IMPROVED PAN-EUROPEAN INDICATORS FOR SFM NOT YET ENDORSED

At the last MCPFE Expert Level Meeting (ELM) (10-11 June 2002) 28 out of the 36 recommended quantitative indicators as well as the recommended qualitative indicators for sustainable forest management were endorsed. Eight quantitative indicators were not endorsed so far. In the subsequent round of comments the status and text of the following five indicators have not been questioned:

- **Indicator 5.2 Protective forests – infrastructure and managed natural resources**
  Area of forest and other wooded land designated to protect infrastructure and managed natural resources against natural hazards, part of MCPFE protection category “Protective Functions”

- **Indicator 6.5 Forest sector workforce**
  Number of persons employed and labour input in the forest sector, classified by gender and age group, education and job characteristics

- **Indicator 6.6 Occupational safety and health**
  Frequency of occupational accidents and occupational diseases in forestry

- **Indicator 6.7 Wood consumption**
  Consumption per head of wood and products derived from wood

- **Indicator 6.8 Trade in wood**
  Imports and exports of wood and products derived from wood
The advantages and disadvantages of the following three indicators have been commented and should be discussed again at the Expert Level Meeting, 7-8 October 2002:

- **Indicator 4.7 Landscape pattern**
  Landscape-level spatial pattern of forest cover

  **Pros:**
  - Forest pattern gives information on the size, shape and spatial distribution of forests
  - Reflects the potential of a landscape to provide forest habitats

  **Cons:**
  - Indicator is very complex
  - Harmonised data not yet available

- **Indicator 6.4 Investment in forestry**
  Gross fixed capital formation in forestry

  **Pro:**
  - Gives information on the continuing investment in the forestry sector

  **Cons:**
  - Indicator is difficult to measure
  - Indicator might raise wrong expectations

- **Indicator 6.10 Recovery rate**
  Paper recovered for use as raw material as % of total consumption of paper and paper board

  **Pro:**
  - Knowledge of the recovery rate of paper is necessary to fully understand with respect to SFM information provided under indicator 6.7 (wood consumption) and 6.8 (trade in wood).

  **Cons:**
  - Recycling rate can not be influenced by SFM
  - Increase in the recovery rate might change the management