelling approach. Private companies and governments were identified as possible sources for contributions of funds and/or staff.

89. All team members rated the ToS leadership highly. Feedback from the core team to country correspondents was evaluated as sporadic and limited by time pressures and scarce resources. Interestingly, the ToS mandate and procedures were clear to only half of the respondents.

**(c) Thematic content**

90. All replies to the questionnaire confirmed that this ToS addresses very relevant themes that are worth continuing to address in upcoming meetings and projects. The development of scenarios reflecting major policy challenges was highlighted as a very successful approach. Moreover, members consider exchanges within the team, especially within the core group, to be very useful for keeping track of the projects and ensuring consensus decisions. More time could be devoted to technical discussions at the expense of organisational matters. The technical quality of the major outputs (EFSOS II and NAFSOS) was rated highly at 4.2 out of 5. Feedback was received mostly through informal channels such as e-mails and conversations.

91. For future work, team members suggested placing more emphasis on globalisation, the influence of emerging economies as well as on climate change impacts and links with ecology. They also recommended a more coherent approach to the modelling of scenarios and improving consistency between sub-regional outlooks with a view to considering an outlook study for the ECE region as a whole.

**(d) Structure of the team**

92. Active involvement of team members outside the core group is limited. Ways and means to keep the national correspondents better involved should be explored. Russia, the Mediterranean and Balkan countries were particularly less present in the process. Member affiliation was judged to be rather balanced among government, university and NGO experts. A balanced composition within the core group was perceived as critical to covering all aspects in the studies. One member pointed out that the participation of academic institutions and universities in the outlook process was limited compared to their potential. EFSOS II and NAFSOS are not scientific, “peer-reviewed” publications in the strict sense of the terms perhaps making them less attractive to academics. Nonetheless, the level of expertise within the team was regarded as very good, scoring a rating of 4.2.

**(e) Support of the secretariat**

93. Overall secretariat support and guidance was rated highly (4.4) by respondents.

**(f) Impact of ToS/Communication**

94. The main outputs (EFSOS II and NAFSOS) are used by trade associations and researchers. Industry professionals and public policy and decision makers are less aware of these studies and the wealth of information provided by the ECE/FAO in general. Except for the core group, communication within the ToS was not optimal and correspondents need to be more involved. Exchanges with other ToS were extremely limited by time and resources. Common reporting (through the JWPFSSEM) could improve this situation although ToS members called for the Secretariat to provide basic information (e.g. summaries of the reports) prior to meetings to allow all participants a good level of knowledge.

95. The impact of the ToS’s work is difficult to assess. Suggested means to measure impact were: attendance at meetings where results are discussed, citation statistics and discussions with policy makers and industry professionals.

## **C. Recommendations**

96. For future work, team members suggested placing more emphasis on globalisation, the influence of emerging economies as well as on climate change impacts and links with ecology. They also recommended a more coherent approach to the modelling of scenarios and improving consistency between sub-regional outlooks with a view to considering an outlook study for the ECE region as a whole.

97. Team members called for better visibility and funding of authors and therefore encouraged the Secretariat to call on governments to secure contributions and to raise awareness of the importance of the outlook work.

---