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Origin/Mandate

Originated in Resolution 10/2 of the 10th session of the UNFF (19-28 April 2013, Istanbul, Turkey).

According to this resolution, the independent assessment of the IAF should work in complement to other relevant intersessional activities.

In preparation for a decision on the post-2015 international arrangement on forests at UNFF11.

→ Independent expert review team
→ AHEG process on IAF
IAF Independent Assessment Team

Experts
BLASER, Juergen (WEOG - Switzerland)
CHIPETA, Mafa Evaristus (Africa - Malawi)
LOBOVIKOV, Maxim (Eastern Europe - Russian Federation)
LLLUECA, Jorge (Latin America and the Caribbean - Panama)
UMALI, Ricardo Martinez (Asia - the Philippines)

Co-Facilitators
HOOGHEVEEN, Hans (The Netherlands)
Amb. ABDULLAH, Saiful (Malaysia)
Purpose of the Independent Assessment of the IAF

Provide an independent expert input to AHEG (the *ad-hoc* expert group). AHEG is tasked to provide its views and recommendations to UNFF11 to arrive at decisions on the future of the IAF.

The **Independent Assessment Team** will present interim findings to the AHEG I and will submit its final output prior to AHEG II.

The assessment will analyse whether the IAF remains

- relevant and appropriate to its mandate,
- its faults and achievements,
- Its efficiency and effectiveness since 2000.
- The impact of UNFF’s work and the sustainability of actions
- Make recommendations for a future arrangement if any.
Composition of the International Arrangement on Forests

- The core objectives of the UNFF as stated in ECOCOC Resolution 2000/35;
- The implementation of the Forest Instrument (NLBI) and the 4 Global Objectives on Forests (ECOSOC 2006/49);
- The contribution of forests to the IADG/Millennium Development Goals; and
- The actors of the IAF who constitute the UNFF’s “membership”.
Composition of the International Arrangement on Forests: Stakeholders

The IAF consists of:

- The **Member States** and countries who are members of the Forum acting individually and working together;
- The **UNFF Secretariat** located within DESA in New York;
- The 14 members of the **Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF)** contributing to the work of the UNFF collectively and individually, including implementation of the Resolutions of the Forum;
- Relevant other IGOs;
- **Regional organizations and their processes**; and
- **Major Groups** who take part in the Forum’s sessions.
IAF Team working approach

The **inception phase**: developing a common understanding amongst team members of the issues relating to its task and of gathering more in-depth data and information (End of October – December 2013).

The **inquiry phase** includes a team meeting in NY on 11/12 Jan 14: data collection and analysis work by each team member at regional level → interactions with you. Includes reporting to AHEG 1 and receiving feedback from AHEG 1 (December 2013 – April 2014).

The **conclusion and recommendation phase** which starts with a team meeting in April 2014 that will do further analysis, consolidation and the preparation of a single expert report (April-September 2014).
Organisation of work

Matrix Approach: Thematic and regional inputs
Each consultant to provide inputs on the TORs for his region and highlights regional perspectives on to lead thematic consultant colleagues on all their specific assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Work of The Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing UNFF and its processes since year 2000 . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of forest instrument . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Forum’s Secretariat and the Review of CPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of financing; Full range of financing options &amp; strategies  MAXIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UNFF in the context of UN Sustainable Development framework/Inter-sectoral context  JUERGEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a full range of options, including a legally-binding instrument or otherwise  ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[Initial] Challenges

- Independent review?
- No culture of evaluation, no methodological support
- Leadership within team not specified, not easy to coordinate
- Relation to AHEG needs to be flashed out
- Expectations might be too high (particularly for AHEG 1)
- Regional coverage not easy because of financial and organizational constraints
Please contact us...

For Eastern Europe, Russian Federation and Central Asian Countries:

Maxim Lobovikov  maxim.lobovikov@mail.ru

For EU, JUSCANZ countries:

Juergen Blaser  juergen.blaser@bfh.ch
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